OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

3 EDWARD VII., 1903

VOL. LXI

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JULY TO THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF AUGUST, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1903

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, July 29, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 234) to amend the Bank Act. He said: The explanation is very brief. The object of the Bill is to limit the investing power of the banks by placing it, as regards foreign securities, largely in the hands of the shareholders.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

FALSE CREEK, VANCOUVER.

Mr. EARLE asked:

1. Has the government granted a lease to Robert Kelly and Frank Burnett of certain portions of False Creek, Vancouver, known as the 'Mud Flats,' as stated in letter of Robert Kelly and Frank Burnett to the mayor and aldermen of the city of Vancouver, dated May 13, 1903, a copy of which was brought down in answer to an address of the House of Commons, dated 4th and 5th of May, 1903; the terms of said lease being stated in that letter as for ninety-nine years at a rental of $100 per annum, to be increased to $500 per annum, notwithstanding the resolution of the municipal council of Vancouver, protesting against such lease?

2. If a lease has not been executed, is it the intention of the government to grant a lease; and if so, on what terms?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine):

1. No lease has been granted to Messrs. Robert Kelly and Frank Burnett.

2. Matter under consideration.

BINDER TWINE.

Mr. CLARKE asked:

How many pounds of binder twine have been imported into Canada from the United States in each fiscal year since 1897?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). The quantity in pounds of binder twine imported into Canada from the United States in each fiscal year since 1897 was as follows:—

Fiscal Year.	Pounds.
1897	3,394,475
1898	8,679,823
1899	10,629,211
1900	8,016,354
1901	9,674,268
1902	14,927,302
1903	14,198,690

Mr. CLARKE asked:

What was the average price per pound paid each year since 1893 by the government of Canada for manilla used in the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston Penitentiary?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I beg to reply:

1893	None purchased
1894	$4 38 per cwt.
1895	4 13 "
1896	4 46 "
1897	4 26 "
1898	3 71 "
1899	5 39 "
1900	None purchased.
1901	$7 54 per cwt.
1902	6 00 "
1903	8 75 "

TRANS-CANADA RAILWAY AND G. T. PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the government what truth there is in the report which I find in the 'News' of Toronto, of July 28.

TRANS-CANADA IS TO SELL OUT.

Quebec Promoters to hand charter to the Grand Trunk.

To Safeguard Quebec.

Sir Wilfrid Reported to be looking after the Interests of his Constituents.

Quebec, July 28.—Alderman George Tanguay, M.P.P., chairman of the Trans-Canada Railway Company, left for Ottawa this afternoon in response to a telegraphic message received from the Capital.

It transpires that the Trans-Canada Railway Company, realizing that their Pacific scheme is non est on account of the Dominion government adopting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, has offered to sell their charter to the latter railway company.

They state that their only desire was to see a railway built from Quebec to Lake Winnipeg, through the northern section of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and if this is only accomplished by the scheme promoted by the Grand Trunk Railway and backed by the government, they will be absolutely content.

It is also learned from reliable authority that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is looking after the interests of the Trans-Canada directors, and is de-

termined to see that their charter is purchased, so as to recoup them for all the money which they expended in surveys, &c., in connection with the scheme which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway has made impossible.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the particular point on which the hon. gentleman desires information ?

Mr. MONK. I desire to know whether the government is making or has made any arrangement for the transfer to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway of the charter of the Trans-Canada, and the terms of such arrangement ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The government has not made and is not making any arrangement for the transfer of the charter of the Trans-Canada to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

SUPPLY—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—RAILWAY FACILITIES IN TWO MOUNTAINS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Two Mountains). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to draw the attention of the House and of the government to a question of the greatest importance which interests the county of Two Mountains and the neighbouring district. Every one admits that that part of the province of Quebec which borders on the Ottawa river from St. Andrews, in the county of Argenteuil, to Cartierville, in the county of Jacques Cartier, and which comprises such beautiful and thrifty parishes as St. Placide, St. Benoit, St. Eustache, St. Joseph du Lac and St. Dorothée, is favoured with the most fertile soil and an exceedingly well-to-do and reliable community of farmers and business men.

Before the long and important work of this session is over, I think it is incumbent on me to recall to this House some of its actions in past years, as regards the county I represent, and to request from the government some help and efficient protection on behalf of the farmers of the county of Two Mountains and vicinity in the same way as railway charters are granted throughout the country and especially in the county of Two Mountains. Unfortunately some ill-advised or unscrupulous opponents, certain papers opposed to the government and to the member for that county have thought fit, a few days ago, to publicly announce that I was not in sympathy with the plan of building a railway through the counties of Argenteuil, Two Mountains, Laval and Jacques Cartier. I need not name those papers, as everybody knows 'Le Journal' and 'La Patrie.'

I protest, Mr. Speaker, against the false statements and misleading comments contained in the article of 'Le Journal,' dated July 25, 1903, under the title : 'The Monk Bill' : and in 'La Patrie,' of July 24, 1903, under the title 'A Railway.' Notwithstanding what those papers say and print, I have always been, and am still in favour of building a railway along the location I have just mentioned.

But prior to the interests of individuals, prior to the interests of shameless stock gamblers and speculators, who unfortunately heretofore have made themselves conspicuous in the history of railroad building in Canada by the scandals and thefts which we know, there stands the public interest which the Railway Committee and the House are in duty bound to protect.

In perusing our federal and provincial statute-books, I have come across charters and subsidies granted to various companies : the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company, the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, the Great Eastern, the Montreal and Sorel, the Montreal Bridge Company ; and in all of these, I find as promoter, director, president or largest shareholder, a man known, unfortunately, throughout the country : C. N. Armstrong. And considering the use which has been made of these charters and subsidies obtained under that man's patronage, I can only congratulate the House and the government on having rejected all further application made by him.

The facts connected with the building of the railway from St. Andrew's to Lachute, in the counties of Argenteuil and Two Mountains, are too recent, Mr. Speaker, to have been forgotten. It is known that Mr. Armstrong received $52,000 for the building of that road, seven miles long, and that, to the detriment of the public, he appropriated these $52,000, in order to pocket them, by abandoning a railway which had been in operation only a very short time, thus causing much trouble and great losses to that district. It is a matter of surprise, and the public may well wonder, that individuals of that stamp should succeed in securing the assistance of men of worth. Fortunately these speculators are known ; the Railway Committee and the House of Commons are acquainted with their achievements. Both the committee and the House have realized that as long as Mr. Armstrong was connected with a public undertaking of any kind, the matter could not be considered seriously ; and that was my ground for taking the stand I took recently.

I wish to state that I am most anxious that a railway be built between Grenville and Montreal. A section has already been built under a charter granted to the Grenville and Carillon Railway Company. I shall favour the application of any bona fide company having the means requisite for the carrying through of such an undertaking. But I am against the idea of leaving it to a man like Mr. C. N. Armstrong to carry

out. I deemed it part of my duty, as representative of the county of Two Mountains, to resist the proposal to put that prosperous district in the hands of such a man; and so deep is my belief, that I would not hesitate in case of need to take once more the same stand.

In conclusion, I beg of the government to revote the subsidies already granted and lapsed. They are as follows:—

First, 49 Vic., cap. 10, p. 74, which reads: 'For a railway from St. Eustache to St. Placide, county of Two Mountains, 18 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding altogether $57,600.'

Secondly, 51-52 Vic., cap. 27, p. 98, as herewith: 'To the Carillon and Grenville Railway Company, for 12 miles of railway from St. Eustache to Sault au Recollet, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile, and not exceeding altogether $38,400.'

Thirdly, 55-56 Vic., cap 5, p. 47, as herewith: 'For a railway from St. Placide to St. Andrew's, 8 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $3,200 per mile and not exceeding altogether $25,600.'

The first grant, that for $57,600, was voted in 1886, and revoted in 1892. By reviving that subsidy as well as the two others I have mentioned, the government would only be doing justice to the farmers of the counties of Argenteuil, Two Mountains and Laval, and would facilitate the building of the railway asked for by that part of the country. As I have already stated in this House and before the Railway Committee, the carrying through of this undertaking has become a necessity, in view of the remarkable progress and development which have taken place in these localities of recent years. I am confident that by so doing, that is by reviving these grants on behalf of any company having a charter and sufficient means or of any other company which might be formed and would offer the same security to the public, there would not be wanting reliable men, such as those with whom we are negotiating, who would be in a position to carry out the undertaking, and thereby, satisfy the just and legitimate ambition of the people of the county of Two Mountains.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of vindicating the papers which my hon. friend has criticised so harshly. I read the articles which appeared in 'La Patrie' and 'Le Journal.' They comment on the stand taken by my hon. friend regarding the Bill which I had the honour to submit to the consideration of this House. Likely, the criticism contained in these articles reflecting on the stand taken by the member for Two Mountains (a stand which cannot be defended on any ground), was very much to the point, and on that account, and also in view of the uneasiness and discontent prevailing in his constituency, my hon. friend has thought proper to make a further attempt to explain his point of view, but without success.

The hon. member states that he is favourable to the building of a line of railway similar to that outlined in the Bill which I submitted to the consideration of the House. He was in favour and he is still to-day in favour of that line.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER. (Translation.) I never said that I was in favour of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend. I stated before the Railway Committee,—and my hon. friend must remember,—that I would support the motion of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in order to enable the hon. member for Jacques Cartier to obtain the required information to answer the objections raised by Mr. Armstrong's name being mentioned in the Bill. That was on June 30th last. I stated before the committee that it was only fair that the promoter of the Bill should be allowed to get the information required by those who had put him in charge of it; and I requested that the consideration of the Bill be postponed for a week, reserving my right to resist later on the application of its promoters.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) The hon. member stated that he had asked for time to inquire into the merits of the promoters of this Bill.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) I did not ask for time to inquire; but I requested the committee to grant time to the hon. member, promoter of the Bill, to examine it and obtain information.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) At any rate my hon. friend reached the conclusion that the promoters of the Bill were shameless speculators. I am unable to thank my hon. friend. He considers me evidently as a shameless speculator. The same would apply to the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Leonard), who, surely, was interested solely as member for Laval, being anxious to have this railway go through his county. And the stigma would attach to the name even of the member sitting by his side; the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) who supported the Bill.

Now, does my hon. friend contend seriously that the list of shareholders certified by the secretary of the company contains the names of shameless speculators only? Does he consider that Mr. McMullen, an American, who holds much the larger part of the shares, is a brazen-faced speculator? Far from it, Mr. McMullen is a respectable citizen of the neighbouring republic, a man occupying a high position which surely puts him beyond the reach of my hon. friend. Mr. McMullen has had interviews with the government and with the right hon. the Prime Minister himelf, and I have reason to believe that he was very well received. If actually he was a man connected with all kinds of suspicious speculations, how is it

that not a word was said about it heretofore ?

The other gentlemen who are concerned in this plan which I submitted to the House are citizens of the United States, Messrs. Richardson, Stevens——

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is not allowed to discuss a measure which is not before the House.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I am not discussing the Bill ; but I am going over the reasons which induced the hon. member for Two Mountains to vote against the Bill of which I was the promoter before this House. The hon. member stated that he had voted against the Bill because those interested in it were shameless speculators.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I took it that the hon. member for Two Mountains was content with laying down the general principle, in stating that he was in favour of the building of a railway in that part of the country, provided the undertaking was in the hands of a bona fide company, and that he did not refer to the Bill which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is discussing. I must call the hon. member's attention to the fact that he has no right to discuss a Bill which has already been under discussion. I am confident that it will suffice for me to call his attention to the matter, and that he will readily comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) But after my hon. friend from Two Mountains has stated that he was not in favour of a company made up of shameless speculators, it seems I might well be allowed to vindicate the perfect respectability of the promoters of the scheme. It is not my intention to discuss the merits of the Bill which I had the honour to submit to the House ; but I wish to show that I was not acting for and in the name of shameless speculators, for these are the words which my hon. friend used just now.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) I must state the rule which forbids to re-open a former discussion. When a matter previously disposed of by the House is taken up once more, it seems clear to me that the rule is being disregarded. I state the rule, and I hope the hon. member will kindly conform to it.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I willingly comply with your request, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Two Montains, is it allowable, I say, to brand as shameless speculators men such as the hon. senator R. Thibaudeau, or Mr. Raphael, a reliable and thoroughly respectable business man of Montreal, and besides, an enthusiastic supporter of the Liberal party ? Mr. McLaren, manufacturer, is also one of the shareholders ; and I am exceedingly surprised, as, no doubt, will be all the citizens of Montreal, when they learn of it, to hear my hon. friend from Two Mountains call this business man a shameless speculator.

My hon. friend may complain of what he terms the unfairness of the papers which have taunted him for his stand in the matter, but he will have difficulty in explaining his conduct in connection with a Bill intended to benefit the county he represents ; especially when it is taken into account that the company which these gentlemen had formed undertook to begin the work within a year and to finish it within three. Moreover, that company promised to comply with the requirements of the House regarding the amount of work to be carried out in the short space of a year.

I have given the names of the shareholders. I have shown that they are well known gentlemen. They are the only holders of shares, and my hon. friend has the proof of that. Under the circumstances, I fail to understand how my hon. friend has reached the conclusion that Mr. Armstrong alone was at the bottom of this scheme.

For it is for that reason, among others, that he refused to give his approval to that measure so important for his county. Today my hon. friend chatters about a man who was not a party to the Bill. My hon. friend has not given any proof of it ; he has not been able, in any way, to detract in any way from the value of the authentic certificate signed by the company's secretary-treasurer.

Mr. ETHIER. (Translation.) The certificate referred to has, I understand, been contradicted by a sworn statement of the hon. senator Thibaudeau, contained in the report of the Railway Department.

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation.) As regards the matter of this certificate, I must say that I fail to see how it can be properly taken up at present in this House. That matter has previously been discussed before the committee.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I shall not discuss any longer, Mr. Speaker, the question of the certificate or its value in connection with the list of shareholders.

Now, my hon. friend appears to be very anxious that a line of railway be provided for his county. He states it is time that the government should grant subsidies for the building of a railway through his county ; it is time, he says, we should obtain from the Treasury a grant to build such a railway. How can he reconcile that proposition with his refusal to grant delay to a company which did not ask for any charter or grant from this House, but merely requested the power to extend its line already in existence, and which would have run through his county as well as through those of Argenteuil, Laval and Jacques Cartier ?

It will be a rather difficult matter for my hon. friend to explain his inconsistent action under the circumstances.

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

Department of Trade and Commerce—salaries including Mrs. S. S. Cox at $650, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $12,800.

Contingencies, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The committee will see that in salaries there is a slight reduction as compared with last year. The amount was $13,790, and it is now $12,800. The only increases are statutory increases of $50 each and one of $10 to a messenger. The reduction is chiefly due to the death of the late Mr. Nutting, who had attained the highest salary in his class. As to contingencies the amount is the same, but printing and stationery has been increased and sundries reduced.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada, $150,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the arrangement under which this service is being carried on ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is carried on by the Allans. The only difference between the former arrangement and the present one is that a different sum is paid according to the quality of vessel employed, ranging from £500 to £1,000 per round trip. The maximum is paid in the case of the fast vessels, the 'Bavarian' and the 'Tunisian' for the winter service. The summer service for these vessels is £750.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is the entire sum paid for carrying the mails, or do they render some other service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No other service. They carry freight in the ordinary fashion.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How is it that some vessels get $750 and some get £750 ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, £500 sterling is the lowest sum paid for the round trip.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). A vessel getting £500 carries as much mail as one getting £1,000 ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No doubt, but she would not carry it as fast, and is not as good a vessel. I should greatly prefer to have four vessels of the size and class of the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian' than those we have.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the speed of these two vessels ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Fourteen knots is the average speed of the 'Bavarian' and 'Tunisian.'

Mr. CLARKE. How long has this contract to run? Is it made annually ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE It is made annually at the close of the winter navigation. I think it runs until April, 1904.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) anything in his mind's eye with respect to securing faster vessels for this service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, we have ; but I am afraid that, owing to various circumstances, we cannot very profitably enter upon a discussion of the fast service if that is what my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) refers to. We received, as he is aware, a couple of tenders —but neither satisfactory to us—for a service of twenty-one knots and of sixteen knots. But they may serve—they are serving —as a basis of negotiotion in some quarters. I have some expectation that we will be able to come to terms. But the demands of steamship owners and our ideas were rather far apart.

Mr. CLARKE. Are negotiations going on now with any company ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, with two or three.

Mr. CLARKE. In the hope of securing a fast service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. To ascertain if we can obtain one on reasonable terms.

Mr. CLARKE. I thought the matter was practically dropped as there was nothing in the estimates——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE No, it is not dropped. We have a statutory vote, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. CLARKE. But there was a great divergence of opinion among the ministers themselves as to the utility of the service. That is the reason I asked if the right hon. gentleman has anything in view.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There are negotiations going on, but they are not in such shape that I can communicate anything.

Mr. CLARKE. So, we shall have to be content in the meantime with the fourteen and twelve-knot service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, that is the best we can have for six months.

Mr. KEMP. I understand that the larger portion of our mail to and from Great Britain goes and comes via New York. Is there any expense to this government for that service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The steamship company receives,

I believe, a proportionate sum from us and a proportionate sum from the British government, according to the amount of mail matter they carry. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) is aware that there is a vessel out of New York nearly every day, so, of necessity, the greater portion of our mail goes that way. We could not possibly confine the mail to a weekly service.

Mr. KEMP. Then, the larger portion goes by New York ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Decidedly the larger portion.

Mr. KEMP. And I understand the government pay these vessels no subsidy.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No regular subsidy, but the post office has to pay them a certain sum. I rather think it is paid through the British government. The New York steamers do not carry the mails for nothing, but they do not charge a heavy rate.

Mr. KEMP. Where do we find the figures showing these payments ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The payments are made by the post office. It is entirely outside of my department.

Mr. KEMP. It is not a very large sum ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I believe not. Of course, the Postmaster General can give my hon. friend full information as to the amount paid.

Mr. KEMP. We seem to be paying a very large sum for carrying the Canadian mails to Great Britain and bringing mails from Great Britain by these twelve and fourteen-knot vessels, while, as a matter of fact, for very little expense the greater portion of our mails is carried by way of New York. What is the object, in view of the fact that we get so much quicker service by New York, of paying these large sums to old-fashioned and out-of-date vessels ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As a matter of course, the hon. gentleman knows that faster vessels will be very much more expensive. We could have the faster vessels if we paid for them, but, up to the present time the sums demanded, as I have stated, have been very heavy, perhaps more than the House would care to pay. With respect to the use of this service, I may point out that the utility to Canada is very considerable in the winter season. These vessels go from St. John and from Halifax, and if the subsidy was discontinued there would be no service from Halifax to England. That service has been going on for a good many years, and I think the House would be loath to deprive the maritime provinces of the service of these vessels. This is an old service which, as the hon. gentleman knows, was established before confederation. In those days it went from Portland and from Montreal ; now it goes from Montreal and Quebec, and from St. John and Halifax. Without this, we could hardly maintain a service from the maritime province ports.

Mr. KEMP. I understand that this service is maintained chiefly for the maritime provinces. This service may have been going on since confederation, but I quite recognize that we have not kept it up to date, and it is a question whether the service is worth that much now. These vessels have fallen so far behind that they are slow as compared with the regular mail vessels that ply between this continent and Europe. In view of that fact it seems to me, unless these people can give a quicker and better service, the existing contract should be reconsidered.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). A copy was brought down last session of the agreement with the Donaldson firm, by which they carry the mail for $750, the round trip between St. John and Glasgow. I was wondering whether the thousand pounds that is paid here is not partly a subsidy to these vessels in order to secure their running.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is paid as a subsidy to Montreal, but not in the case of the other ports, to St. John and Halifax. The £1,000 is only paid during the winter, and is only paid to two vessels. The other subsidy of $750 is paid for a fortnightly service, and they only go during the winter season.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It is paid for each trip, though.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is paid for each round trip. But these vessels are very much smaller than the Allan steamships.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Still, I presume they carry all the mail that is offered. I would like to ask if, in this contract where a subsidy is given, it is stipulated that the vessels should be ventilated ? These vessels all carry perishable cargoes, and it is necessary for the safety of the cargoes that the compartments in which they are carried should be ventilated.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In a good many of them that is done. I think there are some thirty or forty steamers now sailing which do that, but they do that mostly under agreement with the Department of Agriculture, and not under the contracts they have with this department. There is one exception, the Furness Line, in which that stipulation is enforced ; but with the majority of them it is done through the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I ask the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce what is the average duration of the trips made

by the steamers which are carrying the mail between Quebec and Liverpool ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I can speak better as to the trip between Moville and Rimouski. I presented this to the House the other day. The average duration is a little over seven and a half days in summer, and a trifle over eight days in winter, from Moville to Rimouski, and from Rimouski to Moville in the summer season, and from Halifax to Moville and Moville to Halifax during the winter.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. What was the duration of the fastest trips that have been made during this season ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The fastest trip that was made, I think, was six days and sixteen hours, I think about ten hours less than seven days, from Moville to Rimouski.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How many fast trips, if I may call them so, have been made under seven days ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Answering my hon. friend from recollection, I think there were eight under seven days. But I may observe that the contract calls for an average. If they make a little better trip one time, that can count against the longer duration another time. The service latterly has been considerably better than it was a couple of years ago, that much I can say. I think there has been an improvement on the average of about twenty to twenty-four hours as compared with a year or two ago.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I remember right, the mail service is being entrusted to-day to several companies.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have tried several.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I ask if my hon. friend has the names of the boats under his hand ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Pretorian,' the 'Bavarian,' the 'Tunisian.' I think are the boats stipulated in the first instance. In the event of a disaster occurring to these they are allowed to substitute the 'Numidian,' the 'Corinthian' and the 'Sicilian' and 'Ionian,' of course, under consent.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. May I ask whether steamers of some other lines have also been employed during this season ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not during this season. Replying to another question of the hon. gentleman, I can give him the average time. From Moville to Halifax, it is seven days and twenty hours ; from Halifax to Moville, six days and twenty hours.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the distance between those points ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. From Moville to Halifax it is between 2,300 and 2,400 knots : between Moville and Rimouski it is perhaps 2,500. It depends upon whether they take the south route or go via Belle Isle. But I think the shortest distance would be about 2,500 miles.

Mr. KEMP. I do not see the advantage of paying subsidies for carrying our mails from Rimouski to Moville. Letters from the district of Montreal and from the west will go to New York just as quick as they go to Rimouski ; and they would go from the maritime provinces to some ports in the United States as quick as they would go to Rimouski. As long as these slow vessels are on, what is the use of paying subsidies ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Is that the fact ? Let us take things as they are. When the hon. gentleman speaks of slow boats, perhaps he will remember that the steamers which are being used now are a great deal better than those used in the past. The 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' rank among the best steamers on the Atlantic ocean.

Mr. CLARKE. That is as far as seaworthiness is concerned.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I quite grant that they are not as speedy as a great many of the steamers that are plying between the old country and American ports, but let us not forget that the St. Lawrence route is the shortest route between the east and the west by nearly 500 miles. Even if we have not steamers just as speedy as the fast liners that our American friends and the German empire possess we are still able to compete with them. I would like very much to have faster steamers, but I cannot forget that the St. Lawrence is navigated to-day by improved steamers.

Mr. CLARKE. If the St. Lawrence route is the shortest route, as it is, why do you not put fast steamers on that route to accelerate the carriage of mails and passengers ? The great bulk of the people who go to England, as the hon. gentleman knows, go by way of New York, for the reason that they have better steamers there.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I quite grant that during the winter months especially our Canadian route is not very much used, but if my hon. friend will look at the passenger lists of the steamers leaving the port of Montreal during the summer months he will find that there is not one available berth, not because our steamers are the fastest, but because our route has such magnificent scenery, which is a feature of the journey. I quite appreciate the efforts made by members of parliament who have given some attention to this question in

trying to get the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to give us faster steamers, and I deprecate the idea of suppressing the very small amount that is now in the estimates to encourage our navigation companies in their work. They have an uphill work for the reason that the insurance rates have been higher on the St. Lawrence than on the American route. Let us recognize frankly that we have not done for our waterways what we should have done. We have not improved, especially our great St. Lawrence route as we should have improved it. We have not lighted or deepened it as we should have done, and let us not commit the mistake of discouraging our navigation companies. When I was a minister I remember very well that some of the navigation companies would decline to put their best boats on the St. Lawrence route. It was our fault. I do not speak in a party spirit. We had not provided in past years the necessary accommodation for trade and navigation. The St. Lawrence was not as safe as it should have been made. The amount in the estimates is a moderate one. I am sure that the great majority of hon. members will be ready to vote a larger sum fos faster steamers. But, we have a fine service this year. The 'Tunisian,' the 'Bavarian,' the 'Canada' of the Dominion line, and the 'Ionian' are very fine liners indeed. They are not as fast as I would like them to be, but in the meantime I hope that instead of discouraging——

Mr. CLARKE. We are not discouraging this service.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I just speak my own mind and I do not make allusion to anybody—instead of contemplating the removal from the estimates of the very moderate sum of money that is there now we should try to get more money and a better service.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the right hon. minister tell us the average weight of the mail matter that is sent by these steamers ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, that is very considerable. Of course, the great bulk of newspapers, and mail matter of that description go by way of the Canadian route, while the letters are sent by way of New York.

Mr. CLARKE. Could the right hon. gentleman tell us the weight of the letters or of the mail matter generally ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid I could not do that very well. I will try and get the information if the hon. gentleman desires it.

M.r CLARKE. There must be some information in the department as to the weight of this mail matter ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That particular information is in the Post Office Department rather than in the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Mr. CLARKE. The right hon. minister is asking a vote for this service and I think it is not unreasonable for us to ask that we should have this information. It must be available.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have no doubt I could obtain from the Post Office Department a statement of the average weight.

Mr. CLARKE. If we had a statement showing the average weight of the mails carried on each of these trips, the average weight of mail matter sent by way of the Canadian route and by way of the New York route, we would be able to decide as to the appreciation which the Canadian people have of their own route.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I could give in a general way information as to the proportion. I am quite sure that at least six-sevenths of the letters that go from Canada go by way of New York. Most of the mercantile correspondence westward of Montreal goes by way of New York. The mail matter from the maritime provinces goes chiefly from Halifax to St. John, but the great weight of the mails, that is to say, the newspapers, &c., goes by way of our vessels. Very little of that goes by way of New York.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the right hon. gentleman any figures under his hand or in his department showing the weight of this mail matter ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have never looked upon it as a matter of so much per pound. I have no doubt as a matter of freight, if that is what the hon. gentleman wants to get at, that the price paid for the transmission of the number of tons of freight we send would be a very large one. But, that is not the reason for which this subsidy was originally given or has been continued. It was for the purpose of encouraging navigation from Canadian ports, and I may remind the hon. gentleman—perhaps he is not aware—that originally the subsidy given to the Allan Line was at least three times as great as it is at present. I think the subsidy, when it was first started, and that was from old Canada alone, was $408,000 a year. It was afterwards reduced to $200,000 and then it has been subsequently reduced to what it is now—between $150,000 and $170,000. The real fact of the matter is that this subsidy is given substantially for the pnrpose of maintaining inter-communication. We could easily send our mails during the summer season from Montreal and Quebec, but in order to maintain communication from the Canadian winter ports, to which both sides of the House have attached a great deal of importance, we are obliged to subsidize vessels going from St. John and Halifax very heavily, or we would have no line from these points in any degree equal

to what we now have. One hon. gentleman has asked what is the average speed maintained by the steamers. The average speed of the 'Tunisian' was 13 7-10 knots, the 'Parisian' 13 3-10 knots , the 'Bavarian' 13 3-10 knots and the 'Ionian' 13-6 knots. I think the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked me a question in regard to the distances. The distance between Moville and Rimouski, via Cape Race, is 2,455 miles, and between Moville and Halifax, via Cape Race, 2,254 miles. My hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was inquiring how many of these trips had been made in less than seven days. There were eight trips made under seven days. The majority of them were above seven.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. We have fast steamers leaving almost daily from New York and other American ports, and for a good many years to come we will be obliged to use the American route on that account, but all the same it is most desirable that we should build up our Canadian route as fast as we can.

Mr. COCHRANE. No one is disputing that fact.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I know, but there may be some hon. gentlemen who are not as kindly disposed towards the St. Lawrence route as I am.

Mr. MACLEAN. I believe that the line of the fast service between America and Europe is from a Canadian port to a British port, and that if we had the courage to establish a fast passenger express across the Atlantic we would get all the American traffic to come our way, and instead of paying tribute to them, the American people would be paying tribute to us. But it wants a government of courage who will settle the matter at once and for all. It may be a comparatively large expenditure at the outset, but it can be financed, and it will go a long way towards elevating Canada in the eyes of Europe. I have given some attention to the matter, and the idea now is that an express boat on the Atlantic is not a great big boat of 10,000 tons, but probably one of 5,000 tons, constructed for the express purpose of making the trip in the shortest possible time. We have the most contiguous ports to Britain, and we should make some effort to establish this fast service. We have been at it for years and years, and we are further away from it now than ever before. Probably the port of Sydney would be the nearest port, or there may be a port in Newfoundland from which the Atlantic could be crossed in two days by these new turbine steamers. The question must be taken up by the government in a courageous way if we are to have this fast express service. I believe the government should try to solve the question at the earliest possible moment on some such line as I have suggested.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The weight despatched by the Allan Line steamers from the 1st of April, 1902, to 1st of March, 1903, was : letters, and post cards, 7,330 pounds ; other matter, 60,795 pounds ; in all, 68,089 pounds. I have made inquiry at the post office with reference to the weight coming the other way, and I have been informed that it is not customary to weigh mails exchanged between countries of the postal union, except when it becomes necessary to obtain the weights for statistical purposes. No record has been kept of the weight of mails despatched to Canada from the United Kingdom, and unless the British office has done so for its own information it cannot be obtained.

Mr. CLARKE. Does that mean that the total mail matter carried for 12 months from Canada to Great Britain would be only 34 tons ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Thirty-five tons, to be correct.

Mr. CLARKE. Probably there would be half that much coming this yay.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Very likely.

Mr. CLARKE. And we are paying $150,000 a year for that privilege ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes. If the House likes to abolish the service, of course, it is in its power to do so, but that would probably be very inconvenient for our friends in the maritime provinces.

Mr. CLARKE. We have no desire to inconvenience our friends in the maritime provinces, but we are most anxious that this service shall be improved and accelerated.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, it is a question of cost.

Mr. CLARKE. By the way, there was a very elegant model of a bottle-necked steamer out in the lobby for some years ; what has become of it ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it was returned to Mr. Petersen along with his deposit.

Mr. CLARKE. And the interest.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did you test the ball-bearing apparatus on it before you returned it ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he has given any consideration to the question of freight rates on commodities between Canadian centres and British centres. The American government furnishes the rate of all classes of commodities over all lines to and

from the great American centres, and between American ports and European ports, and I am satisfied that if these were furnished to the people for Canada they would find a very great discrimination against Canada in the matter of long haul through-traffic rates, as compared with the rates in the United States. We in Canada have taxed ourselves liberally and cheerfully to build railroads from which our municipalities derive very little taxation, and I think it quite unfair that the rates from American points to the old land should be much less than the rates from Canadian points to imperial centres over those same Canadian roads. That handicaps our farmers, and I would like to ask the minister if he purposes giving the question consideration.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member has referred to me——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I meant the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that on a former occasion this question was brought to my attention and I have discussed it a little with the officers of my department, and I hope to obtain certain statistics in regard to it, but it will take some time to get that information.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have paid a good deal of attention to it and I may observe to my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) that as a rule the steamship companies complain that the service during the winter is utterly unprofitable, so unprofitable that if they did not make a little money during the summer, they would be compelled to abandon it. Of course, statements of that kind may be taken cum grano ; but, there is no doubt that during the winter season, very little money has been made on the service from Halifax and St. John, and that it is substantially true that what they carry they carry at a loss. The House will of course recognize that, from the geographical configuration of our country, the railroad haul to American ports is very considerably shorter than the railroad haul to points on our Atlantic coast ; and the old rule that ocean navigation is very much cheaper than railroad hauling prevails. Moreover, as my hon. friend very well knows, the American routes leading into New York have very great advantages, not merely in the equipment, which is a matter of expenditure, but in the grades. You can have grain carried at an extremely low rate from Buffalo to New York, because there are no grades of any magnitude to surmount. Under these circumstances, I do not know that we can hope to compete, with the superior advantages they possess, unless we subsidize.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What I want is to get the facts, and then I am satisfied that public attention will be drawn to the very points the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture have brought forward, that it is a question of hauling, and that if we had our railroads constructed with very low grades, they would be in a better position to compete.

An hon. MEMBER. And fitted with ball-bearings.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, and fitted with ball-bearing axles for freight cars. I am satisfied that is coming in the near future, and that the hauling capacity of locomotives will be doubled, or increased at least 50 per cent when the cars are equipped with the modern system of ball or roller bearings. I know that our rates are higher than the American rates ; but I want the facts to be brought out, and, having found out the reason, we will proceed to reduce our grades.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). I think it is time that our railways and our steamships were so equipped that whenever Canadians wish to take a trip to Europe, they can find as good accommodation at Canadian ports as they can at American ports. I notice in reading the papers that whenever any of the members of our government, or any of our public men go to Europe, they go by New York. They are generally interviewed there by newspaper men, and they tell everything that has happened in Canada. I do not say that they have a private car to go to New York ; they surely would not charge the country with that ; but the Intercolonial is always at their disposal. During the summer they can sail from Montreal. Perhaps the river is not properly equipped, and they might be in danger in going down the river. If it is not, the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have their attention called to the matter, so that our ministers' lives will not be jeopardized. Then, they can sail from Halifax, which is one of the best ports in America. Why do the ministers not set the example and sail from our own ports ? It is time that their attention was called to this matter.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman looks at the records, he will find that the Prime Minister set a good example, for he both went and came by the Canadian route.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I wish to take issue with the statement just made by my hon. friend the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. He has stated that we cannot, in his opinion, compete with the American railways running between Buffalo and New York. My hon. friend is mistaken, and the facts are there to prove that he is mistaken. The distance between Buffalo and New York by rail is 445 miles, not one more, not one less. The distance between Depot Harbour and the port of Montreal is, in round numbers, 370 miles ; the distance between Midland and Montreal is 365 miles. Now, the

rates from Duluth, Chicago, Milwaukee, Buffalo and Fort William, Port Arthur and Parry Sound, are the same. They were very low last year; at one time they went as low as one cent a bushel for wheat—not for a very long time; but for two or three weeks the rates between these points and the Atlantic ports was one cent a bushel. The average rate during the whole season was one and a half cents, the rate being the same by the Canadian route and by the American route. What was the railway rate between Buffalo and New York? It was on an average three and a quarter cents, or, let us say, three and a half cents. The rate was not higher on our Canadian routes. Mr. Booth, of the Canada Atlantic Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway, carried grain for three cents a bushel. There is no reason why we cannot compete even as we are located to-day with the American railroads. The reason why we have not been more successful in the past is not that the rates have been higher on the lakes from the grain distributing centres, but that the rates on the St. Lawrence route from Montreal to the English market have been higher; and why has it been so? Because as I have said repeatedly, and as I cannot say too often or too earnestly, we have not improved our St. Lawrence waterway as we should have done. We have not been quick enough in that respect. Fortunately things have been improving every day, and I have no hesitation in saying that the St. Lawrence to-day, between Quebec and Montreal is in good shape. During the last three or four years it has been widened, dredged, better lighted, and made a safe route. The St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal will, within a year or a year and a half, or two years at the outside, have a uniform depth of thirty feet at low water, that is to say, from the 15th of September to the close of navigation, and at other times from thirty-three to thirty-five feet of water; and it will have a width of four hundred and fifty feet in the straight parts and six hundred or seven hundred feet at the curves.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the same pilotage system continue in the future?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I quite grant that our pilotage system has been bad in the past. It is improving, however. I wish it were improved more quickly. I wish the Department of Marine and Fisheries, as I have frequently suggested, would take charge of the pilotage; the country would then become responsible. However, that is a matter of detail. Let us go on with the improvement and equipment of the St. Lawrence. Let us do it now. I fully agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, of whose wide experience we are always glad to avail ourselves, that our waterways are the only practicable and feasible means of competition with our American neighbours.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman give us the freight rates from Montreal to Liverpool?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I have not got them under my hand. For the last year or two there has not been as much difference between them and the rates from American ports as during the past. In the past there has been a difference of at least 50 per cent, and at times more; but all that is simply a question of detail.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any reduction in the insurance rate?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The Canadian Pacific Railway have arranged with Lloyds for a much lower rate. I think that the Allan Line also insure at lower rates. When the insurance companies have no longer the pretext that we have been neglectful, they will be obliged to come down.

Mr. CLARKE. The experience of the insurance companies has not been a very happy one.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Navigation companies have met with accidents in the Lower St. Lawrence as in other parts of the world, and the insurance companies have been very zealous in charging against the St. Lawrence route wrecks that have taken place even elsewhere. However, let us equip that St. Lawrence route as fast as money and energy can do it. It is easy to have first class lighthouses and fog signals. Money and energy can secure all that. During the last year or two the Department of Marine and Fisheries has moved ahead pretty fast. There is now no danger between Quebec and Montreal of a complete wreck, even if a steamer should meet with an accident. As the St. Lawrence is becoming lighted up more and more between Quebec and Montreal, in a year or two that part of our navigation will be perfectly safe. I came up the river a few nights ago in very dark weather, and I found the system of lighthouses between Sorel and Montreal so perfect that the biggest ship can navigate at night without any fear at all. The St. Lawrence is lighted up just as Sparks street is; and if we go on in improving our Canadian waterways, we can secure the trade.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are not the freight rates across the Atlantic from a Canadian port more expensive than from an American port?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Why should they be? They have been in the past, but why should they be in the future? From New York to Liverpool the distance is 3,000, and from Montreal to Liverpool it is 2,600. If we make our system safe, why should the rates be higher?

Mr. COCHRANE. Is it not a fact that to-day the freight rates are higher from Halifax and St. John, or even Quebec, than from an American port?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am talking especially from the standpoint of the port of Montreal. The rates are about the same from the port of Quebec. At times they are a little higher, for the excellent reason that the port of Quebec has not been able to supply the same kind of freight that Montreal does, but as a rule the rates are the same. As regards Halifax and St. John, I cannot say, but I believe that I am right in stating that the Canadian Pacific Railway, now that it has acquired a fleet of its own, will be able to make through rates just as cheap as any American company. If we stand by our Canadian route, we will accomplish our object. The nations of the world, which have become great, were not discouraged at the first attempts. I have been reading lately a good deal of the history of the German empire, which to-day is second as a maritime power. How was that accomplished? Because it has not been afraid to spend money on its own waterways and in subsidizing its own navigation companies. Its trade now covers the world. There is no reason why, when we certainly have the choicest route, we would not be able to make it the best. Let us not forget that the St. Lawrence route, for perishable products, such as butter and cheese, is far superior to the American routes, as it is cooler and fresher. If the hon. Minister of Agriculture will allow me to make a suggestion, I would suggest to him that his officers, who have given a great deal of attention to the agricultural trade, could do more in Montreal. On the wharfs themselves there should be refrigerators to receive the butter and cheese from the cars. We know very well that to carry butter and cheese only a half a mile under a hot sun will damage these products very much. Therefore, I believe that it would be of the greatest advantage to the country to have on the wharfs at Montreal and elsewhere the accommodations which are found in all equipped ports of the world. It always surprises me to hear some of our friends complaining that we are spending money on our harbours. Why, we have scarcely begun to spend money. What is it to spend five or ten millions on a great national harbour, when other nations are spending thirty millions, fifty millions—any amount that may be necessary to make their harbours commodious, speedy and capable of handling goods to advantage? I apologize to the committee for having spoken so long.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In answer to the hon. member who asked the question, I may say that the current rate from our ports to Liverpool is 5½c. per 100 pounds on wheat and other kinds of grain.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. That is during this season?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At present. That is probably the lowest rate ever attained, and I am advised that it compares favourably with the rate by New York.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has the right hon. gentleman the freight rate from Chicago and other points on cheese and butter?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot give the rate on cheese and butter. It varies a good deal. From such a point as Midland to Liverpool, the rate is 12½c. That would give 5½c. to the steamship and 7¼c. to the railway.

Mr. KEMP. I would not take second place to my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), in my enthusiasm about the St. Lawrence route. I did not design to bring about the discussion that has arisen as to the St. Lawrence route as a route for freight traffic. I spoke of the carriage of mails and the subsidy we are giving for the carrying of mails. I agree with a great deal of what has been said by my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and I should say further that this year, up to the present time, more freight has gone by the St. Lawrence route than in any other similar period in the past. This of itself must prove that the freight rates by that route must be favourable, at least so far as grain is concerned. As to butter and cheese, that is another question. The St. Lawrence route is the popular route for dairy products. Our Canadian shippers do not avail themselves of the facilities by American ports for these products. One reason is that ours is cooler and the facilities are better. As to the insurance rates, it is to be borne in mind that when the Canadian Pacific Railway bought out the Elder-Dempster Company, the insurance rates on the vessels bought were reduced. That will afford us some encouragement on this subject. We have a right to regard the St. Lawrence route more hopefully than at any time in the past. I believe that the grain of this great northern part of the continent will go by this route in increasing proportions year by year. What I wished to draw attention to is this: The Minister of Trade and Commerce has told us that the quantity of mail that went by the Canadian steamers, for which we pay $150,000, was 68,000 pounds, or about 35 tons.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is one way only.

Mr. KEMP. Would there be as much coming this way?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not quite.

Mr. KEMP. I quite admit that the Tunisian is a very fine vessel, and we are thankful that we have so very fine a vessel. There are one or two others that are creditable. But these vessels are not fast enough for a mail service. In the discussion that has taken place, it has been clearly brought out

that that 35 tons of mail matter is carried from Canada and about the same quantity from Great Britain to Canada—say 70 tons of mail altogether. The subsidy we pay would be equal to about $2,150 a ton. The ordinary rate of freight from Great Britain to Canada per ton of 2,240 pounds is from $3 to $5, and from Canada to Great Britain it is a little more. I cannot think that the maritime province people are availing themselves of the facilities provided. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce says it is not so much the Rimouski route that we care about as providing these facilities for the maritime province people. Let us see what this means. An ordinary freight car carries 40 tons. It must be plain, when our total mail matter one way amounts to only 35 tons, that the maritime province people are sending their mail by way of New York.

Mr. CLARKE. That 35 tons includes packages.

Mr. KEMP. Yes, this includes mail matter of all kinds. I think it is clearly demonstrated that the people in no part of the country are availing themselves of these facilities. I think the time has come when the government should look at this matter seriously and see where we are at. Are we to have a fast Atlantic line? Is it a thing we can afford? What is our policy to be? Certainly, we should not go on paying $2,150 a ton for mail matter between Canada and Great Britain. The thing, to my mind, is unreasonable.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). What the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), says may be quite right. But he was for a number of years Minister of Public Works, and I think he had an excellent opportunity to improve the St. Lawrence river so that large boats could go up and down it without danger. Before the hon. gentleman became Minister of Public Works I went down the river twice and returned twice. It was safe enough for me; and I think if it is good enough for me, it is good enough for the hon. member for St. Mary's or any member of this government. We are all anxious to see the port of Montreal well equipped and made a free port if possible. But we want to see the people of Montreal take an interest in their own port. I had the pleasure of visiting Montreal a few weeks ago, and that was not my first visit. I lived there over forty-three years ago. And in my recent visit I found Montreal, with the exception of the harbour, very little improved so far as cleanliness is concerned. The farmers of Ontario will hesitate very much before they ship butter and cheese and other goods that will spoil through tainting by way of Montreal. If there were any members representing the city present I would try to lecture them on this point. There is plenty of water in the St. Lawrence river to keep the city clean, and if the people there expect the farmers of Ontario to ship their produce that way, they must keep their city clean. I will not say what further I saw in Montreal. But the next time I go, if it is not in better shape than it was two weeks ago last Saturday, I will tell you about it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). This discussion has brought out the fact that this subsidy of $150,000 is not given for the purpose of carrying the mail. It is given as a subsidy to secure these vessels going and coming by way of Montreal and St. John. If we get a well-established and satisfactory service, the money is well spent. As I have suggested already, these vessels should all have thorough ventilation. The minister has said that in one or two cases it has been stipulated in the contract that this ventilation should be provided. I would like the minister to say what lines are subsidized by this $150,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Allan Line only.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is it contracted with the Allan Line that the vessels should be thoroughly ventilated?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' have refrigerators. I have explained that this subsidy is not primarily granted for mail services; I have never contended, and I do not think any of my predecessors ever contended, that we were receiving good value in a mail point of view from this service. Practically speaking, we could get everything we wanted carried at very trifling cost during the summer season; but you cannot maintain a service from the Atlantic ports in winter unless you subsidize it. That is the exact position.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that we are paying the 'Tunisian' and the 'Bavarian' subsidies for cold storage. These two ships are not getting a subsidy at the present time for cold storage.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Have the government not paid anything for cold storage or for cool storage service on either of these vessels?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not for cool storage, and I do not think for cold storage either.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth.) Do the government not pay anything for cool storage on either of these vessels?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not say positively about cool storage, though I do not think either of these vessels are amongst those for which we are paying for cool storage. As to the cold storage, I am not positive.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The point is this: We are paying $150,000 subsidies to

the Allen Line, and as we get nothing out of it in the way of a mail service, we should get something out of it in the way of a freight service. I have heard the Minister of Agriculture complain in this House that he or the members of his staff did not feel that they were in a position to compel these steamship companies to provide the proper ventilation necessary for carrying perishable products. But here is an opportunity to secure that when these contracts are made. When something is paid for which no other service is rendered, the least the minister can do is to provide in that contract that these vessels should have their compartments properly ventilated in which perishable products are carried. In one of the contracts that is provided, so there can be no excuse why it should not be called for in the other contracts.

Mr. MONK. The reproach made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Robinson) to the city of Montreal, rankles in my bosom. I can say in the language of Shakespeare :

I am not prone to weeping as some folks commonly are, but I have that honourable grief lodged here which burns worse than tears drown.

I do not think the hon. gentleman is justifiable in his aspersions upon the city of Montreal. Montreal is not such a dirty city as he would have us suppose. The houses are clean, the port is not in an unclean state, and I am sure the people are clean. I am quite sure that the agricultural products which come from the province of the hon. gentleman pass through less clean places than the city of Montreal. We have had a very unfortunate period in our municipal administration. We lost a great deal of money in a way in which the money should not have been lost. Some members of this House who know something of our municipal history, know that that state of affairs which has existed in the past has now come to an end. We have a better administration, an improved administration, and a large sum of money is going to be spent next year in keeping the streets clean ; that is the principal point. So the hon. gentleman need not discourage people from sending freight through that very important port. I would like to add this at the same time, since my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) has raised the question. It is very important, when we give such large subsidies to steamship companies, that we should know what is the rate of freight for agricultural products, and how that rate compares with the rates of American shippers. The Americans are great rivals in the carrying trade, and it would be a proper thing for this government to treat primarily with the steamship companies in order to secure from them such a rate of freight as would enable us to compete with the American lines. That would not be difficult, and I do not think it has been done, or attempted by this government. Competition is becoming very close, and it seems to me that such a step as a conference with regard to the rate of freight in order if possible to secure one that is fair and just, should be a necessary precedent to the granting of a subsidy. I would apply the same remark to the question of insurance. It is no use for us to improve the St. Lawrence, to spend millions of money upon that route, unless, by a conference with the underwriters on the other side of the Atlantic, we can secure from them more favourable terms of insurance, as we spend more money to make the navigation of the St. Lawrence safer. Now, these men reside at a distance. As the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said, they charge up all losses to the St. Lawrence route. It seems to me it would be a fit and proper thing for the members of this government who travel frequently to the other side of the Atlantic, to meet these men and to find out upon what conditions they will improve their insurance rate, provided we carry out the improvements which from time to time have been suggested, and which possibly these gentlemen might suggest. I am sure that if this government made such arrangements with these underwriters, who to a large extent, naturally, ignore the improvements we are carrying out on the St. Lawrence route, we would before long have a diminution of these insurance rates. The rates upon freight, which most largely concerns the public, are far more than the rates upon the steamships themselves. These rates have not, so far as I am informed, been diminished, in spite of all the money we have spent upon this route. They remain stationary, and will remain stationary, until we bring these people on the other side to understand that every million of money that we spend upon that route tends to diminish the danger and protect the underwriters. Some years ago, I believe, it was contemplated to organize a marine insurance company upon this side of the Atlantic. I believe that would be a proper thing to do, and this government should assist such a company if it was formed. There is no doubt that if we created on this side of the Atlantic a company of underwriters amongst ourselves, who would be able to follow much more closely than European underwriters the improvements we are making in the St. Lawrence, a very salutary rivalry will be created between those who do an insurance business, to the advantage of our Canadian shippers.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the Minister of Customs what he did last summer, during his long stay in London, with regard to interviewing the underwriters to see if it is possible to get better rates from them on the steamers which sail on the St. Lawrence route ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Personally I did not have any such interview.

I think the Postmaster General could give information on that point.

Mr. KEMP. Did he have interviews with the underwriters on that subject ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. Postmaster General had.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have had many interviews with the underwriters, and the case is no doubt one that deserves all the attention the House can give to it because the rate of insurance is one of the great obstacles in the way of making the best use of the St. Lawrence route. They presented a statement to the effect that the number of disasters that had occurred in the St. Lawrence was so numerous that for several years their accounts showed a loss and not a gain. Of course, this was their statement, and I give it for what it was worth.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Of course, if my right hon. friend remembers the fact, these underwriters——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They charged us with a wreck that occurred on the Scotch coast in one case.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. And they took the last ten or twelve years without taking into account the improvements made within the last five years. I remember very well discussing it with them and showing them they were wrong, because they were simply charging against us all the accidents that had happened in the past. The St. Lawrence has been improved very much within the last four or five years, it is improving year after year and day after day. There is no ground for the extra charges that the Lloyds are exacting from us—and I cannot see for the life of me why they are allowed to do so. Of course, they are a very powerful company and I apprehend that our American friends, being a little bigger than we are, may have more influence with them in London than we have ourselves. But when we have done our duty, when we are on the right side, when all our improvements are completed, if they do not do the right thing—I may not have much to say in public affairs then, but I hope I would not hesitate to take the most energetic measures to see what we could do here to improve the conditions in regard to insurance.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it has not been reported to the House already that there was a reduction made in the rate on the Canadian Pacific Railway line of steamers ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Then, the good work has commenced.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, because we have ourselves done the good work of improvement. Things are not going badly, but it seems to me they should go better. I take every opportunity to impress upon the House the necessity of not delaying any longer the improvement of our waterways. It is obvious that they are the best means of trade that we have at our disposal. If that is so let us not lose time.

Mr. CLARKE. What has been the experience this season so far on the St. Lawrence route ? How many marine casualties have taken place ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There have been scarcely any accidents between Quebec and Montreal.

Mr. CLARKE. I am speaking of the river generally, not of that particular part of the river.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There have not been any accidents of any magnitude. Lately there has been the loss of the 'Monterey' of the Canadian Pacific Railway Line and it was off the island of St. Pierre Miquelon, not in our territory at all.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. In answer to the hon. gentleman for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) in regard to the insurance rates, I would say that I do not think the underwriters are charging at all an exorbitant rate from this country. You can get your cheese insured at 20 cents per $100 all the way from Toronto to the interior of England with ten days on the wharf at either end. Surely that is not an exorbitant rate. The rates have gone down during the last two years 50 per cent, and this reduction is largely due to the improvements made in the St. Lawrence route. In regard to the establishment of a company on this side, I may say that there are two or three companies which have exclusively Canadian shareholders. We have the Royal Marine Insurance Company, recently established at Montreal, the British American and the Western nearly all with exclusively Canadian shareholders. To-day the rates are down to twenty cents per $100 for the best steamers, such as those of the Allan Line, including ten days on the wharf on each side. Will any hon. member of this House undertake to say that that is the reason why the business is not going by way of the St. Lawrence route ? The Canadian Pacific Railway got a reduction of 25 per cent in the spring of 1903. Last season we had seven or eight wrecks in the St. Lawrence or in the gulf. The government instituted very searching inquiries as to the causes and in every case the accident was due to no want of improvement in the St. Lawrence route but to the inefficiency of the officers.

Mr. CLARKE. Of what officers ?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. In some cases of the captain, in some cases of the mate, and in other cases of the pilot, but I do not think there is a single case where the cause has

been brought home to any defect in the St. Lawrence channel. These facts have been brought home to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by Commander Spain who has had charge of several investigations and by Commander Salmon who also inquired into some of the cases and in every instance they brought home the fact that the accident was not due to any defect in the channel, but was due to inefficiency on the part of the officers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How do the rates of our own underwriters compare with the rates charged by Lloyds ? I suppose we have Canadian underwriters who take risks on the St. Lawrence route. Are they practically the same ?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. They are practically the same.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. How do these rates compare with the American rates ?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The American rates are about 20 per cent less than ours.

Mr. MONK. That is what I was referring to. My hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) is at the head of an insurance company himself, and my experience of insurers is that they have always found the rate of insurance extremely moderate and reasonable, while the larger class of the insured have always found these rates very exorbitant and high. I will not discuss the question of rates because I am not familiar enough with the question of insurance to do so, but the point is that our rates are very much higher than the American rates. That is the question which I want to bring to the notice of the committee.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. It must naturally always be so because there are several hundred miles of river forming a part of our route which is always more dangerous.

Mr. COCHRANE. I thought the hon. gentleman said there was no trouble in the river at all, but that these accidents were due to the carelessness of the officials.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Exactly.

Mr. MONK. That is the question and without suggesting for a moment the creation of a commission which is rather à la mode for this government, it seems to me that if we had a man specially qualified for the purpose of acting for the government, taking up that question and representing to the insurance companies the value of the improvements we are making to the St. Lawrence route every year, steps would probably be taken before long to bring the insurance rates down to such a figure as would enable us to contest successfully with American ships.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The subject under discussion has extended over a very wide range. In the first place, I hope there is no hon. member on either side of this House who would discountenance the $150,000 vote, because by the grant alone can we ensure communication. If we depend upon trade vessels they can come and go just as they please to suit their own convenience. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, (Hon. Mr. Tarte), to use his own expression is always fresh when speaking about the St. Lawrence route and the improvement at the port of Montreal. The port of Montreal has an advantage this year because of the abolition of the canal tolls, and that has increased its trade. I hope that later on not only Montreal, but other ports in this Dominion will become free ports, and that I believe will result in a large volume of trade coming to them. The question of the cleanliness of the streets of the city of Montreal is somewhat outside of this discussion and I shall not refer to it. There is one thing we must not forget, and that is that the port of Halifax is 250 miles nearer Great Britain than any other port in the Dominion.

Mr. KEMP. What about Sydney ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Yes, but you cannot use Sydney all the year round. I am a Sydney man because I was born on the Island of Cape Breton and everything connected with that island is dear to my heart. I would hold up both hands for Sydney if you could use it all the year round. The port of Halifax does not require to be deepened. It has every facility at the present time except that perhaps you would want more docks for steamship accommodation. The merchants of Halifax are sometimes sneered at because it is said they are not up to the times, but the fact is that there are seven or eight wharfs in Halifax to which the largest steamers can come and these wharfs were built by the merchants of Halifax with their own money and without any outside assistance. I was pleased to find that one gentleman from Ontario takes an interest in the port of Halifax. I wish to say a word in favour of the views of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). As every one knows I am an old man, but perhaps I am a little in advance of the government in my ideas as to what a fast line should be.

Mr. CLARKE. That's easy.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) If we have a fast line from Canada the passengers will go by that fast line when we can prove that we can shorten the ocean voyage two days to Great Britain as compared with New York. The United States is a large country and the passengers will come to the place from which you can make the shortest ocean trip. If a gentleman with his family wants to go to Europe he wishes to avoid seasickness as much as possible, and he will go to the port from which the quickest ocean voyage is made. I am not disappointed that we have not a fast line just now for the reason that I am disap-

pointed at the rate of speed which the government have stipulated for this fast line.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I may say that a lady who is anxious to get to Europe without seasickness should take the ship at Montreal for the reason that she gets used to the swing of the boat before she gets out to sea, and then she will not get seasick. Every Canadian who wishes to avoid seasickness should take the steamer at Montreal or Quebec and not go to Halifax.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) You cannot go to Montreal in the winter time.

Mr. KEMP. I wish to ask the hon. member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) if the hulls of British steamships are insured in Canadian companies ?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No. There are no Canadian insurance companies large enough to do that business. It is done entirely at Lloyds in England.

Mr. KEMP. That is what I thought, and of course the hull is usually worth more than the cargo. I wish to ask the Postmaster General what steps were taken when the members of the government visited London last summer in regard to the rate of insurance on British ships coming to the St. Lawrence ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I attended before a committee of Lloyds, and I stated that the opinion prevailed in Canada that Lloyds was discriminating unfairly against the St. Lawrence water route. These gentlemen pointed out some reasons that seemed to warrant their action, attributing however to the St. Lawrence route disasters that were not fairly attributable to it. In fact I think that they even attributed to the St. Lawrence route disasters to vessels sailing from a Canadian port though these disasters happen on the coast of England or Scotland. However, they stated that they were anxious to remove any discrimination, and on behalf of the government I invited them to send representatives to Canada to study our route and to point out what action on our part would remove these difficulties. I stated on behalf of the government that we would pay all the expenses of that examination in order that we may know definitely if possible what their objections were, so that we might take steps to remove these objections. They have promised to send a committee here, but I am not aware that they have done so yet.

Mr. CLARKE. Was anything said at that conference about the fast Atlantic line ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That was not the subject we were discussing at Lloyds.

Mr. CLARKE. I thought it was anticipated that there would be a good deal of difficulty in getting insurance for these ships.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That was not the subject of discussion.

Mr. KEMP. The Postmaster General can hold out no hope from any expression of opinion on the part of the underwriters that there will be a reduction in the insurance rates in the immediate future.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would not be warranted in speaking for them. They expressed the utmost friendliness towards Canadian trade and a desire to be fair. They explained however that Lloyds, as we all know, is not a corporation having a fixed rate of insurance, but that the rates are fixed by the opinion of the underwriters on each occasion. When a bottom is to be insured the broker goes to the room where the different underwriters have their desks and he presents a memorandum to the underwriters showing what amount of insurance is wanted on a certain ship, and he puts down the rate offered and all who are willing to underwrite at that rate do so. The broker, from the knowledge of the requirements of the individual underwriters, practically estimates what the rate will be and the figure is reached as the result of the prevailing opinion among the underwriters. The difficulty is of course to change the opinion of the underwriters. I found a very friendly feeling on the part of the committee towards Canada and a desire on their part to be satisfied that our route was not entitled to be black-listed as it has been. Perhaps some correspondence has taken place betweeen the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the time (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) and the underwriters. But the point I pressed upon them was, that they should themselves send representatives to learn for themselves that the reason for discrimination no longer existed or, if it did, then to have that reason made clear with a view to its removal.

Mr. KEMP. I would like now to inquire as to what the cost is of carrying the Canadian mails from here to New York, and transferring them across the Atlantic ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The rates are fixed by the International Postal Convention. I cannot say from memory what they are.

Mr. KENDALL. There is a phase of this question which I would like to accentuate. The insurance companies, I think, are not entirely to blame. The steamship companies are very largely to blame for many of the wrecks that occur. To show this, I may mention two incidents that came under my own observation. By accident I happened to be in the office of a large steamship company in London when I heard the captain of one of their vessels soundly censured by one of the directors for not having made better time on two of his recent trips. The captain pleaded that he had to run through a fog, and that if he had run faster, he would have been in danger of running into

icebergs. I heard that director tell the captain that if he was not prepared to make better time, the directors would find a man who would do so. On another occasion I sailed from Halifax to London. We had fog a large part of the way. I did not hear the conversation myself, but I learned in London that the captain of the steamship was told, as the other had been, that if he was not prepared to make good time, he would be dismissed. I returned on the same boat. When we reached the banks it was at night and we were in a fog. The captain was asked to slow down. He promised to do so, but he continued to run the boat at the same rate as before. At six o'clock in the morning the fog arose, and we saw an iceberg close on our bows. I am not going to make this statement on my own authority, but on the authority of a sea captain who is very well known in the maritime provinces. Referring to the accidents that occurred in the St. Lawrence last season, this captain—who has had a large experience in the gulf, and has never, I believe, had an accident—said that neither of these accidents would have happened if the captains had not been too anxious to shorten the time between the points. He further said that no matter what appliances might be placed in the dangerous parts of the gulf, in the shape of lighthouses and fog-whistles, unless the sea captains were ordered by the steamship owners not to hug the chief dangerous points too closely, no precautions we might take would prevent disasters in the gulf of the St. Lawrence.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. All of us who have travelled by the American and Canadian routes in the fall season know very well that there is as much fog on the banks by the American route as there is by the Canadian route. I have made several trips by both routes, and I can state that there is as much fog on the routes from Boston, New York and Philadelphia as there is on the route from Quebec. So that the fog cannot be fairly given by Lloyds as a reason for the high insurance rates. I am very much afraid that the genuine reason for Lloyds action is the large volume of trade between the American ports and England; they have too much influence for us. Now, we are passing through days of government ownership. Governments are becoming more and more inclined to assume heavy responsibilities. It seems to me that when the trade of the country and its good reputation are at stake, the government might take some little risk; and if Lloyds, who have been invited by my hon. friend to come and see our improvements, and who have not responded to our invitation, and may not respond—if they do not come to terms, the government might to a certain extent become our own insurers. It is a feasible thing. Lloyds must understand that we are somewhat of a nation now. When we talk of fifty millions, and one hundred millions, we show that we have courage; and if my hon. friend and former colleague would speak loudly enough on that insurance question, it seems to me that Lloyds would come down. The St. Lawrence has been improved, and we are continuing to improve it every day; and yet the more we improve it the less it seems Lloyds recognize the improvement. When the Canadian Pacific Railway Company became the owner of their line, the reason that was given, I think, for lowering the rates was that that company were sure to secure the services of the best officers. My hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) was right when he said that the accidents that were investigated last season were all found to be due either to incapacity or bad conduct on the part of the officers. I am very much afraid that some of the companies are trying to secure cheap men. You cannot have good men in these days of prosperity without paying for them.

Mr. BROCK. I think the object we all have in view would be very much advanced if we were a little more moderate in our desires for a fast service. The service which the government seem to have been striving for is a twenty-knot or twenty-two-knot service. I think we would be much more likely to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion of this matter if the government would be satisfied with an eighteen-knot service. This is a service which could be rendered by a good many lines which would be shut out if we insisted on the faster rate. It is said that passengers will go a long distance by land in order to take a short trip by ocean. That was the case many years ago when we had a poor class of vessels on the Atlantic. At the present time, with the comforts provided on first-class steamers, there is not such a desire to cross the Atlantic in a short time. And here the subject of insurance comes in. You can get one of our first-class steamers insured to-day from Liverpool to Montreal at a great deal lower rate than you can a steamer which is forced to cross the Atlantic at the rate of twenty-two knots an hour. When crossing from the other side, as soon as we are at all near the banks of Newfoundland or the shores of Canada we run the risk, at certain seasons, of being detained by fog during two or three days. A twenty-two knot steamer cannot go faster through a fog than an eighteen-knot steamer, and it costs a great deal more to keep her going. The expense of running a twenty-two knot steamer per day is enormous compared to that of running a sixteen or eighteen knot vessel. I quite agree with the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that in the attempt to run our steamers as cheaply as possible across the Atlantic, one of the means adopted is to get cheap men. To this no doubt is due some of the accidents. What should be rather aimed at is to get men who will bring our steamers safely across. The steamship

companies appear to value a man by the shortness of the time he takes to bring his vessel from port to port. This has a good deal to do with the losses that have occurred on approaching our shores and also in going up the St. Lawrence. But it seems to me we pay a very heavy price for the sake of saving an hour or two in speed. Having crossed the Atlantic some sixty or seventy times, I have a little of experience in the matter ; and I know that at present, when the passages are made so pleasant and comfortable, there is not the same desire as formerly on the part of the passengers to reach shore speedily. With all the comforts on board, electric lights in the cabins, exquisite music, luxurious drawing-rooms and smoking-rooms, first-class table, and everything as comfortable as possible, the passengers, as a rule, enjoy their trip too well to be in any great hurry to finish it. Some years ago, when we used to have to smoke alongside the smokestack on the hurricane deck and when our cabins were right over the screw, the case was different, and people were anxious to get across as speedily as possible. But to-day you cannot get people to risk crossing on a twenty-two knot steamer and pay the extra price, when they can cross on an eighteen knot steamer for several pounds less. I would urge on the government, in its negotiations for a fast Atlantic service, to keep safety in view rather than speed. The greater the safety the lower will be the insurance. If you insist on a twenty-two knot service, it will be impossible to get freight, because the rates will have to be so high to meet the extra insurance and expense of running these fast steamers. I do not believe that the country would care to pay a million dollars per year subsidy for a fast Atlantic service such as is talked about. Many of those who advocate such a service would be the very last to commit the country to the expenditure of a million dollars a year for it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In what particular does the contract with the Allans of this year differ from that of the 15th of March, 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is the same contract.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I do not find in it any reference whatever to the ventilation of the steamers.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is not.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I wish to draw attention to this very important matter. If the whole $150,000 a year were paid for that purpose alone, it would not be money thrown away by any means. We have had up to the last year or two our vessels carrying perishable articles to the old country in a very bad shape indeed. The loss has been millions annually on the various perishable products, especially apples. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has told us at times that he does not find himself in a position to dictate to the vessel-owners or to go on board these vessels and see if the fans, which the government pay for, are being used. But when the government give a large subsidy it should put a condition in the contract that these vessels be ventilated. Some of them are ventilated at a trifling cost to the government or free of cost to the government ; but we cannot tell if the ventilation is proper unless an officer of the government has the right to go on board and make the tests in order to see whether the fans are being used or not. That cannot be done now unless by the courtesy of the steamer-owners, but it could be easily provided that we should have the right to do it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman is well worth considering, and I shall take a note of it.

Mr. SPROULE. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock), as our silence might be interpreted as an assent to his observations, I wish to say that I do not agree with him. We are living in a very fast age. As Fanny Fern says, we are all somewhat of the squirrel order, on the rush from morning to night. It is not the custom of travellers to-day to take very kindly to a slow road, whether it be a steamboat line or any other mode of conveyance. The faster we go, the better we like it. It would not be worth while for the government to provide a subsidy for a fast steamship line if it could not do better than eighteen knots an hour. I do not think we should give a subsidy to a line that would make no greater speed. If we have a fast line at all, it ought to be equal to the very best, or we will not get the travelling public.

Mr. LOGAN. I can heartily endorse what the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said. To subsidize a sixteen knot service would be simply throwing away the money of Canada. Let us either have a fast service or not subsidize a service at all. We have to compete with the New York route. In my opinion, we ought to secure a fast service across the Atlantic with the least possible delay. There seem to be many difficulties in the way of our doing so, and I do not know that the government is at all to blame ; but if we are going to have a fast passenger service, let it be one of twenty-one or twenty-two knots an hour. We should endeavour to divert British travel into Canada through Canadian ports. At present if you will ask travelling Englishmen how they came to this country, nineteen out of twenty will tell you that they came via New York or Boston. But in coming by New York, travellers get a wrong impression of Canada. When a man has visited St. Peter's in Rome

he has no great desire to visit other small cathedrals in Europe. The same principle applies when a man comes from Europe to New York, and then comes from that great metropolis to a Canadian city, his impression of Canada is not as good as would have been formed if he had come across the ocean direct to Quebec, Montreal, Halifax or St. John. Therefore, it seems to me that money spent for a service of sixteen knots, as mentioned by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), is money absolutely thrown away. Let us have a fast service, or let us not give Canadian money to secure any kind of a service.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I wish to say one word in reply to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock). That hon. gentleman has overlooked the fact that railway travel is far more comfortable now than it used to be. On a train you can get as good a bed, I was going to say, as in most of our hotels, and quite as good a table. People are much more ready to travel by railway now than they were twenty years ago. I had the experience myself of travelling from Portland to Ottawa in 1867, and it was a very tedious, trying journey. There were no beds of any kind, and no comfort at all. But it is far different now. If you take the Intercolonial from Halifax to Montreal you will get as good table accommodation as in any hotel in Canada, and everything else in keeping.

Mr. HEYD. It is quite evident that there is a difference of opinion as to the necessity of a fast line service. So far as I am concerned, I am very glad that the government have failed, up to the present time, to make a satisfactory arrangement. I am satisfied that an expenditure of a million or a million and a half per annum to encourage a fast line service would be lost money, so far as the people are concerned. It is a matter of absolute indifference to ninety-nine men out of a hundred whether we have a fast line service or not. Whether we add to the comfort of the few people who may avail themselves of the opportunity to travel by such a line at the expense of the great mass of the people is a matter of no moment. If we have a million or a million and a half of dollars to spend for the encouragement of anything in this way, let us spend it in making the transport of our freight to the old country cheaper and more secure, and so develop that trade in which the great mass of the people are interested. Whether we shall ever be able to induce people, as some think we can, to come from New York and take the fast steamer at Montreal, is also a matter of indifference to the great mass of the people. What we want in Canada is to be able to place in the markets of Europe the products of our Canadian farms in the best possible condition and at the least possible expense.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that the most important feature in connection with the whole matter is the question of the freight rates. As I understand it from the figures given by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), the cost of carrying freight from lake points to Montreal or other Canadian ports is as low as from the lake ports to the American seaboard, but the cost of transport to Europe is greater by way of the Canadian route than by way of the American route, notwithstanding the fact that we have an advantage, and a very considerable advantage, in distance. It seems to me it is the duty of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to apply himself to ascertain what is the cause of that great difference in the freight rates to Europe as between our Canadian ports and the American ports. If it lies in the fact that the insurance rates are higher, surely some arrangement could be made to obviate that difficulty and lessen the insurance rate. These insurance rates, it seems, have not lessened, or their lessening has not kept pace with the improvements on the St. Lawrence route or the improvements from St. John and Halifax. It is a matter of very great importance to us in the maritime provinces that the products of the great west, so rapidly increasing in quantity, should be carried through a Canadian port. I think we all feel, those from the west as well as those from the east, that if we are going to be a nation, we must carry our own foreign trade through our own ports. Therefore, it seems to me most important that this matter should be looked into and some way found of at least equalizing the freight rates. In fact, the rates should be cheaper by the Canadian than by the American route. It has been complained that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has not very much to do, that the department is a useless department. I understood—I was not in the House, but learned of the matter from my reading—that the present incumbent in this office spent many hours in this House denouncing the Department of Trade and Commerce as a useless appendage to the government. I suppose the reason the right hon. gentleman has not bestirred himself in the matter now before us is that he wishes to justify the statement he made when in opposition. He declared that the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce was useless, and he proposes to justify it by not performing any duty while he himself remains the incumbent of that office. It does seem to me that this is a matter of very great importance and one that has been too long neglected. I trust the right hon. minister will bestir himself and take steps to find out where the difficulty lies, and, having found out, will take steps to remove that difficulty.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am inclined to think that at

the present moment the rate from Montreal is quite as cheap as it can possibly be expected to be. A rate on grain of 5¼c. per 100 pounds is just as cheap as we are likely to get for a considerable time to come.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know the facts myself, but it has been stated here as a fact that the rate from Montreal and Quebec is higher than the rate from New York, Boston or Portland.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not at present.

Mr. FOWLER. Then, what becomes of the statement that it is cheaper to ship by the American route, which statement has been made here to-day, and, so far as I have heard, not contradicted?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not cheaper during the summer season. Our reduction in tolls has thrown a very large volume of traffic on the port of Montreal.

Mr. FOWLER. Yes, but during the winter season that rate does not obtain, and a great deal of freight is shipped during the winter season from the Atlantic ports.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. During the winter season it is not possible.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is it not true that in the contracts with some of the lines it is provided that the rate of freight from interior points in Canada to the sea-board and Great Britain shall not be greater than the rate of freight from the same point in Canada via New York?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In some of them it is.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). But, as I understand it, there is no such provision in the contract with the Allans.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Could the hon. minister tell us why.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have already stated that the Allans represent, and I think quite truthfully, that the winter freights are carried at a dead loss from St. John and Halifax.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). But is it not provided in some of the contracts that the rate from Montreal shall not be in excess of the rate via the American ports?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The contracts with several of the lines from St. John do contain that provision, but not the Allan contract; and I do not think we could obtain more favourable terms if we were to ask for them. You can abolish this if you like. In my opinion, it is not of the slightest value in the summer season. It is kept on the statute-book because it is a great convenience to the ports of St. John and Halifax.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). That clause in the contract is of very great importance. I have known cases in which, on account of that clause, a steamer sailing from a Canadian port reduced its freight rate because its rate was shown to be higher than that from an American port. As they were obliged to carry at the same rate, they had to make a reduction, and this was a matter of great importance to the shipper.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am speaking of this particular contract we now have under consideration, and I tell the hon. gentleman that all the parties concerned in it have represented to the department, and I believe truly, that their freights during winter were carried at a dead loss.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How is it that some contractors agree to these terms, while the Allans do not?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Because they make a profit on the summer season, I presume, that about equals the loss that they sustain in winter.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The Allans also run their boats in the summer season. Do they not make a profit on their summer business?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I say there is no such stipulation in their contract, and I do not think it could be put in to any advantage.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would not be feasible to have it inserted, I suppose the right hon. gentleman means?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I doubt very much whether we could obtain it unless we were prepared to pay a larger subsidy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, it would be some advantage if we could obtain it without any increase in the subsidy?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As it is contained in some contracts, I suppose that possibly, without a great deal of difficulty, it might be included in this. The service is of some importance no doubt to the ports of Halifax and St. John. But the difficulty about mails and passengers is just this, and I can show it by an illustration. A friend of mine two or three years ago was one of two gentlemen who were in Great Britain. Coming home, one of them left by a steamer direct to Halifax, and the other left the following day by a steamer for New York. The latter arrived in New York, and came thence by rail to Halifax, a day in advance of the gentleman who sailed direct to Halifax. That, of course, is owing

to the fact that to New York they have faster lines than the line to Halifax. I think the service is not very much better now than it was forty years ago.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Considerably better.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have seen some comparison made in the papers as to the rate of speed which prevailed forty years ago. I have not verified the record myself, but the gentleman who was making this contribution to the press proved to his own satisfaction, at least, by the records, which he alleged to be correct, that we were not very much in advance of what we were forty years ago. It has been suggested that an 18-knot service would be a sufficient service from Halifax to the mother country. A gentleman of great experience in these matters pointed out to me once that if we gave a large subsidy for an 18-knot service between Canada and the mother country, we would be practically giving that subsidy for a service between New York and the mother country. The way in which he argued it was this: He said, suppose you give $500,000 or $750,000, and the mother country gives half as much, for an 18-knot service or a 19-knot service, the result would be that the second-class boats now running between New York and London would be put on the route between Canada and the mother country, and the money paid as a subsidy would be used for the purpose of putting on first-class boats between New York and the mother country. There may be some force in that. I do not think that any hon. gentleman in this House, at all events on this side, desires to see this service abolished; but they would very much like to see it improved, they would very much like to see that fast line service that has been in contemplation for the last ten years, a service about which I think there was no division of opinion in the House of Commons in the spring of 1896, when the resolution passed. I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether, in the arrangement which was made by this government with Petersen, Tate & Company, the carriage of the mails was provided for, or was there to be an additional subsidy for carrying the mails?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was provided for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So assuming that could be done for $500,000 a year, it really only amounted to an increase of $350,000. Now, I was in hopes that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce brought this item before the House to-day, he would have been able to give us some more definite information as to the progress of negotiations concerning this fast Atlantic service, which we think is of a good deal of importance to the country. The negotiations, as the right hon. gentleman knows, have been going on for a long time. I may illustrate that fact to him in this way, that since they first begun, eight members have disappeared from this government and have been replaced. I think only six of the gentlemen who were in this government at the time we were assured that the service had been secured for this country, still remain in the government. So this service might very well sing the song of the brook, slightly paraphrased: 'Ministers may come and ministers may go, but our negotiations go on for ever.' Now we have had a good deal of negotiation with Petersen, Tate & Company, which have occupied wearisome time; then there was a sort of interregnum, and now we have negotiations on again by public tender and advertisements for a service, called, I think, by some of the newspaper men, a long legged and a short legged service, a 21-knot and a 16-knot service. My right hon. friend, when he laid the tenders upon the Table of the House, told us that while the government were not disposed to accept either of the tenders—I think there were only two—the government were of opinion that these tenders might form the basis of further negotiations. I was not in at the beginning of the debate upon this item; but would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us whether these negotiations have made any real or substantial progress, and whether we are any nearer the goal than we were at the commencement of this session?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am sorry to say I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman the information he desires as to what can be done. The hon. gentleman is aware that since these tenders were laid on the Table the attention of the government has been very much occupied indeed with other matters affecting transportation, and that really we have not had time to give much consideration to the question of the fast Atlantic service; though certainly we have not lost sight of it. But he can very well understand that with the work in hand it is simply impossible to find time to take up the other question.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the minister tell us what is the idea of asking for a 16 and 20-knot service?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It was supposed we would obtain a considerable number of tenders. Several of the objections that had been raised by parties was the enormous expense of supplying four vessels of the speed that was at first asked for, or supposed to be asked for. Everybody knows that the slightest increase beyond 20 knot means an enormous proportionate, or rather disproportionate, expense in the cost of construction and in the cost of running. It was supposed, erroneously as it would seem, that we might obtain a much larger number of tenders for only

two vessels as we asked for in the first instance. I may call attention to this fact, that almost all the freight lines seemed to have practically gone on some such principle. They had only a couple, at the outside, of really Atlantic greyhounds in their service at any one time. Their other vessels have been of less speed. There is a good deal of force in what the leader of the opposition has said as to the result of taking a less rate than was named. It might result, as he says, in our having a second-class vessel and practically assisting the New York route. That has not escaped our attention.

Mr. CLARKE. In asking for tenders for a fast service what is the idea in also asking for a sixteen-knot service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The idea is that we will do as the great lines have done ; we will have a couple of very fast vessels making record trips and other vessels which would be a great improvement on the present service, while not requiring the enormous outlay that is necessary to maintain the fast service.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Some resolutions reported.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will go on at first and correct some clerical errors in the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would ask the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) what further stage he intends to take to-night in connection with this Bill ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand from the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick), who has charge of the Bill, that he has arranged with some members not to proceed with the discussion of any controversial matters. We have simply been engaged in correcting some typographical errors in the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. The committee will sit again to consider the Bill further ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What remains to be considered in connection with the Bill ?

Mr. MACLEAN. On the third reading, I intend to propose some amendments.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But not in committee ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No. I would like the government to give notice when the third reading of the Bill is to be proposed, so that members who are interested in a clause on which they may wish to take the sense of the House may be prepared.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I desire to move to add a subsection.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are one or two members who thought of making suggestions to-night. I told them it was not intended to proceed further. Therefore, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CLARKE. When is it intended to proceed with the further consideration of the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We desire to consult the convenience of the House. Of course it will be well to get the Bill through the House and get it before the Senate as soon as possible. At the same time, as I say, we wish to consult the convenience of the House.

Mr. CLARKE. You will not proceed with it to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Grand Trunk measure, I understand, is on for to-morrow.

Mr. SCOTT. I have an amendment to propose which I hope will not prove of a controversial nature. I am willing to go on with it now if the committee is ready to consider it.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

For the branch of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying, including live stock, dairy, cold storage, extension of markets, poultry, seed and fruit divisions ; employees paid from this sum not to be subject to the Civil Service Act, $220,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the item comprising cold storage and the general work under Prof. Robertson. It was passed some weeks ago, but the hon. gentlemen asked for an opportunity to discuss it again when I would be able to give them some more information with regard to it.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How is this amount of $220,000 to be apportioned among the different branches ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As follows : At the head office, $26,800; live stock division, $21,460 ; dairying division, $37,840 ; cold storage division, $77,000 ; fruit division, $19,600; seed division, $14,400; extension of markets division, $15,200; poultry division, $7,700.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Is this $77,000 entirely for cold storage on ocean vessels ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there is for cold storage on vessels, $53,000.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How much has been spent for cold storage on vessels altogether up to the present time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that is in a report of the department. Not long ago, I think in the early part of the session, that information was brought down to the House.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In that return the amount was said to be $134,000. How much has been spent since that time, up to the 1st of June last ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory I think payments were made just before the beginning of this fiscal year, to the amount of $26,000.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What cold storage is it proposed to effect with this $36,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is for refrigerator chambers. The contracts with these vessels are all expired and terminated, and this money is for the circulation of cooled air entirely.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What were the agreements made with the different steamship companies when the cold storage plant was put in, with regard to temperature ? Did the government arrange that they would have control of the temperature for the cold storage proper ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not a copy of these agreements here, but speaking from memory, the temperature was to be about thirty-five, that is the temperature at which the ships were to hold the chambers, thirty-five to forty.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In the annual report I see that the minister recommends that butter should be carried at about twenty.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is true, but the ships have of their own accord lowered the temperature for butter. Our original contract, when we gave assistance for these cold storage chambers, was made at a time when the butter shippers only required a temperature above freezing, and the contracts included not only butter but chilled meat and fruit; therefore we only required a temperature that was considered to be low enough to carry all the goods that were included. Since that time butter shippers have demanded a much lower temperature, and the shippers have voluntarily reduced the temperature. To-day our thermograph shows a temperature ranging much below thirty in the butter compartment. Of course in the other compartments where cheese, meats and fruits are put, which are not allowed to freeze, the temperature must range higher.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I would remind the minister that several of these steamers have carried butter at a much higher temperature. I notice in the minister's report that he specifies one steamer as having carried it at a temperature of something like fifty-six degrees. On the 'Pretorian,' the average temperature was forty-three to forty-seven for butter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was on a steamer whose contract with us had expired, and we had no longer control over her temperature. But we still put thermographs in all the steamers to record the temperature, though we are not able, after the contract has expired, to control the temperature in the holds. I may say, however, that the ships which are furnished with our thermographs and not allowed to carry at low temperature, are getting very little butter, because shippers will not send their butter except in those ships which have shown a good record by our thermograph.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Then I understand that the government have no control over those vessels which have had subsidies from the government, as to temperature, after the expiry of a certain term of years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Our control expires when the contract expires.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How long does the contract last ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Three years. We paid these ships in three annual instalments, and after that term has expired we have no control. The origin of this work was that at the time it was initiated by my department the ship owners said that the trade and the requirements of this cold storage were so uncertain that they were so little likely to be able to get goods to fill these compartments that they could not afford to put in the chambers. For the purpose of showing the advantages to the trade of these compartments the government assisted them to put in the compartments and the machinery necessary to maintain a cold temperature. That was done for three years. We believed at that time that after three years of test the advantages of this system would be so proven that the trade would require a continuance of it, and that the shipowners would find that the advantage of the continuance of it was so great that they would carry it on themselves. In many cases that has occurred ; in fact, the shipowners themselves have put in a great many of these cold storage plants without any assistance and without entering into any contract with the government.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). May I ask the hon. minister whether all the butter and cheese exported from this country in vessels goes in cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically all the butter tnat is now exported in the summer time from Canada goes in cold storage. The cheese does not, except in very warm weather. Cooled chambers are preferred for cheese to absolutely cold chambers, and, as a matter of fact, experience has shown that it is only butter that requires such a low temperature as 20. Meats require a temperature a few degrees below freezing. Cheese and apples seem to be served better by cooled air driven through and amongst these products serving the purpose of keeping the temperature down to about 60.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Are the ships provided with cooled air chambers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). All the ships that are engaged in this trade, or only certain ships ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were certain ships which had the original cold chambers for low temperatures. We have now made arrangements with certain ships for cooled chambers, but the two systems are entirely different and worked independently.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Did the contract on the 'Pomeranian' expire last season ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell off-hand the names of the vessels, but I think her contract did expire last season. That was for cold storage. I do not think that there was any vessel under contract for the season of 1902 for cold storage.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I would judge from that that no money has been paid by the government for cold storage for some years, if all the contracts are three years old or more.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say exactly when the last money was paid, but the accounts for some of these cold storage subventions were not closed up. I think, during the year 1902, that some payments may have been made, but I think, I am pretty correct in saying that there was no ship under contract for the season of 1902 for cold storage. That is for the old system of cold storage.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It is very unfortunate that the government in making these contracts did not provide for control of the temperature for a longer period than three years. A good deal of money has been expended for cold storage, and I am sure it has not been thrown away if we have a cold storage service, but when we find that there are a great many of these boats carrying products in a temperature of from 45 to 60 and the government have no control over the matter it seems rather an unfortunate condition of affairs. Surely, when the contract was made, it would have been a good condition to have put in the contract that the government should retain a certain control over the temperature for a longer term than three years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We could not get control for a longer period than the period during which we were making the payments. As long as we were making the payments we had a hold upon the companies. When payments were finished we could not control the owners of the ships. The ships in many cases have taken off the service and other ships put on and the owners of the ships hold themselves free to take these ships wherever they like.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). In regard to fruit the hon. gentleman says correctly that the temperature should be 35. I would like to draw his attention to the steamer 'Lakonia' September, 1900. That is surely when the contract was in existence three years ago. There was a temperature in one compartment of from 39 to 60 degrees and in another compartment, of from 28 to 50 degrees.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not in my mind the details that the hon. gentleman speaks of. I suppose he is reading from a return which was made to an Order of the House ?

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say anything about that particular case.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Complaints were made to me by an apple shipper regarding the placing of fruit upon the steamer. The fruit was shipped in the ordinary way not intended to go into cold storage, and the complaint was that it was placed in a part of the vessel not properly ventilated. The apples were in good condition when shipped and they arrived in very poor condition, and the surmise was that these apples might have been put too near the engine or in a heated part of the ship. Are there any inspectors in the department whose business it is to see that apples are properly placed in the ship ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first duty of the inspectors that we have at the port of Montreal to look after that work is to see to the special chambers which are prepared for products. If they are able besides that to have a general supervision of the manner in which stowage is done in all the ships they are to do that also. I was talking only the other day with one of

the most efficient of these inspectors and one who has been for the longest time at this work upon this subject. I happened to meet him, and discussing his work quite informally with him, I asked him some questions on that very point. He told me that as a matter of fact the stevedores understood thoroughly well the demands of the different kinds of products that they had to put into the ship and that it was quite an unusual thing for apples to be put in a place where they would be unduly heated. He said that such a thing might occur occasionally, but very very seldom, and his opportunities of observing are probably as good as any one in the country. He said that whenever he had observed anything of the kind he had drawn the attention of the stevedores to it and he had always found them quite willing to see that the cargo was properly stowed in a place suitable to its carriage. Our inspectors have no absolute control over the stevedores. All they can do is to draw attention to the matter and report to the shipper so as to enable him to recover from the ship owner if his fruit was damaged by being improperly stored in the hold.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). We have inspectors to see that proper space is given to cattle on the ocean voyage, and that is a very important matter. But if the condition of things exists as was represented to me, it is a calamity that apples especially should be shipped in a manner in which they are liable to get overheated. The greater portion of the apples that are shipped from Canada are shipped as ordinary freight; and under these circumstances I think it would be in the interests of the trade of the country if an inspector were appointed to see that these apples are properly placed in the vessel.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The inspectors do watch it, but it is not their first duty, and it may be better that a man should be appointed for that express purpose when the apple shipping season comes. All the complaints have been with regard to apples, but from the report of the inspector I do not think there is a great deal of difficulty even with apples. However, it may be well to obviate whatever difficulty there is when the apple shipping season comes around.

Mr. MACKINNON. A year ago the government established a service between Charlottetown and Manchester by the Manchester Line. The service was a very good one and the cold storage was all right, but in one case the steamer did not arrive at the date prescribed and the shippers who had collected the cargo at Charlottetown were put to heavy loss. They had to feed the cattle, and to go to expense in preserving the other products until the steamer arrived. Is there any hope that these people will get compensation out of the subsidy. Is there any method which the department can adopt by which these gentlemen who lost so heavily can be compensated. The steamer was advertised to sail in November, but she did not turn up until December, and then she went to Georgetown, so that the cattle, and the rest of the cargo had to be shipped there at heavy expense to the shippers. A great many people in the island are interested in the matter, and they think that since the government was subsidizing the steamer, the government should reserve part of the subsidy and apply it to compensating them to some extent. Can the minister do anything in the matter?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The subsidy is entirely in the hands of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and my department has no control over it. When the subsidy was given I was consulted as to the cold storage accommodation on these ships, but what my hon. friend says now is the first intimation I have had of the facts of this case. I will draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the matter and if the subsidy has not already been paid I will ask him to see whether something cannot be done in the matter. I take it, however, that it would rather be a matter of recourse against the ship-owners for non-fulfilment of their contract. However, I will draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the matter.

Mr. BRODER. Is any portion of this vote to be applied towards the maintenance of icing cars from internal points to points of shipment? It is very important to the cheese industry of the country that cheese should be placed in these cars from internal points to the points of export. The system was tried last summer and I believe was satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have made an arrangement to extend that service very largely.

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

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have arrangements now for about one hundred iced cars per week for the carriage of cheese. It was successful last year and it is to be very much extended. In addition to that there is a very large number of specially ventilated cars being built by the railway companies for the express purpose of carrying cheese and fruit, and the railway companies have done that in consequence of the representations made by us. These cars will be available for the service this year.

Mr. BRODER. When cheese arrives in the old country is there any provision to carry it in cold storage cars to points in the interior?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are not paying for any service there,

but in consequence of the representations made by our agents in England a considerable number of refrigerator cars have been placed on the railway lines, particularly those leading from London and from Bristol.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). If the minister will look at the 'Lakonia's' report for September 12th, 1901, he will see that the temperature ranged from 28 to 50. For several hours it stood at 28, four degrees below freezing point, which of course would utterly ruin tender fruit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know what was in the chamber at the time, but there certainly should not have been such variation of temperature as appears to have been the case. An instance came to my attention not very long ago, a lot of butter which was found to be very warm was put into the second chamber, and the thermograph was put in alongside of some of the packages of this butter. The ordinary thermometer in the chamber showed a perfectly even temperature, while the thermograph showed an irregular temperture. When this extraordinary condition of affairs was tested, it was found that the irregular temperature was in one part of the chamber only, while there was an even temperature in other parts. An accident of that kind might happen in any chamber. It could not happen if the chamber was full of fruit.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The minister will see that it is stated on the back of the return that it was tender fruit. Are butter and fruit allowed to go in the same compartment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, no. I may say that this high rise in the temperature up to seventy took place after the chamber was opened.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I do not refer to that; but the temperature was at fifty for a long while after the fruit was put in.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Probably the fruit was very hot when it was put in.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). If the hon. minister will look at No. 175 of the same boat, he will find that the temperature was sixty in that case. That is altogether too high.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is very evident from this chart that there must have been a lot of very hot fruit put in, so that it took the chamber a long time to cool. It apparently took from Thursday, when the temperature was at sixty, until Sunday evening to get it down to fifty, and it was only on Wednesday that it got down to forty, where it ought to be. It is, I might almost say, absolutely impossible, if a great mass of hot fruit or butter is put into the chamber, to get the chamber down to the proper temperature immediately. One of the greatest dangers we have to contend with lies in the fact that the goods arrive at Montreal in a very warm condition, and if they are immediately put into the chamber it is impossible to get the temperature lowered for some little time, even with the machinery working at its fullest capacity and the chamber right in every respect.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I would draw the minister's attention to the fact that both the butter and the fruit always arrive in refrigerator cars.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not always the fruit.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The tender fruit surely. I think it is all shipped at Grimsby, where it is kept in the government cold storage establishment. From there it is transferred to a cold storage car. If the hon. minister will peruse some thermograph records, he will see that the fruit, and also the butter, were brought down to the proper temperature almost immediately on being put into the boat, and they were kept at an even temperature all the way across the ocean; which goes to show that the fault is with the man in charge of the cold storage on the boat. That is evident because there are so many cases in which both fruit and butter have been carried as well as it is possible to carry them. I could cite a dozen more cases of fruit being carried in a ridiculously high temperature, or in an uneven temperature, and in some cases in a temperature below the freezing point. Some of us who have made these tests at Grimsby have wondered why we could not have these fruits carried to the old country in good condition when we could keep them in good condition in our own cold storage establishments for two months. Yet the choice fruit which we sent to the old country in cold chambers was said to have arrived there in a decayed condition. We were told that the fault must be with the packing and the management of the fruit before it arrived at the boat. But when I see these returns and the report of the thermograph, which is an absolute test, and which shows what occurred on the way across the ocean, I cannot wonder at the results. The fact is that the cold storage shipment of tender fruits from Ontario is practically killed. To-day we are not shipping anything except hard late pears. We dare not ship even Bartlets, the staple pear of commerce much less peaches and plums. We spent considerable money in making experiments, and we strongly hoped that a large trade would be built up. England wants the fruit of which we have a superabundance and we can keep this fruit in perfect condition in our own cold storage plants for a much longer time than it takes to go to England; and why cannot it be taken across

the Atlantic ? It seems to me that the minister has not kept his promise to us in this matter, but that he has been very negligent of the interests of the fruit growers of Ontario, who hoped that he would develop this trade.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman is jumping to a rather hasty conclusion. He says that there are a number of instances in which the fruit was carried in an even temperature and in good condition. I have no doubt that where that was the case, the fruit was put into cold storage in proper condition. There are other cases in which the temperature of the chamber was too high at the beginning of the voyage and continued to be too high for some little time. My information is that it depends very largely on the condition of the fruit. If the fruit is in a heated condition when it is put into the chamber, it is impossible to reduce the temperature immediately. Very frequently the fruit itself, in a certain condition of ripeness, generates heat, and heats the chamber in which it is. The cooling apparatus cannot immediately overcome that. It is very much easier to put fruit into a cold chamber at the orchard, close to where it is picked, and to keep that at an even temperature, than it is to put it into a car and bring it to Montreal, and put it into a cold storage chamber there to be carried over to England. A comparison between the two is unfair. It is much easier to maintain it at the same temperature when put into cold storage and kept in the place where it is packed, than when it is carted from one place to another. I do not profess that this work is perfect, but I think great improvements have been made. These thermographic charts were only begun in 1900 and have contributed to greater regularity and efficiency in the working of their machinery. I find that the temperatures have been published regularly and are improving steadily. Probably in certain instances the temperature has not been what it ought to be, but we immediately report such instances to the ship owners, and the men who are irregular are immediately dismissed, because the ship owners are extremely anxious to make a good showing in their cold storage chambers, as that is the only way they can secure the trade which they are very desirous to get. I think my hon. friend is too pessimistic. I know that a good deal of fruit sent forward last year and the year before, especially the year before, arrived in good order. Last year the fruit was of an inferior quality, so that not so much was exported and the returns were not so satisfactory. But the unsatisfactory returns were not due in any way to the lack of cold storage.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). This return shows 31,000 packages, how much of that was Canadian and how much Californian fruit that went forward last year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the details with regard to that.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). So far as the shipments from Grimsby district are concerned, they were not many last year. According to this return there were none the year before. The hon. gentleman says that improvements are being made. These are, no doubt, due to urgent representations to his department. Looking at the returns of the 'Maria,' I find that in 1901 the temperature was 32·38 throughout the voyage, which is what it should be, but in 1902 it was 40·52. No. 89, so that instead of being improved it got to be worse. The hon. minister admits that he has no control over these temperatures. Here was a period when the contract had not expired, yet the temperatures were outrageously high, and in some cases far too low.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know whether the contract with regard to that particular vessel had expired. It may not have expired on the first occasion and may have expired on the second occasion.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). With regard to the arrival of the fruit in vessels at different temperatures, they all go through the same process and should arrive in the same condition. Take the government plant at Grimsby——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is not managed by the government. The building belongs to the department, but we have had nothing to do with the management. We gave it to the people there some time ago.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). At any rate it goes through the same process. It is put into a cold storage chamber and goes in cold storage to Montreal, where it is transferred to the vessels, so that I cannot see why one lot should come in all right and another in bad condition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That depends a good deal on the ripeness of the fruit. One lot may come out all right and the other may be all wrong just because the condition of the fruit in each lot was different.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The growers must have learnt by this time the right stage of ripeness in which their fruit should be when put in cold storage, instead of putting their fruit up in worse condition year after year they have beeen putting it up in better condition each year. Certainly they are not so stupid as not to learn how their fruit should be put up after six years' experience in this line. It therefore should go on the boat in better condition each year and come off in better condition. I would like to ask how many vessels have been fitted up with cool air appparatus. I understand that a large part of this vote is for the

establishment of refrigerator vessels for the production of cool air. What is the extra charge for the carrying of products on these vessels ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I find that the Allan Line has three steamers, the Thompson Line five steamers, the Donaldson Line one, and the Elder Dempster two steamers, making altogether eleven steamers fitted up with cool air circulation. Others have been fitted up since, without any contract, by the ship-owners themselves. The rate they charge is ten shillings per ton on cheese and the equivalent to that on apples.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What is the difference between these two plants, cold storage and cool air ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is practically a difference in temperature. In the cold storage plant, the chambers are shut up entirely. In the cool air plant there is a circulation of air and the temperature is only required to be down to sixty. In the cold storage it is much lower.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It will cost much less to keep the temperature at 60 than 30 or 32.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The arrangement for circulation and ventilation costs more. The air has to be cooled and forced through, and there is constant change of air, whereas, in the cold storage chambers, which are tight, they get the temperature down to a certain point and it takes but little to keep it there.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). That might account for the bad carrying of freight in cold storage chambers. There is no circulation of air. In our private cold storage establishments, we do have a circulation of air. What steps have been taken to ascertain with certainty whether in the forced air plants the circulation of air is kept up during the voyage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have thermographs in these as in the cold storage chambers. Consequently, we know the temperatures.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I have some figures summarizing certain reports of the thermograph records where there was ventilated storage. The average minimum temperature was 4:54, and maximum, 67½. And in eleven records, where the cold air plant had been provided, and for the benefit of which the shippers paid ten shillings per ton extra, the average minimum was 55½, and maximum 66 4-11. So, there was practically no difference. It is true that the eleven instances I have averaged were those in which the temperature was highest out of twenty-three. Yet the cooled air system costs very large sums to the government for the installation of the plant, and the shippers paid ten shillings a ton extra, yet the practical result is that there is no lower temperature than is secured by the system of ventilation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the data before me which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) has. I think he will find that the figures depend upon the period of the year and the weather. If in one case the figures were for the summer, and in the other for the autumn, that would explain the matter.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). The cases of ventilated storage I referred to were : August 19th and September 23rd, the 'Sarmatian'; August 21st, the 'Importer'; August 1st, the 'Numidian'; August 8th, the 'Pomeranian,' and October 10th, the 'Commerce.' The cases of cold storage were September 26th, September 17th, July 18th, August 24th, August 28th, August 1st, July 18th, July 4th, July 11th, June 27th, and June 19th. So, the figures cover practically the same season.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that last season was a particularly cool season, and did not show the full effects of this system of the circulation of cool air. That was remarked by shippers last year, and, as a matter of fact, many of the cheese shippers did not send goods in cool air chambers because of that fact.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Has the minister taken definite steps to ascertain whether this forcing of air through the holds has been properly carried out ? My opinion has always been that although steamers put in this plant, which costs very little, in many cases the plant is not operated. Of course, in many cases it is, and excellent results are secured. I know of many cases where the results have been observed and most favourably commented upon on the other side. I have known cases of apples, the same variety picked at the same time and packed at the same time by the same parties, taken from the same storage at the same time, but shipped in different compartments of the steamer, yet some coming out in good condition and others in very bad condition. It must be that there is a difference in the storage on the vessel. I cannot explain it except on the idea that in some compartments the ventilation system is carried out, thus securing low temperature where the apples are, besides having pure air, while in other cases the hatches are battened down and the fans not used. I have suggested to the minister that it is easy to ascertain whether the fans were operated or not. All that is necessary is to put a thermograph where the apples are and another on deck. If the two correspond, that is proof that the fans are operated.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I ordered a large number of extra thermographs and have given most positive and reiterated instructions to the officers in charge that no chamber shall be allowed to go without a thermograph in it. If it is there it will show the temperature, and we shall be able to know whether the fans are used or not. My instructions are plain and positive and I believe they will be carried out.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I am glad to hear the minister say that. It has taken a long time, but at least we seem to be getting to the point where we may hope to get a good service and be able to carry our perishable goods across in good condition. If the people are allowed to know which vessels do carry cargoes perfectly, it will be a great advantage to the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These thermograph records are posted on the board of trade of Montreal, and there the people in the trade who are interested can examine them and see for themselves.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Do the steamship people, or those in charge in this country make every effort to resist the government——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It appeared to me that the fault lay with the officers in charge of the vessels.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say positively as to that. I would not like, without greater knowledge than I have, to accuse anybody. But the hon. gentleman can understand that a new system—for, though it has been working for a number of years here, it is still new to a great many people concerned—will not be worked perfectly for some time. But I am satisfied that the ship owners, and, as a general rule, their officers are desirous of carrying it out properly and are doing all they can to that end.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the committee has listened to the Minister of Agriculture with no small degree of disappointment. The hon. gentleman has been very profuse in his advertising, especially on the occasion of election contests, advertising the success of his department, and particularly of the cold storage. And now we have the deplorable spectacle of the hon. gentleman admitting that cold storage under his administration has been a dismal failure and that to-day it is worse than it was the day he took hold of it. Immense sums of money were voted by this parliament for cold storage. The hon. gentleman has abandoned the undertakings one after the other, and those systems that have been put in have turned out most unsatisfactory. My hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Smith) has pointed out what seems to be a severe lesson to the hon. gentleman; I hope he will take it to heart, and I am quite sure the people of this country will take it to heart. He has pointed out that the cold storage system is a mere mockery, and there is no hope that it will be brought to a proper condition. It is used to-day for butter almost alone. The hon. gentleman stated on a former occasion that outside of poultry, meat and butter, the shippers would not pay the extra sum they were being charged for cold storage. The country has learned long ago that there was no such thing as cold storage in the sense the hon. gentleman speaks of; and after he has been nearly seven years in office, and after declaring that he had made it a perfect system, he is to-day compelled to come before the House and admit that his system is in a most deplorable condition. He has not said so in so many words, but he has disclosed the fact by his admissions to my hon. friend from Wentworth, who has gone somewhat thoroughly into this matter. I think this House would be prepared to vote any reasonable sum of money for a service of that kind. But the hon. gentleman has squandered thousands and thousands of dollars to no purpose. There seems to be but little hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to offer to the fruit growers and shippers of this country any relief from the present unsatisfactory condition of things. I do not know whether this committee would be justified in giving the hon. gentleman the additional sums of money that he is asking for. We had a cold storage service which was said to be very expensive, steamships were assisted by the government, but at the end of a three years' contract it has been abandoned. I want to repeat what my hon. friend from Wentworth has said, that there has not only been carelessness in taking a contract for so short a period as three years for so large a sum, but that during the period that contract was in existence there was either gross negligence on the part of the steamship companies or their officers, or on the part of the Minister of Agriculture in failing to enforce the conditions of the contract. I repeat that it is a dismal condition of things, and that we stand precisely where we were, if not infinitely worse off than we were in 1896.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose the hon. gentleman is disposed to be a little facetious on this matter. I will not go into details, but I will only say that if he should to-day propose to the shippers of Canadian produce to return to the condition of affairs that existed in 1896-97 he would be met with a storm of indignant protests. I have before me a statement which was made by the chairman of the Home and Foreign Produce Exchange, Limited, of London, England, in which they state that two steamers which sailed from Montreal to London fitted with cooled air

arrangements, have proved a great success, and they say that it would serve the best interests of Canadian shippers if all steamers were so fitted up. That experiment was made the year before last, and it was continued last year, because we found it so successful. The success of the cold storage arrangements cannot be contradicted, even though here and there an apparent failure may occur in the great number of vessels going out every year from our ports fitted up in this way. But I have the constant support of the people who send their produce in these vessels, especially the shippers of butter and cheese. The cases of failure instanced by the hon. member for Wentworth are cases in which the fruit perhaps did not go forward in as perfect a condition as it should. There may have been some slackness on the ships, but I do not think the fact that these shipments arrived in poor condition proves any defect in the system. I acknowledge that there may be an occasional shipment going forward in cold storage which would not be perfectly successful—possibly including cheese, though no case has been called to my attention where difficulty has occurred with cheese. Occasionally products are put into refrigerator cars in such a condition that it is impossible for the ice to overcome the heat in these packages when they are put in. We are trying to induce the people who ship butter and other things to see that when the stuff is put into the car it is in proper condition. Our refrigerator cars are not for the purpose of cooling things, our refrigerators on ships are not for the purpose of cooling things, they are for the purpose of preserving things which are already cool. We do not profess to supply ice to cool butter and fruit, but we do profess to see that cars are so iced that things which are put into them in a reasonable cool condition will be maintained in that condition. The same on the ships. But if heated stuff is put into the chambers it will require some time before any cooling apparatus that we can provide can bring them down to the right temperature. The men who do business with these refrigerators would be the last men to allow that they should go back to the condition of things when this work was commenced by the department.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has been told that shippers of fruit are not novices at that sort of thing. He assumes that in every case where the shipment has gone forward in bad condition, it has been received in bad condition. The hon. gentleman has no evidence in support of that assumption. His assumption that the shipments were sent aboard the refrigerator cars in bad condition is not fair to the shippers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking of proof, I have had an inspector out during last fall, last summer, and this summer, who is testing the temperature of the butter that is put into the car, and watching these shipments, and he has found dozens of cases where it has had a temperature as high as sixty when put into the refrigerator car. So that my evidence is quite complete upon that point and my hon. friend is mistaken in believing that I am assuming.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that the butter has all been landed in good condition. The hon. gentleman is not making out his case because he declares that if there has been any butter not arriving in good condition he is not aware of it. Now, the hon. gentleman wishes to shift his position and to say that even butter received in bad condition has been landed in good condition in the old country, so that the hon. gentleman is in rather an unfortunate position. Is it possible that it may have gone in fairly good condition if it had not gone in cold storage ? I am going to assume that it would not have gone in good condition under those circumstances. I think it is fair to say that the cold storage system properly carried out is a good thing. The only regret I have is that so far it has not been a success. It was believed at one time that our perishable fruits could go forward in good condition, but, the hon. minister must admit that up to this time that part of it has been a decided failure. Whether the hon. gentleman will be able to overcome that or not seems doubtful at this moment, but I again ask the hon. gentleman if he has had any evidence of fruit going aboard the cars in bad condition, because it is no doubt a fact, that fruit has arrived on the other side of the Atlantic in a decidedly bad condition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not been taking the temperatures in regard to fruit in the same way as we have in regard to butter. We have found that fruit arriving in Montreal to go on board the ships was so ripe that it was in a heated condition, not from the cars in any way, but from the overripeness, and I think there is no doubt that that fruit must have gone into the cars in a condition unfit for transhipment.

Mr. BLAIN. Is all of the fruit that is put into these cars inspected by a government inspector ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Would that not be worthy of the attention of the hon. minister? It seems to me that if fruit arrives in bad condition in the old country there should be an explanation given to the public why it has arrived in that condition, and if the responsibility does not rest upon the government it should rest upon the proper party who would be the shipper.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have inspected as much as we can at

Montreal, but, not by any means all of the fruit. It would be almost impossible, physically to attempt an inspection of the fruit going forward in these cars, although we might make a special effort to inspect the fruit going in cold storage more than we do in other respects. We have done that to a considerable extent, but still not by any means completely.

Mr. BLAIN. How has the fruit arrived that has been inspected by the government inspector ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have never undertaken to stop fruit if it is in bad condition. We have no authority to do so. We have to allow it to go forward and the result has been that fruit in bad condition in Montreal arrived on the other side in bad condition. Fruit in good condition when put into the ships at Montreal arrived forward as a rule in good condition.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to draw the hon. minister's attention to an article in the Montreal 'Herald':

New Butter Bill Unfair to Canada.

London, July 22.—The butter Bill which is now passing through the House of Commons, shows a preference to Ireland over the colonies. According to the provisions of the Bill, all butters, including colonial butters, which contain over sixteen per cent water, will be penalized. Irish butter will, however, be allowed to contain twenty per cent water, which gives the Irish dairy industry a decided advantage over that of Canada.

Could the hon. gentleman tell us if he has received a copy of the Bill and is informed as to its contents ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not seen a copy of the Bill but I know that there was a Bill which did make some exceptions in connection with certain classes of Irish butter and allowed them privileges that other butters in the markets of the United Kingdom are not allowed. That is, of course, a regulation of the home authorities over which we have no control. I am trying to get information in regard to it, but I have not yet obtained any. I saw the item in question and that was the first intimation I had that Irish butters generally were exempted from the operation of the law requiring only 16 per cent of water in butter. I have not yet had any further details about it, but, I hope to get them very soon.

Mr. BLAIN. Has Irish butter, when it goes upon the market in the old country, any special stamp upon it to distinguish it from Canadian butter?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Only the private stamp. Of course, nearly all butter is marked in some way or other when it goes upon the market. Our Canadian butter has to be marked with the word 'Canadian' and Irish butter has special stamps or brands put upon it which are known in the markets of England. I am not aware that Irish butter is given any particular stamp as Irish butter.

Mr. BLAIN. How is butter usually put up upon the London, Glasgow and Liverpool markets with which our butter comes into competition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course butter is put up in all sorts of shapes just as our butter is put up in different shapes. There is some Irish butter put up in boxes, something like our own. Most of our butter is sent to England in square boxes but a good deal still goes forward in the old fashioned tubs. Irish butter is put up in different packages, some of it similar to our own, but according to our own law all butter going forward from Canada is marked 'Canadian' on the package. Of course, when it is turned out in retail stores it would not have that mark upon it. There is an English law which requires that all provisions coming from outside the united kingdom shall be marked with the name of the country from which they come whether foreign or colonial. For instance butter from Canada is marked 'Canadian,' New Zealand, is marked New Zealand, Australian is marked 'Australian,' Dutch is marked 'Dutch,' French is marked 'French' and so on. I do not think that law would require Irish butter to be marked 'Irish' because Ireland is part of the united kingdom.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the hon. minister tell us how the Canadian trade in butter is prospering ? We see general statements and read the reports in the newspapers. Can the minister tell us the quantity of butter exported from each province last year, and whether it was put up in pound rolls or in what kind of packages ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The production of butter in Canada is less this year than usual, due to a large extent to the high price of cheese, so that factories which were equipped both for butter and cheese making, turned their attention to cheese, and also due to the fact that in the earlier part of the season we had a great drought and the production of milk was smaller than usual. Nineteen hundred was a large year ; 1901 was a trifle smaller than 1900, but I think it is the largest except 1900 we ever had up to that date ; 1902 was abnormally large and this year has fallen back very much. This year we have exported only about two-thirds the amount exported last year, but of course that does not show the quantity of butter in storage throughout the country. The reports say that the butter is arriving in England this year in most excellent condition. The reports issued by Mr. Weddell, a well-known firm in London, speak highly of our butter. We are exporting chiefly in fifty-six pound

boxes and there is a considerable quantity being shipped in tubs. Until a few years ago the round tinnet was practically the Canadian package, but the square box has taken its place, and about 75 per cent of our butter now goes in the square boxes. The rolls or blocks are only for the local trade, and very little if any of them go to Great Britain.

Mr. BLAIN. About two years ago I noticed a statement that a large portion of the butter used in the Yukon was supplied from the United States. Is that still the case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am happy to say that the Canadians are supplying the Yukon market with butter now, and the government creameries in the North-west are shipping largely into that territory.

Mr. WRIGHT. I may say that I have been over in England with butter and I have seen the Irish butter coming into the Liverpool and London markets in all manner of shapes the same as butter comes to the Montreal market. There is no danger of our coming into competition with the Irish butter, because there is no doubt that we make butter better and can beat them every time. If reports in the newspapers are correct the percentage of water in butter applies only to the Irish butter, and if we do not send any butter over there with more than 16 per cent of water in it there is no danger of our trade being injured. We have tried to ship butter to the old country in prints, but it does not keep nearly as well as when sent in fifty-six pound boxes. Occasionally a few of the seventy pound tubs are sent, but nearly everything goes in the fifty-six pound boxes now.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there any conference at any time between the Ontario government and the Department of Agriculture here having regard to the partial system of cold storage that was instituted by the Ontario government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember any conference within the last two years with the Ontario government in regard to any matter of that kind. Some years ago there was a proposition made by the Ontario government for certain co-operation in regard to cold storage work and there were some shipments made by the Ontario government, but I had no official connection with them. That was over two years ago I think, and I have no information that I can give to the hon. gentleman with regard to it.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister is about right when he says that it was two years ago, because the Prime Minister of Ontario was preparing for the elections and he was telling the farmers of Ontario that they would have cold storage at their doors. For what length of time does the contract run for what is known as the cooled system of cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the contract for the cooling chambers covers two payments and is for two years.

Mr. CLANCY. What is being paid for the cooling chambers as compared with what was called cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are paying half the cost of the plant, not to exceed $7,000 per ship, and that payment is extended over one quarter of one year and one quarter of another.

Mr. CLANCY. What was paid for the cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Half the cost, running up to $12,000 per ship, in some instances more than that, according to the size of the compartments and the strength of the machinery.

Mr. CLANCY. Two years seems to me to be a very short period, when the hon. gentleman pays half the cost of installing the plant, which at the end of the two years becomes the property of the steamship company. It seems to me that we have no adequate return for so large an expenditure of money, especially in view of the fact that the shipper must pay as much as he did under the cold storage system. Did the hon. gentleman find it impossible to make contracts extending over a longer period, or had he some reason for making such exceedingly short contracts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did find it impossible to bind the companies for any longer period. Experience has shown that if the efficacy of the work is once proved, the demands of the trade require it to be carried on. We found that in the case of the old cold storage system, and I am satisfied that we shall find it to be the case with the cooling chamber.

Mr. CLANCY. I suppose these contracts have been made with the steamship companies with whom the contracts for cold storage were made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The contracts for the old cold storage practically covered all the ship lines which came to Canada, and these contracts are with the same people. There were no others to make them with.

Mr. CLANCY. If the system is to have such a future as the hon. gentleman seems to hope for, is it not fair to assume that we have gone beyond the experimental stage ? If the cold storage system has been a sufficient success to induce the steamship companies to put in the plants themselves, or with the assistance of the government in

the past, it is no longer an experiment; and if the steamship companies are not disposed to install this plant on getting the large sum of ten shillings per ton extra for the goods shipped in cold storage, one is at a loss to understand why the government of Canada should contribute a dollar towards it. If the cold storage system has been even a measurable success, even in a few articles, it seems to me that the steamship companies should not refuse to install even the cheaper system for which they charge higher rates than they did for the other system. It seems that the experiment has not been such a success as to induce the steamship companies to install the plants at their own expense, and that they are expecting more from the government of Canada than they are entitled to receive.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was with the greatest difficulty that we were able to induce the steamship companies to put in these chambers, because they did not know whether or not the experiment would be a success. We tried the experiment on two ships first, and the reports were satisfactory; but even with that result we had the greatest difficulty in inducing the steamship companies to agree to it. I confidently believe, however, that it will be a sufficient success on these eleven ships to induce other companies to adopt it, or the same companies to put the apparatus into other ships. But until we had started it on a sufficient scale to show the benefits of it to the trade, we were not able to get them to take it up.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand the minister to say that all the steamships which were fitted up with the plants for cold storage are now being fitted up with what are known as cooling chambers?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, I think there are over forty ships fitted with the old cold storage; but we have only succeeded in getting eleven ships fitted with the cooling chambers. I do not know whether all these ships have the old cold storage or not. Most of them have.

Mr. CLANCY. Are the ships that were originally fitted up with cold storage continuing to keep up an efficient plant?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Every ship we know of is.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is answering hastily. He has no control over them, and the contracts have ceased.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend forgets that we have the records of them. We put thermographs into their cold storage chambers, and we watch their operations, although we do not force them to do what they originally did.

Mr. CLANCY. How many creameries are now in operation in the North-west, and what is the condition of the undertaking there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1902 there were sixteen; in 1903 there will be nineteen. The increase is due to one, which was closed during 1902, being reopened at Wetaskiwin. We are running two others, one at Black Falls and one at Lacombe. These have been built and equipped by the settlers without any advance or loan from the department; but we are running these for the settlers this year.

Mr. CLANCY. Have the loans all been repaid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not all. There is still $16,000 unpaid. There has been $36,436 repaid.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the rest likely to be repaid?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think most of it will be, I would not like to say positively that all will be. Some factories have not at all done well. The country in those particular districts has not filled up with dairymen sufficiently to hold out great hopes of final repayment; but I think that most of this money will be repaid.

Mr. CLANCY. Has there been some new arrangement made there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I am not aware of any change.

Mr. CLANCY. I find that generally throughout the North-west such payments as these occur. Take the creamery of:

Tindastoll B. & C. Association: school taxes, 1901, $7.56; premiums of insurance on creamery, $24; rent of creamery, 1899 to 1901, three years at $172.50; extra allowance for rent, 1900 and part of 1901, one and a half years at $50; less advance, $100.

What is the meaning of that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These items were all charged against the manufacturing account. There was a surplus in the creamery, and consequently these items were not really paid by the government at all, although the money went through the hands of the department.

Mr. CLANCY. What is meant by the rent of the factory? Who rents the factory?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is rent paid in all the factories to the original owner. That is charged in the manufacturing account.

Mr. CLANCY. Are not the government advancing considerable sums and becoming owners of some of the factories which have failed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not become owners of the factories.

Mr. CLANCY. There was a large sum expended in fitting up and rebuilding certain factories. After spending large sums of money on the factories, does the government pay rent for them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not take over the factories. We rent them from the owners and advance certain sums which we spend in improvements, so as to put them in proper running order. Any one who takes a factory and runs it has to pay rent.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the department keeping up the system of making these advances ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, we have not made any for several years. I do not think we have made any since 1900.

Mr. BLAIN. Who has charge of the sale of butter for those creameries ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Primarily the head office here. Mr. Marker is inspector in charge of the creameries in the North-west Territories, at Calgary, under direction from here and he manages the sales.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the output last year as compared with the year before ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1902 the output was 532,000 pounds and in 1901, it was 672,000 pounds.

Mr. BLAIN. How do you explain the decrease ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that it is due largely to the floods and bad roads in the spring which prevented the farmers bringing in their milk. Also in the district of Assiniboia, the large wheat crop kept the farmers too busy to attend to the creamery.

Mr. BLAIN. Where is the butter sold ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In British Columbia and the Yukon and a portion in China and Japan.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What do you charge the farmers for making butter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Four cents a pound.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). That might account for the falling off. In the Ontario creameries it does not cost more than two cents per pound.

Mr. WRIGHT. We always charge three and a half.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Yes, but it does not cost more than two. I happen to be a director of one of them.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am a director also, and I know the cost is more than that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The expenses are very much higher than in the North-west and the output is very small, so that you have to charge higher prices than if you were running on a very large scale.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). You must make a good profit because butter can be made in quite a small factory at not over two cents a pound in the east. The government is supposed only to charge the actual cost.

Mr. WRIGHT. Four cents per pound is charged in the United States and in some places three and a half cents. But three and a half to four cents is the price.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We charge four cents, and if the actual disbursements do not come up to four cents, the difference is credited to the dairy on the advance paid by the government.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Then it costs four cents ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In some cases it costs about two and a half. We charge four cents, and when there is a surplus we credit it.

Mr. BLAIN. How many factories have been assisted by the government, and how many are now operated ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The creameries at Indian Head, Wolseley and Maple Creek have ceased to operate because these places are in the wheat belt and the farmers had all their time taken up with their wheat.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the government any control over those which have repaid the money advanced ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are still operating them, but the time is near when we will cease to do so.

Mr. CLANCY. The understanding on which the hon. gentleman got his first vote was that at the end of three years the experiment would cease.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but the people have been urging us to go on, and as they owe the government we thought it best to do so. Now that some have paid off their indebtedness, it is about time we should cease to operate those factories.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). How many had paid off their indebtedness ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ten.

Mr. CLANCY. Are there any which have given up operations entirely ? Some twenty were assisted in the first instance with skimming stations outside, which were as a sort of subsidiary stations for the collecting of cream. There were originally, I believe,

about twenty. Are there any of that number that have ceased to operate ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, those at Indian Head, Wolseley and Maple Creek.

Mr. CLANCY. How much did they owe ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Indian Head owed nothing. Wolseley owed $2,000, but they have paid something through the sale of part of the machinery. We hold the rest of the machinery. Maple Creek owes about $1,000.

Mr. CLANCY. In both these cases, there would be a loss ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We still have some of the plant that will be available against the debt.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it the intention of the department to operate these creameries until the debt is paid off ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would not say positively as to that. Some, as I have said, may not be able to pay off the advance.

Mr. CLANCY. Why ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because the conditions do not seem favourable for dairying in those places. The conditions may change. A few have been successful, and in the others it is hoped that the debt will be paid off.

Mr. GILMOUR. There was only about 570,000 pounds of butter made, and I almost think that two of the factories alone made half that quantity. Has the minister any account of the butter made in the factories ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have here a statement of the butter made in these factories for the year 1902. I will give the total in round numbers : Calgary, 19,000 pounds ; Churchbridge, 116,000 ; Edmonton, 14,000 pounds ; Glenfel, 38,000 pounds ; Innisfail, 99,000 pounds ; Moosejaw, 16,000 pounds ; Moosomin, 11,000 pounds ; Olds, 42,000 pounds ; Prince Albert, 14,000 pounds ; Regina, 25,000 pounds ; Red Deer, 55,000 pounds ; Saltcoats, 6,000 pounds ; Qu'Appelle, 20,000 ; Tindastoll, 28,000 pounds ; Whitewood, 6,000 pounds.

Mr. GILMOUR. The factory at Tindastoll is a new one. Has the government advanced anything toward that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not made any loans to the Tindastoll factory. We did pay for some small items of machinery. And the money is being repaid out of the season's work.

Mr. BLAIN. As to the operation of these factories after they have repaid the money advanced, did I understand the hon. minister to say that his department was considering the advisability of closing them up ?

Mr. CLANCY.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not closing them up, but ceasing to operate them—putting them into the hands of the people.

Mr. BLAIN. Have they been successful since they repaid the debt?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are still operating them as before. No change has been made in that respect. But I have warned them that, as they have paid off the debt, I thought it time for them to take up the work themselves. They have asked us not to insist upon that, because they find that the general management of our inspector is an advantage. No doubt, with the whole group of factories managed by one head and the marketing and shipping arranged for, the management is more economical. But, now that they have got beyond the experimental stage, it is doubtful whether we ought to continue the management of them. But, so long as we operate any of them, it would perhaps be as well to manage all, even those that are able to stand upon their own feet.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they run at a loss to the government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not those that have paid off their loans. Any money made is paid over to them.

Mr. GILMOUR. The government operation of the factories is considered a great boon by the people. It takes the marketing of the produce and the collecting and distribution of the money off their hands. In some cases it would be very inconvenient for them to do this for themselves. It cannot be managed for each factory so well as it can be managed for all by one head.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite true.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in believing that the government charges 4 cents per pound for making butter and does not collect the cream ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, for making butter and furnishing supplies, such as tubs, salt, &c., and marketing the butter ?

Mr. SPROULE. With us the ordinary charge is 3 cents per pound and the highest charge is 3½ cents, and they collect the cream.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cost is very much higher in the Northwest than in Ontario. Any surplus that there is goes to the patrons.

Mr. SPROULE. But, if the factories were more economically run and the charge for making and supplies reduced below 4 cents, there would be more for the patron. I know of small factories in my section that have been run for years, and the highest charge

they ever made was 3½ cents and they collected the cream. I know that for a fact, for I have been sending to two of these factories for some time.

Mr. GILMOUR. As I understand it, if there is a profit the government pays it back to the patrons.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. But if the charge of 4 cents per pound is made, there is less to be divided among the patrons than if they were charging 3½ cents, which ought to be sufficient, considering that the government does not collect the cream.

Mr. GILMOUR. If the government takes it, it gives it back to the patrons in some way, for the government does not take any profit. These factories were indebted to the government, as I understand it.

Mr. SPROULE. But my complaint is that the charge for making butter is too high. I assume that it would cost a little more in the North-west than in Ontario, but the government must be relieved of a good deal of expense in not collecting the cream. I take it that if they did collect the cream they would charge 4½ per cent.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In my part of the country the average charge is three cents a pound. In the North-west it costs about $180 a car to ship boxes to these factories. Fuel, labour and everything of that kind is very much higher there than it is in the east.

Mr. SPROULE. Was I correct in understanding that the shipment of fruit in cold storage was a success ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has been a great success.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of fruit are you shipping ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The government has not shipped anything themselves. But private shippers, I believe, have shipped several varieties of apples, pears, and a few peaches.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the government did carry on an experiment for some years in shipping fruit in cold storage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We stopped that two years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Then I presume it was a failure ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it was a failure. Those shipments were entirely experimental. We shipped peaches and pears chiefly, and some grapes. The pears went forward as a rule successfully, and so did the grapes, as far as the carriage was concerned. Apples went forward successfully.

Mr. SPROULE. What is supposed to be the proper temperature for sending apples forward ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The best temperature for sending fruit would be 35 to 40 degrees Fahrenheit, for the tender varieties.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen an account from Washington of shipments of the harder variety of apples, which sold in London for $5 a barrel. These were shipped from Illinois. They shipped in carload lots, and realized $5 a barrel. They were sent forward at a temperature of 31. These shipments included pears, lemons and other fruit, and they went forward successfully. They think there is no difficulty at all, provided the cold storage is right. I remember looking up the experiments made by the experimental farm here, and I do not think they were very successful. When the shipments reached London they were sold at a less price than they cost here. Could the minister tell us what is the additional cost of sending butter and fruit in cold storage over the cost of sending it in the ordinary way ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The difference is ten shillings a ton, that applies to all lines of goods. In regard to apples, the harder varieties that are intended to be kept after arrival in the old country, should be shipped at a temperature of 31 ; but the tender varieties which are to be put on the market immediately after coming out of cold storage, need to be shipped in a higher temperature, as otherwise they would spoil in getting into warmer air. The shipments that were made last year by the horticulturist of the experimental farm, realized more than $5 a barrel on the London market, in competition with apples from Illinois.

Mr. SPROULE. What percentage of all the shipments of butter and cheese is made in cold storage or cold chambers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I stated earlier in the evening that practically all the butter goes forward in cold storage, in the lowest temperature that the chambers will give. Of cheese, hardly any goes in these cold chambers, but a considerable quantity is carried in the cooled or ventilated chambers.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you some arrangement made this year for cold storage cars on the different railways for shipping butter and cheese ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have cold storage cars for shipping butter and in addition to that we have a very large number of iced cars for cheese, for the first time this season. There were a few last year as an experiment, and we found it so satisfactory that we induced the railway companies to put on about one hundred im-

proved cars, iced cars, for the carriage of cheese.

Mr. SPROULE. What do they charge extra over the ordinary freight rates for the carriage of cheese in these cars ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They do not charge anything over the ordinary rates. They run once a week.

Mr. POPE. Where do they run from ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They run from practically everywhere all over the country.

Mr. SPROULE. What does it cost the government ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We pay for icing the cheese cars $5 per car, and for the butter cars we guarantee the railway companies two-thirds of the capacity of the car. If they earn more than two thirds of the capacity of the car we are credited with the surplus, and if they earn less we are charged with the difference, and the balance is made up at the end of the season.

Mr. SPROULE. You pay $5 per car irrespective of the length of the run ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, that is the cost of icing.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What was the total expense last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $5,436.11 for butter and $1,940.77 for cheese.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). A year ago it was claimed that a great deal of the damage to fruit that was shipped arose from the fact that it was too hot in the cars, that the cars were not properly ventilated and that the cars were chargeable with a good deal of the damage rather than the ships. I think the hon. minister proposed to take some steps to endeavour to get a large number of cars ventilated. I would like to know what steps have been taken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year we got ten ventilated cars on the Grand Trunk Railway for which we paid $626.50.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What system of ventilation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot very easily describe it. I am told that there is a syphon arrangement by which by the motion of a car the air is drawn into the car.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you have any on the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are building some this year, I believe.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). It cost $62 per car to put this ventilating arrangement on ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, that was for ten cars for the season.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Would it be necessary for the government to pay in order to get that accommodation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are not paying anything at all this season.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Will the railway companies not put this ventilating apparatus on their cars without charge ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe they are doing that this year. We made that arrangement last year to try the experiment and they found the experiment so successful that they are putting them on themselves this year.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). They propose to put on a large number of cars ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe so.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hold in my hand a pamphlet which is headed :

Dominion of Canada.
Department of Agriculture.
Branch of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying.
Poultry Division.
Profitable Poultry Farming.
(Revised Edition).

I presume there was a former edition that did not perhaps show a profit as great as this edition does.

Bulletin No. 6.
Published by direction of the Hon. Sydney A. Fisher, Minister of Agriculture.

It contains a lot of valuable information and a lot of splendid wood-cuts, and on page 38 there is a gentleman dressed in full dress with a chicken in his hand as it is held preparatory to killing, and on page 39 there is a chicken with a brick on its back, showing the position of the chicken in the shaper, with a brick on top to shape it. The whole thing is to induce the farmer to go into profitable poultry farming. I take up the Auditor General's Report and turn to D—76, 77 and 78, and I find how the government give an illustration of profitable poultry farming. I find that at Holmesville, which I presume, the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) will know, a gentleman named Mr. F. C. Elford purchased chickens and feed, and the bill amounted $613.36. He sold them for $196.65, making a loss of $417.31. A gentleman from Bowmanville named Mr. A. W. Foley expended $225.29 on chicken farming and returned 66 cents, making a loss of $224.63. on the speculation. A gentleman at Renfrew named Mr. John Frood expended $183.70 and returned $6.88, making a loss of $176.82. There is a gentleman at Eldon, Prince Edward Island, who expended

$267.77 and returned $88.57, making a loss of $179.20. A gentleman at Alberton, Prince Edward Island spent $225.37, returned $116.87, and made a loss of $108.50. At Andover, New Brunswick, a person spent $347.04 and returned $179.03, making a loss of $168.01. At Bondville, Quebec, Mr. Hillhouse, spent $719.87 and returned $407.71, making a loss of $312.16. I want the hon. Minister of Agriculture to explain how he can put a document like this into circulation advising the farmers to go into poultry farming for profit while making the losses the government have made. They expended $7,621.58 in this way and all they returned was $2,753.12, making a loss of $4,868.46.

Mr. COCHRANE. At how many stations ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not count the number of stations, but this is the total result. How can the hon. minister tell the farmers there is profit in poultry farming while showing such a loss as this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that this is experimental work. You do not expect to make a profit on the work itself. You never can do so and you might as well expect the farm at Ottawa which deals with an immense amount of experimental work to sell enough out of its fields and out of its herds to pay for that experimental work. The same principle applies to the poultry experimental stations where the work is done for the purpose of obtaining information and not for the purpose of obtaining results at the stations themselves.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would the minister let me ask him a question ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would the hon. gentleman wait till I sit down ?

Mr. COCHRANE. I thought that perhaps the minister would never be able to get through in time to sit down. I can tell the minister that if the experimental farm outside of the experimental plots will not pay, then it is no good. What can the farmers of Canada learn from the Minister of Agriculture in reference to farming, when he tells us to-night that he cannot make his own farm pay. He has the most beautiful site there is in this country for a farm, and I venture to say that neither the minister himself nor any man on the farm has brains enough to make it pay. The minister tells us that he has men trotting around the country teaching the farmers how to raise chickens. What is the use of that when the farmers cannot get help enough to do the ordinary farm work. He issues this pamphlet with all these cuts in it at a great expense, and then he tells us that chicken raising does not pay him, and that it is only an experiment. It is the most absurd thing I have ever heard tell of, to think that he has men in our section of the country running around to tell the farmers how to fatten chickens.

Mr. CLARKE. How to suck eggs.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, there is a good deal of sucking going around in that department, and the minister has more suckers than chickens. Mr. Chairman, you yourself, as a doctor, will see the absurdity of sending people to farmers telling them how to raise chickens. We are paying $50 a month to these men to do that, and then the Minister of Agriculture turns around and tells us that he cannot himself make this chicken fattening a paying business. It is better that he would drop the chicken fattening and bring his great ability to bear on running the experimental farm properly. I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, how long you could live on a farm that you could not make pay ? It is worse than absurd to take the money of the hard working farmers of the country and spend it on an experimental farm which the minister says he cannot make pay. What is the use of it as an example to the farmers of Canada if it is a concern that cannot pay its own way ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I admit that I cannot make the experimental farm pay, and I never knew it to pay since its inception, and I do not expect it ever will pay.

Mr. COCHRANE. You had better wind it up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But it does pay, and the farmers of this country acknowledge it pays, in the information they get from these experiments and from the reports and bulletins that are sent out. I can say that since that bulletin has been out we have had hundreds and thousands of applications for it from farmers who want to know how to carry on the business, and I am having more applications for experimental stations every day.

Mr. COCHRANE. From some Grit heelers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but frequently from Conservative voters who appreciate the benefits that are being conferred upon them in this respect by a Liberal government. These are progressive farmers and are not like my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) who thinks he can learn nothing—not from the Minister of Agriculture, who does not pretend to teach him—but from the officials in the Department of Agriculture, who are the best experimenters and the best experts in this country, and I may say on this continent, and who are working to-day for the benefit of the farmers of Canada and doing work that the farmers of Canada appreciate.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister says that he has received thousands of applica-

tions for his pamphlet, but the reason is that he has deceived the public by it, and they will soon wake up to the fact that they have been deceived by the Minister of Agriculture, who pretends to know more than he does. The Minister of Agriculture says that I can learn nothing from him. I would be very sorry if I could learn anything from the minister about farming, and I can tell him that the farmers of this country can learn nothing from his farming. I am willing to pay any reasonable amount for experiments in these experimental plots, and I believe they are very useful, but I also believe I should not be asked to pay my hard earned money to keep up a farm that the minister admits he cannot make pay. I can tell the minister that there are hundreds and thousands of farmers in this country who have better and more artistic buildings on their farms than he has got on his experimental farm. The experiments made by these scientific men are of value, and the people are willing to pay a liberal sum for the benefits we derive from them, but otherwise the thing is of very little value. We know as much about cheese making and butter making as any gentleman there, unless it is Professor Robertson. We know that the minister spent $40,000 in experimenting in curing cheese in cold storage, when he could have made his experiments for a couple of thousand dollars in any well equipped cheese factory. I repeat what I said, that the minister is deceiving the public because he led the farmers to believe that he could make chicken farming pay, when the Auditor General's Report shows that his experiment was worse than a failure.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not surprised at the statement made by the minister that he has had a great many applications for these stations. I suppose every government supporter throughout the country would like to have a station on his farm. There is one of those stations at a place called Holmesville, which, I presume, is in the constituency of the hon. gentleman from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) and there a gentleman got an expenditure of $613.36 and he returned $196, showing a deficit of over $400. Another at Bowmanville expended $225.29 and returned 66 cents. If the hon. minister's statement is correct, that these are experimental stations, how does it come that this gentleman purchased a lot of eggs and supplies, and only got 66 cents out of the lot? Would not every voter in the country want one of these stations at his door when he sees the results that follow. The gentleman at Bowmanville was paid $150 for his services, from the 24th April to the 24th July—$50 a month. Every farmer would like to get that for feeding a few chickens. He bought 1,722 eggs, at $20.78. He must have sucked them all, because he only returned 66 cents out of the lot. So I am not surprised at the statement of the minister that he has application after application for these stations. I have only read a few items, but there are dozens of others all over the country. I am sure that several of these stations could be planted in the constituency of Leeds, among the hon. gentleman's friends there. They would like to have them, and have the care of the chickens. Is the minister satisfied with these results of his experimenting?

Mr. HOLMES. I am sorry I did not happen to be in the House when the matter of the Holmesville chicken station was first referred to, because I would like to have heard all that was said in relation to it. But I can say that although it shows a deficiency on the expenditure, the people in the neighbourhood, irrespective of their political proclivities, are glad to have the station, and admit that it has been a success. I can say further that the egg-suckers referred to by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) are not confined to the Liberal party; for I had an application this week from a Conservative in Goderich who realized the success of the Holmesville station and wanted one established at Goderich also. I am sorry that the minister was not able to grant the request, because I am satisfied that the people of West Huron, altogether regardless of political predilections, regard the station at Holmesville as a success and as doing a good work.

Mr. POPE. Are these chickens fed with the feeding machine?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Sometimes they are, and sometimes they are not.

Mr. POPE. Why are they not all fed alike?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are not using the machine much now.

Mr. POPE. It was only a year or two ago that we were advised by the Minister of Agriculture that the squirt was the only proper thing with which to feed chickens. Surely, after having made the careful investigation which the hon. minister must have made before recommending this priming machine, which was adopted at his suggestion or at the suggestion of his department, he must have known whether that machine was a success or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was an experiment.

Mr. POPE. It had been experimented with in very many parts of the world. It was not the invention of the hon. gentleman—this squirt which he used to pump food into the chickens. Why, as I look at the picture of this well-dressed gentleman in this pamphlet, I could almost fancy that it represented the first experiment of the Minister of Agriculture himself on that chicken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A good likness.

Mr. POPE. A very good likeness indeed—a little too much hair perhaps. It may have been taken in the younger days, before the parting was quite so definite. But I observe here a long description of wringing the chickens' necks. Great heavens, Sir, I have wrung the necks of chickens and some other things ever since I was ten years old. This is what the article says :

Kill chickens by dislocating the neck.

That is simply wringing the neck.

With the left hand——

Don't take the right hand ; if you do, the job will not be properly done.

With the left hand hold the chicken's legs and wings in one firm grasp.

If you are left-handed, you cannot do the business. No left-handed man need apply.

Place the first finger of the right hand——

Mind, not the second finger. If you have lost the first finger, you are not in it.

Place the first finger of the right hand on the right side of the neck, and the remaining fingers on the left side. Grasp the head in the hollow of the hand, with the fork of the fingers behind the head where it joins the neck. The back of the chicken being upwards, hold the legs against the left hip.

If you should put them against the right hip, the whole thing is 'bust ;' the killing of this chicken would be a failure ; the meat would not be worth sending to market; it would be completely spoiled.

Hold the legs against the left hip and the head near the thigh or knee.

It does not give you a choice. Mr. Chairman, this is interesting to you as a physician, to know the proper way to kill a chicken.

Bend the head backward as far as possible, and at the same time stretch the neck, and when it is dislocated, immediately pull the head.

If you don't the chicken will wake up ; you must not give it a second. It says immediately ; the instructions are specific ; the word should be underlined.

Immediately pull the head to you one and a-half inches from the neck.

If you pull it more than 1½ inches, the whole job is incomplete.

Hold the wings firmly——

This is an important matter, that you must hold the wings of chickens at all times with a firm grasp.

Hold the wings firmly after killing——

Even after the chicken is dead, you must not let go ; it is dangerous to let go of the wings——

—and allow the chicken's head to hang down so that the blood can collect in the neck. The head is attached to the body simply by the skin of the neck.

That is, you stretch it 1½ inches, hang on to the wings after the chicken is dead, and let its head drop down. What a cruel act, Mr. Chairman, towards this beautiful bird who but a few moments before was crowing around the barnyard, so proud of himself that you might almost think he was the Minister of Agriculture. There he is, with his head hanging down after you have twisted it off. I think, Mr. Chairman, that there are farmers in this country who might possibly be able to wring a chicken's neck without these elaborate instructions contained in this pamphlet which is issued by the Department of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, Mr. Chairman, we will issue a new edition of the pamphlet with the annotations of the hon. gentleman. It might be more acceptable to his friends.

Mr. POPE. It is very kind of the Minister of Agriculture, who I know is very kindly disposed towards me. If you issue a new addition, just say wring the chicken's neck in the old-fashioned way, and let it go at that. The farmers will catch on, for it is very simple.

Mr. CLANCY. On what principles are those experiments carried on which result in a loss ? The first thing to convince the farmers would be that the work could be carried on privately afterwards without loss.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Whenever experiments have been carried on, there are expenditures which have nothing whatever to do with the profit or loss in the raising or fattening of chickens. Records have to be kept and a certain amount of experiments are bound to result in failure, but our failures serve as a lesson to others. Last year we tried the experiment of raising a certain number of chickens ourselves and feeding them in competition with chickens we bought. We have also been trying incubators for eggs raised from our own hens and eggs that are bought. That kind of work costs more and shows more failure than ordinary work done on purely commercial lines.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman does not throw much light on the subject. The committee must be surprised at the hon. minister stating that they tried bad methods in order to find out good ones. In other words they sow failures in order that they may reap success and spend a lot of money in that way. If the hon. gentleman has men capable of carrying on experiments, it seems to me that the best methods should be thought and none others. There is not a farmer who does not know how to raise chickens, and it is a very poor compliment to their intelligence to have men going about teaching them that work. Farmers have incubators just as well as the Experimental Farm. How many experiment stations have paid expenses, and how many are in operation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None of them have paid expenses. There were twelve stations last year in operation.

Mr. CLANCY. Who are the men employed in carrying on these experiments at these different stations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is one at Calgary under charge of Mr. Barker. One at Renfrew, Ontario, under the charge of Mr. John Broone, and there are several others.

Mr. CLANCY. Where did those gentlemen receive instructions as experts to equip them for the work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are farmers who have been engaged in poultry raising, and they get their instructions from the department.

Mr. CLANCY. They come down here to undergo a training.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. minister intend establishing any more of these experimental stations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are some passing out of our control, and perhaps some others will be established in place of the old ones. There is a demand from almost every quarter for this work to be carried on.

Mr. FOWLER. I should think they would want it carried on in Renfrew.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not a question of the expenditure of the money and the making of a direct profit, but it is the advantage to the farmers of seeing the work done and learning the results of the experiments.

Mr. FOWLER. But the results they find out from the station at Renfrew would tend to prevent the farmers from going into the business. These requests must come from Grit heelers who want jobs.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but from farmers of the district.

Mr. BLAIN. I believe the committee would be satisfied to have a certain amount of money expended in teaching the farmers how to fatten chickens. But I am strongly of opinion that all that work ought to be done at the Experimental Farm at Ottawa. What advantage, for instance, do the farmers of West Huron get from the expenditure of $400 or $500 on this experimental station more than they would get from work properly done on the experimental farm here? It would be better to expend the money in equipping the experimental farm here and sending out bulletins to farmers around the country prepared by the experts in charge of this main station. If it is necessary to extend further in the province of Ontario, the hon. minister must remember that at Guelph there is an Ontario Experimental Farm, which naturally becomes a centre of information for the farmers of West Huron and many other constituencies. What advantage is it to teach the farmers of West Huron by experiments how to kill a chicken ? There is only one way to do it, and no doubt the bulletin set it forth. The minister is reaching out too much, and that is one reason why the experimental farm here is not better equipped. It would be better to equip this farm properly, and from here send out bulletins.

Mr. FOWLER. In my town there are several persons who are engaged in the poultry business. But when the government came to select a person for the work in this experimental station, instead of selecting one of the men who understood the business, they selected a man, a very worthy gentleman in his own line, who was engaged in the sale of agricultural implements. He had not an acre of land, was not a farmer in any sense, and did not even keep a hen or chicken about his premises, until he was appointed to this work. But he had this qualification, that he was very active in working for the Liberal party. I agree with the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that expenditure of this sort is quite absurd. The minister, in the course of his occupation of this department, has done some very absurd things, but of all the things he has been guilty of, this chicken fattening business is to my mind, the most absurd. I am sorry he does not carry out what he intimated to the committee last session, when this subject was up for discussion, when he intimated that he was about through with his experiments along this line. It is impossible for people generally in a large agricultural community to go and see how the chicken fattening business is done. You must instruct by means of bulletins, and these can be issued from the Experimental Farm at Ottawa. When you take this Renfrew case, it is most glaring. The expenditure is $180. It is a small sum, but, on the other hand, you find that the receipts amounted to only $6.86. Did the chickens die off ? Or were they sent in the defective cold storage that the hon. minister has given us, and perish on the way ? It does seem to me that, after the lamentable exhibition he has given us tonight, he can no longer pose as the capable head of this department. When we find that this cold storage of which he boasted so long is so thoroughly inefficient, when we find, that the fruit growers of Niagara district can no longer take advantage of it because their fruit is practically destroyed, and when we find these chicken experiments resulting so deplorably, surely these things should constrain the hon. gentleman to plead guilty to the charge that he is thoroughly incompetent and unfit for his position, and should make way for some better man.

Mr. CLARKE. When this pamphlet was published, I took advantage of the opportunity to write to the officials of the hon. gentleman's department and get a number of copies, which I had the pleasure of sending out to people engaged in chicken raising. I had not then seen this account in the Auditor General's Report. If the gentlemen to whom I sent the pamphlets learn of the financial results of these experiments, it is hardly likely they will follow the advice given. I would like to ask the hon. minister what was the object of establishing this experimental station at Bowmanville? I see that the expenditure was $225.29; and there was a return of just 66 cents. The main item of expenditure was $150 salary to the person operating this branch. On eggs and other things $75.25 was spent. The number of eggs purchased was 143½ dozen. There was also bought 75 gallons of coal oil, two gross of screw nails and other suppiles. Is it the intention to carry on that station at Bowmanville? Was the object in establishing it to incubate the eggs artificially? In any case it seems to have been a lamentable failure, when we get back only 66 cents after an expenditure of $225.29. I notice that at the Holmesville station, to which my hon. friend from Huron referred, there was one purchase of ten yards of flannel. Was that to prevent the chickens from getting the croup?

Mr. HOLMES. It shows that they were pretty honest in putting everything into the account.

Mr. CLARKE. I agree with the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) that the country is ready to spend any reasonable sum in well considered experiments. What is to be done with this Bowmanville station? I am sure the results have not been very satisfactory to the minister. Does he intend to keep that station going on? It has cost this country $225.29 less 66 cents to produce an experiment upon 142½ dozens of eggs. Has there been any practical benefit to the farming community of Bowmanville or of the county of Durham from this experiment?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got the details of the results of the work there. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman what I said earlier in the evening, that I do not expect for a moment that these illustrations at the experimental stations are going to have any profitable results as far as revenue is concerned. But they are beneficial to the country at large, just as other experimental and illustration work in the various parts of the country, in so far as they supply information which is distributed to the farmers throughout the country. In this particular case, if I find that the station has not been productive of anything of value to the country, I should not continue it. The country at large is asking for illustration work of this kind. Not a week passes that I do not receive requests from different parts of the country to establish experimental farm stations. Complaints are constantly coming in that the farmers cannot afford to come to the experimental farm at Ottawa, or to those in other parts of the country, they are asking for something more within their reach. That request has been so constant that wherever it has seemed feasible, I have been glad to try and distribute this kind of work over the country as much as possible. That is the policy I have adopted in these illustration stations and some other branches. So far as I have seen, that has been on the whole acceptable to the farmers, and I believe it is a useful concession to the demands which have been made in the interest of agriculture. The poultry stations are doing work that is partly experimental and partly illustrative. The expenditure and the sales from them have no relation at all to the nature of the work. The balance between sales and expenditure at a station is no criterion at all of the value of the work that is done at that station.

Mr. CLARKE. But what is the particular kind of information which the hon. gentleman wishes to furnish to the farmers by these stations? The principal item in the outlay at this station at Bowmanville is for three months' salary, $150, for the gentleman who had the good fortune to be selected to conduct these experiments. Has he issued any memorandum showing the results obtained by this station?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was one of several stations in which the work of fattening chickens was illustrated for that section of the country. The same work is illustrated in other stations which I have read over.

Mr. CLARKE. Here it is about eggs.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That shows the hon. gentleman that what he finds in the Auditor General's Report does not show the work that is being done there.

Mr. CLARKE. Then what is the use of publishing it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What he finds in the Auditor General's Report is merely a statement of the disbursements and receipts, but as I have explained, these are no criterion at all of the value of the work done.

Mr. CLARKE. Has this gentleman made a report of the result of his operations at Bowmanville?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the minister say what better knowledge we have of the raising, feeding and fattening of chickens as a result of the establishment of that station at Bowmanville?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have pointed out that this kind of work has been conducted in a dozen different stations all over the country for the purpose of illustrating what can be done. One of these stations was in the far west of Ontario, another is at Renfrew, and other is in central Ontario, at Bowmanville.

Mr. CLARKE. The information which the farmers of Ontario will obtain from the Bowmanville station ought to be accompanied by some further information, because those of them who only see or hear of the Auditor General's Report, will only know that this station cost $225.29 and yielded receipts of 66 cents. Will they be edified by getting that information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think they will appreciate what has been done.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be better for the minister to give further particulars as to the results which he has attained in this station at Bowmanville ? We all appreciate the efforts which are made to give our farmers increased knowledge as to the profitable raising of poultry, but the way these accounts are presented will not leave a favourable impression upon the mind of the ordinary reader. If the hon. gentleman is going to issue any more pamphlets, let him give us some memoranda that will show to the people any benefit there may be from the expenditure of this money at Bowmanville.

Mr. FOWLER. So far as we can see, the result of this experiment at Bowmanville will be to deter the farmer from going into the chicken business. But we have a similar result at Renfrew, where the receipts are very much larger., it is true, but still there is a great disparity between the receipts and the expenditure. I know the experiments at the Sussex station, which the minister has partly discontinued, were very disastrous. I think the receipts were only about 25 per cent of the expenditure. The only way in which the hon. minister could possibly get any advantage is by issuing bulletins from these different stations, because all the information that the country has is what is contained in the Auditor General's Report. As the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has pointed out, I do not know how the farmers are going to read between the lines or how they will regard it as a very valuable work unless it be from the standpoint that it is a good business to keep clear of as far as the farmer is concerned. Unless the hon. minister has bulletins issued to the farmers or has farmers' excursions arranged to bring them in, and let them see how the chicken is properly fattened and the egg properly hatched, I do not see where any beneficial results can possibly be attained, and I throw out that suggestion to the hon. minister in order that he may try and improve matters in the future if he proposes to continue his chicken fattening experiments.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman made the statement a few moments ago in order to try and lead the House and the country to believe that he was doing what was fair for the province of Ontario. He said he had established one station at Holmesville in western Ontario, one at Renfrew in eastern Ontario, and one at Bowmanville in central Ontario. If he will look at the Auditor General's Report he will find that on the next farm, at Whitby, he has established another. Whitby is in South Ontario and Bowmanville is in West Durham, two adjoining Grit constituencies, and the gentlemen running these stations are known to be the worst Grit heelers in that section of the country. Mr. Foley, at Bowmanville, every one knows, is one of the faithful, while Mr. Brant, who lives a few miles out of Whitby, everybody knows, is one of the leading politicians in that section of the country and knows nothing more about fattening chickens than the hon. minister himself does. He got $638.41 and returned $266.63, making a loss of about $400. He drew out of that for services from April 1 to December 24, 1901, $382, and the balance went for supplies ; 3,800 pounds oat chop, 12 bushels corn, skim milk, 9,210 pounds, &c., and there is a deficiency of $400 in this case. Central Ontario had to have two stations adjoining each other. The hon. minister tried to lead the House and the country to believe there was only one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Was that not in the year before ?

Mr TAYLOR. This is all in the last Auditor General's Report.

Mr. HOLMES. Just for the benefit of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), who suggests the holding of farmers' excursions, of course, jocularly, I may say that hundreds of people from all over that section of the country have visited the poultry station at Holmesville. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite do not think that Holmesville has any special connection with myself because it happens to have my name. I am sorry to say that nearly all of the residents there vote against me. At the same time I venture to make the statement that if the hon. Minister of Agriculture could see his way clear to establishing a poultry station in every county in Ontario the people of Ontario would endorse his action in doing so. The people of the locality who have had an opportunity of seeing the work that is being done at the station are perfectly satisfied with what has been done during the first year of its existence, because it has only been in existence one year, even though the work is being done at a loss. Of course, as the hon. minister very properly suggests, you cannot expect that experiments of that

kind will show their results in dollars and cents. Whether these stations are expected to become self-sustaining or not I do not know, but I venture to make the assertion that I believe the people are perfectly well satisfied with the work that is being done there, and they realize that it has enhanced the value of poultry in that section to a very considerable degree.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think we might turn our attention now to some other subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I would like to say a few words on the subject first.

Mr. HENDERSON. As an interlude and to allow our friends to have a breathing spell in dealing with poultry, I desire to introduce another subject. I am interested, I may say, in poultry raising. I have for years taken a great deal of interest in it and I think that a great deal can be accomplished by supplying the farmers with eggs of the most approved breeds of poultry. I am sure there is as much accomplished in that way as in any other part of the business undertaken at the experimental farm or by the government. The subject that I desire to introduce at present is a matter that came before the Agricultural Committee in the month of April last, and which I am not sure whether it has been dealt with by the hon. minister or not. I refer to a pamphlet that was written illustrating a portion of the fruit districts in western Ontario. A copy of this pamphlet was shown to members of the Agricultural Committee and the suggestion was made that the author should write another book of about the same size along the same lines but dealing with all the provinces of the Dominion as well as the province of Ontario, which was dealt with in this book. That suggestion met with the approval of the Agricultural Committee. It was thought to be a good thing to have some illustrated book that could be sent to the old country to show the people there the character of the fruit farms of Canada, with a view of directing the attention of the people there to the matter and inducing them to invest money in that business. It is unnecessary for me to attempt to enlarge upon the value of the fruit industry of this country. We have heard a great deal about it. We all know something of it. The other day the right hon. Prime Minister was somewhat at a loss to find where the garden of Canada was. Well, if he will come to the county of Halton I will show him a portion of it and perhaps one of the finest portions as far as fruit-growing is concerned. I would like to see this illustrated book that the Agricultural Committee examined given a circulation in the old country because I believe it would be a very useful kind of literature and something that the hon. Minister of Agriculture would find profitable and useful in soliciting a certain class of people to come to this country. The report of the Agricultural Committee was presented on the 5th of May last, and as the minister was then out of the country it is possible that his attention may not have been called to it. I read the report from the Votes and Proceedings, page 277 :

Mr. Douglas, from the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, presented the third report of the said committee, which is as follows :—

The committee submit, for the information of the House, the following report of a sub-committee, and said report adopted by the committee on the 1st April, 1903.

The sub-committee of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, appointed to examine into and report upon the advisability of procuring a second and extended edition of the pamphlet written by Miss Martha Craig, illustrating the fruit industry of a portion of Western Ontario, beg leave to report as follows :—

We are of opinion that a booklet prepared on the plan indicated by the sample above named is admirably calculated to attract the attention of people in the old land interested in fruit-growing.

Miss Craig's proposal to us is to issue a second edition of the said work, eliminating from the sample shown to the sub-committee all that does not relate exclusively to fruit-culture and the results accruing therefrom, and to extend the scope of the work to all provinces of the Dominion.

Subject to these conditions, the sub-committee advise that your committee recommend to the honourable the Minister of the Interior and the honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that departmental support be granted to the extent of the acceptance of a sufficient number of copies of the said enlarged booklet as will warrant the authoress to proceed with the work to completion and publication at once.

This report received the endorsation and commendation of the Committee on Agriculture, but for some reason or other the chairman did not move its adoption. I hope that the minister, if he has not already done so, will give his attention to it and will carry out the views expressed by the committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not had the matter brought formally to my attention although several members of the Agricultural Committee have spoken to me with regard to it. The report was not adopted by the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It was never presented.

Mr. HENDERSON. The report was presented but for some reason or other the chairman refused to move its adoption and in this way he thwarted the intention of the Agricultural Committee. I am satisfied that had the report been moved it would have received the unanimous approval of the House.

The MINSTER OF AGRICULTURE. My impression is that a report of that kind recommending the expenditure of public

money would not be in order, and probably that is why the chairman did not move its adoption. My attention is being constantly drawn to various publications by private individuals and I have been averse to purchasing publications of that kind. Without in any way going into the merits of this publication, I think it is better for the Department of Agriculture to issue the publications of its own officers rather than to buy from private individuals publications for which they wish to get patronage. Those publications are frequently pressed upon us in all sorts of ways, and if we once began to purchase them it will be very difficult to refuse some and to accept others. I have not dealt with this particular matter, but on general principles my first disposition would be against the Department of Agriculture purchasing such a book.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am rather surprised at the strong position the minister takes upon this matter. The Committee on Agriculture having recommended to the minister this small appropriation, surely he would consider it his duty to listen to the voice of that committee. What is the committee for if it is not to examine into matters of this kind, and to give the result of their investigation? The minister has not examined this book, but the Committee on Agriculture has examined it and approved of it, believing it was an excellent work for the purpose for which it is intended. Surely the minister will accept the recommendation of such a large committee as that? As to the excuse that the chairman could not move the report because it involved the expenditure of public money, we know that the chairman of the Agricultural Committee day after day moved reports recommending the printing of certain bulletins which involves expenditure. If it is wrong in one case it is wrong in the other. To my mind the minister takes a very strong position indeed when he tells the Committee on Agriculture that he is not going to accept any advice from them, and that he prefers to act on his own judgment and utilize the works that are prepared by the officials of his department. He may have in his deparment officials just as competent to write a work of this kind, but I do not think that any of them has succeeded in doing so. The book is got up in an attractive form calculated to attract the attention of people in the old land, and it was the opinion of the committee that it would be an excellent work for that purpose. I hope that the minister on reflection will not so lightly treat the recommendation of such a large committee, who after a full examination of the work sent this report to the House.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). I rise to support the contention of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). Our immigration department costs over $600,000 a year, and large sums are expended for literature of one kind or another chiefly in advertising our western grain fields. We are losing from Ontario each year many thousands of our young men, who are going to the Northwest; and it is very fortunate that it is so, because they make the best settlers and form the backbone of that country. But their places in Ontario must be taken by some other persons, and fruit-growing is one of the best industries in which immigrants from the old country could engage, whether in Ontario or any of the older provinces. This pamphlet will show the merits of fruit-growing in different parts of the Dominion, not confining its attention to any one locality. I have seen a work by the same author, and it was very well got up and a very handsome work; and I am sure that the work proposed will be a very attractive pamphlet to place in the hands of intending immigrants in the old country. I do not think the minister could spend what it would cost to better advantage. If he has a man in his own department who could do the work better and has the time to do it, well and good; but I suppose that his officers have no time to write books, and if that is the case, I do not think the hon. minister could do better than act on the recommendation of the Committee of Agriculture, who have examined this work and recommended it to the government.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I happen to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture where this subject was fully discussed. The gentleman having that publication in charge took a great deal of trouble to seek information from every part of this Dominion, so that the book, when published, will not be confined to particular localities, but will include every part of the Dominion, on a subject that will be very interesting and full of information to parties in the old country if they get the opportunity of reading it. I think a limited expenditure—because the expenditure would not be large—in getting this book published would be of great service to the Department of Agriculture in inducing a better class of immigrants to come to this country.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth. I find in a late issue of the Montreal 'Star' that at a meeting of butter and cheese merchants in the city of Montreal, it was stated by Mr. Ayer that he did not know of a single creamery in Canada which was putting up butter in proper shape. Another gentleman, Mr. Hodgson, stated that thousands of cheese are arriving on the other side without the vestige of a box. A year ago the minister was going to take some steps to induce the factories to put their cheese and butter into strong and sufficient boxes. It seems to me that that has not been done, and that the business is in a worse condition now than ever before, if these statements are correct.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think there has been a great improvement this year. Just yesterday, a gentleman from Montreal, in conversation with one of my officers, stated that he noticed a great improvement in the boxing of cheese this year. The experiment of shipping cheese from the cool curing rooms in good boxes has been very successful, and the other cheese makers have taken example and warning from that.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). Does the government continue to guarantee to pay 5 per cent on the cold storage plant established in the city of Quebec, and has the government been obliged to pay it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That has all been settled three or four years ago, and I think nothing has been paid since.

Mr. SMITH (Wentworth). What space is reserved for the merchants of Montreal in the ships with cool air ? I think I have seen in some of the agreements that a certain amount of space is reserved.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was some agreement of that kind in connection with the old cold storage system. It was not that a certain amount of space should be available for the shippers of Montreal, but that a certain amount should be reserved for shippers from the west as against the Montreal shippers for a certain time before the ship sailed. That is not in this agreement with reference to the cooled air chamber.

Mr. GILMOUR. What use has been made of the cool chamber last year and this year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This year we have had to refuse cheese all the time. We have not been able to accommodate all that was offered. The results last year were so satisfactory that the factory men have been crowding their cheese in.

Mr. GILMOUR. How long has the cheese been continued in that curing room ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Two or three weeks, and sometimes four weeks. The absolute limit as advertised is eight weeks, but the cheese has never been kept nearly so long as that.

Mr. CLANCY. Are the government bearing any share of the cost of the cold storage concern at Charlottetown now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no payment this year.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the government ceased to have any connection with that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.35 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, July 30, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) presented the sixth report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House during the present session, as follows :

Your committee recommend :

1st. That an additional English reporter be appointed on the staff of the official reporters of the debates at the same salary as that paid to each member of the staff, and that the appointment and remuneration of the said reporter date from the day on which he enters upon his official duties.

2nd. That the salary of C. W. Boyce, assistant to the chief reporter be increased from $1,000 to $1,200 per annum, such increase to date from the 1st August prox.

3rd. That the amanuenses to the official reporters who at present are receiving $3 per diem for their services be, as regards salary, placed on the same footing as the extra sessional clerks, i.e., that they be paid $4 per diem and that the said increase date from the beginning of the present session.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) L. N. CHAMPAGNE,
Chairman.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway. The Bill which I have the honour to place in your hands is divided into two parts. The first provides for the creation of a commission to be composed of three members, and to be empowered to build a certain portion of the railway which is mentioned in the Bill, the title of which I have just given. I do not know that at this moment it would serve any good purpose to go minutely into the dispositions of this part of the Bill. They are such as are to be found in Bills of this character, to empower the commissioners to do a certain work, and they define their powers and their obligations.

The second part of the Bill provides for the ratification of a contract which has been entered into between the government and certain gentlemen now seeking incorporation under the name of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. This Bill will have to be supplemented by resolutions, which I will place on the Order Paper to conform with our rules of procedure in such cases. The House has been impatient, and not unnaturally, to be informed of the leading features of the policy which we have to present with regard to the building of another transcontinental railway. It will be my duty now to inform the House

and to give it all the knowledge it is in my power to give at this moment, in order to satisfy a very legitimate curiosity.

First, Sir, perhaps it would not be amiss if I were to address myself at once to a question which has come to us from different quarters, and which may find an echo within these walls. Why this new enterprise? Why this expenditure? Why should parliament be called upon to assent to such a policy as is here indicated? We ask parliament to assent to this policy because we believe—nay, we feel certain, and certain beyond a doubt—that in so doing we give voice and expression to a sentiment, a latent but deep sentiment, which is to-day in the mind, and still more in the heart, of every Canadian, that a railway to extend from the shores of the Atlantic ocean to the shores of the Pacific ocean, and to be, every inch of it, on Canadian soil, is a national as well as a commercial necessity. That such a road must be built, that it is, in the language which I have used, a national and a commercial necessity, that it is a corollary of our status as a nation, that it is a requisite of our commercial development, is a proposition to which, up to this moment, I have heard no dissent.

Exception has been taken to the immediate necessity of building such a road, exception has been taken to the policy which we have to suggest for the immediate construction of such a road; but as to the idea itself I have never heard a word of opposition, nor do I believe that such a word will be heard in the debate. The first of these objections, that is to the immediate construction of such a road, can be disposed of, I believe, with a single observation. To those who urge upon us the policy of to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow; to those who tell us, Wait, wait, wait; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is: No, this is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood of tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again. If we let it pass, the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows. We cannot wait, because time does not wait; we cannot wait because, in these days of wonderful development, time lost is doubly lost; we cannot wait, because at this moment there is a transformation going on in the conditions of our national life which it would be folly to ignore and a crime to overlook; we cannot wait, because the prairies of the North-west, which for countless ages have been roamed over by the wild herds of the bison, or by the scarcely less wild tribes of red man, are now invaded from all sides by the white race. They came last year 100,000, and still they come in still greater numbers. Already they are at work opening the long dormant soil; already they are at work sowing, harvesting and reaping. We say that to-day it is the duty of the Canadian government, it is the duty of the Canadian parliament, it is the duty of all those who have a mandate from the people to attend to the needs and requirements of this fast growing country, to give heed to that condition of things. We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people, to provide immediate means whereby the products of those new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost, and whereby, likewise, a market may be found in this new region for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces. Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels, and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land. Upon this question we feel that our position is absolutely safe and secure; we feel that it corresponds to the beating of every Canadian heart.

With regard to the plan which we have adopted for the construction of the road, there may be honest and honourable differences of opinion. The House knows there have been already such differences of opinion, honourable and honest, because it has been our misfortune to lose one of our colleagues upon this question. We make bold to say, however, that we stand upon very firm ground, and it will be my duty to present to the House the reasons which have led up to the policy which we have adopted and the reasons which we can invoke in favour of its support.

Our conception that this road, in order to give to the people the full benefit which they have a right to expect from it, should extend westward from the heart of the maritime provinces, from the town of Moncton, at the juncture of the two lines which proceed from Halifax and from St. John. I know very well that amongst those who oppose our policy there are a good many who maintain that it is sufficient that such a road should be constructed from Quebec westward to the Pacific ocean; that there is no need whatever of extending that railway from Quebec to Moncton because, between Quebec and Moncton, there is already the Intercolonial Railway. Sir, the answer which we have to make to this objection is plain, obvious, categorical, peremptory and paramount; the answer is that the Intercolonial never was intended, and never was conceived, and never was built for transcontinental traffic. The Intercolonial was first conceived as a military road. It was built and located for politi-

cal reasons, not from any commercial considerations. Far be it from me to cast any aspersions upon the memory of those who conceived and carried out this very useful enterprise. But if the truth must be told, it must be said that those who conceived and carried out the Intercolonial added to its length, to its normal length, several hundred miles. I will not quarrel with them at this stage. The reasons were political, and they were reasons we can all understand. If that railway was located where it is to-day it was simply because it was desired to give railway facilities to the groups of population which inhabit the northern section of New Brunswick and the south shore of the St. Lawrence. Far be it from me to blame the judgment of those who carried out that enterprise ; but the action which they took affords us a lesson which we should not forget at the present time. The action which they took is a lesson to us who are to-day entrusted with the destinies of this nation, as the trustees of the people, that in building a transcontinental railway we have to build not only for the time being, but for the morrow as well, and not for one locality, but for the whole of Canada. Sir, the men of 1867 built for the condition of things which they found in 1867 ; but we the men of 1903, have to build for the condition of things which exists in 1903, and not only for that condition of things, but also for a condition of things that we see looming up in the near future.

The line which we propose will extend from the Quebec bridge down on the southern slope of the mountains which extend through the counties of Lévis, Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet, Kamouraska and Temiscouata up to the town of Edmundston. At the town of Edmundston that line will connect with the system of railways which now gives direct connection with St. John. From the town of Edmundston the railway will proceed eastward to the town of Moncton ; it is impossible to say at this moment by what route, perhaps by Chipman, or in the vicinity of Chipman. At all events, from this point it is impossible exactly to locate any precise line, or to say where it will be ultimately. Suffice it to say that we desire to have the best and the shortest line between Lévis and Moncton. This is the line which would have been adopted in 1867, but in 1867 the settlements within the territory which will be covered by this line were few and far between. If there were any at all they were certainly very few in number. But, that condition of things has been changed since. The surplus of population north of the chain of mountains has overstepped the mountains, and is to be found upon the other side. They have occupied the fertile valley which is now rapidly settling up. New farms are being established, new parishes are springing up and, therefore, this is our justification, for this road will serve a local as well as a national purpose. But, we will be told —we have been told already—that by building such a line we are paralleling the line of the Intercolonial Railway. I have already taken issue with my late colleague the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), and once more I beg to take issue with him upon this point. If you will look at the map you will perceive that the Intercolonial Railway, when it leaves the station at Halifax, proceeds almost directly in a straight line to the head waters of the Bay of Fundy, which it reaches at Truro. From Truro the line proceeds in an almost due west course to Moncton. From Moncton it strikes northward to the waters of the Baie des Chaleurs. Upon reaching the waters of the Baie des Chaleurs, it hugs the shore very closely until it comes to the confluence of the Restigouche river. At the Restigouche river the line strikes northwards again and follows the waters of the St. Lawrence river to Chaudière Junction, a little west of Lévis. Thus, the line makes a long loop towards the north, it describes almost a complete semicircle, and the distance covered by it is no less than 488 miles. If it were possible to have a line of railway in a direct course from Lévis to Moncton it would be possible, I believe, without any exaggeration, to abridge the distance almost one-half, but, unfortunately, and I say it frankly to the House, it is not possible to have an absolutely direct line, or the shortest line possible between Moncton and Lévis, and if you will know the reason, you will find it at a glance at the map, and you will find it in the blunder which was made by British diplomacy in settling our boundary line by the Ashburton-Webster treaty. No one can look at that map without feeling a sentiment of anger, almost akin to indignation. But, it is no use to go back to what has been done. We have to take facts as they are, we have to submit to the inevitable and to the fact that the boundary line of the state of Maine has been projected through our territory within a distance of about 45 miles of the St. Lawrence. We have to follow the line of the state of Maine, and following that line we believe we can abridge the distance between Moncton and Lévis by from 120 miles to 140 miles. Between these two lines of railway, the one extending northward along the shore of the St. Lawrence, and the line which is now laid down on the map, there will be a distance at every point of at least 30 miles, and at some points of at least 75 miles. It is impossible, under these circumstances, therefore, to say that the second line will parallel the Intercolonial Railway. First of all, how can we say that the line is parallel at all ? What is the definition of a parallel line ? I could not conceive that one line is paralleling another because they start at the same point and end at the same point, but they only become parallel lines when it is possible for the people living between

these two lines to use either the one or the other of them. This is a condition which does not apply to the present line which we are contemplating. There will be a distance of 30 miles, which alone would prevent communication from one to the other, but, in addition to that, between these 30 miles, there is a chain of mountains which it is very difficult for people to overcome. Therefore, I say it cannot be fairly stated that this line is going to parallel the line that we already have in existence. I stated a moment ago that the line of the Intercolonial Railway was placed where it is for political reasons. Certainly, those who built that line, those who conceived it, those who planned it, never contemplated at the time that the day would ever come when it would be used for transcontinental transportation, yet, scarcely had the last rail been put down, scarcely had a train commenced to run upon it when it was discovered that the long, tortuous meanders of the line were a serious impediment to trade, even to the comparatively small trade of the Canada of that day. An agitation immediately commenced in the maritime provinces, in the province of Quebec and even westward in the province of Ontario, to have a shorter line built between the centre of confederation and the eastern ports of Canada. Those who were in the House of Commons in the years 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884 will remember that almost every session allusion was made to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway could not serve the purposes of the growing traffic of Canada, and that we had to find a shorter line of railway than we then had. The feeling became so acute, the agitation became so strong, that the government of Sir John Macdonald had to give heed to it, and in 1884 the following resolution was introduced by Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals:

> For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax, by the shortest and best practicable route, a subsidy not exceeding $170,000 per annum for fifteen years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period, as interest on bonds of the company undertaking the work.

Mark the language of this resolution.

> For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax, by the shortest and best practicable route.

There was an admission that the line of the Intercolonial Railway was not the shortest and best practicable route, that it could not serve the purposes of the growing trade of that time, but, strong as is the admission contained in the resolution, it is perhaps still better that I should give the commentaries made on that occasion by Sir Charles Tupper himself to illustrate and develop the thought that is there contained. He said:

> Then a very strong feeling has grown up in the maritime provinces, and not only in the maritime provinces, but throughout Canada, because I believe that from British Columbia down through the North-west Territories, through the province of Ontario, and in the province of Quebec, there has been a strong and general sentiment that this great interoceanic line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be incomplete if we were obliged to have our Atlantic terminus in a foreign country. I believe the sentiment is not at all confined to the provinces of Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, or the province of New Brunswick, but I believe it has taken just as deep a hold of the minds of our friends of the other provinces almost as it has in the maritime provinces. Although every effort has been made to render the operation of the Intercolonial Railway as successful as possible, although more has been accomplished in the development of the country, in the development of the trade and business of the country, through the agency of the Intercolonial Railway than any person on either side of this House a few years ago supposed to be possible, still we have found we were too heavily handicapped by the distance, and that we could not, reluctantly as we are driven to the conclusion, we have been driven to the conclusion by the force of circumstances and by the practical results, that it is impossible for the ports of St. John and Halifax to compete with the nearer ports of Portland and Boston, in the United States.
>
> Under these circumstances, the attention of the government has been drawn, as I have said on one or two occasions before in this House, to the best means by which we might secure a realization of that which we all desire, the Atlantic terminus being in Canadian territory as well as the Pacific terminus, and thus be placed in a position to fairly compete for the transcontinental trade and traffic that we all know must flow over that line. * * * *
>
> I have stated the position in which this question stands from its national or larger point of view, and I believe I may confidently rely not only upon the kind support of our friends on this side of the House for carrying out a measure which has been considered by the government in all its aspects and in all its bearings with a view to the promotion of the best interests of the country, but I believe I can rely with equal confidence upon the support of gentlemen opposite in carrying out what we all recognize as most important, making a complete line of communication through Canada, and enabling us to have the great ocean termini on the Atlantic as well as on the Pacific within our own borders. * * * * From Montreal, Halifax will be brought within 672 miles, and it is found practicable to obtain a line which will bring the port of Sydney under the effect of this subvention, within 774 miles. There will thus be saved in the present distance from Montreal to Sydney 219 miles, in the distance from Montreal to Halifax 173 miles, and the distance to St. John will be reduced 159 miles. I have only to read these figures to the House, in order to show that the government, in asking for this aid in extending practically the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, involving as it will the transport of the traffic of both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway down to our own coasts, and our own ports in the maritime provinces, are asking aid which will, without any question, assure the completion of that work. I have already stated that it is proposed that this shall not only be the shortest line to Montreal, but the shortest line to Quebec. * * * *
> In fact I believe that, within a very brief

period—I have stated four years as the term of these resolutions—this line of communication will be perfected and we will have the satisfaction of finding that we have the complete realization of our hopes and expectations in reference to the transcontinental traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway being brought down to our own ports. The questions with which I have been dealing up to this point, of course, are based upon broad and national considerations. They are founded upon a policy that is recognized and has been recognized from the first as the first duty that we owed to the country, and that is to be obtained by the construction of a national line of railway the closest possible intercommunication between one section of our country and another. The great disadvantage under which Canada has laboured, if it may be regarded as a disadvantage, was the remoteness of important sections of our common country from one another, and we have all regarded it as a first duty we owed to the country to endeavour to remove and obviate that as far as possible by diminishing the distance between all the important points of communication in the several sections of our country, thus bringing them as closely as we could together. Not only commercially but socially, the greatest possible advantage may be fairly expected from shortening the distance of intercommunication between the great commercial centres of the country and the outlying portions of it.

Now, Sir, in this long extract which I have read from that important speech of Sir Charles Tupper, the central idea is that the mode of communicating with the maritime ports over the Intercolonial Railway was inadequate on account of its abnormal length, and that it was the duty of the Canadian parliament and the Canadian people to at once provide for a shorter route of communication between the west and the east. This policy was never dissented from ; it was accepted immediately. But, I would call the attention of the House to one thing which is noticeable, which perhaps has escaped the attention of gentlemen on the other side, but which did not escape our attention when we were sitting on that side —it is noticeable that whilst Sir Charles Tupper lays great stress upon the fact that our national harbours must be upon Canadian territory and that we should have a shorter line of railway between St. John and Halifax he specially avoided any reference to the equally great necessity that that line of railway should be on Canadian territory.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Sitting as we were on the opposition side of the House we were not slow to point to this omission. We called the attention of the government to it, and as we received no satisfaction, then I, sitting in the seat now occupied by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), moved the following amendment because we had reason to believe as it actually turned out to be true afterwards, that it was the intention of the government of that day not to build the short line of railway upon Canadian territory but upon American territory. I moved :

That the said resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with power to amend the same by providing that the route for the line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax, for which a subsidy of $170,000 a year for 15 years is provided, should be subject to the approval of parliament.

I am sorry to say that this motion was defeated. If it had not been defeated, if the policy which was there enunciated had been implemented, probably it would not be my duty to-day to ask this House to vote money for the building of another line between Quebec and Moncton, for the line would have been built on the very ground where we now propose to locate it. However, the motion was defeated. And in order to obtain the majority of parliament to vote against this motion, the government had to promise and it made the promise on the floor of this House, that during the recess between that session and the following session, surveys and explorations would be made by competent engineers to discover if we could not have a better route than the one which was indicated as we understood, across the state of Maine. During the recess in the summer of 1884 several exploring parties went out and their reports can be found in a return which was brought down in the session of 1885 being a :

Return to an Address (Senate) presented to His Excellency the Governor General, dated the 17th March last; praying His Excellency to cause to be laid before this House copies of the reports of the various surveys made by engineers under the direction of the government for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route including the reports of Messrs. A. L. Light and Vernon Smith on the lines surveyed by them, respectively, running up the valley of the Etchemin river and from Canterbury, N.B., to the northern end of Chesuncook Lake, in the state of Maine.

In the session of 1885, the government came down with the policy which had been foreshadowed the previous year, that is the policy to build a short line of railway, not upon Canadian territory but across American territory, in the state of Maine. The resolution was introduced by Sir Charles Tupper and it was in these terms :

Also for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax via Sherbrooke, Moose Head Lake, Mattawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury, a subsidy not exceeding $80,000 per annum for 20 years, forming in the whole, together with the subsidy authorized by the Act 47 Vic., cap. 8, a subsidy not exceeding $250,000 per annum, the whole of which shall be paid in aid of the construction of such line for a period of 20 years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work.

Well, Sir, we took strong exception to this policy and that exception was formulated in an amendment which I myself moved from the opposition benches and which was in these words :

In the opinion of this House, additional surveys are requisite in order to a sound decision for the short line railway, and it would be premature to adopt any line before further surveys have been made.

The surveys which had been made had not been complete. The line was simply surveyed in a portion of the province of Quebec and very little in the province of New Brunswick. We therefore demanded before the policy was adopted to run that line of railway across the state of Maine, that new surveys should be made so that we might come to a better understanding of the question and arrive at a more proper decision. Again, I am sorry to say, this motion was voted down and the policy was adopted of building the short line of railway across the state of Maine. Now, Sir, it has been more or less in the air for the last twenty years that the government of Sir John Macdonald assented very reluctantly to the policy of building the short line of railway across the state of Maine. There has been a tradition in the air for a great many years that that policy was imposed upon the government by a gentleman who was then a very powerful member of the administration. As to that, however, I have nothing to say. Whatever may have been the reason, the policy was adopted of building the short line of railway across the state of Maine. Now, Sir, in the resolution which I have just read to the House, I want at this moment to call attention to a particular phase of it.

The resolution called for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax, via Sherbrooke, Moosehead, Lake Mattawamkeag, Harvey Fredericton and Salisbury. It was supposed that these words, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury has been inserted in order to give a shorter route to Halifax. I ventured at the time, in the speech which I delivered in support of my motion, to point out that these words seemed to be an after-thought. I did not believe that they were genuine. I supposed that they were a blind, and I expressed my opinion accordingly. The suspicion to which I gave expression called for an answer from the government which was given by Sir Hector Langevin, and it was in these words :

Well, I am sure the hon. gentleman will be pleased to hear the declaration which the government makes through me, that in the arrangements to be made with the company to build the railway, to take advantage of this vote of money, of $250,000 during twenty years, the government will take care to secure the completion of the railway, not only to Mattawamkeag, but also to Salisbury, and if that is not secured, there will be no subsidy given. We must act in good faith ; the faith of parliament is pledged, and we must take care that that money is employed as parliament wishes.

These were very strong words; but it turned out afterwards that my suspicions were correct, and that these words were introduced simply as a blind, because this promise, which was made solemnly on the floor of parliament, and to which the faith of parliament was pledged, never was implemented; and the line through Harvey, Salisbury and Fredericton has not been built to this day. Whatever may have been the reasons which militated against the government implementing that promise so solemnly made—made with all the sacredness which ought to attach not only to the word of the government, but to the word of parliament—whatever may have been those reasons, I do not know; but some years later (it took four or five years to complete the line by way of Sherbrooke and Mattawamkeag), about the time that road was completed, in the session of 1889, Sir John Macdonald, under the strong pressure which was brought to bear upon him by the parties whose interest it was to have this railway built from Harvey to Fredericton and Salisbury, introduced into this House a resolution to the following effect :

That it is expedient that a railway should be constructed as a government work, between a point of junction on the New Brunswick Railway, at or near Harvey, in the province of New Brunswick and a point of junction with the Intercolonial Railway at or near Salisbury, in the said province, or somewhere between Salisbury and Moncton, and that the sum of $500,000 be granted towards the construction of the said railway.

This was another effort to implement the solemn promise which had been made on the floor of parliament. That Bill passed this House. The resolution was introduced, adopted, and put in the shape of a Bill, which was sent to the Senate. But that happened in the Senate which rarely happened in those days ; the Senate rejected the Bill thus solemnly introduced by the government. Whatever may have been the reasons, whatever may have been the whispers in the ears of senators, whatever may have been the influences which caused the Senate thus to rebel against the policy of the government, it is not for me to say; I have no particulars on this point to offer. But certain it is that in the following year a company was formed, known as the St. Lawrence and Maritime Provinces Railway Company, which tradition says was acting under a tacit understanding between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the government of Sir John Macdonald for the construction of a line of railway from the town of Edmundston to Moncton. If that railway had been built, it would have provided a shorter line of communication by way of Halifax, Moncton, Edmundston, and Rivière du Loup. The line was surveyed, and I have the report of the engineer in charge,

Mr. Davy, who said that a good line could be found between Edmundston and Moncton. Here is his language :

The total length of the line surveyed from Grand Falls to Berry's Mills was 166 miles, and adding thirty-six miles from Edmundston to Grand Falls, and seven miles from Berry's Mills to Moncton, the total distance from Edmundston to Moncton would be 209 miles, which would make the distance from Montreal to Halifax, by the Grand Trunk, to Chaudière Junction, the Intercolonial to Rivière du Loup, the Temiscouata Railway to Edmundston, and the proposed line to Moncton, and thence by the Intercolonial to Halifax, 759 miles in all.

If, however, the line from the Grand River north of the Sisson Range, which, as I have already stated, I explored myself and with an assistant engineer, be adopted, a saving of distance of at least ten miles would be obtained, and the improvement of the line at the de Chute River, recommended by Mr. Cranston, would also affect a saving of distance, so that, in my opinion the total length from Edmundston to Moncton may be reduced to 199 miles, or 749 miles from Montreal to Halifax. Time did not allow for our making a complete survey of the line by these alternative routes at the two points I have referred to, but I believe that when made it will result in the saving of distance already stated.

However, Sir John Macdonald died shortly afterwards, and the scheme fell through.

Now, Sir, the policy which we propose, apart from all other considerations, may be taken as a step, tardy though it be, to implement the solemn pledge which was made in 1885. I confess, Sir, that perhaps this of itself would not be a sufficient reason, though in one respect it ought to be a sufficient reason; because, if there is one thing as to which the parliament of Canada ought to be firm, it ought to be that the solemn word of parliament is sacred, and that every promise made by parliament should be implemented.

But, Sir, there is another consideration of a far more important character than this, to which it is now my duty to call the special attention of parliament. When Sir Charles Tupper in 1885, speaking from the place from which I now speak, stated that the Intercolonial Railway, located as it was, could not perform the service we expected from it, that it could not give thorough satisfaction in the way of providing transportation for the growing trade of Canada, he stated a proposition to which, no exception was taken to it then, no exception can be successfully taken now. But, Sir, there is something more than that. When Sir Charles Tuppper stated also at that time that it was essential to the welfare of the people of Canada that the terminus of any transcontinental railway that we might have should be in Canadian territory, in Canadian waters, he simply voiced what is the conscience of the Canadian people. I am sorry that Sir Charles Tupper did not with equal firmness insist that not only should the terminus be in Canadian territory, in Canadian waters, but that the route itself should be in Canadian territory. When he agreed that the line should be in American territory, Sir Charles Tupper went back on the heart and conscience of the Canadian people.

Now, Sir, we lay it down as a principle, upon which we are to be judged by friend and foe, that we are to have a transcontinental railway, that its terminus must be in Canadian waters, and that the whole line, every inch of it, must be in Canadian territory. We say further that such a line is a necessity of our commercial independence. Sir, I am surprised at the levity displayed by some hon. gentlemen on so grave a question. What have you to say to-day to this ? What are your minds running to when you have facts staring you in the face which show you that at this moment Canada is not commercially independent of the United States ? What is our position to-day ? From the early days of railway development of this country, we have been dependent on American good-will for the transportation of our goods across American territory. From the early days of Canadian railway development, we have been forced to make use of American territory and harbours. The American government granted us the bonding privilege. They granted us the privilege of using their harbours for our imports and exports without paying them tolls and customs dues. But my hon. friends opposite are aware that this privilege has always been held over our heads by the American authorities as a sword of Damocles. My hon. friends on the other side are aware that the abrogation of this privilege has been used again and again as a threat to obtain from us concessions. Why, Sir, it is only last week that an American citizen of great influence wrote a letter to the London 'Times,' in which he reviewed the policy we have offered to the British government. When in England last year, the Canadian ministers at the intercolonial conference made this proposition to the British authorities :

The Canadian ministers stated that if they could be assured that the imperial government would accept the principle of preferential trade generally and particularly grant to the food products of Canada in the United Kingdom exemption from duties now levied or hereinafter imposed, they would be prepared to go further into the subject and endeavour to give to the British manufacturer some increased advantage over his foreign competitors in the markets of Canada.

This policy is to-day attracting the attention of the civilized world. It is being submitted to the British electorate, and it is this policy which is reviewed by an American citizen, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, in the great exponent of public opinion in England, the London 'Times. ' Mr. Carnegie states the reason why the British public and the Canadian electors cannot give heed to this policy which I have just outlined, cannot go forward with it, cannot under-

take to give the British people a preference in return for a preference from them, because the American citizen has a weapon in his hands which he can bring down upon the head of the Canadian people, and that weapon is the bonding privilege. Mr. Carnegie, in a letter, which I find summarized in some newspapers, uses this very striking and significant language :

A word from the president cancels the privileges now generously extended to Canada of reaching open American ports through American territory with all her exports and imports free of duty for five months in the year when her own ports are ice bound. She uses the privilege all the year. President Roosevelt is the last man I could think of who would hesitate a moment to say the word, but even he and all his cabinet would be powerless to resist the imperious demand that at least we should not furnish the weapon that enabled another power to wound us. The withdrawal of the privilege given to Canada would probably be sufficient to satisfy Great Britain that the American people were in earnest. Negotiations would soon begin, and the privilege so rashly distributed would be restored. Simultaneously peace would reign, but the bitterness created would remain for years to retard the return to the present unusually cordial relations so wantonly impaired.

Let me observe that if we have used American ports, it is not because for five months in the year our own ports are ice-bound. Everybody knows that our ports in winter are just as open as the American harbours. Everybody knows, except Mr. Andrew Carnegie and the bulk of American public opinion, that if we have used American ports and the bonding privilege, it was not because our harbours were ice-bound in winter, but simply because we had no railways to reach them. In the face of this, are the Canadian parliament and people going to stand on their manhood and place us in such a position that at all times of the year, not only by one railway, but by two or more, we shall have access from January to December to our own harbours, and be able to say to our American neighbours : 'Take off your bonding privilege whenever it suits you, we are commercially independent.'

Hon. gentlemen opposite may ask : Who is Mr. Andrew Carnegie, he is simply an American citizen, he is not speaking for the nation ? Sir, when men speak, who are in the position of Mr. Carnegie, we must take it for granted that they know something of the public opinion of their country. We know that Mr. Carnegie, unfortunately, is not voicing his own opinions alone, but the opinions of a large section of the American people, because the ideas to which he has given expression have been again and again expressed in the American press. We cannot take a step to better our position, to improve our trade, but we are told from the American side that we had better look out, because, forsooth, the bonding privilege will be taken from us. When, in 1896, Sir Charles Tupper thought of asking for tenders for the fast Atlantic service—a thing with which, after all, the American public have nothing whatever to do, a thing which is purely a measure of domestic concern—we were told by the American press that if we dared to go on with that project, the bonding privilege would be removed. The New York 'Sun,' which is an American of Americans, and a good exponent of American public opinion, which voices the sentiments and even the prejudices of the American people—and I do not use the word 'prejudice' in an offensive sense, because prejudices are sometimes only the exaggeration of a noble feeling, and I do not blame any one for having prejudices in his heart, they being frequently the result of education and other circumstances—but the New York 'Sun,' speaking of the project of a fast Atlantic service between England and Canada, made use of the following language :

The route by the new steamship line from Liverpool to Halifax and thence by Canadian Pacific Railway to Chicago would be shorter than the route to and through New York, and hence its advantages are obvious. Goods and merchandise would be carried from Halifax to Quebec through American territory under protection of the bonding privilege, and accordingly the Canadian Pacific Railway would be able to profit largely by their transportation westward.

Here is a condemnation of the policy which had been adopted a few years before, of having the Canadian Pacific Railway built across the state of Maine :

The privilege thus conferred by us is already essential to the prosperity of that company. This road could not run without it. The Canadian Pacific Railway therefore lives and prospers by our sufferance and direct assistance. We furnish it with feeders and traffic essential to its existence ; yet it was built and is maintained as a military road along the northern border, and as a tie binding together in political combination, the widely separated Canadian provinces with a view to the strengthening of the Dominion against us in the event of a war with England. This military and political road, sustained by American bounty in the form of bonding privilege, is consequently a permanent menace to us. Its very existence is a distinctly hostile demonstration.

Will our government furnish the new steamship line with what amounts to another subsidy, and insure the prosperity of the military and political road by continuing to grant the bonding privilege, which Canada is already using to the disadvantage of our own railroads?

Sir, I am told, and perhaps I may be told again : This is simply the opinion of a journalist. Why, Sir, if the expression of this opinion only came from private citizens, as Mr. Carnegie, if it were confined to newspapers, as the New York 'Sun,' perhaps we might pass lightly over it and not feel much apprehension upon the subject. But what will you say when I bring to your attention the expressions of the highest in the land, of those in authority, of those who are in a position to speak for the

American government and the American people? What will you say when I bring you messages of presidents of the United States and reports from the American Senate? In the month of August, 1888, President Cleveland sent the following message to Congress:

> The value to the Dominion of Canada of the privilege of transit for their exports and imports across our territory, and to and from our ports, though great in every aspect, will be better appreciated when it is remembered that, for a considerable portion of each year, the St. Lawrence river, which constitutes the direct avenue of foreign commerce leading to Canada, is closed by ice.
>
> During the last six years the imports and exports of British Canadian provinces carried across our territory under the privileges granted by our laws, amounted in value to about two hundred and seventy millions of dollars, nearly all of which were goods dutiable under our tariff laws, by far the larger part of this traffic consisting of exchanges of goods between Great Britain and her American provinces brought to and carried from our ports in their own vessels.
>
> The treaty stipulation entered into by our government was in harmony with laws which were then on our statute-book, and are still in force.
>
> I recommend immediate legislative action conferring upon the executive the power to suspend by proclamation the operation of all laws and regulations permitting the transit of goods, wares and merchandise in bond across or over the railways of the United States to or from Canada.

This was the language, the peremptory language of the president of the United States. Now, it is, perhaps, not out of place, nay, it is extremely important, to make clear what was the cause which brought President Cleveland to hold such a threat over our heads? The cause was the fact that we would not agree—the Canadian government, the Canadian people, would not agree—to the abrogation of the Fisheries Convention of 1818. Under the convention of 1818, American fishermen are granted certain privileges in Canadian waters. They are allowed to make use of the shore of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for certain purposes—for wood, water, repairs and shelter. They are not allowed to make use of that coast to buy bait or to land their fish. The Americans have applied to us again and again for these two privileges, the privileges of buying bait in Canadian territory and the privilege of landing their cargoes of fish. We have refused, unless we were given some compensation. We have always been ready to negotiate with them. We have told the American fishermen again and again: We will share with you our advantages, if you will share with us your advantages. On the coast of Nova Scotia, we have a basis for the operations of fishermen, and Canadian fishermen have the advantage that they can use the coast to supply themselves with bait and to land their cargoes of fish. The American fishermen have the advantage of having a market in their own territory. We have told them again and again: Yes, we are ready to agree with you; give us the opportunity of sharing with you your market, and we will give you the privilege of sharing with us the advantages of our base of operations. That was a fair proposal. But it never was acceded to, it never was accepted. But, because we would not agree to give away our birthright, we were threatened by President Cleveland with the withdrawal of the bonding privilege. Nor is that all. A few years afterwards, in the session of Congress of 1892, a report was brought down to the Senate from the Committee on Interstate Commerce again dealing with the bonding privilege. This time, the reason why this threat was held over our heads was, not on account of the fishery question, but on account of the railway question. The American railways wanted to have certain privileges upon our territory that we were not prepared to give them; and, because we would not give them these advantages, because we were not ready to make the soil of Canada, for railway purposes, part of the territory of the United States, again we were threatened with the removal of the bonding privilege. This was the conclusion of the report I have referred to:

> The committee therefore recommend that either such a license system shall be established as will be applicable to the Canadian railroads doing business in the United States, or that some other plan, not injurious to the general trade and commerce of the country, be adopted which will secure to American railroads an equal chance in competition with Canadian railroads. Such action, in the judgment of the committee, is in the interest not only of American railroads, and especially American transcontinental lines, but in the interest of American commerce and of the general prosperity of the American people.

Even that was not all. In the following year, President Harrison again approached the subject, and again approached it in the same hostile spirit, and approached it, as the committee of the Senate had done, from the point of view of American railways. He made the following recommendation to Congress in a message dated November, 1893:

> The statutes relating to the transportation of merchandise between the United States and the British possessions should be the subject of revision. The treasury regulations have given to these laws a construction and a scope that I do not think was contemplated by Congress. A policy adapted to the new conditions growing in part out of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, should be declared, and the business placed upon a basis more just to our people and to our transportation companies. If we continue the policy of supervising rates and requiring that they shall be equal and reasonable upon the railroads of the United States we cannot in fairness at the same time give these unusual facilities for competition to Canadian roads that are free to pursue the practices as to cut rates and favoured rates that we con-

demn and punish if practised by our own railroads.

I regret that circumstances prevented an earlier examination by me of these questions, but submit now these views in the hope that they may lead to a revision of the laws upon a safer and juster basis.

Fortunately, Sir, up to this moment, we have escaped the danger with which, on repeated occasions, we have been threatened. But, Sir, what would happen if at any moment there should come one of those frenzies, one of those periods of excitement which we have seen sometimes amongst nations, the American nation included ? At any moment we may be deprived of the bonding privilege which we have had up to the present. The only way whereby we can contemplate such a contingency with equanimity is to provide against it, and to have upon our own territory all the facilities by which we can get access to our own harbours. Sir, our relations to-day with our American neighbours are friendly ; they were never more so, and I hope they will so continue. For my part—I never made any secret of it—I have the greatest possible admiration for the American people. I have always admired their many strong qualities. But I have found in the short experience during which it has been my privilege and my fortune to be placed at the head of affairs, by the will of the Canadian people, that the best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them. These are the reasons why we apply to parliament to give its countenance to the policy which I have outlined, a policy which will give to this new Transcontinental Railway its terminals in our own harbours, and an all-Canadian route to reach them.

Now, Sir, let me call your attention to some of the objections taken against this proposition, which we have seen and heard in the press ? They tell us : If you build this railway right through you will injure the Intercolonial. Sir, I do not admit that we would injure the Intercolonial, because I have no doubt and I submit it to the judgment, the intelligence and experience of every man in this House, that there will be trade and business enough coming from the west, not only for one road but for two roads, if not more. But, after all, I say to our friends on the north shore who may perhaps feel that the Intercolonial might be prejudiced by this new line, that there is nothing to be feared in this respect, because the new road will not prejudice the constituency which is served by the Intercolonial : the business of the new road will be created by the road itself, it will be a business which is not in existence to-day. Again, let me say this to the members of the House, and I submit it to the Canadian people as well, that even if the Intercolonial were injured to some extent, were to lose some traffic, let me ask this question : Does the Intercolonial exist for the Canadian people or the Canadian people for the Intercolonial? Are we to be told that if we made an error we cannot correct it, if we injure somebody we cannot repair the injury ? Sir, are we to be told that if we are to have traffic from the east to the west, the people of the west must not have the benefit of the shortest route, or that the people of the east must not have the benefit of this western line ? No, Sir, if it comes to be a question between the management of the Intercolonial and the interest of the Canadian people, we leave the issue in perfect confidence to the judgment of the Canadian people.

Now, Sir, I have to pass to another point of this scheme. The public has been made aware already, by the correspondence which has been exchanged between myself and my hon. friend the late Minister of Railways and Canals, that it is proposed to divide this line of railway which is to extend from Moncton to the Pacific ocean, into two sections. One section, that from Moncton to Winnipeg, is to be built by the government ; the other section, that from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, is to be built, owned and operated by a company. I know that this policy has already been the subject of much criticism. We are told that we are keeping to ourselves the unproductive portion of the road, while we are leaving to a company the productive portion of it. This criticism might have a good deal of force in it if we were ourselves to operate the line which is to be built by the government. But we have made a contract whereby this line is to be operated, not by ourselves, but by that company, which agrees to pay us a rental at the rate of three per cent per annum upon cost of construction. Therefore, let our friends on the other side of the House, and let our friends on this side of the House also, take note of this fact, that with the exception of a few years of interest, to which I shall allude later on, we shall have this portion of the railway built by the government from Moncton to Winnipeg without the cost of one dollar to the Canadian people. We shall have to advance the money, and we shall have to pay interest upon it, but we shall receive interest upon it at the same rate ; so that whatever we give with one hand we shall receive back with the other. To this extent there is no risk whatever assumed by the Canadian government or the Canadian people.

But, why did we keep this section of the road in our hands ? Why did we not give it to the company to build as the other section? We did it because we want to keep that section of the line which is to be the exit of the productive portion of the west, in our own hands so as to be able to regulate the traffic over it. The prairie section will be teeming with business, as we know ;

it will be teeming with activity, as we know. Already there are three lines of railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Great Northern and the Canadian Northern ; and this one will be still another. Other roads are also going to be built there to meet the increasing wants of the people. The Canadian Pacific Railway has its exit on the north shore of Lake Superior ; those other railways have no exit. It is our intention that this road shall be kept and maintained under our supervision, so that all railways may get the benefit of it, so that the Canadian people may not be compelled to build another road across that section of country. This is the reason why we have adopted a policy which I shall supplement later on by other explanations.

Now, I will be asked : Why do you not retain also the western section ? Why do you not continue building by the government the railway from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean ? We came to the conclusion to have that railway built and operated by a company for the reason that we do not believe, under existing circumstances, and for many years, perhaps for many generations to come, it will be possible, with such activity as may be developed in that section of the country, successfully to operate it as a government road. I may be biassed and prejudiced on this question. I formed my opinions some years ago, and perhaps I may be permitted to relate a personal experience which went far to form my own conviction in this regard. In the fall of 1896, Mr. J. R. Booth, of this city, invited me to visit his railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway, which was then in process of construction. I accepted the invitation. The road had been built almost to the shores of the Georgian bay, perhaps within half a mile of it. When we left the train we walked to the shore of the lake, a bleak shore with not a building upon it. Mr. Booth said : this is the terminus of my railway. I asked Mr. Booth : Where is the trade to come from ? His answer was : 'I have to create it, I have to collect it from Port Arthur, from Duluth, from Chicago and from both sides of the lakes. I will have to build elevators, I will perhaps have to buy wheat in order to furnish trade to my railway.' Then, I say, it dawned upon me that no government under such a condition of things, with everything to create, could successfully operate a railway in a new country like that. When this railway is taken to Port Simpson, there will be the same thing which I found on the Georgian bay in 1896—a bleak shore with nothing upon it. Everything will have to be created. Wharfs, warehouses and sheds will have to be built, elevators will have to be provided, branch lines will have to be constructed, possibly hotels may have to be built and managed, steamships will have to be built or chartered and trade will have to be brought from all points of Asia. Would any one tell me that government management, under such circumstances, could do justice to the undertaking in such a big question as that ? Would any one tell me that the management, even were we to put it in the hands of a commission responsible to parliament, having to come here for appropriations for this and for that, would have that elasticity which would be a condition essential to the successful management of such a road ? Would parliament be willing to give power to the Minister of Railways and Canals, or to the commission, to build or acquire steamships, or would parliament give power to send agents across to the coast of Asia, to Japan, to China and elsewhere to collect trade ? Would parliament, in its disposition, as I have known it for many years, be willing to give the government power to go into the business of hotel keeping and hotel building? I doubt it, and for all these reasons we have come to the conclusion that it is better and preferable in every possible way that such a railway should be built and operated by a private company. Now, I shall come to this subject again, at a later period in my remarks.

It is about time that I should touch upon another branch of the subject. An accusation has been made against us, which, perhaps, may have caused some uneasiness and trepidation among those who do us the honour to give us their support in this House and out of it, and which would have been serious enough if there had been in it any basis of truth. But, I am happy to say that for that charge as for many others, there is not even a shadow of foundation. It has been stated and restated in all possible tones from the plaintive wail to the indignant protest that we are launching into railway construction of gigantic magnitude through a country of which we know absolutely nothing, and without taking the usual elementary precaution of having a previous exploration. I say again there is not a shadow of truth in this charge as I shall show later on. But, before I proceed any further, let me say that the conception which we have of this work which we are now contemplating is very different from the conception entertained of it by some of our critics. Most of our critics look upon this scheme simply as a commercial venture to be judged by the only rule of profit and loss. We look upon it as a work of a national character necessitated by the status of Canada in the year 1903, just as the Intercolonial Railway was necessitated by the status of Canada at the opening of confederation, and just as the Canadian Pacific Railway was necessitated by the status of Canada a few years after confederation. Sir, when the conference met in 1864 which laid down the basis of confederation, it passed a resolution affirming the necessity of the immediate construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It passed this resolution without waiting to have surveys

and explorations of the ground to ascertain whether or not all parts of this railway would be equally productive. It passed this resolution as it conceived it to be a work of political necessity, and if it was a work of political necessity it had to be built, cost what it might. When, a few years later, upon the accession of British Columbia to the confederation, the government of the day pledged themselves, and wisely pledged themselves, in favour of the building of a highway across the Rocky mountains, in order to bind the new province by the Pacific to the rest of the Dominion, they did it although they supposed that all sections of the country would not be equally productive, but they did it in the faith that the weaker sections would be carried by the stronger sections. If our conception of this railway is the correct and true one, as we contend it is, that it is a work of a national character, then, it follows that this railway has to be built from ocean to ocean to connect the tidal waters of the Atlantic with the tidal waters of the Pacific though we know in advance, though we are sure that all sections of it will not be equal in fertility, in resources and in productiveness. In that consideration alone there would have been cause sufficient for us to go on with this work without any previous explorations, but I have to say this more that we have a wealth of information on this subject. We have more information upon this scheme than ever was possessed by former governments when they decided upon the Intercolonial Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not expect even the most fastidious of our critics will ask us that we should have had an exploration across the prairies. They are satisfied that we have enough information now to deal with this question so far as the prairies are concerned. But, I shall be asked : What about the Rocky mountains? My answer in regard to the Rocky mountains is that we have mountains of information. We have mountains of books, pamphlets and reports—books, pamphlets and reports from traders, from explorers, from engineers. From the early days, when the French settled upon the shores of the St. Lawrence, the constant aim of those hardy pioneers was to reach that western sea now familiar to us, at that time unknown, and which inspired the awe of everything unknown. Samuel de Champlain devoted years to the task in the hope of finding a passage to the sea. Robert Cavelier de La Salle lost his life in the attempt. Another man, LaVerendrye, took an overland journey to reach it by exploring the prairies, and his two sons, on the 1st January, 1743, were the first Europeans to cast eyes upon the Rocky mountains. LaVerendrye himself lost his life like Robert Cavelier de La Salle in the attempt to get to the Pacific ocean. After the country had passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown the task was resumed by Scotch traders established in Montreal, and in 1793, Alexander Mackenzie was the first white man to reach the Pacific ocean across the mountains by the overland journey. Many private individuals subsequently attempted and performed the same feat. The last of them was Captain Butler, of the British army, who in the winter of 1872 crossed the continent from Fort à-la-Corne at the forks of the Saskatchewan by way of the Peace river to the Pacific ocean.

In that year, 1872, the Canadian government undertook a systematic and scientific exploration of the whole northern region from Lake Abitibi westward to the Pacific ocean. From the year 1872 to the year 1880 no less than twenty-eight expeditions were organized to visit, explore, and report upon that country. Their reports are all available to us now and during that time the sum of no less than $5,000,000 was expended for that purpose. Now, one district was specially examined at that time and that was the northern section of the Rock mountains. Several passes, aye, all the passes north of the Kicking Horse Pass were examined and especially the Pine River Pass and the Peace River Pass. Mr. Marcus Smith, Mr. Cambie, Mr. Hunter, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Horetzky and several other, all engineers of eminence, crossed and recrossed that territory and became as familiar with it as they were with the streets of Ottawa. Any one who to-day would care to look into the reports now accumulated in the archives of the Railway Department will know that country just as he may know his own home. These explorations show conclusively that the best of all these passes may be found either in the Pine River Pass or in the Peace River Pass. It is not only a fact that there is a very successful way of crossing the Rocky mountains either by the Pine river or by the Peace river, but on both these rivers are to be found lands as fertile as the lands of the Red river or the Saskatchewan.

It is of some interest to follow the area of wheat produced on this continent from the early days of the 19th century. Wheat-growing first began on the shores of the St. Lawrence; from the shores of the St. Lawrence it passed to the Genesee Valley in the state of New York; from the Genesee Valley it passed to the Ohio river; from the Ohio river to Illinois; from Illinois to Minnesota; from Minnesota to Dakota and from Dakota to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, where it now is. The wheat area is fast advancing towards the Saskatchewan river and in a few years it will pass over to the Peace river and to the Pine river valleys. And when the Red river and the Saskatchewan river territory have been exhausted for wheat production and have been given to mixed farming, then the Peace river and the Pine river territory will become the wheat producing centre of the world. Instead of giving my own opinion

on this, it is perhaps better that I should give the language used by the explorers employed by the government of that day. But before I go into that, let me quote the language of Captain Butler who was the last of the individual explorers to whom I have alluded. In the appendix to his work 'The Wild North Land,' Captain Butler writes in the following pregnant language :

But should this Indian Pass at the head of the Pine river prove to be, on examination, unfit to carry a railroad across, I am still of opinion that in that case the Peace river affords a passage to the western ocean vastly superior to any of the known passes lying south of it. What are the advantages which I claim for it ? They can be briefly stated.

It is level throughout its entire course ; it has a wide, deep, and navigable river flowing through it ; in its highest elevation in the main range of the Rocky Mountains is about 1,800 feet ; the average depth of its winter fall of snow is about three feet ; by the first week of May this year the snow, unusually deep during the winter, had entirely disappeared from the north shore of the river, and vegetation was already forward in the woods along the mountain base.

But though these are important advantages for this mountain pass, the most important of all remains to be stated. From the western end of the pass to the coast range of mountains, a distance of 300 miles across British Columbia, there does not exist one single formidable impediment to a railroad. By following the valley of the Parsnip river from 'the Forks' to Lake Macleod, the Ominica range is left to the north, and the rolling plateau land of Stuart's lake is reached without a single mountain intervening ; from thence the valley of the Nacharcole can be attained, as we have seen in my story, without the slightest difficulty, and a line of country followed to within twenty miles of the ocean, at the head of Dean's Inlet.

I claim, moreover, for this route that it is shorter than any projected line at present under consideration ; that it would develop a land as rich, if not richer, than any portion of the Saskatchewan territory ; that it altogether avoids the tremendous mountain ranges of Southern British Columbia, and the great gorge of the Fraser river ; and finally, that along the Nacharcole river there will be found a country admirably suited to settlement, and possessing prairie land of a kind nowhere else to be found in British Columbia.

That, Sir, is the opinion of a traveller of eminence, but let me give now the opinion of a professional engineer. Mr. Gordon, whose report is to be found in Mr. Fleming's report for 1880, says :

Were it necessary or expedient to find a course for the Pacific Railway, as far north as the Peace River Pass, a comparatively easy route is offered in this direction. Even at the wildest and most rugged parts of the pass, the mountains are almost invariably fringed by flats or by gentle slopes of varying width. One or two avalanche courses, a few ravines, and occasional projections of rock would form the chief difficulties, which are apparently much less serious than many obstacles that have been overcome on other Canadian railways. At its higher or western extremity the pass is not more than 1,650 feet above the sea level, and the current of the river, which is very equable, is not more than from four or five miles an hour, where it cuts through the mountain range. East of the pass, for fifty miles, till the canyon is reached, the engineering difficulties would probably be not much greater than those presented by an open prairie. But the chief difficulty on this route would be found at the canyon where the river sweeps round the base of a solitary massive hill, known as the Mountain of Rocks, or the Portage Mountains, just above the Hudson's Hope ; yet even here, although the work would be heavy, the difficulties would be by no means insuperable.

Mr. Cambie, in the same report, says :

The Peace river, which is the lowest known pass through the Rocky Mountains, offers a wonderfully favourable line for a railway through that range, and for sixty miles east of its main summits.

Mr. Marcus Smith, in the same report for 1878-9, says :

This can undoubtedly become the great wheat-producing province of the Dominion. In aid of its development, it possesses a noble and navigable river, which runs through its centre, affording easy means of collecting its produce, and bringing it cheaply to some convenient point, where it could be received by the railway.

Mr. Marcus Smith, referring to the Pine River Pass route in another report, says :

There is further the important consideration that, in the place of a bleak sterile country the line by the Pine river route would traverse an area of remarkable fertility—the fertile belt, or wheat-producing country, extends nearly 300 miles further to the west, before the Rocky Mountains are reached, than by the route over the Yellowhead Pass ; a corresponding reduction being made in the breadth of sterile country to be crossed in the Rocky Mountain district.

Now, Sir as to Port Simpson, which is to be the terminus of this railway, it is also important to know what is the opinion of the engineers who surveyed the country at the time of which I have spoken. Mr. Fleming, in his report for 1878-9, says :

Port Simpson is possibly the best harbour on the mainland. . . . of all the terminal points projecting on the mainland and on Vancouver Island, Port Simpson is most conveniently situated for Asiatic trade.

Mr. Marcus Smith, says :

There is really no harbour in the coast of the mainland of British Columbia, with the exception of Port Simpson, eligibly situated for purposes of foreign commerce. . . . It is easily approached from the ocean, and is the nearest to the coast of Asia of any harbour in British Columbia.

Again in another report written in 1878-9, Mr. Marcus Smith says :

Port Simpson may possibly be considered at present, too far north for the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it is important that the fact should be borne in mind, that by virtue of low altitudes and consequent easy gradients, together with the moderate character of the works required to reach it, this terminal point offers advantages which would enable a Canadian line to defy competition for the trade with China and Japan.

This is not all. The section of country east of the city of Winnipeg and extending to Lake Abitibi was also explored by the engineers of the government at that period. In order to save time I will not refer to the opinion then expressed; but I will come to the information which has been collected by the government of the province of Ontario, which in 1900 organized a special expedition entrusted to carefully selected commissioners for the express purpose of visiting and reporting upon that section of country between Lake Abitibi and the western boundary of the province of Ontario. In their report the commissioners speak as follows :

Agricultural Land.

The great clay belt running from the Quebec boundary west through Nipissing and Algoma districts and into the district of Thunder bay comprises an area of at least 24,500 square miles, or 15,680,000 acres, nearly all of which is well adapted for cultivation. This almost unbroken stretch of good farming land is nearly three-quarters as great in extent as the whole settled portion of the province south of Lake Nipissing and the French and Mattawa rivers. It is larger than the states of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey and Delaware combined, and one-half besides of the state of New York. The region is watered by the Moose river, flowing into James bay, and its tributaries, the Abitibi, Mattagami and Missinabie, and the Albany and its tributaries, the Kenogami and Ogoke. Each of these rivers is over 300 miles in length, and they range in width from 300 or 400 yards to a mile. They are fed by numerous smaller streams, and these in turn drain numberless lakes of larger or smaller size, so that the whole country is one net-work of waterways, affording easy means of communications with long stretches fit for navigation. The great area of water surface also assures the country against the protracted droughts so often experienced in other countries. The southern boundary of this great tract of fertile land is less than forty miles from Missinabie station on the Canadian Pacific Railway; and the country north of the height of land being one immense level plateau sloping off towards James bay, the construction of railways and wagon roads through every part of it would be a comparatively easy matter.

In the small part of the district of Rainy river which was explored, the proportion of good land is not so great, but the clay land in the townships around Dryden was found to extend north in the valley of the Wabigoon river, with an area of about 600 square miles, or 384,000 acres. There are also smaller cultivable areas at various other points.

The Climate.

Another important fact established by the explorations is that the climate in this northern district presents no obstacle to successful agricultural settlement. The information obtained completely dispels the erroneous impression that its winters are of Arctic severity and its summers too short to enable crops to mature. The absence of summer frosts noted by the explorers and the growth of all the common vegetables at the Hudson Bay posts must disabuse the public mind of this erroneous impression. The 50th parallel of latitude passes through the centre of the agricultural belt, and the climate is not much different from that of the province of Manitoba, lying along the same parallel, with this exception, of course, that the winter is tempered by the great spruce forests and the presence of so large a proportion of water surface. The country, too, has an abundance of wood for fuel, building and commercial purposes, and plenty of pure water every where.

The Timber.

Another point equalled only in importance by the existence of a vast area of agricultural land in this country and its moderate climate is the fact that it is largely covered with extensive forests of spruce, jackpine and poplar. The value of this class of timber, as everybody knows, is increasing every day and the market for it is widening; and rich, indeed, is the country which has boundless resources in these varieties of woods. In the district of Nipissing, north of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, there is estimated to be at least 20,000,000 cords of pulp-wood; in the district of Algoma, 100,000,000 cords; in the district of Thunder Bay, 150,000,000 cords; and in the district of Rainy River, 18,000,000 cords; a grand total of 288,000,000 cords. The pine region does not seem to extend much beyond the height of land, but on this side, in the country around lakes Temagaming and Lady Evelyn, and to the north, an area of red and white pine of fine quality was explored and estimated to contain about three billions of feet, b.m.

Water Powers.

A feature of this region, which it is well to note from an industrial point of view, is the existence of many falls on the rivers and streams. These will no doubt be utilized with advantage in the creation of economical power when the country comes to be opened up.

Conclusion.

It was not expected, of course, that the parties would be able to make a thorough and exhaustive exploration of all the territory assigned to them, and the estimates here given of what has been reported are very conservative. Totalling up the figures here quoted, however, we have over 25,000 square miles of good fertile land, or over 16,000,000 acres, and 288,000,000 cords of spruce or other pulpwood. There are also numerous smaller areas, both of timber and land, which are not included in these figures, but which will all be available when the development of the country takes place.

The country east of Lake Abitibi, in the province of Quebec, has also been explored, and explored several times. It was in the possession of the early French settlers, as far back as two hundred years ago. The French, I believe, had a port on Lake Abitibi in the seventeenth century. But it is difficult to summarize all the information with regard to that country, collectable in books of exploration. The Quebec government has had it explored in the last few years by an engineer of eminence, Mr. O'Sullivan, and his opinion has been summarized by another engineer, Mr. Doucet, in the following language :

From Roberval (which is a station on the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway) to the western limit of the province of Quebec, a distance of some 375 miles the line runs through a good farming country, the soil being chiefly clay.

I need not continue the quotation, because what follows is simply an amplification of this sentence.

To recapitulate what I have stated on this subject:

It is established that the railway can be easily built across the Rocky mountains by way of the Pine river or the Peace river.

It is established that along these rivers will be found rich prairies equal in fertility to the best land along the Saskatchewan river and the Red river.

It is established that the railway built by way of either the Pine river or the Peace river would place us in communication with the famous Omineca district, famous for its gold mines, which to-day are idle because it is impossible for the miner to get access to them with his tools and provisions, but which probably, the moment we secure access to them, will become valuable and develop into another Klondike.

It is established that the region between Winnipeg and Quebec is a fertile clay belt, rich in good land, rich in timber, rich in water-powers, rich in all those resources which go to make a fine agricultural and industrial country. In fact, it is only within the last four weeks that an important authority on the lumber trade, the 'Lumberman' of Chicago, stated that this section of country would become the source of supply for the future wood-pulp and paper industry of the world.

Such being the facts, what is the conclusion to be drawn from them? The conclusion seems to be obvious and imperative: That is, that we must at once provide for a railway to tap these rich and fertile territories. I will not dwell upon facts which are well known and patent to everybody. Our fertile prairies are becoming settled, and are going forward by leaps and bounds. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of immigrants are coming in every year. For one, two, three generations, at least, and perhaps more, these new settlers will grow cereals, and probably nothing else. They will have need of everything that is required by civilized men. They will have need of clothing, furniture and every other kind of manufacture. Then, Sir, what shall we do? Shall we allow them to be supplied by our American neighbours, or shall we provide a railway which will enable our manufacturers in Ontario and Quebec to supply them with what they shall require? There is one thing above all which will be their chief need, and that is lumber. They must have lumber for their houses, their barns, their stables, and all their buildings. Where are they to get it? Not from the section of country where they live and work, for the lumber is not there.

But luckily for us, the other sections of the road, the section between Moncton and Quebec and the section across the Rocky mountains, are rich in lumber of every kind; and the moment the road is open there will be established at once an important trade between all the sections covered by the railway. Nor is that all. There is another branch of trade which seems to be forgotten or passed over at present, but which is also of the greatest importance. I refer to the cattle trade. I need hardly tell you, Sir, that the foothills of the Rockies are perhaps to-day the best grazing lands under the sun, and the herds of domestic cattle in those grazing districts are becoming as numerous as were the buffaloes of old. The breeders must find an exit to the ocean. This new line, by its shortness, directness and climatic conditions is an ideal line for the cattle trade. The shipper, when he lands his cattle at Quebec, St. John or Halifax, will have them in the ideal condition of being able to set at once to sea without any loss of weight.

There is another consideration, in some respects even more important, and that is the trade of the Orient. All nations at this moment are competing for the trade of Japan and China, and there is no nation so well situated as Canada to capture that trade. Take a look at the map, and you will find that the route from Europe to the Canadian harbours is the shortest of any of the routes available to European merchants. Take the route which will be opened by this new railway, and you will find that it is the shortest of all the lines across the American continent. Again look at the map and you will find that the route from Port Simpson to the coast of Japan is the shortest of all the routes to that country from the American continent. All these considerations led us to the conclusion that it is our imperative duty not to wait until to-morrow, but to provide at once for the building of such a railway as I have indicated, if it is possible for us to obtain it on reasonable conditions.

It now becomes my duty to lay before the House the conditions on which we are to have this railway built; and, unless I am greatly mistaken, they will astonish friend and foe by their superior excellence. I shall have the honour, before resuming my seat, to lay on the Table a contract entered into between

His Majesty the King, acting in respect of the Dominion of Canada, and herein represented and acting by the Honourable William S. Fielding, acting Minister of Railways and Canals, of the first part; and Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, C.B., G.C.M.G.; the Rt. Hon. Lord Welby, G.C.B.; John A. Clutton-Brock, Joseph Price, Alfred W. Smithers, all of the city of London, England; Charles M. Hays, Frank W. Morse and William Wainwright, all of the city of Montreal, in the Dominion of Canada; and John Bell, of the city of Belleville, in the said Dominion, representing herein and acting on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by Act of the parliament of Canada at the present session thereof.

I may say at once that one of the first sections of this contract is to provide that the capital stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific

Railway, which in the Bill before the House to-day is $75,000,000, is to be reduced to the sum of $45,000,000. Of this sum $45,000,000 —$20,000,000 shall be preferred stock and $25,000,000 common stock ; and I would ask special attention to this feature of this common stock ; It is provided that the whole of the $25,000,000 shall be acquired and retained at all times by the Grand Trunk Railway itself. When we were approached by the gentlemen associated with the intended Grand Trunk Pacific Railway with the view of coming to an arrangement for the building of this line, strong and responsible as were the gentlemen connected with the enterprise, we told them that we would not act with them separately or individually. We told them that we would not act with them unless they brought into this enterprise the old Grand Trunk Railway, well tried, with a foothold in every city, town, village and hamlet in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and there is the consequence of this first covenant between the corporators and ourselves. Then the preamble of the contract recites :

Whereas, having regard to the growth of population and the rapid development of the production and trade of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, and to the great area of fertile and productive land in all the provinces and territories as yet without railway facilities, and to the rapidly expanding trade and commerce of the Dominion, it is in the interest of Canada that a line of railway, designed to secure the most direct and economical interchange of traffic between eastern Canada and the provinces and territories west of the great lakes, to open up and develop the northern zone of the Dominion, to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada and to develop commerce through Canadian ports, should be constructed and operated as a common railway highway across the Dominion, from ocean to ocean, and wholly within Canadian territory.

Section 2 provides that the line is to be divided into two sections—the eastern section, from Moncton to Winnipeg ; and the western from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean. Another clause provides also that the western section shall be divided into two sections—the prairie section and the mountain section.

As I indicated a moment ago, it is our intention that the government shall build the eastern section from Moncton to Winnipeg, but it shall be leased to and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It is also provided that the western section, from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, shall be built, owned and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Before proceeding further, perhaps it would be advisable to give to the House the respective covenants of the government and the company with respect to the building, owning and operating of the western section. If I do that, the other covenants with regard to the eastern section shall be better understood. It is provided in the contract that the government will undertake to guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for the construction of the western section to the extent of 75 per cent of the cost of construction, the liability in no case to exceed $13,000 for the prairie section and $30,000 for the mountain section per mile. It may be asked if the aid of the government is to be given only to secure the construction of 75 per cent of the road, where is the company going to get the other 25 per cent ? The answer to that is this : That it is provided in the contract that the company shall be authorized to issue a second series of bonds which are to be guaranteed, not by the government, but by the old Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. Let me read here to the House this section, as it is an important one :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Inasmuch as the bonds to be guaranteed by the government only make provision for a part of the cost of construction of the western division, the company hereby agrees that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall guarantee bonds of the company for the balance required for the construction of the said western division, exclusive of the said twenty million dollars required for first equipment, which the company is required to provide under paragraph 22 of this agreement, and the company may issue a second series of bonds, to be guaranteed as aforesaid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, to be a second charge upon the property described in paragraph 25 (b) hereof, and to be subject to, and to rank upon, the said property next after the said bonds so to be issued and guaranteed by the government.

I need not dwell upon the importance of this covenant on the part of the company. It practically takes away from the guarantee of the government all risk. There is not a dollar to be advanced by the government. We do give our credit and nothing else. And our guarantee of seventy-five per cent of the construction of the road is to be supplemented by the credit and all the backing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself.

The company is to provide, upon the completion of the road, equipment to the amount of $20,000,000. Let me quote the contract on this also—section 22 :

The company shall equip both divisions of the said line of railway with modern and complete rolling stock suitable and amply sufficient for efficient operation and handling of all classes of traffic to the satisfaction of the government, and the first equipment for the completed road shall be of the value of at least twenty million dollars, of which not less than five million dollars worth shall be supplied for the operation of the eastern division of the said railway, and the said five million dollars worth of rolling stock, together with all renewals thereof and additions thereto, shall be marked as assigned to the said eastern division and shall be held to be and form part of the equipment of the eastern division of the railway during the said period of fifty years and shall be used as the equipment appertaining thereto, according to the ordinary practice of railways during the said period of fifty years.

Now, Sir, I have to call the attention of the House to another important provision.

We undertake to guarantee the bonds. But it is an important question, what is to be the character of the road ? The answer is this : The character of the road to be constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, between Winnipeg and the Rocky mountains is to be the same as that of the road between Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. MACLEAN. Double track ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) speaks too soon.

The company shall lay out, construct and equip the said western division of the said railway to a standard not inferior to the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada between Montreal and Toronto, so far as may be practicable in the case of a newly constructed line of railway, but this section shall not be held to oblige the company to construct a double track railway.

And I would add 'before the time has come for it.' Now, it will be asked : What is to be the liability of the government, what are they to contribute to the building of this railway, for they must contribute something ? What they contribute is simply this—the payment of the interest for a certain number of years. It is provided that the bonds shall run for fifty years. During the first seven years, the company are not to be called upon to meet the interest, which is at three per cent ; that interest will be met by the government. After seven years the company shall pay the interest, if the proceeds of the road are sufficient to earn three per cent. But, if the proceeds are not sufficient to earn three per cent, the payment shall be made by the government. But, at the end of three years, the government shall be recouped every cent by the company. It is important that, from this point, I should give the very section of the contract :

The government shall pay the interest upon an amount of bonds equal to the principal of the bonds guaranteed by the government on account of the construction of the mountain section, accruing due during the first seven years from the date of the issue of said bonds, and shall not have recourse against the company for any interest so paid. After the expiration of the said period of seven years, the company shall be primarily liable to pay the said interest, and should default be made by the company in payment thereof, or of any part thereof, the government shall pay the same and take up the coupons representing such interest, and any moneys so paid by the government under its guarantee, whether for principal or interest of the said bonds, shall be held to be paid in discharge of the liability of the government, but not in discharge of the liability of the company with respect to the said bonds, and any moneys so paid by the government shall continue to be a charge under the said mortgage, to be given to secure the said guaranteed bonds hereinafter mentioned, and the government shall be subrogated to all the rights of the holders of the said bonds, the interest upon or the principal of which shall have been paid by the government, and the government shall in respect of all moneys which it may so pay, be in all respects, in the position of holders of bonds in respect of whose bonds default has been made to the extent of the moneys so paid by the government, subject to the following proviso and exception, namely : That the government shall not, during the next succeeding period of three years following the period of seven years above mentioned, be entitled to exercise any rights of foreclosure or sale against the company or to take possession of the said railway, if the default of the company consists in failure to pay during the said period of three years the interest upon an amount of bonds equal to the principal amount guaranteed by the government on account of the construction of the said mountain section, but any moneys so paid by the government shall be repaid by the company to the government in the following manner : At the end of the said period of three years the whole amount so paid by the government shall be capitalized and shall be repaid by the company to the government with interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum, or the company may, at its option, repay the same in forty equal annual instalments, with interest at the rate aforesaid, or may give to the government bonds for the said interest so capitalized, payable in forty years from the date thereof, with interest at the rate aforesaid ; in any event, the interest so capitalized and the bonds so to be given therefor, if any, shall continue to be secured by the said mortgage to secure the bonds guaranteed by the government, hereinafter mentioned, and the said mortgage shall contain proper provisions in that behalf.

Mr. SPROULE. That only applies to the prairie and the mountain sections ?

The PRIME MINISTER. To the mountain section only. Now, what is the disposition for the prairie section ? The disposition with regard to the prairie section is that the company shall pay interest from the issue of the bonds ; the government will pay no interest at all upon the prairie section. Now, Sir, what is the liability incurred by the government for the construction of this road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean ? Assuming that the road across the mountains is 600 miles long, the cost of construction will be $18,000,000, and the total interest for three years will be $3,780,000. This is the whole of the liability which is incurred by the government for the construction of the railway from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean.

I pass now to the eastern section. It is provided that it shall be operated by the company under a lease. As we are to build a railway that they are to lease it from us at the rate of three per cent per annum, we have thought it advisable that they should have a joint voice with us in the construction of it. Therefore, section 7 provides :

In order to insure, for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to, and approved of by, the company before the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to the said speci-

fications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer of the company, and, in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in the case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the question in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

When completed, the company will lease the road and will pay to us a rental at the rate of three per cent per annum upon the cost of construction, whatever that may be. The same abatement of rent is provided also as in the case of interest on the western section. During seven years the company will be exempt from the payment of rent. For three years the company will be bound to pay the revenues and tolls of the road if they amount to three per cent; and if they fail to amount to three per cent, then the difference between the revenues gathered and the three per cent will be capitalized and added to the cost of construction, and the company will pay interest upon it. So that here again the whole of the liability which is incurred by the government for the building of that section from Moncton to Winnipeg is simply seven years of interest. The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of that line of railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean will be in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, and not a cent more. Now, Sir, what is $13,000,000 in the year 1903? It is about the surplus of our revenue over the expenditure. The surplus for this year will pay for the construction of this road. I will come presently to the objections which I see in the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite. They will ask me: What guarantee have you that the company will be able to pay that rate of interest? I will come to that presently. But let me first give to the House the provision we have made for the use of the railway for traffic by other roads. It is our intention that this line of railway shall be a common highway for all the railways who want to use it, and for this purpose we have made a provision in the contract in the following language:—

24. The said lease shall also contain proper and usual provisions.

(a.) Reserving to the government in respect of its ownership, present and future, of the Intercolonial and any other line or lines of railway, running powers and haulage rights over the said eastern division upon equal terms with the lessees, subject to such reasonable restrictions as may be necessary to secure safety and convenience in the operation of all the traffic over the said division and subject to the payment by the government to the company of such reasonable compensation as may be agreed upon between the government and the company:

(b.) Reserving power to the government to grant running powers and haulage rights sufficient to enable any railway company desiring to use the said eastern division or any part thereof, to do so upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the companies, or, in case of their failure to agree, then upon such terms as may be deemed reasonable and just by the government, having regard to the rights and obligations of the lessees:

(c.) Securing to the government, in respect of its ownership as aforesaid, running powers and haulage rights over the western division, or any portion thereof, upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the government and the company;

(d.) Securing to any railway company desiring to make use of the same, running powers and haulage rights over the said western division, or any portion thereof, upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the companies, or, in case of their failure to agree, then upon such terms as may be deemed reasonable and just by the government.

(e.) Securing to the company running powers and haulage rights over the Intercolonial Railway, or any portion thereof, upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the government and the company.

So that under this agreement an Intercolonial train can leave St. John or Halifax and proceed all the way to Port Simpson. Under this agreement, a train of the Great Northern or of the Canadian Northern can enter upon this road at any point and go as far as the maritime provinces. So we have guarded this point in every way, and I believe that in this respect the provisions we have made will command the full satisfaction of the Canadian people. But coming back to the rental, I may be told, you have taken provision, you say, that the rental shall be paid by the company for all the time the bonds run, with the exception of seven years. What guarantee have you that this will be implemented? We have taken precautions upon this point, which I will now recite to the House.

35. For the purposes hereinafter in this paragraph respectively defined, the company may and shall create mortgages to trustees as follows:

(a.) A mortgage which shall be a first charge upon the railway, undertaking, equipment and property, tolls, rights and franchises of the company, including all equipment and property to be thereafter acquired by the company (but not including branch lines exceeding six miles in length or the revenues therefrom or the franchises in connection therewith, or such additional rolling stock as may, with the assent of the government, be designated and marked by the company as constituting the equipment thereof, and not including ships or any municipal or provincial grants of land, by way of bonus or subsidy, to the said company other than for railway purposes) to secure the payment of the said issue of first mortgage bonds guaranteed by the government.

(b.) A mortgage which shall be a second charge upon the property covered by the mortgage provided for by paragraph 35 (a), save and except the rolling stock constituting the equipment of the eastern division, to secure the bonds to be guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Company of Canada as aforesaid.

(c.) A mortgage which shall be a charge upon the rolling stock constituting the equipment of the eastern division next after the charge mentioned in paragraph 35 (a.) to secure to the government the rental payable in respect of the eastern division, the efficient maintenance and

continuous operation of the said eastern division, and the observance and performance by the company of the terms of this agreement.

Now, you see we have provided a special mortgage to force the company to implement the conditions imposed upon it, and especially the operating of the railway. But, I may be asked: Will this be sufficient? There is a mortgage of $5,000,000 upon the rolling stock; will this be sufficient to force the company to implement its promise to operate this road? We have far more in this undertaking than the simple mortgage to which I have alluded. We have the interest of the company itself to operate this road. No one doubts that the interest of the company would be to keep the traffic of the Grand Trunk for that railway. The company will take it over its present line to North Bay, from North Bay over the road which is now being built by the Ontario government, and then, transferring it at the junction of this road with the proposed road, it will send it westward to the Pacific ocean. I wish to make myself understood. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has an immense interest in getting to the fields of the prairies. Its trade to-day is in the province of Quebec and in the province of Ontario. It will take this trade from Toronto, from Montreal and from points eastward to North Bay, from North Bay, it will take it over the new line being built by the Ontario government to the point of junction with the present road, and then westward to the prairie section. Its interest there is manifest. It must operate that portion of the road. Otherwise it would never have gone into this contract. This contract is to give it the privilege of taking its traffic in the prairie section from Ontario and Quebec, but the condition is this, that it shall operate not only that section of the road, but the whole of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. It cannot default upon the eastern part, because, if it defaults upon the eastern part, it defaults upon the western part. It cannot default upon one part without defaulting upon the whole and therefore, we hold them tight to their bargain, and they cannot deviate from it.

There is another important provision as to rates and tolls. We have provided in section 39 that the rates and tolls are to be under the direct control of the government, or, when the commission has been organized, of the commission. We thought it advisable at one time to follow the suggestion which had been made by my hon. friend the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), to which he referred in the correspondence exchanged between him and me, to force the company to give us part of its profits upon the western section, but, upon consideration, it is our intention, instead of forcing the company to give us a portion of its profits when the profits reach a certain reasonable point, to use them in such a way as to compel a decrease in the rates which are chargeable to the people who use the railway.

Now, there is another feature of this contract to which I shall call the attention of the House. If we have gone into this contract, our intention has been, as stated in the preamble, to force traffic in Canadian channels and through Canadian waters. We have made it a special condition of the contract and this condition is expressed in section 42 as follows:

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

Section 43. The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely, the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

Now, to show that this is not simply an idle covenant, but that we mean what we say, and intend to implement it, I have to call the attention of the House to another disposition of this contract whereby we force the company to procure all the ships necessary at both ends of the line on the Pacific and on the Atlantic as well as on the St. Lawrence, to accommodate all the trade that is offered.

Section 45. The company shall arrange for and provide, either by purchase, charter or otherwise, shipping connections upon both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, sufficient in tonnage and in number of sailings to take care of and transport all its traffic, both inward and outward, at such ocean ports within Canada, upon the said line of railway, or upon the line of the Intercolonial Railway, as may be agreed upon from time to time, and the company shall not divert or, so far as it can lawfully prevent, permit to be diverted, to ports outside of Canada any traffic which it can lawfully influence or control, upon the ground that there is not a sufficient amount of shipping to transport such traffic from or to such Canadian ocean ports.

There is another provision which I am sure will be welcomed by the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Pringle), and it is that the company shall buy all its supplies in Canada. There is another covenant, and it is the last of those which I

shall call to the attention of the House at this moment, to this effect :

The company shall within thirty days after the passing of the Act confirming this agreement and of the Act incorporating the company hereinafter referred to, deposit with the government $5,000,000 in cash or approved government securities, or partly in cash and partly in such approved securities, at the company's option, as security for the construction of the western division and for the first equipment of the whole line of railway, as provided for in this agreement.

Now, Sir, these are the salient features of the contract which we have made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. Compare its terms with the terms which were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the session of 1880-1881. Twenty-five million acres of land were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway—not an acre of land is granted to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Twenty-five million dollars was paid in cash to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and works were handed over to that company which had been built by the Canadian government at the expense of the Canadian people, the cost of which was at least, if my memory serves me, $35,000,000.

Therefore the cash aid which was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was in the neighbourhood of $60,000,000—the cash subsidy which is promised and which is to be given under this contract to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will not exceed $13,000,000 or thereabouts.

Under the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for 20 years there was an exemption of competition—in this contract there is no exemption whatever. Everybody is free to compete with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has to face competition from whatever quarter it may come.

Exemption from taxation was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in a manner that is felt even to this day in the North-west Territories and Manitoba—not one dollar of exemption from taxation is given to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Now, Sir, I think under such circumstances that I can appeal with some confidence to the judgment of the House to ratify, and to ratify with earnestness and with joy the contract which I have the honour to lay upon the Table. Canada has made greater sacrifices, I imagine, that any other nation in the world for the benefit of her people, in building railways. These sacrifices were rendered necessary on account of our geographical position. We border on a powerful country which had a long start on us in the march of progress and which was in such a condition that it could well afford to leave railway construction to the unaided effort of private enterprise. These greater sacrifices on our part were rendered necessary likewise by the immensity of our territory, by the sparseness of our population, and the imperative duty which was cast upon us of binding together all the groups into which our country is divided. Sometimes, indeed more often than otherwise, the terms granted for railway construction in the past were excessive and perhaps extravagant. But, looking back upon the history of the past we can all see that even in the face of these excessive terms the result has been beneficial.

We offer to the House to-day a contract which is free from all clauses which were the blemish of former railway contracts, and which is far superior to them in every other respect. Sir, it can well be said that of all the inventions for which the last century has been famous, perhaps the one invention which has had the greatest potentiality for civilization has been the discovery of the locomotive and the railway. Justin McCarthy in his 'History of our own times' writes, that when Sir Robert Peel was summoned from Rome to London to assume office as Prime Minister, he travelled in the same manner exactly as 1,500 years before Constantine had travelled from York to Rome to become Emperor. The writer remarks that each traveller had only the power that horses and sails could lend to speed him on his way, but, had Sir Robert Peel made the journey a few years afterwards he would have covered the distance in the space of about forty-eight hours. The railway has been the great agency of civilization in the last century. It has done more to bind nations and nations together than any other human agency. It has removed old prejudices by enabling peoples and nations to know more of each other, and it has made union possible where but for its aid ignorance would have continued to sow its seeds of discord and strife.

The Canadian confederation would have been a union on paper and a union on paper only, but for the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway brought all parts of our country together to act in unison and to beat with the same heart. This new railway will be another link in that chain of union. It will not only open territory hitherto idle and unprofitable ; it will not only force Canadian trade into Canadian channels ; it will not only promote citizenship between old Canada and new Canada but it will secure us our commercial independence, and it will for ever make us free from the bondage of the bonding privilege. For that reason alone, in my estimation, it would be worth all the sacrifices and far more than we are called upon to make.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Sir, it is therefore with a firm heart that I offer this

scheme to friend and foe ; it is with a firm heart that I present it to the Canadian people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am well aware that it shall not be received everywhere with the same feelings. I am well aware that it may scare the timid and frighten the irresolute ; but, Sir, I claim that every one who has in his bosom a stout Canadian heart will welcome it as a scheme worthy of this young nation for whom a heavy task has no terrors which has the strength to face grave duties and grave responsibilities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman has pursued a somewhat unusual course in the introduction of this measure. Every one acquainted with parliamentary procedure knows that in the case of great projects of this kind the usual practice is to put a resolution upon the Order Paper, to acquaint the House with its terms and to thus enable the measure to be discussed intelligently when it is introduced, if discussion at that time is thought necessary. That was the course pursued with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1873 and again in 1881. That was the course pursued with regard to the Drummond County Railway contract. That was the course pursued with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway contract in 1889. That was the course pursued in every case with which I am familiar, except with regard to the Yukon Railway and this ; and this possesses many of the characteristics which were noticeable when the Yukon Railway project was introduced. I would have thought it not out of place, I would have thought it somewhat more consistent with the courtesy which the right hon. gentleman usually displays to this side of the House, that a copy of the measure might have been placed in my hands at least a few hours before the right hon. gentleman presented it to the House. But at the conclusion of a very discursive statement in which he has rambled over the history of this country for the past twenty-five years, in which he has dealt with the question of bonding privileges and fishery rights, in which he has traced the history of explorations and pointed out that a gentleman named Alexander Mackenzie was the first man to reach the shores of the Pacific——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think some of the hon. gentlemen opposite cheered that under the impression that my right hon. friend referred to a late honoured member of this House and Premier of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). After making his very discursive speech, the right hon. gentleman at his conclusion was good enough to send to me across the floor of the House a copy of the Bill which I suppose he might have sent me this morning or even yesterday. Well, that may be in perfect consonance with the right hon. gentleman's idea of fair dealing with the opposition in this House ; but all I have to say is that it is not in consonance with the treatment which up to this time I have had the good fortune to receive from that right hon. gentleman.

The right hon. gentleman tells us that he has heard no dissenting voice with regard to a transcontinental railway. Well, I did think, Mr. Speaker, that that was a most extraordinary proposition to come from the right hon. gentleman. Has the right hon. gentleman's memory failed him ? Can he not recall the days of twenty years ago when his eloquent voice, with those of his leader and his colleagues and associates, were raised against the project of a transcontinental railway ?—when we were told in effect that it would be better to break to pieces this Dominion of ours than to go to the expense of building a railway across this continent ; when we were told that the western country was so worthless and useless that a railway across it would not pay the cost of the grease of its axles; when we were told that the great province of British Columbia was a mere sea of mountains. Yet, the right hon. gentleman stands up in his place and tells us that he has never heard a dissenting voice with regard to the project of a transcontinental railway. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are glad to hear the eloquent words of the right hon. gentleman to-day. We are glad that he has at last awakened to a sense of the importance of a transcontinental railway across this country ; and we are glad that he admits to-day that the Canadian Pacific Railway, upon which project the Conservative party staked its political life, has been the means of binding together the people of Canada and making it the nation that it is to-day.

It is of course impossible for me to deal in detail with the project of the right hon. gentleman to-day, for the reason that I have already mentioned. But there are one or two general matters respecting which I would like to make a few remarks before this Bill is read for the first time. In the first place, my right hon. friend says there is no time for deliberation ; we cannot wait ; we must do this thing at once ; the time is for action, and not for deliberation. I would like to point out to my right hon. friend that his government has been in power for a period of seven years, that this transportation question has been before them during all that time, that during at least three or four years of that time a large immigration has been flowing into the Northwest ; and yet the right hon. gentleman says that there is no time for deliberation. Well, I think the scheme on its face bears

the imprint of the truth of the right hon. gentleman's remark. There has been no time for deliberation. What the reason for that is I do not know ; but this I do know, that with regard to that the right hon. gentleman has changed his mind very much since the first day of this session. What were the words that were put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General when this session opened ?

> The great influx of population into our North-west Territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels.

Now, I invite the right hon. gentleman's attention to the following words, as to which I wish to address a few queries to him :

> The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

I think we might well ask, what is the position of that transportation commission at the present time ? Nearly five months of this session have passed away since those words were placed in the mouth of His Excellency, and I would like to know from the right hon. gentleman now, if he is able to answer me, what progress has been made with the transportation commission ? Has it even been constituted ? If so, is he prepared to lay its report on the Table of the House ? Is it on the report of that commission, or if not on what substitute therefor is it, that the right hon. gentleman has brought this project before the House ? Does he propose to proceed with this transportation commission, and, if so, upon what shall it report after this project has been brought down and passed through parliament ? Upon what shall it report, and of what use shall it be ? Were these words put idly into the mouth of His Excellency ? Were they put into his mouth with the intention of deceiving the country ? If not, has the right hon. gentleman changed his policy since the commencement of this session, and if he has, what were the overmastering reasons which led him to present this measure to the House, as he says himself in effect, without that deliberation which such a measure as this should demand at the hands of any government? No time for deliberation, when he himself had placed in the mouth of His Excellency the best and most cogent reason possible why there should be deliberation with regard to this matter. And that deliberation was not only promised then, but it was promised to us many times since the session opened ; and yet apparently we are to deal with this measure without reference to any report which that commission could make.

My right hon. friend waxed eloquent in one portion of his remarks upon the importance of the parliament of this country and the government of this country remaining true to pledges which were given in the past ; I must confess that I thought his eloquence was most touching when he was dealing with that subject. He is so firm a believer in the sanctity of promises that he is even willing to carry out pledges made by Conservative administrations. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a good old proverb that charity well understood begins at home, and would it not be well for the right hon. gentleman to deal with a few of the pledges which he has made to this country in the past before he undertakes to deal with pledges made by Conservative administrations ? Would it not be well, before he undertakes a task of that kind, that he should give us that free trade as it is in England which he promised in Winnipeg and in every other city in the west ? I have repeated his words in this House, and he has not denied them. Would it not be well for him to wait until he reduces the expenditure of this country by three or four millions ? Would it not be well for him to wait until he carries out the verdict of the people pronounced in the plebiscite vote ? Would it not be well for him to attend to a few of these matters before he stands up and folds his arms and announces that he is about to implement a promise made by the late Conservative administration ?

The right hon. gentleman is very much impressed with the importance of a railroad through all-Canadian territory. I may say to him in passing that his government has brought down and voted during the present session, a subsidy for a system of railway which passes to the extent of nearly forty miles through American territory ; and my right hon. friend did not seem to have that consideration so much in mind at that time as he does to-day.

Passing to another portion of the right hon. gentleman's remarks, I was astonished to hear the Prime Minister of this country stand up in his place in this House and say that this country is at the mercy of the United States of America on account of the bonding privilege. I do not believe in language of that kind from any man in this parliament and least of all the right hon. gentleman. We thought we had got beyond language of that kind. We heard it a good deal in days gone by, and in our ears it has a certain reminiscence which we would be very glad indeed to shut out. I do not believe that Canada is at the mercy of the United States. And if Canada is at the mercy of the United States on account of the bonding privilege, how does it happen that the government of the right hon. gentleman has stayed in its place seven years without taking any steps to remedy the situation ? They have been seven years in power and they wake up to-day to the fact that Canada

is forsooth at the mercy of the United States because of the danger of having the bonding privilege abrogated. I believe that that bonding privilege is as valuable to the United States as it is to us. And for my part, I desire to disclaim, in language as emphatic as the usages of parliament will permit, the statement of the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, that Canada now or at any time is or has been at the mercy of the United States, for that reason or any other.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I had expressed my disappointment, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. gentleman, in introducing this measure, had seen fit to depart from parliamentary usage in springing his measure upon the House this afternoon without any previous notice of its terms, and in seeing fit, during two and a half hours, to make a controversial speech, instead of contenting himself, as is the practice, with intimating to the House the purport of the Bill. The intention was perfectly obvious. The opposition were to be taken unawares. No reply was to be made to the right hon. gentleman, and his speech was to go forth to the country without any answer whatever. Well, Sir, it will not go forth without some answer, although of course, one is taken very much at a disadvantage, with regard to a measure of this magnitude, in having the printed copy sent across, at the conclusion of the right hon. gentleman's speech, when it might have been placed in the hands of the leader of the opposition hours before. Nevertheless, I think there are some salient points in this measure which ought to be answered on the spot, and which I propose to answer on the spot.

The right hon. gentleman has covered a very wide range of ground. When we took recess at six o'clock, I was dealing with his remarks regarding the bonding privilege between this country and the United States. Before proceeding further, let me say that I do not know, to use the phraseology of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who dry-nursed the right hon. gentleman for this speech which he has delivered to-day. There might be some question as to whether or not the gentleman who wrote that article in the New York 'Sun,' which was quoted by the Prime Minister to-day, had anything to do with the preparation of that speech. The right hon. gentleman declared at considerable length that Canada was at the mercy of the United States on account of this bonding privilege, and it may not be out of place, in passing, to point out the view which another Canadian statesman, who is not now in the House, took of this situation some six years ago. Speaking in this House on the 24th of August, 1896, Sir Charles Tupper said :—

> Occasionally some people in the United States, who are very anxious to create trouble with Canada, who do not hesitate to do everything in their power to hand us over to the United States, have been kind enough to suggest to the United States government to stop the bonding privilege as a means of bringing Canada to her knees, just as they have been kind enough to suggest that the United States have it in their power to adopt a course that would render the great railway lines of this country, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, bankrupt in a very short time. That is the policy which I can understand emanating from the Farrars from the Wymanns and from the Glens ; but I cannot understand the first minister committing himself to a declaration tantamount to saying that the bonding privilege is one we have yet to settle. Sir, it is a privilege that has been conceded after the most solemn declarations by the plenipotentiaries of both countries, and has been ratified by a treaty under which we now enjoy it.

That is in marked contrast to the position taken by the Prime Minister to-day. He tells the people of Canada that we are utterly at the mercy of the United States government, when, as a matter of fact, it has been demonstrated that the bonding privilege is of more value to the shippers of the United States to-day than it is to us, and that, if it were abolished to-morrow, the shippers and the people of the United States would have more to suffer than we. But whether that be so or not, it seems to me a remarkable position for a Prime Minister of this country on the eve of the resumption, as we are told, of negotiations with the United States concerning trade matters, to stand up and say that for a period of five or six years to come, until this road is completed, we shall be absolutely at the mercy of the United States, bound to go down on our knees and submit to anything they may dictate to us. The right hon. gentleman has indulged in efforts of this kind before. The first thing he did after coming into power in 1896 was to give an interview to a reporter in Chicago, in which he very kindly promised to give away almost everything Canada had to offer, provided we could have some better relations with the United States than we then enjoyed; and when the right hon. gentleman expresses his fear of commercial bondage to the United States, I am reminded that eleven or twelve years ago, in 1891, he went through this country advocating a policy which his leader, the hon. Mr. Blake, admitted afterwards, was bound to subject the people of this country, not only to commercial, but political bondage as well, to the United States.

The right hon. gentleman apparently forgets those days, he forgets his attitude of that time, and he is oppressed with the danger of the commercial bondage of Canada to the United States of America. Thanks to the policy of the Conservative

party inaugurated in 1878, this country has found its own market; it has found a market in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe; it stands to-day in its own strength; it does not feel itself at the mercy of the United States, notwithstanding the declaration of my right hon. friend; and it will continue to stand in its own strength and increase in its own strength in the future. And if the government of the day is actuated by the feeling and principles which inspired the establishment of the national policy of this country in 1878, it need not fear from the United States or any other country commercial bondage, political bondage or bondage of any kind. And the right hon. gentleman was somewhat plaintive with regard to the attitude of the United States of America toward this country. That is in marked contrast with the good old days, when, I think, delegates were sent to Washington for the purpose of inspiring American statesmen with the idea that they could much better negotiate with Canada if the Liberal party came into power, and when we were told from one end of the country to the other that the difficulty in the way of making an arrangement with the United States was the unreasonable attitude taken by the leaders of the Conservative party. The right hon. gentleman has changed his views with regard to all this. He does not sing those old songs of long ago, but frankly admits to us that in dealing with the United States of America we are dealing with a people who want—as is very natural—to get the best of the bargain, and who, on all occasions when they negotiate with Canada or any other nation will see to it that their rights and privileges are not neglected. Now, so much for the somewhat discursive observations of the right hon. gentleman this afternoon.

As to the scheme itself, I can only deal with it in its main, general aspects, because it was only handed to me at the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech. But there are one or two salient points with regard to it which stand out in bold relief and to which I will bring the attention of the House and the country.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it has put back for fifty years, at least, the prospect of government ownership of railways in this country. Now, I do not declare myself to-day as absolutely in favour of government ownership of railways, although I know that there is a strong sentiment in this country in favour of that idea. But I say that it is not a wise policy, it is not a prudent policy for the government, looking to the developments of the future, to embark upon a scheme which absolutely puts that policy out of sight for the next fifty years, and this the government has certainly done, for it proposes to build a railway from the city of Moncton to the city of Winnipeg and to hand that railway over to the Grand Trunk Pacific for fifty years at least. That line from Moncton to Winnipeg is described by the right hon. gentleman as the key to the whole western situation. If it be true that it is the key to the whole western situation, the handing of it over in this way places beyond the power of the government for the next fifty years any policy of government ownership of railways.

In the second place, Mr. Speaker, it enables the Grand Trunk Railway Company to practically control the Intercolonial Railway. There is no doubt about that. It looks as if it were intended to result in the eventual ownership by the Grand Trunk Railway of the Intercolonial Railway. How is it to be done? Lines of steamships are to be established on the Atlantic and the Pacific to be operated by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I suppose that on the Atlantic they will sail from the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John. How are these steamships to be operated unless the Grand Trunk shall secure running powers over the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax? And when it secures these running powers, or even without them, what becomes of the Intercolonial Railway? It is virtually placed within the power of the Grand Trunk Railway, and that railway will be in a position to dictate the policy of the Intercolonial Railway and regulate its mode of dealing with traffic. Further than that, it practically converts the Intercolonial Railway, a road upon which we have expended nearly $70,000,000, if I recollect correctly into a local road. Certainly it converts it into a local road so far as that portion of its line from Quebec to Moncton is concerned. And, while my right hon. friend, in speaking here to-day, was inclined to minimize that aspect of the question, nevertheless, he, in effect, admitted that, so far as those portions of the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec traversed by the Intercolonial Railway are concerned, the building of this new line must be detrimental to these localities.

But there is a more important matter in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and that is that the policy brought down to-day is an absolute and complete reversal of the policy upon which this government embarked four or five years ago. And I will show you why. In 1898—I think it was—the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) brought down a proposal to this House to acquire a line of railway from Lévis to the city of Montreal. That proposal eventually passed this House and became law. Under it the government of this country paid for the Drummond County Railway the sum of $1,600,000, that being the capital representing the annual payment of $64,000 for ninety-nine years. In addition, the government has spent upon that line no less a sum than $500,000. So,

the line from Lévis to Montreal represents to-day a capital expenditure of $2,100,000 of the peoples' money. In addition to that, the government, for the purpose of dealing with the western traffic, which, it was said at that time, the Intercolonial Railway would control under this agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway, entered into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company by which it pays to that company, for the period of ninety-nine years, if I remember correctly, the sum of $140,000 a year as rental for its terminals. So you have a capital expenditure of $2,100,000 and a yearly rental of $140,000 payable to the Grand Trunk Railway in respect of the terminals at Montreal. That policy of the government meant certainly this—that, under the agreement, the Grand Trunk Railway was to hand over to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal its proportion of through-traffic to be carried by the Intercolonial Railway to St. John or Halifax for transport to the markets of Europe. Further than that, if that policy meant anything, its logical and necessary conclusion would be the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the great lakes, so as to provide the traffic of the west with another outlet, and also to provide a line of railway from the great lakes to the Atlantic seaboard which could be used, if necessity arose, as a means of regulating railway rates in this country. Well, the project submitted by the government to-day does away with all that. It side-tracks the city of Montreal, it renders vain the expenditure of $2,100,000, it renders excessive and absurd the payment of $140,000 per year to the Grand Trunk Railway for the terminals at Montreal. Therefore, the government, by the proposal which it has brought down to the House to-day, as is its custom in many cases, absolutely reverses the very policy which it brought down to the country only four or five years ago.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is another criticism upon this proposal, namely, that like the fast Atlantic service, which the government have lately asked tenders for, it is of a hybrid character. The government now owns and operates in Canada about 1,300 miles of railway. It now proposes to build and own, but not to operate, 1,800 miles of railway. For what reason or on what ground will a distinction be made? When the government acquired the Drummond County Railway from the city of Lévis to the city of Montreal, it did not propose to hand that over to the Grand Trunk or to any other railway; it stood then upon the policy of the operation by the government of any railway which it owns. Now, we have the spectacle of the government coming down and building some 1,800 miles more of railway, not having the courage to undertake its operation itself, but handing it over at a more or less nominal rental to the Grand Trunk Company, in order that they may run this line in connection with their own. Now, I say that the government should adopt either one policy or the other. Either the policy of the operation by the government of the lines which it owns is a good one or it is not a good one. I do not see that you can make any distinction in that regard between the line from Moncton to Winnipeg and the line from Montreal to Halifax and to St. John. The right hon. gentleman, in the speech which he delivered to-day, did not point out any such distinction; and if it be a good thing to have government operation of roads owned by the state, then I say the government has not acted wisely in handing over to the Grand Trunk Railway Company 1,700 or 1,800 miles of line from Moncton to Winnipeg. If, on the other hand, the government has arrived at the conclusion that it is impossible successfully to operate railways owned by the state, then the government certainly should not bring down the policy it has brought down to-day, but it should propose some comprehensive scheme by which all the railways, including the Winnipeg-Moncton line should be operated on some other basis and under some other management than those under which they are operated to-day.

My right hon. friend told us of an interview which he had with Mr. Booth in connection with the terminal of the Canada Atlantic Railway. It seems that the right hon. gentleman experienced almost a vision, a sudden thought flashed upon his mind, and he saw at once that it would be of no use for the government to attempt ownership of railways in the west. And what were the reasons the right hon. gentleman assigned? Why, he said, if you built a railway owned by the state in the western part of Canada, you would have to build elevators and wharfs, and you would have to send out agents looking for freight. Well, does not the right hon. gentleman send agents all over the country, all over the United States and all over Europe, looking for immigrants, and would there be any great distinction between that and sending agents to look after freight? The right hon. gentleman does not seem to realize that only three years ago his government spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in building elevators and wharfs at St. John. Yet the inexpediency of building elevators and wharfs is about the only reason that I have heard in the right hon. gentleman's speech for refraining from government ownership of railways in the west.

Now, my right hon. friend attached great importance to the idea that this project of his ensures the transportation of Canadian goods through Canadian routes. In the first place, the proposed contract which has been placed before the House gives the Grand Trunk Railway Company absolute control of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg. That company is to own the whole of

the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I venture to think that sections 42 and 43, to which the right hon. gentleman referred in his address this afternoon, are sections which, so far as they are intended to ensure the transportation of Canadian goods through Canadian routes, will prove to be of the most illusory character. It is absolutely impossible, it seems to me, under conditions of this kind to expect that result. Where has the Grand Trunk Railway its terminus at the present time? It has its Atlantic terminus at Portland, in the United States, upon which it has expended millions of dollars. Now, if you can, by any agreement, or by any Act of parliament, prevent the Grand Trunk from routing its freight over this line to its own terminus at Portland, I will be very glad indeed to have that accomplished. I for one venture to doubt whether, under the sections of this Bill which have been referred to by the right hon. gentleman, that matter can be accomplished. What are the sections? Section 42 reads:

> It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels.

Well, that sentence does not amount to anything at all, it has no legal force or effect, and a different policy would not, it seems to me, be attended with any better results.

> The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through-rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

Now, as a matter of practice, as a matter of every day business, I say I believe there would be no difficulty whatever in the Grand Trunk Railway departing from the spirit of that section. Further than that, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the House and to the country that the violation by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of that section is not attended by any punishment under the terms of the contract. Suppose the Grand Trunk systematically violates that provision in the agreement, how are you to recover damages? Is any one to bring an action against the Grand Trunk Railway because some shipper has been induced to route his traffic via Portland instead of via Montreal or Quebec? What is the remedy under this? Section 43 is in the same line, it carries the matter no further:

> The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely, the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

Very nice, high-sounding phrases, Mr. Speaker, but when you come to practical results, where shall we be under a clause of that kind? If we find our traffic, or nine-tenths of it, going to Portland instead of Montreal or Quebec, what is to be our remedy, and what shall we say to the Grand Trunk, and more especially what shall we do to the Grand Trunk? Why, Portland is in a state of delight already over the fact that it is to be the terminus of a great Canadian transcontinental railway. Here is an extract from a Portland newspaper of not long ago. The right hon. leader of the government indulged in some extracts from the New York 'Sun' and other United States newspapers. I wonder what he will think of this aspect of his transcontinental railway, as viewed by the eyes of the people of Portland:

> Portland people will be gratified to learn that it is practically settled that this city is to be the great terminus of the new Grand Trunk Pacific line across the continent. St. John and Montreal are in a great stew about it, and the Grand Trunk people are doing the best they can do to retain the good-will of their Canadian constituents and at the same time carry out their ideas without any special change. Such is the programme, as admitted by those in the best position to know.
>
> To-day an 'Advertiser' reporter had an interview with a prominent Grand Trunk official, who stipulated that his name should not be used for obvious reasons, as it may get him into trouble with his superior officers. This gentleman freed his mind something like this:
>
> 'All this talk about Montreal and St. John being able to handle the Grand Trunk terminal business all the year round is wearisome. St. John has not the harbour facilities to do it, and the expenditure of $5,000,000 would not make that harbour equal to Portland's. Montreal is nothing but a summer port anyway. Portland has no need to worry, for the Grand Trunk people are going to stay where they can get adequate accommodation.
>
> 'Just notice that President Charles Rivers-Wilson and General Manager Hays, in their replies to the queries of the legislators in Ottawa, did not for a moment admit that they had any intention of leaving Portland. Sir Charles put it point blank when he said that the port of Montreal had proven inadequate to handle the business, and Mr. Hays did the square thing when he said that the Grand Trunk had not expended all the money at Portland, but that the people of Portland had provided the most of it.
>
> 'The fact is that Portland is really going to be the great terminus of the new transcontinental railway line, that will equal in importance any in the world. Portland has the natural facilities to do the business and St. John has not. St. John may get a small share of the traffic, but, mark me, Portland is destined

to be the place where the great bulk of the business will be transacted.'

That is from the Portland, Main 'Advertiser.'

Mr. WADE. Of what date ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Published in June.

Mr. WADE. They have changed their tune since then.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have they ? If they have changed their tune perhaps they have done so advisedly and with good reason. Now, I say, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this provision in its actual working out will be found illusory and there will be no practical safeguard to the Canadian people, but it will be found in the end that the traffic over this line will go pretty much as it has in the past as far as the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned. The same thing is true of the running powers to be granted to other railways over this railway from Winnipeg to Moncton. It is well known not only amongst railway men but to those who are not railway experts, that the company which has the management and control of the line can regulate the running powers granted to other railways in such a way that there are of no practical advantage to the railway having those running rights. I do not think there is any doubt in the mind of any railway man in regard to that, and therefore I think that the running powers which are proposed to be granted over the line from Moncton to Winnipeg are of really no value. I doubt very much if they will be used by any railway company other than the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and I believe the Canadian Northern, the only railway which would be likely to use them, will come to the conclusion that no advantage could possibly result to its enterprise from obtaining the running powers which have been referred to by the right hon. gentleman.

The great, the important point which was dealt on by the right hon. gentleman was that the proposal which is brought down to parliament is a proposal that will give to the people of the west an all rail route to the Atlantic, which will be used for the transportation of their products and thus remove all the difficulties of the transportation problem in Canada. The right hon. gentleman did not give to the House one bit of information, one single figure or any data whatever upon which he could base any such conclusion as that. On what can he base it ? What is the position of affairs in the western part of Canada to-day ? There is no congestion north of Lake Superior. The Canadian Pacific Railway operates a line running north to Lake Superior and we are told on the very best authority that it could handle from five to ten times the traffic which passes over that line to-day. The congestion in the west is west of Lake Superior, and it is to that congestion that the efforts of the government should be directed. It is impossible to believe upon what data which have been furnished to the House by the right hon. gentleman that any relief would be given to the west by this line. Look at the position of matters as they are at present. The Canadian Pacific Railway handled something like forty million bushels of grain, I believe, last year. I understand that two and a half million bushels, or about six per cent, went by this line north of Lake Superior. The rest of it was put in elevators at Fort William and was transported partly by rail and partly by water to the Atlantic ports from which it was forwarded to Liverpool. If the Canadian Pacific Railway, having that line north of Lake Superior were able to earn a profit on carrying that wheat by rail and had an opportunity to take forty million bushels of it north of Lake Superior, certainly it would have done so. There can be no doubt about that. It would be to the advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway to handle the whole of the forty million bushels by the all rail route from Montreal to St. John if it could do so at a profit. Instead of that we find that it handled only two and a half million bushels, or six per cent, by the all rail route and it handled it at a rate which is said to be not a very paying rate. Where will this new line get its traffic ? Is it expected that it will take any portion of the traffic which at present goes to the elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur ? Apparently not, because it will not be in any better position as far as we know to handle the traffic than the Canadian Pacific Railway are able to handle it at the present time ; and as that railway handled only six per cent of this grain by means of the all rail route, what warrant has the right hon. gentleman for supposing that any considerable portion of that traffic will be handled by this new line ? And then, what about the rates ? It is said on very good authority that a railway line 360 miles in length can be constructed from a Georgian bay port to the city of Montreal and that grain can be hauled over that line at a cost of four and one-half cents a bushel including elevator charges. It is also said that the grain can be transported from Fort William or Port Arthur to the Georgian bay port at the paying cost of one and a half cents per bushel, making a total cost from Fort William or Port Arthur of six cents per bushel to the city of Montreal. If you add two cents for carriage to the city of Quebec you have a rate of eight cents to Quebec. Now, the lowest rate that the Canadian Pacific Railway, owning a line north of Lake Superior, has ever fixed upon traffic to the city of Montreal from Fort William or Port Arthur is ten and one-quarter cents, and the average rate, I understand, has been something like twelve cents

a bushel. Under these circumstances how is the new railway going to compete with that six cent rate which can be established, and no doubt will be, between Fort William and Montreal ? On what ground does the right hon. gentleman expect to control this traffic and why did he not deal with this aspect of the question instead of talking about bonding privileges and reading us long, wearisome extracts, containing accounts of the adventures of hunters and trappers two or three hundred years ago ?

Then the hon. gentleman seems to have rather a curious idea as to the cost this enterprise will impose upon the country. He has admitted that we are to give to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway a bonus of $3,780,000 in respect to the mountain section. I understood him to say that the seven years rental estimated on the basis of three per cent on the cost of construction on the eastern section would amount to about $13,000,000—the Postmaster General shakes his head; what are the figures ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that when the premier used the figures $13,000,000 he intended these figures to embrace not only the eastern division but the whole line.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, the Prime Minister was not very definite in his remarks and the Postmaster General may be right, but I gathered exactly the opposite of what the Postmaster General says. I understood the Prime Minister to say distinctly that the cost to the country in respect to the eastern section would be $13,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will my hon. friend the Postmaster General tell me what the cost will be, because we have no information as to the cost of that section.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not in a position——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentlemen did not hear the rest of my sentence. I am not in a position to discuss the subject to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well it is a rather remarkable thing that we have this project brought down to the House and no man on the treasury benches is able to give us the slightest estimate of the cost of the road. It certainly fully sustains the declaration of the Prime Minister this afternoon when he said, that this project had been entered into without deliberation. Can any hon. gentleman on the treasury benches give us within ten million dollars of the cost of the eastern section ?

Mr. BENNETT. Give them time to think.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely some hon. gentleman on the treasury benches can give an estimate within $10,000,000 of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I must say that this is a rather unusual spectacle—a project brought down ; heralded by the right hon. gentleman in a two and a half hour's speech; tremendous applause from his supporters, and not a minister of the Crown can give us within $10,000,000 of the cost of the eastern section.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, certainly my right hon. friend put it very mildly when he said that this project had been gone into without deliberation. I should suppose that taking the estimate of the right hon. gentleman this afternoon, that he must conclude that that road would cost at least $65,000,000, if I am right in my supposition that the seven years rental at three per cent amounts to $13,000,000. As three per cent for seven years would amount to 21 per cent, you would simply have to multiply the 13 by 5 and you get $65,000,000 as the estimated cost. If, however, the estimated amount of the rentals is only $10,000,000, then you would have to reduce the cost to about $5,000,000. And yet my right hon. friend alleged this afternoon that the whole cost to this country would be $13,000,000. He winks out of sight the fact that this eastern section is to cost from $50,000,000 to $65,000,000, and I venture to say that in the end it will cost nearer $75,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the right hon. gentleman presented the most delightful and pleasing spectacle to the country of a road built from the Atlantic to the Pacific costing this country only $13,000,000. As a matter of fact, add $50,000,000 or $65,000,000 or perhaps $75,000,000 to that and you get some idea of what this project—brought down without deliberation, brought at the end of the session, brought down in a hurry—means to this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is no wonder that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) shrunk from it. Some small wonder there may be perhaps that the right hon. gentleman saw fit to ask the ex-Minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) to keep his seat in the government and proclaim himself an adherent to that policy when in his heart he did not believe it to be in the interest of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope, Mr. Speaker that there is not on the treasury benches any minister who had the same belief as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals

(Hon. Mr. Blair) but had not the same courage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman was good enough to make a comparison between the terms upon which the Canadian Pacific Railway was built and the terms upon which this railway is to be built; but in making that comparison he very ingeniously put out of sight the $50,000,000, or the $65,000,000, or the $75,000,000 which will be expended in constructing this road from Winnipeg to Moncton. As a matter of fact if you assume that this road from Winnipeg to Moncton will cost $65,000,000—and I believe that is a very moderate estimate—you will have nearly $80,000,000 to the cost to this country of this so-called national transcontinental road.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And as far as the prairie section of that country is concerned, I will venture to say in the presence of this House and before this country; that it is a fairer proposition, a better business proposition to build a road across the western prairies to-day without any government assistance or guarantee at all, than it was twenty years ago to build it on the terms upon which the Canadian Pacific Railway built it.

The right hon. gentleman retracted some of his own views with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the building of it, and the linking together of Canada by that band of iron; but he could not quite recant, and in the latter part of his speech he was bound to say, that the policy of building the Canadian Pacific Railway was an unwise policy. And yet, Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian Pacific Railway had not been built when it was built, and if the western country of Canada had not been acquired, it is probable that another flag, not the British flag, would float over it to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman laid great stress amid the plaudits of his supporters upon clause 37 of this agreement. He told us that clause 37 made it absolutely necessary that every dollar that the company spent in materials and supplies should be expended within the limits of Canada. Let us take section 37 and see what it means. It says:

> The company shall purchase all material and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers, when the same are produced in Canada and when such material and supplies can be purchased in desired quantities and of equal quality suitable for the purpose required, and for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, you as a lawyer, will appreciate the delightful latitude which is afforded to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company under the provisions of the Bill.

Then, my right hon. friend went into ecstacies over clause 12 of the agreement. There is to be a guarantee of $5,000,000 by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and that was a most important part of this agreement. Let us read section 12, and we will observe what this guarantee amounts to, and for what purpose it is to be used:

> The company shall, within thirty days after the passing of the Act confirming this agreement and of the Act incorporating the company hereinafter referred to, deposit with the government five million dollars in cash or approved government securities, or partly in cash and partly in such approved securities, at the company's option as security for the construction of the western division and for the first equipment of the whole line of railway, as provided for in this agreement.

Therefore, the company guarantees, by the deposit of $5,000,000, to do something without which its enterprise would be of absolutely no moment at all. In other words, the company guarantees to build a railway as to which it receives a guarantee of $13,000 per mile for one portion of it and $30,000 per mile for the rest; and it deposits with the government $5,000,000 as security that it will use for the construction of the railway the moneys derived from the bonds guaranteed by this government. That is certainly a most remarkable piece of statesmanship, and I am not surprised at the plaudits with which the announcement of this clause was greeted by the right. hon. gentleman's supporters. It is quite evident they were kept as much in ignorance of the real nature of this clause as were the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some matters as to which I think the House should have information before very much further progress is made with this measure, which has had the result of driving from the cabinet the Minister of Railways and Canals, the man who among them all had experience in matters of this kind, the man whose policy they have been endorsing during the past seven years, the man whom they have pointed out to the country as an able and efficient administrator ever since he took office, in 1896. When this policy is announced to the House and is before us for discussion, there are certain documents and certain information which ought to be placed on the Table before it is further discussed at any great length. In the first place, I submit to my hon. friends on the treasury benches that all correspondence with regard to it should be brought down, and that we should have placed on the Table all surveys and documents relating to location, cost, and earning power of this proposed railway. My right hon. friend said this afternoon that there were mountains of information about this line. Well, let us have deposited on the Table just a small

portion of that information, and let us understand what the reasons are which have induced the government to adopt this policy. Then, I think we should have all estimates of engineers, and the details and data upon which those estimates are based. We should have all documents showing the character of the construction which is to be adopted—what the gradients will be, and what opportunity there will be of operating the line economically, particularly from Moncton to Winnipeg. We should have an estimate of the cost per mile of the mountain section, the prairie section, and the eastern section. We should have a statement as to each of these sections, showing the population, exclusive, of course, of cities, residing, we will say, within twenty miles of the proposed location of the line. We should have an estimate of the earnings per mile and the operating expenses per mile of each section. We should know what portion of the traffic, if any, now controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway, is expected to be carried by this railway. We want to know upon what data the government rely in assuming that this railway will give relief to the congested districts west of Lake Superior. I would like to know what the government's views are as to what proportion of the traffic which will originate in the district through which this railway will pass in the west is expected to be carried by an all-rail route, and what proportion is expected to be deposited in elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, for the purpose of being carried to the seaboard in the way in which the greater part of the traffic is carried at the present time. I assume that the government have investigated and considered all these matters, and are prepared to bring down some information upon them. I would like also to have an estimate of the rates at which this railway is expected to carry traffic from points as far west as Port Arthur and Fort William to St. John and Halifax, because if this road is to relieve the congestion in the west it can only do so by competing with lines already in existence; and the government have surely not embarked in the enterprise without considering what rates can be established and carried out. I would like the government also to place on the Table of the House all information of experts with regard to this line, if such information has been laid before them. I presume that they have acted on such information, because at the beginning of the session they proposed to appoint a transportation commission and to act on its views. They have evidently not acted on the views of that commission, and whatever expert opinions they have acted on should be laid before parliament. I would also like to have, if there be such, all demands and resolutions for the establishment of this line or any portion of it, laid on the Table of the House, in order that we may know whether there has been any popular demand placed before the government for the construction of this line, in whole or in part.

Now, I have had to deal with this question along very general lines. That is not my own fault; it is the fault of the attitude of the government, in not allowing me any means of preparation for this debate tonight. I, therefore, apologize to the House for the very partial and ineffective manner in which I have dealt with this question. This seems to be a project into which, as the right hon. gentleman says himself, he has entered without deliberation, and against the advice of that member of his cabinet who had the greatest experience in these matters. It is an enterprise into which he has entered, if the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) is to be believed, without any surveys or definite information which might place the government in a position to judge of the advisability of building a line which will cost an enormous sum to this country. Let me add that while the right hon. gentleman tells us that no lands whatever are to be granted to this company, nevertheless I find in clause 46 of this agreement the following provision:

> The government shall procure to be granted to the company, in so far as the same are vested in His Majesty in right of the Dominion of Canada, such lands as may be required for the right of way of the western division, and for all stations, station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and appurtenances required for the construction and working thereof, and shall also procure to be granted to the company, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, in so far as the same are so vested in His Majesty, such lands fronting upon and covered by navigable waters touched by the line of the railway as, in the judgment of the government, may reasonably be required for the use of the company in connection with its operations. The right of the company to obtain such lands without compensation shall cease when the said division is constructed and equipped as required by paragraph 29 hereof.

The language of that section is pretty comprehensive. While it does not give to the company any lands for the purpose of sales, nevertheless it will have the effect of vesting in the company without charge very considerable portions of the government domain in the North-west.

The proposal which the right hon. gentleman has submitted to this House seems to me ill-advised. It seems to me a project which indicates, on the very face of it, that it has been entered into without due deliberation, and having regard to the fact that we are asked to take it up at the conclusion of this session, without any details or information laid on the Table up to the present, and having regard to the further fact that there can be no assurance, except the right hon. gentleman's own suggestion, that it will have the effect of either relieving the con-

gestion in the west or of securing transportation of Canadian traffic through Canadian routes and Canadian ports. I am not inclined to view it with favour and am not surprised that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals found it necessary to part company with his colleagues on this very policy.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I listened, Mr. Speaker, with a good deal of interest to the introduction by the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, of that important measure he has submitted to us. I was with the right hon. gentleman when he pictured the prosperity of our country and the aspirations of the youth of our country, and when he told us that we ought to be independent of any foreign country. But when he unfolded to us the details of this measure, I was astonished at its magnitude and at some of the statements of the right hon. gentleman. The road contemplated in this measure is divided into two sections. One is the section which is built by the government, from Moncton to Winnipeg ; the other is the section from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean to be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. In his plea on behalf of the section from Quebec to Moncton, the right hon. gentleman described how the people were anxious to get in the quickest possible time to their destination, and how the Intercolonial Railway, which follows a roundabout route to Moncton, was built for military and not for commercial and practical purposes. But, what he omitted to mention, and what is very important, is the distance to be saved by the new line which he proposes to build from Quebec or Lévis to Moncton. The distance from Lévis to Moncton by the Intercolonial Railway is 489 miles. The shortest distance across through those parishes in Quebec, along by the St. Francis river, by High Falls and by Chipman, over to Moncton, would not be more than fifty or sixty miles less than the present route ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Fifty miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Less than fifty miles is the extent to which the distance will be shortened between these two points ; and to achieve that gain, this country is expected to expend—how much ? No road, Mr. Speaker, can be constructed up to the standard of the Grand Trunk Railway through that section of country for less than $30,000 per mile ; or the cost of building this road will amount at least $13,000,000. From the description of the route to be taken by the new line to Moncton, I notice that it goes down north to a point on the road called Chipman. Well, from Chipman to within 33 miles of St. John, there is a railway already constructed. Does the governmen intend to acquire that road ? Is that road to be built for the purpose of giving to the port of St. John a far shorter connection with Lévis than is enjoyed by Halifax ? That road from Chipman to within 33 miles of St. John must be part of the bargain, and the right hon. gentleman should have given us the full details of his scheme ? He should have informed us whether he intends to acquire that piece of road. If the road from Chipman to Norton, a station on the Intercolonial within 33 miles of St. John, is to be utilized as a government road, that will be virtually an abandonment of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as the trade of St. John is concerned, on the whole length of the railway from Lévis to St. John, and it will be an abandonment of the Intercolonial Railway, so far as the Halifax traffic is concerned, of the whole length of railway from Lévis to Moncton. With the experience we have had in connection with the Intercolonial Railway—an expenditure on capital account of nearly $43,000,000, and a loss to the people for the last six years, putting it at a moderate amount, of $2,500,000 per year—we are asked to build a road which will destroy the traffic on the Intercolonial Railway from Quebec to Moncton. And for what purpose ? For the purpose of saving a distance of fifty or sixty miles in the carrying of traffic from the North-west Territories and Manitoba to St. John and Halifax. Did a more insane idea ever take possession of any one ? The ports of the North-west and the ports of Manitoba are at the head of lake Superior, and I believe will in the future be a Hudson bay. Facilities ought to be afforded for the carrying of that produce from the head of Lake Superior to our ports—Montreal, Quebec and Halifax. But the idea of making a condition in the contract with the Grand Trunk Railway that they will carry freight to Halifax or St. John at the same rate as they carry it to Portland ! Does the right hon. gentleman, or does the government, imagine that a bushel of wheat or anything else exported from Manitoba or the North-west will ever go over this line to Portland, Halifax or St. John ? I am with the right hon. gentleman to this extent, that the one thing that the people, and especially the young men, are interested in is the development of this country, and that the necessary steps for that development should be taken immediately. But they should be upon proper lines. The people are anxious, in these growing times, and when there is prosperity, that something should be done by the government for our national development. And nothing can be more important than providing proper transportation facilities. Proper transportation facilities are at the very foundation of our country's commercial success. But is it by building a road from Winnipeg to Quebec that our means of transportation will receive the improvement they need ? The Grand Trunk Railway want a road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean ; they want also a road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, and they may arrange for connection with their North Bay or Montreal system of roads. But it is no

interest to them, it is a drag and a load upon them, to compel them to accept a road from Winnipeg to Quebec and Quebec to Moncton. I am with the right hon. gentleman in any proposal that will help to develop any part or portion of the country. But we are proceeding upon the wrong lines. As the hon. leader of the opposition has said, what knowledge have we as to the country through which this new road is to run between Winnipeg and Quebec? The government say they have possession of the knowledge. They have mountains of information. Why did not the right hon. gentleman give us some of that information? I can tell him something with reference to that country through which he proposes to build this road. As we all know, the granite ridges to the north of the height of land extend, in the province of Quebec, as far as the shore of James bay. It is a country with small spruce trees growing in muskegs, the muskegs separated from one another by granite ridges running at right angles to the proposed road. For fifty miles south of James bay you have a comparatively fertile country. As you go westward the width of this fertile tract increases, and it reaches in some places two hundred and fifty miles from Hudson's bay. I have been assured in that section it is possible to grow grain nearly as well as in Manitoba and the North-west. But does this railway go near that fertile section? No. It will be built—it must be built—in that section north of the height of land reaching to the plateau which borders Hudson's bay and which, at the verge of the plateau, drops to the extent of three or four hundred feet. Between that drop and the height of land, the land is totally unfit for any purpose known to civilization, a land of low scrubs and unfathomable muskegs crossed by granite ridges. The reports are there in the Department of Railways and Canals. There was a survey made before I was minister, from the Ottawa river north of Lake Temiskamingue north of Lake Nipigon, along the English river to Selkirk. It was supposed that an easier line for the construction of the road around Lake Superior could be found than that which was afterwards adopted, and it was surveyed to a certain extent by the government. I remember reading the reports in the Department of Railways and Canals. I think that one party of surveyors went to the east nearly one hundred miles, and one under Mr. Bailey, if I remember well, went westward towards Winnipeg. And the reports were identical with the statements I have made, and showed that the cost of that railway would be greater than it would be to build through the Rocky Mountains. We all know that the road which passes along the shore of Lake Superior and from Lake Superior to the city of Winnipeg cost more per mile than did that portion of road running through the Rocky Mountains. That section of the road, 1,400 miles in length from Quebec to Winnipeg cannot be graded and constructed for less than $30,000 per mile, or $42,000,000. Then add $13,000,000 for the road from Quebec to Moncton; add between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000 for the bridge crossing the St. Lawrence at Quebec. And yet the right hon. gentleman in making the speech introducing the Bill says that all this and also the prairie section of 1,000 miles west of Winnipeg, and the 600 miles through the mountains to Port Simpson will all be built at a cost to the people of this country of the small sum of $12,000,000. Such an absurd statement! It reminds me of the right hon. gentleman (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) long, long ago, when he was Minister of Inland Revenue and introducing a Bill in this House to amend the Inland Revenue Act. I remember the mess he made of the Bill, and I remember well the remarks of his leader the late Alexander Mackenzie whom I knew very intimately at the time. He said: 'why, the fellow nearly defeated the government; he does not know how many ounces there are in a pound.' When the right hon. gentleman appeals to the heart, I am with him. But when he gets into any mathematical question or anything involving mechanics or anything of the nature of a calculation, he is always astray. Why, look at it. In order to build that road from Winnipeg to Quebec at least a year and a half must be occupied in preliminary surveys. It is impossible that it can be constructed under government superintendence, or under the commissioners proposed in the Bill, in less than seven years. The Grand Trunk proposed to build a road from Winnipeg to the coast in five years from 1904. It is a much easier task to build that section of the road than the other. They cannot build it and have it completed in less than eight years and a half from this date. Look at the interest we will have to pay, the interest on half the cost of the road for eight years and a half. Then there are the seven years in which we give them the use of the road free. Then there are the three years during which they are not obliged to pay any interest, if the earnings of the road do not meet the expenses. Then we have to build the Quebec bridge, or pay for it any way after it is built. You cannot buy that for less than $5,500,000. With the money we spend on the Moncton road, it will cost the people of this country $12,000,000.

Now, Sir, if the right hon. gentleman and the House want to know my views on the transportation question, they are quite plain. It is an absurdity to build any such road as that from Quebec to Winnipeg. It will virtually ruin the Intercolonial Railway by duplicating it from Quebec to Moncton. There is no necessity for it at all. Surely the people of this country have carried out in good faith their bargain with the maritime provinces in the expenditures which we have made on the Prince Edward

Island Railway, and the amounts which we require to spend every year on capital account to make up the losses on the Intercolonial Railway. I notice in one of the clauses of the Bill that all the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway, even after it is constructed, are to be built at the expense of the government. If the permanent improvements go on to the extent that they have lately on the Intercolonial Railway, you can perhaps imagine what the cost of that road will be. I stated some time ago that the management of the Intercolonial Railway for the last six years had killed entirely the idea of government ownership of railways in this country. There is no probability of this parliament acceding to any such thing as a government railway, although in my heart I believe, judging from the experience of other countries, that a government railway can be managed and run as economically as any other railway. My experience upon the Intercolonial Railway was that you could get a service as cheaply and buy supplies cheaper than upon any other railroad in Canada. The people have confidence in the government, and like to sell to the government, and you can get service from your employees cheaper than you can on any company road. It can be managed as efficiently as any company can manage a road. But the money which the people have been called upon to expend on the Intercolonial Railway has, as my hon. friend has said, put the government ownership of railways back for forty years in this country. The people would rather see their money become a total loss than to put it into railways run by the government as the Intercolonial Railway has been done.

Then, what are we to do in Ontario? This scheme completely ignores us. It ignores the city of Montreal, it ignores the city of Toronto. What is the proposition before the government?—because they must have had a proposition, and why do they not state it here? What was the proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway with reference to building a line from Winnipeg to Lake Superior? Any man of sense knows that the western connection would be useless without that. There are 403 miles to be built. There is a connection to North Bay to be built to satisfy the Toronto people and the people of Ontario, and there must be a connection with Montreal in some way or another. Those things must have been considered in council, and what is the policy of the government in reference thereto? Surely they do not intend to build a transcontinental railway that completely ignores that portion of the Dominion that contributes most to the revenues of the country. Are they going to ignore my province altogether? Is there to be no connection with Montreal? Is it to be a road simply for the convenience of the maritime provinces and Quebec, cutting out the province of Ontario altogether? No, they may be insane, but they are not insane enough for that. They have some sort of an understanding, and the people are entitled to know what it is. Then this road goes from Winnipeg to Edmonton, 900 miles.

An hon. MEMBER. It does not say so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The general impression is that the terminus of the road, although it is not mentioned in the Bill, is Port Simpson. The scheme that we have heard talked about is to build from Winnipeg to Edmonton and to Port Simpson. What about paralleling the road which we have at present subsidized to Edmonton, 900 miles? Are we to have two parallel lines running within 30 miles of each other, two main lines from Winnipeg up to Edmonton, and from Edmonton I suppose to the Rocky mountains or to Port Simpson? Is it the policy of the government to tax the people of this country for the purpose of building two parallel lines from Winnipeg to Edmonton? If that is not their purpose, we have a right to know from the government what their purpose is, and where their terminus is to be on the Pacific coast.

Then, what guarantee have we that the parties who build the road from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, and who own the road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, will ever work that section from Winnipeg to Quebec? There is a deposit of $5,000,000. Does that apply to the whole undertaking? I should judge it did, that is the two divisions, the government section and the other. But, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition says, although he forgot one feature of it, that $5,000,000 deposited with the government can be paid out on progress estimates, and for the purchase of rolling stock as the undertaking goes along. Now, look at the importance that the government themselves place upon that section of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. They require as a first equipment of the road that the Grand Trunk Railway should purchase $20,000,000 worth of rolling stock. How is that to be apportioned? $15,000,000 on the section from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, on the longest and hardest part of it to work, and $5,000,000 from Winnipeg to Moncton. The port, as I have said, for the surplus products of Manitoba and the North-west is the head of Lake Superior, or perhaps in the future, Hudson bay. I am glad to see that the government are sending an expedition into Hudson bay, presumably to get more accurate information in reference to the ports, and to the navigation of the Hudson straits. From the information I have, Hudson bay is navigable as long as the St. Lawrence is, and with as little danger to navigation. If that is the case, the surplus products of the North-west and Manitoba, and down as far as St. Paul, and even lower, taking in Kansas and that section of the country,

would go to Liverpool cheaper via Hudson bay than by any other route.

What the government ought to do in reference to the transportation problem is to provide facilities to reach the port. Then they should do what my hon. friend says is easy; they should see that the navigation on the upper lakes is sufficient for the purpose of carrying the products of the west to ports in our country for transhipment. I have no hesitation in saying that so far as the North-west Territories, Manitoba, Ontario, and the greater portion of Quebec are concerned we look to the port of Montreal as the port from which we must ship the produce of this country. Build then, if necessary, as my hon. friend says, lines of railway from Midland or other Georgian bay ports to the port of Montreal. I believe that the Canada Atlantic Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, in this section of the country, are bringing the grades down to four-tenth grades, or a little over twenty feet to the mile, which is the standard low grade of the country. When this is accomplished, with plenty of tracks from Midland, or from some other place on on the Georgian bay, to Montreal, with a proper system of port dues, abolishing them altogether if necessary in Montreal, with that the harbour of Montreal improved, and with the St. Lawrence deepened and properly lighted, you will have provided a proper system of transportation, and the system of transportation that the people need. With the expenditure that you are making for this entirely useless line of railway from Winnipeg to Quebec you could furnish these facilities five times over that are necessary for the trade of the country. If this country to the north of us is developed, if minerals are found and if waterpowers are utilized, or if any of its other resources are turned to account, let the country be opened up by colonization lines of railway, but on no account build this road for that purpose. The right hon. gentleman says that the road would be constructed with the lowest possible kind of grades. What does he know of the contour of the country between Winnipeg and Quebec ? It may be impossible from the contour of the country to get the best grades which are necessary for a freight carrying road and which are grades of twenty feet to the mile. This is taking a leap in the dark. I expect, and I think that the Grand Trunk people believe that in the end, when the government come to examine this railway, when they come to know the expenditure that will be entailed, they will give up the project and there will be no such road built as the one proposed from Winnipeg to Quebec. The Grand Trunk Railway Company do not want it, nor do the people of Canada outside of Quebec. I grant that there is a feeling in the maritime provinces that probably the trade of Manitoba and the North-west Territories will go by way of Quebec over the bridge and then by this new line to Halifax and St. John. There is no probability of that. The eastern traffic may go in that way and the goods imported from the old country for distribution in that section of the country may pass over the road. The traffic will be only one way, but as to the heavy produce of the west, I think it is entirely improbable that it will go down over that road. The right hon. gentleman spoke about the ambition of the people of this country to have a road through their own territory. I am with him in that. We have one line through our own territory at present—the Intercolonial Railway. We have a shortening of that line to St. John by way of the Temiscouata branch. It is true that the grades on that road render it almost useless for transportation purposes. Then, there is a line from the terminus of the Temiscouata Railway to St. John. I am with the people of the maritime provinces in the desire to have a road through our own territory, because, when a foreign country commands the exit or entrance of freight to another country the transportation of that country is virtually under the control of the foreign country. I am with the right hon. gentleman in the desire to have our produce shipped through our own country. But, we can do that without going to the expense that he proposes, without making a port the exit from this country which nature never designed it should be. I would like to emphasize the fact that the ocean port of the North-west Territories and Manitoba is the head of Lake Superior and that I believe that in future the port of shipment for the products of that part of the country will be on the Hudson bay. The transportation policy of this country ought to be to improve the navigation on the lakes and through the canals, to increase the transportation facilities by improving the waterways from the head of Lake Superior to the port of Montreal, and then improve the St. Lawrence river so as to render its navigation as safe by night as by day. We could have a string of electric lights from Montreal to Quebec at very little expense. There will be no need of pilots after this has been done. Any man on board a vessel could take it down night or day and the St. Lawrence river could be made as safe and navigation from the port of Quebec as easy as from a port right on the Atlantic where all a vessel has to do is to draw outside the bar to the broad Atlantic ocean. Our country has been blessed with advantages superior to any on the continent of America. After the old French explorers discovered the St. Lawrence they made use of two great highways on the American continent as a means of transportation from the North-west. These great highways were the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi rivers. The St. Lawrence river offers unrivalled facilities for the movement of our commerce. We are blessed by Providence with a coun-

try which depends entirely upon our own exertions and upon the adoption of a wise system of expenditure of public money in providing the means for taking advantage of the facilities which are offered to us. I was glad to see that the right hon. gentleman placed in the speech from the Throne the statement that the government intended to invite experts to look into this transportation question and to recommend to the people a system of transportation upon which large sums of money would be expended if necessary. Instead of that the right hon. gentleman and the government have taken the duty upon themselves. They have solved the whole transportation question for this country and they are going to impose a burden upon the people, because the day will come when there will not be that excess of revenue that there is at the present time, which will cramp the enterprise of this country and which will have the effect of imposing a useless expenditure of public money upon the people, thus retarding the development of the country, and preventing us from doing the best we can to make of this country a nation and the first nation on the North American continent. Our position, our resources and our facilities give us that advantage, and the people of the country are equal to it if properly directed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the merits of the measure even for a single moment. From our point of view the time has not arrived when the members of this House on either side are in a position to satisfactorily and intelligently discuss the matter. The disadvantage of discussing it before there has been time to read and understand the Bill is already apparent. However, Sir, my only point in rising was to say a word with regard to the complaint of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition as to what he regarded as a discourtesy on the part of the Prime Minister. I think in that respect my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) is mistaken. I can assure him in all sincerity, that among the ministry generally, there is not one, and least of all the Prime Minister, who would desire to extend to the hon. gentleman anything but that courtesy to which he is entitled, both because of himself and the position he occupies. On a moment's reflection the hon. gentleman will see that it was not reasonable to suppose that the Prime Minister could take my hon. friend into his confidence and give him an advance copy of a measure which had not only not been submitted to the House generally, but which had not been submitted to a single member of this House outside of the minstry. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) will realize that while there are occasions where a joint and common action is expected between the leaders on both sides to agree upon some action, yet it was too much to expect, that my hon. friend, in a matter which was notoriously going to be one of controversy, could be taken into the confidence of the Prime Minister and shown an advance copy of the Bill.

As to the procedure, the Prime Minister on making his statement on the first reading of the Bill, I venture to submit was not only within his parliamentary rights, but he was taking a course which will commend itself to the judgment of the House and of the country. The Prime Minister might have given notice of some bald resolution which after all would not have presented the matter fully to the House. I am satisfied that the House and country will feel, that after the delay that has occurred, after the repeated questions that have been put to the Prime Minister as to the desirability of affording the House early information on this subject, the Prime Minister did what was right and proper when he availed himself of the very first opportunity, not merely to move some formal resolution, but from his place in the House to make a full and frank and thorough statement covering the whole question. At all events, I desire to give to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, on the part of the Prime Minister and his colleagues, the assurance that nothing was further from our thoughts than that there should be any discourtesy to him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may be permitted to say that so far as I am concerned, I have usually received from the gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches, and particularly from the Prime Minister, every possible courtesy in connection with the business of the House. I do not think, however, that a controversial speech of the character that was made this afternoon, a speech which obviously required an answer on the spot, should be made without having acquainted me, as I might have been acquainted with the details of the measure at least an hour or two before hand. It is the practice as my hon. friend well knows, to furnish to the leader of the opposition a copy in advance of the speech from the Throne. I thought that under the present circumstances, the same course might have been adopted to-day, and therefore I made the remarks which I did make. But I accept with the utmost frankness the assurance of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) that no discourtesy was intended, and I may say that judging from the intercourse which I have had with the Prime Minister, anything of this kind was, so far as he is concerned, unintentional, even if I have a right to complain.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey.) I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wish to ascertain your ruling as to whether this Bill is in order, introduced as it has been. So far as I have yet heard we have had no intimation given to the House that it has received the assent of the Crown, nor has it been introduced in the usual way, by a resolu-

tion. That very excellent authority on parliamentary procedure, Bourinot, says :

Bills relating to trade or involving expenditure and taxation must be initiated in Committee of the Whole before the House will give leave for their introduction.

This Bill is not introduced by resolution. Bourinot again says at page 596 :

Bills involving public aid or charge—It is the invariable rule that all measures involving a charge upon the people, or any class thereof, should be first considered in a Committee of the Whole.

Rule 88 says :

If any motions be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned until such future day as the House may think fit to appoint ; and then it shall be referred to a Committee of the Whole House before any resolution or vote of the House do pass thereon.

Bourinot at page 539 says :

Governor General's recommendation—The recommendation of the Crown to any resolution involving a payment out of the Dominion treasury must be formally given by a privy councillor in his place at the very initiation of a proceeding.

All these rules have been either overlooked or neglected. I draw attention to the fact that this Bill is not introduced by a resolution. I draw attention to the fact that Bills which provide for the expenditure of public money or taxation must have the assent of the Crown, and we have not had any intimation that the assent of the Crown has been obtained. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker on these points.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The right hon. the Prime Minister might have accomplished the same purpose in another way rather than by formerly introducing his Bill. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) that while the rule is undoubtedly as he has read it, the practice of the House is to permit a Bill to be introduced, and again and again the resolution has been afterwards placed on the notice paper. Of course that resolution must be considered before the Bill is proceeded with.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not ready to decide off-hand the question which has been raised by the hon. member. It is a very important question, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that before I give a decision it would be necessary for me to read over the Bill. At the same time if the hon. gentleman looks at rule 88 he will find:

If any motion be made in the House for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered thereon, but shall be adjourned until such further day as the House may think fit to appoint.

If there is any doubt, perhaps the question could be adjourned with the assurance that the resolution is going on the Order Paper to-day, and then there will be no violation of the rule. However, I shall be glad to look into the question carefully.

Mr. SPROULE. They have not had the assent of the Crown.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolution is on the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take up in supply the estimates of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who cannot very conveniently attend in the evening, and if we go out of the Committee of Supply, we will take up the resolutions on the iron and steel bounties.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 31, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 233) respecting the manufacture of binder twine in Canada.—The Minister of Finance.

SUPPLY.

Ocean and mail service between Great Britain and Canada, $150,000.

Mr. BLAIN. At the last meeting the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave us the quantity of mail matter that went by the Canadian route. Would he be good enough to give us the quantity that goes by the New York route ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Probably about six or seven times as much. That would rather come under the Postmaster General's department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). I could not carry those figures in my memory. Some time ago the question was asked from the other side by, I think, the senior member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and I gave the figures of the quantity of mail that went via New York and via Halifax.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the quantity of mail matter going by the Canadian route increasing or decreasing ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it is about stationary, that is to say, relatively.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the minister was to bring down a statement showing the amounts we paid to the American boats and to the Canadian boats.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What we pay to the Canadian boats does not come in my department. What is paid to the American boats, I understand, is so much per pound. It is fixed by the Postal Convention.

Mr. TAYLOR. Some one ought to know how much we pay per year for carrying the mails via New York.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If my hon. friend wants that information, I will ask the Postmaster General to make a note of it and bring it down. For what year does the hon. gentleman want the information ?

Mr. TAYLOR. For this year or any year.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The weight of letters despatched via New York was 92,530 pounds. The weight of other matter was 663,000 pounds. About one-seventh part goes by the Canadian route and about seven times as much goes by way of New York.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the mail matter going by way of New York increased or decreased in volume ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Speaking from recollection, I think they maintain about the same ratio from time to time.

Mr. TAYLOR. The right hon. gentleman has not got the cost ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, that is wholly a matter concerning the Post Office Department.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the right hon. minister should give the committee a statement of the different negotiations that were entered into by this government in respect to the fast Atlantic steamship service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have already stated what was done.

Mr. BLAIN. The right hon. gentleman has stated what was done with the last contract. I am asking the right hon. gentleman to give the committee a statement of the different negotiations, correspondence, &c., that were engaged in by this government since they came into office in 1896 up to the present time—just briefly ; I do not ask for a detailed statement. I would like the right hon. minister to give us a statement as to the amount of money that has been expended for negotiating the different services that have not matured since they came into office.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may answer the last question first by saying that I do not think any amount of money has been expended in negotiating for the fast service. The only amount of money that has been brought into question in regard to the matter has been the $50,000 which was deposited by Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Company and afterwards returned, or to be returned by vote of this House. As to the progress of these negotiations it has been briefly this : A couple of propositions were made in 1896 to the late government, but neither of them came within the form of a regular tender. After that Mr. Petersen, as the committee is aware, proposed to give the service required for $750,000, $500,000 to be paid by us and $250,000 by the imperial government. The negotiations were spread over a period of three years, and as hon. gentlemen are aware the Boer war took place and the cost of the construction of shipping went up to such a figure as to render it practically impossible to make any bargain at all. Since that there have been no negotiations except those with which the House is acquainted and which are contained in the papers that were laid on the Table the other day, and having reference to the two tenders submitted by the Messrs. Allan and by another company.

Steam service between Halifax, St. John's, Newfoundland and Liverpool, from July 1, 1903 to June 30, 1904, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is the usual vote which we have been giving for several years for this service. The vessels sail once every 17 days. The present contract is with Furness, Withy & Company.

Steam service between St. John and Glasgow during winter of 1903-4, $7,500.

Mr. CLARKE. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is for ten round trips during the winter between St. John and Glasgow. This is performed by the Messrs. Donaldson, of Glasgow, represented by the Robert Reford Company, of Montreal. We pay them only $750 a trip and they give a fortnightly service. Representations have been made from the merchants and the people using this service to the effect that this is a growing trade and they are very anxious to obtain a weekly service in place of a fortnightly service during the winter. Probably we will have to submit a further sum in the supplementary estimates for doubling the service, but I am at present only asking the regular vote which has been

given every year, amounting to $7,500 for ten round trips.

Steam service between St. John, Dublin and Belfast during the winter of 1903-4, $7,500.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a similar service to the last, and is performed by what is known as the Head line. Of course, they are only paid per trip. If they fail in making the number of trips the price is proportionately reduced.

Mr. TAYLOR. They always earn their money, do they not ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, they do not. One year they failed in giving a complete service and the sum was reduced. They are paid simply for the work actually done. The object, of course, is to put ourselves in communication with the important centres of population in England and Ireland.

Mr. SPROULE. Has this any relation to the amount of trade they do ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Why is it necessary to have two or three different companies doing practically the same work ? Why cannot the line that calls at Glasgow, call at Dublin as well ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid that would lengthen the service very much. Vessels that go to these places would probably require to remain there two or three days additional on each trip, if they had any considerable amount of cargo to discharge. I do not think it would be possible without very considerably increasing the subsidy to induce them to make calls at all these ports. The hon. gentleman will notice that the sum granted is a very small sum, barely £150 sterling per round trip.

Mr. WILSON. But it is reasonable to suppose that we could get the service performed by one company for less than we now pay to have it performed by two or three.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid not.

Mr. WILSON. It looks to me as if that would be a reasonable thing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If it were a large subsidy there might be a good deal of force in the hon. gentleman's remark, but, where the sum granted is so small, I do not think we could hope to increase the service without increasing the vote proportionately, and it would certainly lengthen the voyage very considerably.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. WILSON. It might, but then you would have double the subsidy to give one company.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think it would suit the merchants as well. These vessels, not being vessels of any great size, cannot maintain a very rapid rate of speed. If you were to add to the length of the present voyage, say a couple of days for Belfast and a couple of days for Dublin each way, it is quite clear they could not perform the number of trips they are now giving, or take anything like the length of time they assert to be necessary in calling at St. John.

Mr. WILSON. How long do they spend in these ports now ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand that as a rule they have to spend in St. John and at the point they reach on the other end, between three and four days. Of course, it would depend a great deal on the amount of cargo they might happen to have. I won't say it has been the case all the time, but I think of late most of those vessels have had pretty full cargoes. Of course, if we were to employ larger and swifter vessels something of the kind may be done, but that would mean very considerable expenditure.

Mr. WILSON. If there are large cargoes why need you give them subsidies ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I admit that that applies to all these concerns. The truth is that we have been trying to create a trade from these winter ports and the plan we have adopted has been to engage them to go to various ports on the other side of the Atlantic where there were considerable populations likely to consume our products. I think that this money is probably as well spent as any of these subsidy moneys usually are, and we have certainly increased our export trade from St. John during the winter very considerably within the last three or four years.

Mr. SPROULE. Do each of these vessels carry the mail ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They nominally carry the mail, but you are quite right that you cannot call these mail subsidies in any sense of the term. They are freight subsidies in reality. They are called here 'mail subsidies and steamship subventions,' but I do not pretend that these are of any value at all for mail purposes ; they could not be.

Mr. WILSON. Do you expect them to continue ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is for the House to say.

Mr. WILSON. What is your opinion ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My opinion is that we must be governed by the state of trade and the success in developing our winter port service. That service is very properly regarded by both sides of the House as a matter of very considerable national importance, and all these subsidies are for the purpose of aiding and sustaining it. The hon. gentleman knows very well that ports like Glasgow, Dublin and Belfast are not merely considerable cities, but they are centres of a very large population, and everything that contributes to bring Canadian products into active consumption there is worth a considerable deal to the people of Canada. That is the chief reason which induced us to do this, and the chief reason which, I suppose, will induce the House to continue it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the amount of trade rapidly increasing at St. John ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It has increased very considerably. Of course it will greatly depend on the amount of grain that comes forward. Last year they did not send as much as the year before, but that was very largely due to the shortage of the American corn crop which affected all the various lines of transport very materially. As a rule it has been a very rapid increase during the last four years at any rate.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister any figures that would give an approximate estimate of the quantity of grain handled at St. John ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I can obtain that for my hon. friend if he wishes—does he mean by these particular lines or in a general way ?

Mr. SPROULE. I mean from all lines that sail from that port.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Perhaps my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) would know that.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I cannot say what the exact amount of the trade is. I have the figures at home, but I am sorry I have not them here at this moment. The statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is correct that last year it fell off, but the year before it was the largest we have had, and the year before that was larger than the preceding year.

Mr. SPROULE. Of course that information is of no use whatever because it does not indicate whether there was 1,000,000 bushels or 50,0000,00. It is desirable that we should know what advantage is taken of these winter ports especially in the case of grain, for that must have an important bearing on the future as to whether this grain can profitably be shipped by rail to St. John during the winter season.

Mr. WILSON. We should also know what proportion went over the Intercolonial Railway and what proportion went over the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John. I have been told by people who ought to know that the Canadian Pacific Railway has not been able to carry grain to the seaboard except at a loss and that then it was used for ballasting ships that they had to furnish cargo for. The government ought to be able to tell us whether that is true or not.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is correct thus far ; that the Canadian Pacific Railway has probably carried the grain without profit, but I do not think it has carried it at a downright loss.

Mr. WILSON. I have my information from pretty good authority.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are not very fond of that St. John line and their views may be a little pessimistic. I do not think they carried it at a loss, but they certainly did not make a profit on it.

Mr. WILSON. The reason they carried it was to furnish cargoes for the ships.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They have to run cars to St. John and I suppose they want ballast for their cars as well as for their ships.

Mr. WILSON. There may have been some profit in the shipping part of it, but the information I have is that they made a loss on the railway haul.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it is perfectly true they made no profit.

Mr. WILSON. Can we get the quantities carried by each of these railways ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have a record of the quantity going forward in the various steamship lines, but I would have to get the other information from the Intercolonial Railway, and also from the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, of course, is not under our control.

Mr. WILSON. Will you get the figures for us ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly, if you want them. There will be an opportunity on the supplementary estimates.

A line or lines of steamers to run during the summer months between St. John, Halifax and London, and during the winter months between St. John and London direct and Halifax and London direct, $40,000.

Mr. WADE. With regard to this item, I may say that in the past the contract has been given to the Furness-Withy Company, and there have been very serious complaints as to the manner in which

they have performed said contract. During the year 1901, complaints were very loud amongst the apple shippers in the province of Nova Scotia. The contract for the year 1901 was made much more stringent, and it stipulated that the company should run certain steamers of a very high class, but unfortunately during the year they took off two or three of their best ships, and in their place put on others of a much inferior character and a much lower rate of speed, with the consequence of a direct loss to the shippers of many thousands of dollars. These claims are now standing against the company. There have been negotiations, I understand, between the shippers and the company, and there have been constant promises by the company to adjust and pay these claims, but nothing has been concluded. The contract drawn last year was much more stringent in its terms, and the shippers felt confident that they would receive every satisfaction. I am informed, however, that the company did not live up to the terms of that contract—they did not put in the forced ventilation as soon as it was stipulated for, and that the rate of speed was not as great as was contracted for. There was not as much complaint last year, because the apple crop of Nova Scotia was comparatively light. But this year, I am informed, the crop will be the heaviest that has been gathered for many years; the fruit is of most excellent quality; and it will tax the capacity of these steamers to carry it in proper condition. It is important that the fruit should be carried in proper condition, and I am satisfied that it will be if such a contract as was entered into last year is carried out by the company. But the shippers have small confidence in the promises of the company. I am informed by many of them that they would sooner there were no subsidy granted at all than that the service should be performed as in the past. Their argument is that the contract with the Furness-Withy Company prevents other companies competing, and therefore they do not have the open competition they would have if no subsidy were granted. I understand that it has been impossible for the department to obtain tenders from any other concern. This I assume is owing to the smallness of the subsidy, and I would urge that this subsidy be increased in the supplementary estimates to a sufficient extent to induce different steamship companies to compete. I would also urge, in the interest of the shippers, that if the minister is not in a position through his officers to compel the Furness-Withy Company to live up to their contract, no direct contract be given to them. This is a matter of the very greatest importance. Hon. gentlemen can understand that where there is a shipment of 500 or 600 thousand barrels of apples, if there is a loss of even 25 cents per barrel, in consequence of the manner in which the fruit is carried, that means a very serious loss to the country. I would urge on the minister with the utmost earnestness that if the Furness-Withy Company is to be given this contract, it should only be given it on condition that the department shall be in a position to see that the company carry it out. There has been a demand on the part of the shippers, and it does seem to me that it is a reasonable demand, that these people should not be contracted with until they have satisfied these claims for damages, or demonstrated that they are not just claims. It may be said that the parties have the courts open to them, where they can go and assert their claims. But it is difficult for a man who ships one or two thousand barrels of apples, and who meets with the loss of twenty-five or fifty cents a barrel, to go into the courts and fight a powerful steamship company. There are hundreds of these shippers, and I think it would be only fair that this company, before they are given another contract, should make a fair adjustment of these claims. It is unfortunate that the country does not seem to have confidence in the Furness-Withy Company; and, from the information that I have received, I am sure that the Furness-Withy Company merit the estimation in which they are held by the country.

Mr. GOURLEY. I desire to concur in what the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has said. I have received memorials from the Fruit Growers' Association of Annapolis, in which they make a very strong case against this company. It is idle to say that these individual farmers have a remedy against this company. It is irony to tell these people to go into court and fight for $200 or $500 damages, which may be the profit of the whole year's growth, with a company which might lead them from court to court, and compel them to spend their whole profit in a lawsuit, leaving the question at the end in great doubt. I would follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Annapolis so far as to say that I would be perfectly willing to support, as far as I am concerned, a greater subsidy, if that were the remedy to secure proper and safe exportation of the fruit products of the Annapolis valley. Those products are becoming a source of great wealth to the province of Nova Scotia; and all the people of Canada, especially all the people of the maritime provinces, should be most anxious to see that the fruit reaches the market in such a condition as to command the highest prices and give the largest profits to the people engaged in that business. There may be several ways of effecting this. One way would be to establish a large forfeit in the contract, which the company would be compelled to make, in case there was any substantial complaint of non-compliance with the contract; and that money should be held back from the company until every claim in connection with the shipments of

each year was settled, and the matter should be adjusted by some officer of the department. The shipper should not be compelled to go into court and perhaps waste three or four years and the whole value of his shipment in contesting the right with this company. The company could, by appealing from court to court, secure an absolute denial of justice. Consequently, I urge on the minister that every means be taken to secure the fruit-growers of Nova Scotia in the matter of the shipment of these fine fruit products. I have received document after document, and paper after paper, asserting that the greatest injustice has been done to that community. I do not wish to charge this injustice to the Department of Trade and Commerce. I have no doubt that it is due to the greed of the company to make money at the expense of the shippers of Nova Scotia without regard to the consequences. I think that can be cured by the officials of the department in some way making it so costly to this company to do wrong that they will be compelled to do right.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have taken careful note of what the hon. gentlemen state. The present contract was made with two or three very stringent clauses in it to secure proper ventilation and proper accommodation for the conveyance of apples. If the company fail to carry out these, I will most assurdly cut their subsidy.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has the minister any way by which he can ascertain whether the ventilating fans are kept in motion or not during the crossing of the Atlantic ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have on one or two occasions sent down to examine and inspect; but whether the fans are kept in motion on the voyage or not, I cannot say. Except through the intervention of the shippers, I do not see how I can obtain that information. I cannot despatch men on each of these vessels to see that that is attended to.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is that not where the difficulty comes in, that from the compartments not being ventilated, the injury to the fruit takes place ?

Mr. WADE. The difficulty last year was that the company did not put the forced ventilation in as soon as they should have done. The ground of complaint was first the uncertainty of the sailings. They advertised their sailings for certain days. The shippers sent fruit down by train to the point of shipment, and there it had to wait sometimes for several days. Then that the speed of the vessels was not up to the contract. Instead of making the trip from Halifax to London within contract time, they would be two or three days longer, which was most serious for the shippers, especially of apples, it being most desirable that the fruit should only be on board during the shortest possible period.

Mr. BLAIN. I would regard that as a very serious complaint against the hon. minister's department. The hon. member for Annapolis makes a charge against the government——

Mr. WADE. No, I did not make any charge. I said that the contract was not carried out.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman should wait until I had finished. He has made the charge against the government that the government entered into a contract with the steamship company to ply between these two points. He has further stated that after that contract was entered into, the company changed the vessels and put on others which were not up to the contract at all.

Mr. WADE. In 1901?

Mr. BLAIN. I would regard that as a most serious charge, and the hon. minister should give us some explanation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The contract provides penalties for infraction of the contract. In several of these cases, particularly in the case to which reference has been made, a considerable deduction was made from the subsidy that would otherwise be paid, on the score that they had not fully performed their contract. Beyond that or beyond the drastic remedy of dropping this contract altogether, I do not see what we can very well do. These complaints have been investigated. I do not think there was any change in the vessels during the last year. The changes to which the hon. gentleman referred were made a couple of years ago. We have been at pains to insure the introduction of proper apparatus, ventilating and other, for the purpose of carrying these fruits in the best possible condition. That was not put in until somewhat late in the season, and I fined these people for their neglect. If they do not do better this year, I shall either cancel the subsidy altogether or fine them in proportion.

Mr. COCHRANE. Was the money paid over to the farmers who lost?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I cannot undertake to act as arbiter between these parties. If the company damage goods by negligence, that is a matter for the courts to investigate. It is quite impossible for any department of the government to sit in judgment on disputes between the shippers and the steamboat owners. We cannot undertake to do that, but we can undertake, if these people fail to perform their contract, either to reduce or stop their subsidy altogether.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was this company fined?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The service, of course, is not complained of during the greater part of the year. During the part of the year in which there was complaint, a fine of $2,500 was inflicted on them.

Mr. GOURLEY. I find on looking at the results that the uncertainty in the time of sailing is one of the chief complaints made by the shipper, and I can understand that to be a very trying difficulty. Surely it is within the power of the hon. minister to notify these people that if the sailings are not punctual—and they ought to be punctual to the hour, much less to the day—a portion of their subsidy shall be deducted. If such a clause does not already exist, it ought to be inserted in the contract.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is such a clause, and the penalty has been inflicted on several occasions.

Mr. GOURLEY. What is the penalty for not sailing at the appointed time ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There shall be deducted from the subsidy payable for such a voyage a sum equal to one-tenth of the amount for delays or failure to sail at the dates specified.

Mr. WADE. There can be no fault found with the contract. I do not see how it can be drawn any stronger. What I am concerned about is difficulties between the company and the shippers. We have a company admittedly in fault every year since it has had the service, and it should not be re-contracted with unless it will absolutely carry out its agreement. I would urge on the government the desirability of increasing this amount sufficiently so that other companies will compete, in which the people have confidence.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the value of the fruit shipped by this line?

Mr. WADE. The value will be something like $1,500,000 this coming year. Last year it was very small because the crop was almost a failure and the fruit inferior. It was probably not more than one-third of that amount. This service is not for the fruit trade alone. It runs between St. John, Halifax and London all the year around, and incidentally serves the fruit shippers. It is virtually the only line by which shippers can send their fruit.

Steam communication between St. John, Digby, from July 1, 1903, to June 30, 1904, $12,500.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this carry the mails?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it for that the subsidy is granted ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Largely for the encouragement of communication along this coast between St. John and Digby.

Mr. CLARKE. Do the vessels stop at any place between St. John and Digby ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is between Digby and St. John. They have given us rather more trips than the contract called for during the past year. As a matter of course, they carry the mails, but the mail service is a small affair.

Mr. CLARKE. How many trips do they undertake to give for this subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. During June, July, August and September, a daily round trip ; during October, November, December, March and April, four times a week; during January and February, three times a week. As a matter of fact, they have made the trip much oftener than the contract calls for. The distance from St. John to Digby is forty-five miles.

A line or lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax, or either, and the West Indies and South America, $80,700.

Mr. CLARKE. Do these vessels carry mails too ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a service which we subsidize in conjunction with the imperial government, we paying about half.

Mr. CLARKE. What imperial purpose does it serve ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They subsidize it to encourage West India trade to St. John and Halifax. In point of fact these vessels call at pretty nearly all the West India islands. They start from Halifax or St. John and call first at Bermuda, then down along the line of West India islands, bringing up at Trinidad. I think they call at eleven or twelve places.

Mr. CLARKE. What does the imperial government contribute to this service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They contribute £5,000 sterling. We had this service before, but it was only about half the service which we now obtain. When the British government made their contribution, they arranged practically to govern the service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I remember rightly, the British government made the contribution at a time when new and improved steamers were put on the route. I think one of the members of the firm who are owners of the steamships, went to England for the purpose, and had an interview with the imperial government. That was some two years ago.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does answer the purpose of promoting trade between the West Indies and the maritime provinces, and the whole of Canada. I understand that the view the imperial government took was that it was desirable to encourage this trade, inasmuch as several of the West India islands have very excellent steamship communication with the United States, particularly with New York, and the trade of these islands was being very largely diverted to the United States. The trade of the maritime provinces with the West India islands has been very great in the past, and is still very considerable. This trade was formerly done by means of small schooners between the ports of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and those of the West Indies. But the trade cannot be done in this way at present, but must be done by steamships; and the trade is not sufficient to maintain a line of steamers without assistance. The maintenance of this steamship communication has been so highly regarded by the imperial government that, as the hon. minister has said, they have made a contribution towards it.

Steam service between Victoria and San Francisco, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This we are bound to carry out under the terms of confederation with British Columbia. It has been largely reduced from time to time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a small service as well ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I presume that some mails do go by this route, but since the recent development of railway communication along that coast, I fancy these steamers carry very little mail matter.

Steam communication during the season of 1903, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands, $9,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is carried out by the Leslies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What ports are touched on the mainland ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The steamers go from Pictou, call at Georgetown and Souris, in Prince Edward Island, Amherst Island, Grand Entry, and Grindstone Island, in the Magdalen Islands. This is a weekly service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A mail service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes; it is performed by the steamer 'Amelia.'

Steam communication during the season 1903, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, $12,500.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a daily service. Georgetown to Pictou, Summerside to Pointe du Chene.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By what steamers ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Northumberland' and the 'Princess.' This is a five years' contract. Tenders were called for, and this was the only one received.

Steam communication from July 1, 1903, to June 30, 1904, between Grand Manan and the mainland, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the population of Grand Manan ? Is this a mail service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The population is between 2,000 and 3,000. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) knows they are a rather isolated community.

Steam communication during the year 1903, i.e., for not less than fifty-two full round weekly trips between St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth and other way ports, $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase in this vote of $3,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes; it is proposed to make this a weekly service. It used to be thirty-two trips a year.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose these vessels carry passengers and freight, as well as the mails ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the minister tell us whether there is an increase of trade and passenger traffic, and whether it looks as if this service would become self-sustaining?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am rather afraid, judging from past experience, that it will be a good while before it will be self-sustaining. The trade is considerable, but, as reported to me, there does not appear to be any very considerable increase, except, perhaps, in the passenger traffic. The passenger traffic of late has increased a good deal, but not the amount of freight. On the other hand, these vessels have, as a rule, carried pretty good cargoes. They call at a considerable number of ports along that coast.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why is it more necessary to subsidize a vessel running from one point to another on the Atlantic coast than it is from Kingston to Toronto on Lake Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have asked that question myself once or twice. It is to a considerable extent use and wont. I am inclined to think these services were inherited by us at confederation. Prior to confederation, I believe, the Nova Scotia government used

to subsidize most, but not all, the services for which we are now taking votes. Of course, the hon. gentleman is aware that a great many of these sections are very poorly supplied with railway accommodation as compared with other parts of the country. That no doubt is the case why subsidies were originally given, and also why the subsidies are now continued. But I do not know that there is any special reason why one should be subsidized more than the other.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think that is a very good reason. If my memory serves me right, the hon. gentleman used to condemn this expenditure in opposition.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMEFCE. No, I do not think I did.

Mr. COCHRANE. In the position the right hon. gentleman occupies now, if he finds there is an evil he should check it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find that I voted to strike it out. Of course, if he thinks it is an improper expenditure, it is quite open to him to move to strike it out.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not say that. But as the hon. gentleman feels conscientious scruples about continuing it he ought to have backbone enough to strike it out himself.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But I did not vote against the subsidies.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think if the Minister of Trade and Commerce opposed this in opposition, that is the best argument why it should be maintained at the present time. I want to tell the hon. gentleman and the people of Ontario especially, that we have no proper railway accommodation in Nova Scotia. In Nova Scotia we have only 900 miles of railway all told, and our province is two or three hundred years of age ; while in Manitoba, which is only of twenty-five or thirty years' growth, they have nearly 3,000 miles of railway. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce was so dominant in Ontario with a certain section of the people—I am bound to say it was a narrow section, such as the Postmaster General leads to-day——

Mr. CLARKE. The leadership has passed from the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. GOURLEY. It was at any rate a narrow section of Ontario. But I find that to-day the belief is thoroughly grounded in the people of Ontario that Sir Charles Tupper and the men we sent up here filled that province with railways and spent the money of Canada for the benefit of the maritime provinces, whereas in Ontario they got no public expenditure at all. The fact is we have suffered in the maritime provinces to build up the province of Ontario. But we did it uncomplainingly. We said to ourselves that surely the time would come when the people of Ontario would get generous and offer to give back to the people of Nova Scotia something to repay them for the great self-sacrifice they have made to build up the province of Ontario. But the time seems never to come ; and I want the people of Ontario on both sides of the House to understand that so far as railways are concerned, we are simply at the porch of the temple, we have not entered the temple of railway building in the province of Nova Scotia, and we blame that on the people of Ontario. Sir Charles Tupper, when he was here, endeavoured to give railroads, not only to Ontario and to the west, but to the maritime provinces ; but he found his own party first on his back, then he found the Liberals on his back, and he could not struggle up with both parties on his back. He could not liberalize both parties in the province of Ontario. The result was that in Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces we are without railways to-day. Therefore, we had to resort to these tu'penny ha'penny grants to run steamers around the shores of the province in order to give us communication. But these tu'penny ha'penny grants should be doubled or quadrupled in order to give some practical benefit to the commerce of the maritime provinces.

Steam comunication between a port or ports in Prince Edward Island and a port or ports in Great Britain, $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the position of that communication at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. At present we are getting two trips, and we had a good deal of difficulty in getting vessels to call there. My hon. friends from Prince Edward Island have represented to me that it would be much more profitable for them if this vote was reduced and they obtained better communication with Nova Scotia. I am disposed to do that, and I only require for the service which is now under contract the sum of $5,000. Therefore, I move to reduce that vote to $5,000. But I may state that the sum so saved I propose to give, in the supplementary estimates, to another service for the benefit of the island.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is this $10,000 to be appropriated for two trips only ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I propose to appropriate $5,000 to the two trips that I have contracted for.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it the intention of the minister to endeavour to obtain more service if possible ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If I could have obtained it I

would have retained the vote in its present shape.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The right hon. gentleman has not entirely given up the idea of trying to obtain a better service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No ; but for the present year I do not propose to deprive the island of the $5,000 ; I propose to apply it for its benefit in another service, which will be brought down in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Would the right hon. gentleman state what service that will be ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The service for which the balance will be appropriated will be between Prince Edward Island, Sydney and Newfoundland.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has the right hon. minister any steamer to undertake that service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We are endeavouring to arrange for that at the present moment.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Does the right hon. minister know when the first trip will be made to the old country ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We expect in October and that trips will also be made in November and December as may be found most convenient for the trade of the island.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what way is the $5,000 that is to be appropriated for some other service to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In providing a service between Prince Edward Island, Sydney and Newfoundland.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any steamer on that route at present or is one to be provided ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. One is to be provided.

Mr. LEFURGEY. What steamer do you propose to get for the service between Prince Edward Island, Sydney and Newfoundland?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We are negotiating for that, but we have not settled the matter yet.

Direct fortnightly steam service between Montreal, Quebec and Manchester, England, during the summer season, and between St. John, Halifax and Manchester during the winter season, $35,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What line receives this subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Manchester Line. The ships are known as the Manchester Line with various addenda, such as 'Manchester Liner,' 'Manchester Trader,' 'Manchester Commerce' and names of that kind. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, is aware, that the reason why we have been induced to take this up is that the corporation of Manchester has constructed a ship canal leading directly to the city of Manchester which is the centre, perhaps, of the very largest consuming population in England and we have deemed it expedient to endeavour to promote trade with Manchester. A very considerable trade has been developed, it is increasing and is likely to increase. The subsidy was formerly $38,000 and it has been reduced to $35,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these boats supplied with cold storage or cooled chambers ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Most of them are supplied with cold storage, but not all. I may also mention that these people have considerably exceeded their contract. They have given us more voyages than the contract called for. I think the chances are that the trade will not merely develop in a way that will make it a valuable trade for us, but if I am correctly advised the population around Manchester is so densed that within a circuit of between three and four miles there is now stated to be a population of nearly 8,000,000 people, almost all of whom are consumers and not producers of food stuffs; so that, if we can establish a trade proportionate to the consumption we will do very well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any stipulation in the contract requiring the vessels or any number of them to be supplied with cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Most of them are. The corporation of Manchester, who, I understand, are largely concerned in these vessels have, as perhaps the hon. gentleman knows, warehouses especially adapted to the reception of food products in which everything can be placed immediately on arrival. My deputy tells me that he believes that all but two are supplied with the requisite cold storage accommodation.

Direct monthly steam communication between Canada and South Africa, $146,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This we had under discussion some few weeks ago, as perhaps hon. gentlemen will remember, and I laid upon the Table the contract with the three firms who proposed to carry this on. Of course, nothing has been paid to them as yet. It depends entirely on the vote of the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What ports will be called at ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Cape Town, Durban and Port Elizabeth.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And East London ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have the liberty of requiring them to call at three ports besides Cape Town.

Mr. CLARKE. How many trips have been made already?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They commenced in October and they have made eight or nine trips, I think.

Mr. CLARKE. Have the ships had any difficulty in getting cargoes both ways ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The chief complaint that has reached me as yet has been not so much on this side as on the other side. I have been in communication with parties in Natal in the endeavour to obtain better accommodation for our ships when they go there. They have complained that they were held over and found a good deal of difficulty and delay in discharging their cargoes. On the whole the cargoes have been pretty good.

Mr. CLARKE. From where ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. From here.

Mr. CLARKE. Do they get a return cargo ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not much. There is comparatively little at present to return to us from South Africa. It may improve.

Mr. CLARKE. They come back in ballast ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We do not interfere with their return voyage. It is their voyage to South Africa that we are concerned in. When they get to South Africa they have to find their way back, but they may go to England, Australia or elsewhere provided a vessel is forthcoming at the requisite time on our side of the ocean.

Mr. CLARKE. What do their cargoes from here consist of ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have sent lumber, agricultural implements, and we sent out what the Americans would call a cargo of notions on two or three occasions—furniture and miscellaneous articles of all sorts and descriptions. We have also been sending a good deal of flour and oats.

Mr. CLARKE. How much flour has been sent ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am told that on several of their voyages the amount of flour sent was a couple of thousand tons, which is very good if it lasts.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are the Canadian agents in Africa under the control of the department presided over by the right hon. gentleman?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, if Mr. Jardine is the gentleman referred to.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What does he do ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. His present office is to examine the general condition of the country and to report from time to time, and he has made ten or eleven reports to us——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Reports are easily made.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes. He has made these reports pointing out the articles that in his judgment can be most advantageously dealt with from Canada to South Africa. I might add that he has called attention to one feature of the trade which I hope will not need to be called attention to again, and that is the fact that goods forwarded to South Africa on two or three occasions have not been equal to the samples sent.

Mr. CLARKE. What kind of goods?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Articles like lumber. They did not equal the articles that had been ordered, and a good deal of trouble ensued in consequence. I need not say to the House that it is of the first importance, particularly when you are opening up a new trade, that the articles sent should at the very least equal the description. Nothing can do us more harm, in opening up new trade, than to let it be supposed that Canadian merchants will not live up to the samples they send, or will not attend to the orders that are given to them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It would be advisable that the commercial agents for Canada, both in South Africa and Australia, should not only act as agents for the sale of Canadian goods, but should encourage the people of these countries to trade with us. I found in Australia and New Zealand very little interest in Canadian trade, because there was no market in Canada for any of their produce, which largely consists of hides and wool. If there was some interest on the part of the merchants there who have goods to sell in Canadian trade, it would be a great help to Canada.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Quite true. I have instructed them on that head.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I might point out that in Canada there are two firms that have taken first and second prizes in England for the manufacture of wind pumps.

Mr. CLARKE. What's that?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Wind pumps.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have no doubt that Canada is well able to turn out wind pumps, as wind is at a premium. However, I have no reference to the Department of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not under fire to-day.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If our agent drew attention to this fact in South Africa, he would find a ready sale for these articles.

Mr. BLAIN. When was this South African subsidy first granted?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The first vote was $5,000 a couple of years ago, but that was only for the purpose of getting a ship to make an experimental voyage, and I think lumber was chiefly carried.

Mr. BLAIN. The vote is now $146,000, and no doubt the Canadian people are anxious to get this trade if possible, but would the minister tell us why he recommended such a large expenditure and what is his anticipation of the future as to trade with South Africa.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is to be regarded as an experiment, of course, but it was only found possible to obtain a regular monthly steamship service by offering pretty liberal treatment. From Montreal to Cape Town the distance is 6,500 miles, and to Durban it would be 1,000 miles further. We found it almost impossible to get any single company to undertake this service, and the contract is made in a somewhat unusual fashion, the Allans, the Elder-Dempster and the Furness-Withy lines each taking one-third. I placed the contract on the Table of the House a few weeks ago giving full details. How far it will succeed I cannot say as yet, but there is a very considerable industrial development going on in South Africa, particularly in the Transvaal, and the parts adjacent, and it is hoped that we will be able to supply them not merely with a very considerable amount of coarse goods, such as lumber, but food products of various kinds, and possibly furniture and agricultural implements.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is our chief competitor there ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The United States have a pretty large trade there, and one chief reason for our establishing the service was the complaint made to us by Canadian merchants that their consignments were tossed to one side in New York, and that they had very little satisfaction in trading from that port. The various representatives of commerce throughout the country pressed on us rather strongly to give them a Canadian line, in which case they stated a very considerable trade would be developed. It is too early yet to judge, but I think there is a fair chance that a reasonable trade will be developed; I hope a large trade ultimately. The difficulty is that there is no large return cargo, and we are obliged to allow the various ships, if they cannot obtain cargo for Canada, to go around by England or elsewhere.

Mr. BLAIN. I am informed that so far the expectation of the government has not been realized, and that the trade during the eight months has not been up to expectations.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot exactly say that. I did not expect myself that it could attain full grown proportions in the course of six months. You will have to nourish these infants a little before you can expect very much out of them.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any complaint from the shippers in respect to the freight rates?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There was some complaints six or seven months ago, but lately I am told that the service has been more satisfactory.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the complaint ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The complaint was, in part, that the service was irregular, that they did not start on the day appointed, and that they attempted to obtain American trade in preference to Canadian.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not that the complaint at the present moment?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am told that the present complaint has been made as to the matter of cold storage provided for in the contract; that an undue proportion of that has been assigned to American shippers. I called the attention of the various parties concerned to that, and I think if that has been the case heretofore it will be remedied now.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose that the anticipation of the government was that there would be some fruit trade developed between South Africa and Canada ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I did not expect that there would be much of that.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the cold storage for to which the hon. minister refers ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is for the benefit of Canadian products.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that there is a very serious complaint from the fruit-growers of Canada that the vessels are not

fitted up in such a way that we might expect a trade between Canada and South Africa to develop.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The storage accommodation provided was, I think, intended, not so much for fruit, although that is, of course, an item that may be included, as for such articles as cheese, meat products and perhaps butter. If the hon. gentleman will look at the contract which has been laid on the Table, he will find the details there set out pretty fully.

Mr. CLARKE. Do we send butter to South Africa ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We tried to do so, and were fairly successful. We send considerable cheese. Of course, these vessels have to cross the equator, where there is risk of injury to the products. I depend more upon cheese, meat products and canned products than upon such an article as butter. There is a pretty large demand in Johannesburg and all the adjacent regions of the Rand. The American trade with them amounts to a very considerable sum. That we hope to cut into.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that these vessels carry American products as well as Canadian. Can the hon. gentleman tell us which are carried at the cheaper rate ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The freight rate from New York is somewhat lower, I think, than ours, but not very much. That is scarcely to be avoided under the circumstances.

Mr. CLARKE. Do these vessels call at New York ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, they go straight to Cape Town, and then along the coast.

Mr. CLARKE. Do they come to our ports from New York ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are at liberty to go where they please on the return voyage. They may come from New York, but they do not take any freight from New York. They carry Canadian freight from the various ports between Montreal and Halifax.

Mr. KAULBACH. How many trips are made under this contract each year ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is one trip per month. We have the right to vary the ports from time to time, as we see fit.

Mr. KAULBACH. On the return voyage, the vessels could go to Buenos Ayres and get wool or tallow and to Rio for coffee.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, they may go where they please. There is at present scarcely any return freight from South Africa.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that there is provision in the contract by which the government can establish a maximum of freight rates. Can the hon. gentleman tell whether or not any such schedule of rates has been established ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not as yet. We have been waiting to see how this trade developed before we attempted that.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. minister know whether the United States government pay any subsidy to vessels ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think they pay nothing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the hon. minister to say that there had been some complaint with regard to the allotment to American shippers of too much cold storage accommodation. As a matter of fact, is there any considerable quantity of produce shipped to the United States by means of these lines ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman knows that the Canadian Pacific usually picks up a certain amount of American freight and takes it through to St. John. It has been from that quarter chiefly that any American produce has come.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). Where does the Canadian agent make his headquarters ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He has been travelling all over South Africa, from Cape Town to Pretoria and Johannesburg, with an excursion into Rhodesia. It is a pretty large country, and his instructions were in the first instance to make himself acquainted with the whole of the South African territory under British rule. He reports regularly to my department, and his reports are communicated to the various boards of trade and commerce.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin). What wages does he get ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Two thousand dollars a year and his travelling expenses.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister speaks of the American traffic over this line as being largely by way of St. John ; that is to say, the shipments from Montreal and Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I refer to what is carried in cold storage. I do not think there has been any large amount of the other kinds.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Could the minister give us any idea of what proportion of the carryings consist of United States produce and manufactures, and what proportion of Canadian produce and manufactures ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. With the exception of what is carried in cold storage, the percentage of American goods carried is very small. The great bulk has been Canadian goods, and our instructions, of course, were that Canadian goods should have the preference.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, it might alter our ideas as to the advisability of a very large subsidy to this line if eventually we found that the cargo consisted largely of products or manufactures of the United States. Therefore we should have as definite information on that point as the hon. minister can give us.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My information is that but a small percentage of American goods is carried, except of the goods carried in cold storage, of which there was a good deal carried at one time ; but I understand that now the Canadians are getting the bulk of that.

Mr. CLARKE. If these vessels are paid this subsidy for the purpose of carrying Canadian products, surely they should not be allowed to carry American goods.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I suppose the hon. gentleman would not refuse to carry American goods if there is room, and the shippers pay for carrying them ?

Mr. CLARKE. Then it appears that we are subsidizing this line to enable American manufacturers to compete with ours.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, on the contrary, supposing that these vessels carried 3,000 or 4,000 tons Canadian goods and were able also to carry 1,000 or 2,000 tons of American goods to fill up with, for which they would be paid, that would enable them to carry Canadian goods relatively cheaper.

Mr. CLARKE. But the American government do not have to pay for that privilege.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If we have enough Canadian goods to fill the vessels, the Americans will send none. If there is a deficiency of Canadian goods, the vessels will take American goods. I do not think it would be very good policy to refuse the American goods when we have not enough of our own.

Mr. CLARKE. That may be a matter of opinion. It is news to me that these vessels were permitted to carry American freight.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I never knew of a case in which a clause was put in a contract forbidding the carrying of freight from any port, though preference might be given to Canadian freight.

Mr. CLARKE. We are paying $146,000 for this service to South Africa and it is carrying American freight as well as our own.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It may carry some, but the great bulk is Canadian.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether our boards of trade are aware of that fact.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I should say that if we desire to make the best of our routes, particularly the St. Lawrence route, so far from discouraging American goods going by them, I should be glad to see millions of tons of American produce coming down the St. Lawrence and going in our steamships to other parts of the world. These goods will find their way across anyhow, and we may as well have the benefit of the trade.

Mr. HENDERSON. Have Canadians got any better rates by reason of the space being filled up with American products than if American products were not taken ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think they would. If a vessel has accommodation for 5,000 tons and can only got 3,000 tons of Canadian freight, the chances are that the Canadian producer would get better rates if the other 2,000 tons were made up from any other quarter. You will have to pay this service what it costs to take the vessels from one side to the other.

Mr. HENDERSON. The only point is that we are subsidizing vessels to carry the products of a foreign competitor as well as our own.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The great bulk of the freight which we do send is our own, and I do not see that we will gain anything by prohibiting other goods.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. gentleman inform us what proportion of the freight is Canadian and what American ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I doubt very much if ten per cent is American.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the average tonnage of these ships ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. About 5,000 or 6,000.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood that the American part of the cargo consists of goods that have gone in cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Some portion of it.

Mr. CLARKE. That would be food products ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, of course we ourselves are sending some by New York.

Mr. CLARKE. Where does this fruit come from ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is supplied us by the railway systems chiefly. Some come by the Grand Trunk Railway and some by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLARKE. Where do we get our supply of American freight ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The only trade we get is what comes across our lines of railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that there are three companies, each getting a portion of this $146,000. Did any of the vessels call at Canadian ports before the government entered into this contract ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Of course, the Allan Line did.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the others ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Also the Elder-Dempster called at Canadian ports, but they did not go to South Africa.

Mr. BLAIN. Were any vessels put on after this contract was entered into ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. New vessels were put on certainly by the Elder-Dempster Line. The Furness-Withy I am not sure of. The Allan's have a large steamship fleet, and they relegated some of their vessels to this South African service. Several vessels formerly employed on other routes were put into the South African service.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the hon. gentleman any means of ascertaining what proportion of the cargo comes from the United States ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is somewhat difficult, because we receive the goods from the railway companies and they do not discriminate between the two very carefully. We are obliged to approximate, but I think I am right in stating that the percentage is but small.

Mr. CLARKE. I should like if possible to have definite information on that point.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will try. It is somewhat difficult to get minute information. I can tell the hon. gentleman generally that the great bulk of the cargoes has been supplied by Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. Where did the hon. gentleman get that information ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. From the steamship companies and customs.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be unreasonable to inquire from the steamship companies what are the exact quantities that come from the United States ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly.

Steam communication during the season of 1903, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Gaspé basin and Dalhousie or Campbellton, $12,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is any change being made in the service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This used to be performed by the steamer 'Admiral'. It is now being performed by a screw steamer of greater draught. But there has been some difficulty about getting into various harbours.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Has the contract been signed ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I cannot allow this item to pass, Mr. Chairman, without thanking the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the trouble he has gone to during the last two or three years in trying to improve this service. I might also mention the right hon. the Prime Minister in this connection. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) and myself have been to see the right hon. gentlemen often in the last three years to try to get a more satisfactory service than has been given in the past. This service is from Dalhousie to Gaspé Basin, a distance of 160 miles, along the whole county of Bonaventure and Gaspé. The county of Gaspé being entirely without railways, and Bonaventure the same for nearly one-third of the distance, great importance is attached to this steamship service. The old steamer 'Admiral' performed this service for twenty-five or thirty years. But, though a good boat in her time, the 'Admiral' is somewhat out of date. She was formerly the property of General Grant as far back as 1864. She is a paddle-wheel steamer, and, for that reason, not fitted for the route. For the last five or six years the people have insisted on a change and on a more modern steamer being provided. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce saw the reasonableness of the request and invited Mr. Connolly, who has the contract under the name of the North Atlantic Transportation Company, to secure a better and a more modern boat, and one propelled with a screw, so that she could start earlier in the spring and keep the service up later in the fall, for the service in the Baie des Chaleur can easily be kept up for at least ten months in the year and a specially constructed vessel could ply along that coast for almost twelve months in the year. Paspebiac and other ports are open for the whole twelve months. Mr. Connolly

consented last year, at the request of the government, to remove the 'Admiral' and replace her with a better boat. He went to England and secured a freight boat which he named the 'Restigouche.' This boat has been performing the service since the spring without a contract with the government. And I must say, the letters that I receive from my constituents are strongly to the effect that the 'Restigouche' is altogether unsuitable for the service. She is a good freight boat, but not suitable for passenger service. And, in a country where there are no railways, the question of passenger accommodation on the steamboat is a very important one. There were very few cabins on the 'Restigouche,' though a certain number have been added since she was put on this route. She is now performing the service in a more or less satisfactory manner without a contract; but, I presume that at the end of the season Mr. Connolly will come and ask the government to pay him for the number of trips he has made. There is published at Campbellton, New Brunswick, from which it is proposed to run this service, a newspaper called 'Events', which is a non-political paper, and I believe, fair in these matters. It speaks of this steamer service, which, it should be remembered, is not only for the people of that locality, but for the large number of tourists who visit this section in summer. The editor of this paper went on one of the trips of the 'Restigouche,' and he has given his impression in an article of two columns and a half in that newspaper. Of course, I have no intention of reading that article, but I may be allowed to read extracts in order to convince the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce of the necessity that exists for a change in this service. In a portion of his article the editor points out the requirements of a boat for that particular service:

> What are the requirements for a boat for the Bay Chaleur?
> Not too commodious, but staunch.
> Quick in getting under speed.
> Very responsive to her wheel.
> Not drawing a great deal of water.
> Good speed out of port and prepared for a little ice in a late season.
> The 'Restigouche' is too long, while proportionately narrow, practically doesn't make a wharf at all, naturally slow in getting under speed, draws too much water, being a single screw boat is helpless to back water, and except under speed her helm is not of service.
> In short as to her present requirements she is out of her element
> If she were here to make a through trip, Dalhousie to Gaspé for handling freight and accommodating passengers, with a little further care for those on board she would give good service, but that is not her work and far from it.

When the boat leaves Dalhousie at two o'clock in the morning, she has twenty-two or twenty-three stops to make before reaching Gaspé at ten or eleven o'clock at night. Being a coasting steamer, she is expected to go as near as possible to the shore. But a boat drawing sixteen feet of water cannot go near the shore and people have to go out in small boats and wait, it may be for two or three hours, for the boat to come along One of the stops is New Carlisle; but the first trip made by the 'Restigouche' she passed by the shiretown of Bonaventure without stopping at all, to the great disappointment of the people. She had through freight for Gaspé Basin, and did not stop. The editor of 'Events' describes her efforts to stop at Carleton, which is a well known summer resort. Where there is a splendid wharf with fourteen feet of water at high water:

> Our first stop was Carleton, where in an effort to come to the wharf, it was sadly missed and the 'Restigouche' found herself getting into the beach sand in her strugglings to keep to her element. Reversing her screw (and those who purported to know said that except when dead still it is not permissible at all) the whole boat shook from brow to stern, but she finally got back and a second effort brought her up angling broadside on the narrow end of the wharf. We need not here enumerate the sailors' efforts but suffice to say almost two hours were required to secure her to the posts.

It will easily be seen that a boat of that kind is not suitable for this service. What is required is a boat drawing not more than ten feet of water, or twelve feet at the outside; a screw steamer that will break through the thin ice in Dalhousie and Gaspé Basin, in the month of April and keep up the service to the 1st of January. She should have proper passenger accommodation, and also be able to handle freight, because considerable freight is carried on that line. I have said these words in justice to my constituents, and I know that if the hon. member for Gaspé were in the House at the present time—he had to leave for Montreal this afternoon—he would have endorsed every word I say. I hope the right hon. minister will take steps which will result in an improved service next year. If calling for tenders publicly is the only protection we can have, I hope they will be called for early during the present season. It should be stipulated that this navigation should be kept up as long as possible, not merely at Dalhousie, because that is a landlocked basin where ice forms early in November, but be kept up for ten months in the year, where it can be easily kept up, in the Baie des Chaleurs. That is all I have to say. I once more thank the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the trouble he has gone to to secure us a good service, and I would ask him to excuse me for the trouble I have felt it my duty to put him to. The peculiar situation of these counties requires special attention to this steamship service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The 'Restigouche' has not given

as good results as we hoped to see. I have made careful note of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure), and will try to do all possible to accommodate the people of the Gaspé peninsula.

Steam service during the year 1903, between St. Stephen, New Brunswick, St. Croix, river points, Deer Island, Campobello and the inner islands, Passamaquoddy bay and L'Etete or Back bay, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is done by a steamboat company to Campobello.

Mr. GANONG. The only objection is that this vote is at least $1,000 less than what is needed to give the service we should have.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend will find in the supplementary estimates something more for the purpose of carrying out that service.

Administration of the Chinese Administration Act, including remuneration to trade and commerce and customs officers, $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We have had a good many more immigrants and a good deal more is received from them. The number of Chinese immigrants during the year has increased from 2,544 to 3,587; and the revenue has increased from $178,000 to $364,000. We are getting now about $500,000 out of the Chinese. I suppose when the present statute comes into force that will be stopped.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By what means is the Immigration Act administered?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Under the supervision of the controller of Chinese immigration, but we chiefly employ customs officials and give them a certain allowance to look after these immigrants and to collect the poll-tax. The tax is chiefly collected at Vancouver or Victoria.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The amount received for the past year was how much?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. $364,000. For the present year the amount is estimated to be $526,000. One-half goes to us and one-half to the British Columbia government.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the increased tax?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That does not come into force till the 1st of January next. Of course the increased number is probably due to anticipation on the part of these people.

Mr. BLAIN. How many are in Canada at the present time, giving the number by provinces if it is convenient?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid I will have to refer the hon. gentleman to the census for the exact numbers. But about 20,000 are supposed to be in Canada now, the great bulk in British Columbia.

Mr. BLAIN. How many have come in since notice of the increased tax has been given?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The number reported to have come in is 3,587.

Canada's proportion of expenditure in connection with International Customs Tariff Bureau, $600.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is a small charge that we pay to the customs bureau in Bruxelles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does it do?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is supposed to furnish us with information as to the changes occurring from time to time in the tariffs of the various countries in Europe and elsewhere. It is a bureau of information. We subscribe for the purpose of receiving early notice of the changes.

Mr. BLAIN. Do we get an annual report?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, we get reports much more frequently than annually. We get the changes in the tariffs whenever any are made by the respective governments connected with this.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they published in the blue-books?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Commercial agencies, improving expenses in connection with negotiation of treaties or in extension of commercial relations, $40,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This is the same as heretofore. There have been four officers appointed since last year—one, Mr. Poindron, in Paris; another, Mr. Jardine, in South Africa; another, Mr. Ross, in Melbourne, Australia, and another, Mr. Ball, in Birmingham.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many commercial agencies have we altogether?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Eleven.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what places are they established?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is Mr. Larke at Sydney, Mr. Ross at Melbourne, Mr. Jardine in South Africa, Mr. Ball at Birmingham, Mr. Poindron in Paris, Mr. Burke at Kingston, Jamaica, Mr. Bryson at Antigua, Mr. Horsford at St. Kitts, Mr. Tripp at Trinidad and Tobago, and Mr. Sontum at Christiana, Norway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the right hon. gentleman give us some idea as to the service to the country which these commercial agents render ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The minor ones, as the hon. gentleman will see from the salaries fixed which are very small, report from time to time whenever they see any chance of trade and they keep us informed as to what trade is going on with Canada in their particular districts. The ones who receive larger salaries, such as Messrs. Larke, Ross, Jardine, Ball and Poindron, are expected to traverse the country more or less in which they reside, to report to us as a rule monthly, or oftener when required, and generally to advise us in what possible direction the trade of Canada can be developed. Of course, most of these gentlemen have been appointed very recently. Mr. Larke is the only old appointment. He has been in New South Wales for a considerable number of years.

Mr. BLAIN. Have there been any new appointments during the present year ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, I gave them. Mr. Ross was appointed at Melbourne, Mr. Jardine at Cape Town, Mr. Ball at Birmingham and Mr. Poindron at Paris.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the right hon. gentleman give us his opinion as to the practical results which they get from this expenditure ? Does he regard this expenditure as well justified ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, most of these gentlemen have just been appointed. Mr. Ross has only been appointed for six months, Mr. Jardine for about a year, Mr. Ball for two or three months, and Mr. Poindron for six or eight months. How far these gentlemen will succeed in developing trade and commerce I can hardly say as yet. They all appear to be very zealous in calling the attention of the communities in which they reside to the articles that Canada can produce and in making suggestions as far as they can to Canadian manufacturers and merchants as to what classes of articles are best adapted for the markets, in what way they should be prepared and generally how trade can be increased. I am in hopes that they will justify the expenditure of the sum which we are now asking for them, but in most cases the appointments are too recent to say how much or how little they may accomplish. Mr. Larke's reports which have been received for a period of six or seven years are very carefully prepared and I think he has done his utmost to promote trade with Australasia. This trade has shown a very considerable development within the last few years and I have no doubt Mr. Larke has contributed considerably to it. The other gentlemen, I think, will assist more or less in diffusing information, but it will rest, of course, very largely with the manufacturers and merchants themselves who may choose to take advantage of it. These officers discharge to a very great extent the functions which are discharged by the consular agents appointed by European countries under somewhat similar circumstances. You may regard them as Canadian consular agents.

Bounties on iron and steel and on the refining of lead. To cover expenditure in connection with the administration of the Acts, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Most of this will be refunded by the parties to whom these bounties are granted. We are obliged, of course, to check the products and will be obliged to increase considerably our vigilance particularly in the case of lead bounties.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase of $2,500.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, the hon. gentleman is aware that we are increasing the bounties on iron and steel and lead and probably there will be a considerable additional output in both of these cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite see, although the hon. gentleman seems to imagine I should, why an increase in the bounties would increase the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It will increase the output and consequently will increase the amount of work that will have to be done, and moreover I suspect that the justification for giving the bounty is that a number of lead mines will come into operation which are practically idle now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it covers lead also, I admit there is force in the right hon. gentleman's observation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It covers lead. We propose to make these parties pay the expense of inspecting them and seeing that they earn the bounty in conformity with the regulations.

Inspection of staples—chief inspectors, inspectors, deputy inspectors and other employees under the general inspection of the Manitoba Grain Acts, $48,000.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. These officers were in former times paid out of the Manitoba grain fund and they were paid by fees. We have deemed it better that these officers should receive a fixed salary, and that the fees should go into the consolidated revenue fund. We received from the fees collected up to June 30 of the present year $76,900, and the total expenses have been $65,000.

Inspection of binder twine, $2,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister explain why he appointed an inspector of binder twine ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Various complaints have been made to us by farmers and others that the binder twine was not up to the requirements, and we thought it expedient to make sure that the farmers' interests were duly protected, and we appointed an inspector at a salary of $1,200.

Mr. TAYLOR. How can an inspector inspect a lot of binder twine ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Probably in the same way as you would inspect barrels of apples, by taking samples and seeing that they correspond with the requirements of the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. How will he do it—by taking samples ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Each parcel of binder twine is supposed to contain a certain number of yards and, I think, a certain weight, and he can inspect a number of these parcels in the factories, and if he finds that on the average they are correct, he would be justified in assuming that the remainder are good. If he found there was a deficiency in any considerable number of these he would be justified in so reporting, and have the parties fined. There is a statute providing penalties in the event of binder twine being deficient in quantity or quality.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it applies to the quality, but only to the quantity. The statute provides that there must be a tag on each ball showing the number of feet per pound, and I apprehend that this inspector's duties would be to see that it contained the proper length.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He will see that the statute is complied with.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will that apply to American twine as well as Canadian?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My instructions to him were to see that the American twine came up to the standard represented.

Mr. HENDERSON. The importer is liable if the statute is not complied with.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Has the inspector been inspecting binder twine this season ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Has he reported to you ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Did he find any delinquents ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He reported to me that as a rule the results have been satisfactory. I think they are allowed a deficiency of five per cent, but if it is more than five per cent, they are liable to be fined. His report is that the majority of the manufacturers have complied with the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister might just as well admit that this was done for the purpose of giving a job to Mr. Joseph Haycock, who was the leading Patron element in helping the Liberals in the elections of 1896, and who deserved something at their hands. Mr. Haycock had to be provided for, and so they appointed him inspector of binder twine, something that there is no more use for than there is for appointing an inspector of mosquitoes. If he wants to inspect a ball of twine he has to unravel it, and that spoils the ball and the government will have to pay for it. That is about all Mr. Haycock has to do. The farmers of this country are shrewd and sharp enough to inspect their own twine when they are buying it.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is just a job.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We would not do such a thing.

Mr. BLAIN. How did you manage to get along for several years without this inspector ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Complaints were made to the department that the farmers' interests were neglected.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose there is some correspondence with respect to this appointment ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I don't think there is any correspondence.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the statute passed providing for inspection of binder twine?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not quite certain, but it was prior to the inspection being assigned to the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. BLAIN. And since it was passed the binder twine had been manufactured in the penitentinary without any inspection at all. Has there been any general complaint with respect to the quality of the twine manufactured ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As to the penitentiary, I cannot say, but there have been complaints that the balls of twine were not up to the standard prescribed by the statute.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the inspector's duties ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. To go to the several factories at which twine is manufactured, and also to inspect from time to time the larger wholesale and retail establishments in which twine is sold. If he discovers any defalcation, he has to report and endeavour to have the party fined.

Mr. BLAIN. Seventy-five per cent of the twine now consumed in Canada is manufactured in the United States. Has the inspector anything to do with that twine?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. His instructions are to ascertain whether the twine sold conforms with the provisions of the statute.

Mr. BLAIN. There was a time in the history of Canada when a large proportion of the twine consumed in Canada was manufactured in this country, but at the present time, since the free trade policy adopted by my hon. friend, 75 per cent of the twine used in Canada has been manufactured in the United States.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am not prepared to say what the proportion is.

Mr. BLAIN. That statement was made in the House, and I think it is within the mark. What I do not understand is that when there was a very large quantity of twine manufactured in Canada the government did not see fit to appoint an inspector, but now, when a much smaller quantity is manufactured, they think it necessary to have an inspector.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think it makes much difference whether we have an inspector or not. The idea of appointing one man to inspect all the binder twine used in Canada is utterly ridiculous; he cannot examine the thousandth part of it. I am inclined to think, with my hon. friend from Leeds, that the object has been a good deal more to find a position for Mr. Haycock than for any good he is likely to accomplish. I am sure that all the balls of binder twine he will examine will not return very much profit to the farmers of this country. You would require to have fifty men, if you are going properly to inspect the binder twine used by the people of this country. Then, what is going to become of the twine that Mr. Haycock inspects? A man cannot inspect a ball of twine without destroying it. Is the government going to pay the manufacturers or the agents whose twine is examined, for the loss they have sustained by reason of the inspection? Because, when a ball of twine is once unwound, I rather think it will not accomplish the purpose for which it was made. I have heard it said that Mr. Haycock has some instrument by which he can rewind the twine, but I think he will not be able to do it in that scientific way required to make it run freely off the binder. There will be a considerable sum required to compensate the binder twine men for the twine lost in this way, and the minister had better put it in supplementary estimates.

Mr. WILSON. What particular qualifications has Mr. Haycock for this position? I did not think that a market gardener was specially qualified to inspect binder twine. I presume that the reason Mr. Haycock got the appointment was because of the good he did the government in stumping the various counties for them. He stumped mine, but I do not think he did any harm, because he is too well known in that part of the country. I remember the Minister of Trade and Commerce once writing a letter in which he claimed that the Patron platform was the policy of the Liberal party, and economy was then a prominent plank in that Patron platform. I do not know what economy there is in appointing a man as inspector of binder twine because he posed at a Patron, and at the same time stumped for the Liberals.

Mr. BLAIN. We would like the hon. minister to make a statement of the qualifications of Mr. Haycock for this appointment.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman has met Mr. Haycock, on the stump or anywhere, I think he will substantiate my statement that Mr. Haycock is a man of very decided intelligence.

Mr. CLARKE. He has made a very bad use of it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have known men of intelligence in very high positions who have put their intelligence to a very bad use—not meaning anything personal to my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not understand that it was one of the necessary qualifications of a binder twine inspector that he should be a good stump speaker. I might remind the hon. minister that there is a very large number yet to be provided for. For myself, I wish to enter a protest against this expenditure, and I think I shall move to strike out the vote. As I understand the law respecting the manufacture of binder twine, it provides that each binder twine manufacturer must put a tag upon each ball, stating the number of feet per pound in the ball. If that is true, what is the necessity of having an inspector?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Sometimes they make mistakes, and do not give the requisite number.

Mr. BLAIN. This gentleman was appointed last June. There has been a very large amount of twine manufactured since then, and I suppose the officer has made some report to the department as to the duties he has performed—whether he has found that any of the twine manufacturers

in Canada have not been living up to the law, and whether the large quantity of binder twine imported into this country has been found to be up to the standard manufactured by the Canadian people.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. He has made a report, and, so far as he can discover up to the present date, the twine manufactured corresponds with the regulations imposed by the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister bring down his report ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. minister had appointed an inspector to see that the manufacturers did not make over 100 per cent profit, he might be of some value to the Canadian farmers. If the hon. gentleman will turn up 'Hansard' of July 29, he will find that the Minister of Justice gave the prices that were paid for pure manilla each year since 1893, and if he will look at the report made by the late Minister of Justice, he will find that twine can be manufactured for ¾ cents per pound. To that add the cost of the manilla, and a reasonable profit, and you will have the price at which the inspector should see that the twine is sold to the farmers. Double it, if you like, and you will see that the farmers have paid a good deal more. Mr. Clarke, of Toronto, asked :

What was the average price per pound paid each year since 1893 by the government of Canada for manilla used in the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston penitentiary ?

The Minister of Justice stated in reply that in 1893 there was none purchased : in 1894 the price was $4.38 per cwt. Add 75 cents for manufacturing, and you have 5 cents per pound. In 1894 twine was sold to the farmers for about 6½ cents. In 1895 the cost of manilla was $4.13; in 1896, $4.46; in 1897, $4.26. In 1897 the farmers of Canada paid about 13 cents a pound for binder twine. This thing has been going on under the eyes of the government for several years, and why did they not appoint an inspector before to see that the farmers were not being overcharged ? In 1898 it cost $3.71 for pure manilla according to the Minister of Justice. Adding 75 cents for the cost of manufacturing, that would give $4.50 per hundred pounds, yet the farmers paid 13 cents in 1898. In 1899 pure manilla cost $3.39. In 1900 none was produced. We purchased enough in 1899 at $5.39 to do for another year, yet in 1900 it was sold away up from 12 cents to 15 cents. And this government put the blame on the war for the heavy prices they were charging. In 1901 it cost $7.54, and in 1902, $6 per hundred pounds. Adding 75 cents for the manufacturing, that would make $6.75, and giving a cent per pound profit, you have $7.15. Yet, it was sold from 12 to 13 cents. In the face of these facts, why do the government not see that the farmers are not obliged to pay two or three times the cost of the production of twine. There was something for an inspector to investigate. The government have appointed Mr. Haycock, market gardener, at a salary of $100 per month and travelling expenses, which will amount to another $100 per month, going around the country to see that the manufacturers put a tag on each ball, showing the correct measure. Surely the hon. minister will allow this item to drop and pension off Mr. Haycock, or give him some other work to do.

Mr. COCHRANE. The right hon. the leader of the House pleaded yesterday that he was carrying out a moral obligation. Let me draw his attention to this fact. We are told by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that Mr. Haycock has superior qualities and was very eloquent on the stump. We also know the right hon. gentleman once sent a letter to this institution, of which Mr. Haycock was one of the prominent members, endorsing its policy. What policy had the Patrons at that time ? Criticising the extravagance of the government. I remember very well the hon. gentleman, when he was on this side, raising his hand to heaven and denouncing the extravagance of the Tory party in spending $35,000,000 to govern 5,000,000 people. I call upon the right hon. gentleman to carry out now the pledge he made while in opposition to reduce the expenditure of the government $3,000,000 or $4,000,000. Does he think he will reduce it by employing this man at $1,200 per year ? The right hon. gentleman must feel very sad when he thinks that this government are not carrying out the principles they advocated in opposition.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think that at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. Circumstances alter cases. The hon. gentleman has a very satisfactory berth and is willing to throw to the winds all the promises he ever made. All his anxiety is to retain office. I challenge him and the Minister of Trade and Commerce to point to one principle which they advocated on this side that they have not thrown to the winds. They excuse their extravagance in every instance by the plea : 'Oh, we have inherited this from previous governments.' Well, they did not inherit this particular item. What has become of the $60,000,000 which they have frittered away ? They have not inaugurated one scheme which they ever intended to carry out. They have now before the country a scheme which I do not believe they intend to carry out. The only ambition they have is to keep in office as long as they can.

Mr. HEYD. One of the highest tributes paid to the present government is every allusion to the fact that the patron in-

dustry—an organization that grew into great strength and influence because of the extravagance and iniquity of our hon. friends opposite—has disappeared since the present government came into power.

Mr. BLAIN. We should have some explanation as to the qualifications of the gentleman appointed to this position. When you appoint an inspector at a salary of $1,200 and expenses, or equal to $2,500 per year, we naturally expect him to have some qualifications for the position. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether there has been any complaints made to the department that the twine manufactured and imported into this country in years past was not up to the standard, and if the Patrons of Industry or the farmers have made any general demand for the appointment of such an officer.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There have been complaints that the quantities provided by the statute were not furnished to the farmer. As regards the inspector, I think that a gentleman of his intelligence and general ability is quite able to discharge the important and onerous duties assigned to him.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman say that this officer is really required in the interests of the farmers ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think it desirable that the farmer should be protected. We should see that he is supplied with the quantity of twine which the law provides should be contained in each separate spool. It will be found that the farmers of Canada, who are not over and above well regarded in the distribution of patronage, approve as a rule of the appointment of one of their number to see that the provisions of the statutes are carried out for their benefit. Moreover, I have heard from several parties that they were glad to find the government had taken action.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the hon. gentleman present those letters to the House ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am afraid that many of them are marked confidential.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is rather a reflection on the Minister of Justice that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce should employ a man to watch over the government output, and see whether the twine turned out has a tag giving its length. I wonder if the hon. minister has got a report from the manufacturer at Kingston. For it is quite possible, if others put up twine at short length, that it may be done there. But it seems that the government have to appoint farmers to watch their own operations.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) thinks we need a good deal of watching, and has said so a good many times.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I hope that no reflection is being cast upon the patrons or the farmers, because I was a patron myself. I was elected by the patrons to keep down the expenditure of the government, if I possibly could. They elected me to see that justice was done to every man, if I knew what justice was, and they thought I did. There is just one point I wish to emphasize, and that is this, the manufacturers and the importers of binder twine, knowing that there is an inspector of binder twine will be very careful to make the ball full length. There is that point in favour of the appointment of an inspector of binder twine. The question is whether the right man has been appointed, and whether the appointee should be a gardener, a farmer or something else. I am in favour of farmers for every thing. I think a farmer could be found to be the First Minister for that matter, and more particularly Minister of Trade and Commerce. However, I do not want to make this a matter of guess, but, I want to say that the money paid to the inspector will be well earned if all the manufacturers and importers of binder twine are compelled to see to it that there are 650 feet of binder twine to every pound. I met the inspector of binder twine a few days ago, and he told me he had visited a large number of manufacturers, and watched their operations, and he found some of them were 'sailing very close to the wind' whatever that means. That was his language, and I infer that he meant that they were hardly giving the farmers justice. I said—and put emphasis on what I said—'Now, Sir, your reputation is at stake ; and if you find any man not doing his duty and not giving us fair measure, bring him to justice.' He said he would. I am not one of those who cavil and think the office of binder twine inspector is a useless one. If the inspector does his duty fairly, his salary will be well earned, and I hope the minister will see to it that the inspector does his duty.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 152) to incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Riley.

Bill (No. 231) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the

relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. McIsaac.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FERRY COMPANY

House in committee on Bill (180) to incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—Mr. Emmerson.

On section 14,

Mr. HACKETT. This is an entirely different Bill from the one that was before the committee yesterday, and I would like to ask that the matter stand over to allow us an opportunity to consider it. Several clauses have been introduced that were not before the committee.

Mr. MACKINNON. The clauses referred to were before the committee yesterday. The only distinction between the Bill now and the Bill as it was introduced at the beginning of the session, is that the bond issue is now made to apply to steamship companies, and it was agreed to by the committee yesterday. The hon. gentleman may not have observed it, but that is the case. The bond issue was to apply to the railway company for the purchase or construction of the railroad, and there were separate clauses added for any steamship companies that were bought. These are the general clauses that are in all the statutes relating to steamship company Bills.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the request of the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) is a very reasonable one. The affair occurred in this way. Considerable change had to be made in the Bill inasmuch as it was practically made a charter for the steamship company. It was arranged that the chairman, I think, and the clerk of the committee were to introduce certain clauses in order to get the Bill into proper shape. I think it is quite reasonable that the hon. member who is interested in this Bill should have an opportunity of looking over it before it receives its final reading. It will certainly do no harm, and it will satisfy the hon. gentleman that he has done his duty.

Mr. MACKINNON. I have no objection to it standing over, but I wish to correct the hon. gentleman; the Bill passed the Railway Committee yesterday. However, I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

ST. CHRYSOSTOME RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 158) respecting the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company.—Mr. Brown.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How did we get back to this Bill?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The promotor was not present when it was called, and it was called again.

Mr. ROBINSON (West Elgin).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This has been done twice to-night, and it should not be done as a matter of course. I have not the slightest objection to it being done, but it should be done in the regular way, and the permission of the House asked.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You are perfectly right.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have never heard of it being objected to, and it often has occurred. If objection is taken the order can be discharged.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not the slightest objection, but I say it should not be done as a matter of course, and without calling the attention of the House to it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We will do it in future.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Inspection of binder twine, $2,500.

Mr. BLAIN. When the committee rose at six o'clock the hon. minister was to give us a report of the inspector.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that he is not in a position to produce the information to-night. There is no formal report, though there are some letters from the inspector.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that the binder twine factories are scattered all over Canada. For instance, there is one in Brandon, Man. Does the minister think it is possible for one man to inspect all the binder twine in this country, if it is necessary to have it inspected at all? If it is necessary, would it not be better to have an inspector paid a small salary and located in each town or city where there is a manufacturing establishment, so that the inspection would be an inspection in fact as well as in appointment? The inspector should be there when the factory is in operation, which is only a short period in the whole twelve months.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the manufacture of binder twine goes on for a very considerable time throughout the whole year.

Mr. BLAIN. There are a great many months in the year when the binder twine factories are not in operation at all. I think my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Heyd) will bear me out in that statement. The factory in Brandon is not in operation more than six months out of the twelve. I repeat, if the department has decided that it is necessary to have an inspection, would it not be better to appoint a man where the factory is and have the twine properly inspected?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Trade and Commerce thought that as a beginning one officer might do a large amount of inspection. I fancy that the value of an appointment of this character is not so much for the cure of the evil as for the prevention of the evil. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) stated this afternoon that the knowledge that there was such an officer, who might come in and inspect at any moment, would have an excellent effect on any manufacturer or dealer. If we adopted the policy suggested by the hon. member for Peel, it would not only involve the appointment of an inspector for each factory, but one in each town where there is a dealer. It may be that the method of inspection is not as broad as it should be. We shall have to learn by experience how far it may be necessary to extend it.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the binder twine imported into this country to have the same number of feet to the pound as that manufactured in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the regulation applies to the imported article as well as the manufactured article.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is the great bulk of the twine imported into Canada manufactured ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman. Probably he is aware himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am. The hon. Minister of Justice knows that we have on the statute-books a law prohibiting the importation into Canada of any article made in the prisons of the United States, and I believe that from one-half to two-thirds of the binder twine imported into Canada is manufactured at the Stillwater prison, and is sold to agents at the big binder twine establishments in Minneapolis and St. Paul, and by them exported to Canada.

Mr. HEYD. Have you any evidence to that effect ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have information to that effect which I believe to be true.

Mr. HEYD. Convince us by giving us the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend has that information in a form that permits it to be used, he as a friend and protector of the manufacturers of Canada has been doing them a great injustice in keeping it to himself, because he is well aware that if he placed that information at the disposal of the Minister of Justice every pound of that binder twine would be prohibited from coming into Canada at all. I am afraid my hon. friend is not as good a protectionist as he professes to be.

Mr. TAYLOR. I came into possession of the information within the last six hours, and as soon as I received it I addressed the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice, whose duty it is to see that the law is enforced. If the hon. gentleman inquires, he will find that there is a large quantity of binder twine made in the Stillwater prison, and if he traces that product, he will find that a great proportion of it is landed in Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But my hon. friend, in justice to himself, should not be content with a mere statement in parliament. That statement is of course entitled to respect, but after all it is not a basis for action. If he has that information, I think he should place it in possession of the Minister of Customs in such a way as to enable him to follow it up.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is this army of inspectors for ? What is the army of customs officials for if not to attend to cases of this kind ? Why play the bluff game of asking my hon. friend from Leeds to inform the Minister of Customs. What is this army of heelers appointed for except to trace the binder twine that is imported and find out where it was made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry that the hon. member for Victoria characterizes the customs officials as an army of heelers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Now it is time to drop a tear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is time to drop a tear ; but the hon. gentleman cannot refer to an army of inspectors of binder twine, because there is only one, though of course sometimes one is a host in himself.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is that all ? I thought there were several. I apologize ; I thought there was an army, and that this last one was the chief of the outfit. I trust that the minister will see that this new officer attends to his duty and traces this prison-made binder twine, wherever it comes from, and sees that it does not come into Canada.

Mr. HEYD. It seems a curious thing that the binder twine makers have sent deputations down here and told the government the difficulties under which they laboured, and yet not a single representative of the binder twine makers ever made that statement to the government : and to assert that the International Harvester Company and the Plymouth Company, who sell 90 per cent of the twine sold in the United States, would be guilty of palming off on their customers either on this side or on the other side prison-made twine, is something that the hon. gentleman himself does not believe. If the statement which the hon. gentleman now makes is true, the men who make the binder twine would be aware of it and would have brought it to the attention of the government long ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is not the twine made in the prison as good as that made in the factory outside? Do they not turn out as good binder twine in the prison at Kingston as in the city of Brantford? In the United States the prison manufacture is probably the best twine turned out in that country. Where is it sold? It must compete with the other twine manufactured in the United States, and I am informed that the whole outfit of the American prison goes into the hands of gentlemen who supply the trade in Canada.

Mr. HEYD. The trade in Canada is supplied by the International and Plymouth people.

Mr. TAYLOR. They do not make it all.

Mr. HEYD. They make 90 per cent of all that is used in the United States and send 16,000,000 pounds to Canada. It is not likely that a concern of that importance would sully its reputation by palming off prison-made twine, even if it were as good as that made in the factory, which it is not. No factory in Canada would palm off prison-made twine for its own.

Mr. TAYLOR. All I ask the hon. Minister of Customs to do is to put a detective to work and investigate and he will find my statement correct.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would not like to say that all the officials in the Customs Department are heelers, but there is one thing I am sure about, and that is that the gentleman who is receiving this appointment is a political heeler. He has been active from place to place in every by-election held in recent years.

Mr. HEYD. What do you mean by heeler?

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). A man who seems to make his living by stumping in constituencies and doing such work as his party requires. This gentleman spent nearly a month in North Grey during my by-election, and now he is apparently receiving his reward. I must say that I do not think he was any particular advantage to the Liberal party, but rather a source of strength to the Conservative party, and I would like our hon. friends opposite to send out that class of heelers at every election. Why should he receive a government appointment worth $2,500?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $1,200.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The vote is for the inspection of binder twine, $2,500. If he does not receive it in salary, he will receive it in some other way. Here is a man who is nothing but a political heeler and has been so for years, then he is placed in charge of certain government work, while officials who have been in the service for years are pressing the government to pay them $600 or $700, and are unable to do so. What are this man's duties?

Mr. TAYLOR. To draw his salary?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, fully explained that this afternoon. Was my hon. friend present?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Perhaps both could not tell the same story.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a good reason why I should not tell any. I understood my hon. colleague to have explained that the object was to guarantee to the farmers that each of these parcels of binder twine contains the quantity it should contain.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). How is he to make this inspection? There is a tag on each ball giving the contents, so many feet to the pound. Do you mean to tell me that this inspector is going to measure each of these balls of twine?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not all of them.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). He will, I presume, go into a factory and measure one ball and certify that it is 650 feet long. If he does not measure it, how will he inspect it?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He will weigh it.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). These packages may weigh two or three pounds each and may be measured and stamped. It seems to me that this is another case of providing for friends of the government for whom they can find no other place.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What are the special qualifications of this official? He may be a politician and not have qualifications for the office to which he has been appointed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was fortunate enough to be present ten minutes before recess and heard my hon. colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, say that this man was very intelligent and capable of doing the work assigned him, and he thought the farmers would be pleased to have one of their own appointed to this position.

Mr. RICHARDSON. One would suppose that the gentleman appointed to an office of this kind would be an expert, should know how to discern what is sisal and what manilla, of what is the substance the binder twine is composed of. It may be a simple thing to take a ball of seven yards of twine and ascertain by weighing how much is in the ball. Anybody could qualify to do that in half an hour's experience. But to understand what the substances are that the binder twine is made of would require a man of considerable experience. The committee would like to know the qualifications of this man?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is not a manufacturer of twine.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I see the hon. Minister of Justice there. It appears to me that the manufacture of binder twine, as carried on in the Kingston penitentiary, has not been satisfactory to the people. The price of twine during recent years has been very high, and the farmers have complained very much. I notice by the Auditor General's Report that twine which the Minister of Justice said cost 6 cents per pound, was sold to the farmers at 10½ cents. That would appear an unreasonable profit. Twine imported into the country, made of pure manilla, is sold at from 10 to 15 cents a pound, but this is a mixed manilla. If it only costs 6 cents per pound, why is the farmer charged 10½ cents ? When the farmers refused to pay that price, it remained on his hands, and later in the season he could sell it at 5½ cents to some of the government jobbers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is very good of the hon. gentleman to give me an opportunity of explaining the discrepancy. It would be convenient for me, indeed, if the hon. gentleman would attend when the estimates are under consideration. If he will kindly refer to 'Hansard,' I have not the number of the page under my hand, but I will be able to find it and give it to him—he will learn all the details. I gave all the details of cost of twine and the reason why we were not able to dispose of the twine during the season required and had to keep it over. He will get the information and more if he will kindly refer to the 'Hansard' report of the debate which took place when he did not happen to be in the House.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I have the Auditor General's Report for 1902, and I find that at page M—47 it is noted that the government sold 6,783 pounds of mixed manilla, at 10½ cents per pound. And the hon. minister stated early in the session that it cost 6 cents per pound.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not accept the statement of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I will look it up in 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If the hon. gentleman will do so, he will then be in a position to give some information to the House.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Then, the department sold 10,000 pounds at 10½ cents, and 220,000 pounds at 5 1-10 cents, or less than half the money. It would seem to me that the farmer is being imposed upon. This institution was established in the Central Prison to regulate the price, so that the farmer might not be imposed upon by any combination in this country or any other. The local government established a similar institution in the Central prison, for the same purpose. And, as my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) is here, I may say that the Farmers' Binder Twine Company was established for the same purpose, yet, that hon. gentleman has stated in his place that that concern made no less than 240 per cent in three years, besides being able to make great improvements in their plant. The Kingston penitentiary was making twine for 6 cents per pound and charging the farmer 10½ cents per pound, the same prices that were being charged by American firms selling the goods here. There seems to have been some understanding among the manufacturers to charge the farmer more than is fair, for——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am afraid the committee is wandering away from the point under discussion. We are not discussing the general question of the manufacture of binder twine, but the propriety of appointing an inspector to see to the proper measurement of the twine. I hope the members of the committee will not enter upon irrelevant discussion.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The only reason I adverted to this question was that the Minister of Justice was not present when this was brought up.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson) was not present.

Mr. COCHRANE. How do you know ?

Mr. HOLMES. I was here.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Well, I was not lecturing in the Young Men's Christian Association anyway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid there is no danger of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Thomson, Grey) having any opportunity to do that.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The Minister of Justice was not in his place, and the Minister of Finance took note of that and apologized for his colleague's absence. But, if we are not allowed to discuss the question of manufacture, there is still a good deal to say as regards the appointment of this inspector, and I must say that I will support a resolution to strike out this amount. It is simply making an office for a party heeler. The service can be performed for much less money than the allowance given to Mr. Haycock. If other appointments under the government are made in the same way as this, it is no wonder that the expenditure of this country rises to such an enormous sum.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I could understand if such an appointment could be useful at all, that it might be made useful by the appointment of some man who had had experience in handling or manufacturing binder twine. But Mr. Haycock's qualifications are of an altogether different char-

acter. This is simply the creation of an office for the benefit of Mr. Haycock. He has qualifications, but they are rather of a kind that are useful in a by-election. But nothing I have ever heard or read about him would lead me to believe that he has any qualification for this office. The name might suggest a knowledge of grasses, and so, of cordage of some kinds, but there is nothing in a name in this case. This office is useless to anybody but Mr. Haycock himself, and the money paid to him could be devoted to some useful purpose.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the Act passed making it necessary for the manufacturer to put a tag upon each ball giving the number of yards per pound? Can the hon. minister read us that clause?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot point to the particular Act, it was passed some years ago.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). If that is all the law provides, what is the use of this inspector? If the law only requires that the tag shall be put upon the binder twine, why should this inspector be saddled upon the people? What are his duties?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the farmer is so desperately anxious to know that the tag is on, but what he wants to know is that the quantity corresponds with the tag.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Then, all that this inspector will do is to test one ball. And for this you employ him for the whole year at $2,500 of public money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In any case where inspection takes place, I imagine every package is not inspected. When a number of parcels are sent through the customs house the officers do not inspect every one, but they sample them. I suppose the same will be done by this inspector.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand the Act, it makes no provision for an inspector. It simply provides that every manufacturer shall put a tag upon his products stating the number of feet in each ball. In that case, every farmer can be his own inspector; and if he finds that the twine does not meet the requirements of the law he can set the law in motion to have the penalty enforced. When he buys a ball of twine that weighs what the Act calls for and has the number of feet in it required by the law, the farmer can be his own inspector, and there is no need of paying $2,500 in salary and expenses to Mr. Haycock to make the inspection, because he has no more effect on the production of binder twine than if he remained at home attending to his market gardening. The last time I met Mr. Haycock was at a provincial election where he was speaking in the interest of the Reform candidate against my friend Mr. Gallagher, who was the candidate for Frontenac in the local election. I was speaking on behalf of my friend Mr. Gallagher, and I drew attention to the fact that the last time I met Mr. Haycock was at a Dominion by-election, when he had the Auditor General's Report in one hand and a can of Australian mutton in the other, pointing out to the farmers the iniquities of the late Conservative government, and showing by the Auditor General's Report that they had bought so many jack knives, so many envelopes, so many sponges, and a lot of little things like that, reading them out of the Auditor General's Report and then holding up the can of mutton.

Mr. GOURLEY. That shows he can read.

Mr. TAYLOR Oh, yes. He served his time in the provincial legislature, and was appointed leader of the Patron party that the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Postmaster General created. They created this Patron party for the purpose of helping their elections and splitting up the Conservative party. Mr. Currie was another leader. Mr. Currie is appointed immigration agent now over in the United States, drawing another $2,500 a year. I would suggest to the minister that Mr. Currie be authorized to go over and see if the binder twine that is being imported into Canada is not made in prisons. They wanted to give him a job. There is a third one, Mr. Lockie Wilson, that they have not provided for yet. He is the third gentleman who was a leader of the great Patron party. Two of them are provided for at a large salary and they have nothing to do. My hon. friend can turn up the Auditor General's Report and find that Mr. Currie, who was a leader of the Patron party in the west, is now in the employ of the government over in the United States, riding around in Pullman cars at great expense to the country, and drawing a big salary besides. Mr. Haycock is provided for at a salary of $1,200, and $1,300 for travelling expenses and hotel bills, for the balance of the year. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Heyd) who is interested in the binder twine establishment up there, knows that every word that I am saying is correct, and that there is no more necessity for an inspector of binder twine than there is for a dozen inspectors, one for each factory.

Mr. HEYD. I am afraid our friends are not so hostile to the position of an inspector as they are to the gentleman who happens to fill it. I just wondered to myself whether if Mr. Haycock had been busying himself in the interest of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) and his friend Mr. Gallagher, we would have heard one word of objection to the creation of this office.

An hon. MEMBER. We have heard it from you.

Mr. HEYD. I do not think so. The mere fact that the office happens to be filled by Mr. Haycock is the reason why all this objection has been urged. Had it been filled by a good, active Conservative organizer we would not have heard a whimper from the other side.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It really does appear from this discussion that this is an entirely unnecessary office. Any farmer going into a store to buy twine and looking at the tag and seeing how many feet to the pound are stated to be in the ball, can demonstrate that to his own satisfaction and can prove it to the dealer at once. It will not take him more than a minute to do it. He can take a few yards and then weigh it and find out at once whether it comes up to the standard which is stated by the tag upon the ball. Anybody is qualified to do that. The only other object of the inspection of binder twine is to find out whether it contains the right proportion of manilla and sisal. If it makes no provision for that, then the office is entirely useless. If Mr. Haycock must have a position, I would suggest, after hearing the discussion the other night in regard to the killing of chickens, that probably Mr. Haycock understands this business, and the government could give him a job of going around and teaching the farmers how to kill chickens.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the minister should give the committee the Act under which this gentleman is appointed. There was a special Inspection Act for binder twine, passed either in the session of 1901 or 1902. I would have thought that if the government intended to appoint an inspector, some provision would have been made for it in the Act. I do not think the acting minister would say that there has been any demand from any section of the farmers or of the merchants selling binder twine, for an inspector to be appointed. I am quite sure the office is an unnecessary one. I think, under the law, there is a penalty for the infringement of its provisions. This looks to me like an after-thought on the part of the government. The gentleman no doubt was pressing for some appointment, and this position seems to have been created for him. I am not opposed to the inspection of binder twine, but I think if it is to be inspected some better system should be adopted. I am sure it is impossible for one gentleman to inspect all the binder twine that is produced and imported into this country. The minister must be aware that a large quantity of binder twine is imported into western Canada and the province of Manitoba. There is some manufactured in Manitoba, but a very large quantity is imported.

Mr. HOLMES. The argument of some hon. gentlemen opposite is to the effect that because there is a certain law passed that does not require an inspector to be appointed, therefore no inspector is required. We have on the statute-book at the present time a law requiring that weights and measures should be of a certain standard size. According to their argument now no inspector is required to see that that law is enforced. I suggest that they turn their guns for the time being on the gentleman who happens to occupy the position of inspector of weights and measures for western Ontario, who happens to be a good Conservative, retained in his office by the present administration. Now, if their argument is of any force that because there is a law on the statute-book requiring weights and measures to be of a certain standard size, they do not require to be inspected, and therefore they would do away with the services of that inspector, as they are proposing to do away with the services of Mr. Haycock ; by the same process of reasoning, all the license inspectors should be dismissed—I know in their opinion they should be anyhow. But it is illegal to sell liquor after certain hours, it is illegal to-day to do certain things in connection with the hotel business.

It is necessary that an inspector shall be appointed to see that the Act is enforced and I think the same thing holds good in reference to the appointment of an inspector of binder twine. I do not think it comes with very good grace particularly from our hon. friends opposite to make use of the arguments which they do against the appointment of Mr. Haycock. What is Mr. Haycock's offence in their eyes ?—simply that he has taken an active part in political campaigning. He has gone out and done stumping—to use a common phrase—in different parts of the country. If that is a serious offence, then, our Conservative friends themselves have a great many heelers among their numbers, because I know there were some of them in the riding of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson). I think their argument is a very weak one and that it comes with bad grace from a party who, while in power, were continually appointing persons who had been political heelers to various offices within the gift of the government. I think the fact that a man has a certain amount of ability qualifying him to take part in a political campaign should not stand in the way of his getting political preferment. Besides that, Mr. Haycock, whatever his offences may have been, is a practical farmer. He may have been the representative of the Patron party, as he was no doubt, but he is a practical farmer, he knows a great deal about the binder twine question, and I think the people generally would approve of his appointment and endorse the government for having placed him in that position.

Mr. BARKER. Was Mr. Haycock appointed chief inspector or an inspector as mentioned here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy minister will be here in a moment and I will be able to give the hon. gentleman an answer. As far as I know there is only one inspector, but whether he is designated chief or otherwise at the moment I cannot answer.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). Generally when the term 'chief inspector' is used there are deputies under him, but in this case it would appear that there is only the inspector himself.

Mr. BARKER. I have no doubt that is so. As the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Ross, Victoria) says he is an inspector and I would therefore ask the hon. Minister of Finance for what division he has been appointed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose we must ask that of the deputy ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a pretty full discussion of this item before recess and I thought the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had satisfied the laudable desire of every hon. gentleman opposite for information, and that all I would have to do would be to call the item and it would be carried at once. I am amazed that it should not pass.

Mr. BARKER. I am amazed that the hon. gentleman does not know more about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not pretend to know very much about it.

Mr. BARKER. In looking at the statute I find that the government, when appointing an inspector, are required to designate the district for which he acts. When a chief inspector is appointed he is appointed for the whole province, it is true, but when a division superintendent, who is called ordinarily an inspector, is appointed, he is appointed, apparently under the statute as follows :

> The Governor in Council may from time to time, designate the several cities, counties, towns and other places or inspection divisions in Canada, at and for which respectively it is expedient to appoint inspectors.

I presume that the hon. Minister of Financ, looking over this matter, has considered whether Mr. Haycock should be an inspector of a particular division or not and if he is appointed simply as an ordinary inspector for a division, a particular county or a number of counties, or for a particular city, or district, the fact should be designated by the Order in Council. I think we are entitled to the information, because, as far as I see there is about as much foundation for the appointment of this particular inspector as an inspector of binder twine as if he were appointed as an inspector of haycocks.

Mr. CLARKE. It is surely reasonable to ask what division he is going to act in ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The whole includes different parts.

Mr. BARKER. No, the statute clearly says that there shall be an inspector for a particular district and a chief inspector over the inspectors. I would like to know whether Mr. Haycock is an inspector of inspectors or an inspector of binder twine.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The statute may enable us to appoint a great many inspectors, and an inspector of inspectors, but as an economical and business-like government we do not deem it necessary to make any more appointments than the public interest demands. If it is found that Mr. Haycock can cover all the ground then it will not be necessary to put the country to the expense of a second appointment.

Mr. BARKER. Is he the only one ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is the only one up to date. He has only been appointed within two months.

Mr. BARKER. You do not know but that you will want more.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is coming on towards harvest time. Mr. Haycock is a man highly respected by the class who use binder twine. For many years he enjoyed the confidence of the farming community as representing their views upon public matters. I have no doubt he still enjoys that confidence and he is particularly qualified in so far as a knowledge of the farming community goes to guard their interests in a matter of this kind. However, as hon. gentlemen opposite are complaining we have not appointed enough we will bear that in mind, and if, after the harvest season has gone by, experience shows that the appointment has been productive of good and if we are satisfied that the public interest calls for an additional appointment we will have to do our duty, but do not blame us because we have not rushed in and appointed a whole army of officers at once. I believe an hon. gentleman earlier in the discussion called one an army. We have not gone that far yet.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Minister of Finance explained that he is a whole host in himself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No doubt he is a very capable man.

Mr. BARKER. The explanation of the hon. Postmaster General shows that he has not read the Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I have.

Mr. BARKER. The Act empowers the Governor General in Council to appoint inspectors for certain divisions and presumably the Governor General in Council will authorize the appointment of inspectors where they may be necessary. To-day there may be an inspector required in Brantford. Possibly such an inspector was very much required when the manufactory there was making 240 per cent profit on its business. It would have been a very proper thing for the Governor General in Council to appoint an inspector for that district and for different places where it might have been found necessary to appoint inspectors. But, the government when they had appointed half a dozen or more Haycocks, or inspectors throughout the country might have found it necessary to appoint a general inspector to overlook the whole of these, and that is provided for, but the hon. gentlemen have begun with a general inspector and if he should be the only one that begins the work then he should be placed where his inspection is required to be done. If the hon. Postmaster General had read the Act he would have seen that the whole spirit of the Act was that the government should begin at the districts where the inspection is required and after they had provided for a number of districts they ought to have appointed a general inspector. The very term implies that he is an inspector of inspectors. They have begun with a general inspector who has one general district of inspection.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister tell us what are the duties of this inspector and whether his instructions are in writing ? It is not unfair to ask that we should have a copy of that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that when he was appointed he received instructions, but I did not imagine the question would be asked. I shall be glad at a later stage to produce this valuable information.

Mr. CLARKE. It is very important, because I understood from the Postmaster General that this is only the first of a series of similar appointments.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no such inference to be drawn from my remarks. We propose to appoint one inspector, and if it is found that one is not sufficient for the work, we intend to appoint more, but gentlemen opposite are endeavouring to drive us into making a large number of appointments. We are a government of economy ; that is one of our strong cards ; we enjoy the confidence of the country because of that, and we intend to stand by that principle. The only thing that will drive us from it will be a due regard to the public interest, and if the public interest demands two inspectors, we will appoint them. The hon. gentleman from Hamilton desires us to put on frills before we have the fabric and to appoint an inspector of inspectors. What we are doing now is the appointing of an inspector of binder twine.

Mr. BARKER. The Act says you must designate a district.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Act says :

> The Governor in Council may from time to time designate the several cities, counties, towns and other——

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear, that is the whole contention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has a habit of interrupting when something is being said or read. If he will have the kindness not to interrupt me until I read two lines he can interrupt at the end of the third line :

> The Governor in Council may from time to time designate the several cities, counties, towns and other places or inspection divisions in Canada.

The statute does not say we 'must' do it. This Act was passed by our opponents, and does the hon. gentleman say that it was intended to force the government to divide the country into districts and appoint inspectors That has not been done in a single case.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then it is all wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman from Hamilton say that all Canada is to be divided into inspection districts for every article mentioned in the statute ?

Mr. BARKER. The only authority to appoint an inspector is under this Act, and the Act says that until you designate districts you cannot appoint inspectors. Let me ask the minister whether a board of examiners has certified that this gentleman is a fit and proper person to conduct this inspection. The Act requires that he should obtain a certificate from a board of examiners of certain boards of trade. Has that been obtained ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let us stick to one point at a time. This Act has been in force since 1896, and I am informed by the deputy minister that in no instance has such an interpretation been placed upon the Act as the hon. gentleman now puts on it. There is only one case in which there is a district set apart for inspection and that is in the case of grain. This Act deals with the inspection of flour, meal, wheat, beef, pork, leather, fish oil, hides, &c., and by the Act of 1901, binder twine is added to the list. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) say that all the appointments since this Act became law are illegal ?

Mr. BARKER. I did not say that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then he argues that they are illegal when made by the Liberals but not illegal when made by the Conservatives.

Mr. BARKER. The Act requires that your inspector should get a certificate from a certain board of examiners.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL Have you abandoned your other argument ?

Mr. BARKER. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Either that or you are defeated.

Mr. BARKER. Not at all. Under this statute the first step of the government is to name a district in which the inspector is required, and the next step is to obtain a certificate from a proper authority that the person to be appointed is competent to fulfil his duties. Even this very government required a board of trade of which I was president to send certificates that certain persons were competent when they were to be appointed as inspectors.

Mr. GOURLEY. This matter is one of great seriousness. I listened to the scientific part of the debate with great pleasure, but now there is a nice legal question lying at the bottom of the appointments that are to be made. I undertake to say that it is a local jurisdiction that has been created by this statute, and it is elementary law that a local jurisdiction must be definite and distinct before an officer can exercise any authority under that jurisdiction. My hon. friend is a lawyer. Let him take the case of a justice of the peace who is appointed for a city or county. He cannot act for one moment until the territory for which he is appointed is defined. If he did, every act he performed would be without authority, and he would be liable for an action. The point my learned friend has made is quite clear. The Act says that 'such inspector shall hold office during pleasure, and shall act within such local limits as the Governor in Council assigns to him.' How does my hon. friend, who, I understand, is a lawyer, in name at any rate, get over such plain and distinct language ? My learned friend takes a very illogical position in arguing that as the government were only going to appoint one inspector, there was no necessity of assigning local limits. If you only wanted to appoint one inspector for the province of Ontario, the proper course would have been to pass your Order in Council declaring the province of Ontario to be one district. If you want to appoint a man for a county or a city, you must first plot out your county or city, and declare that that is the territory and these are the local limits in which you desise the inspector to act; and then he would have jurisdiction to act within those limits. This inspector can be kicked out of every store in Ontario ; and you do not want the government to send unauthorized men to act as inspectors and to run the risk of being put out. If such a man were put out, the Minister of Labour would be put out at the same time, because his agent is the minister himself in law; and how sorry I would feel if any indignity were put upon the Minister of Labour. A gentleman of his commanding stature ought not disrespectfully to be put out of any place in this country. But if he persists in acting in the face of the law so plainly pointed out by my hon. friend from Hamilton, who is no doubt a very careful lawyer, he has only himself to blame. But the next difficulty my hon. friend pointed out was that you have two classes of men to appoint. You have the familiar illustration of the stipendiary magistrate and the justice of the peace. You must define in your commission whether you want to appoint a stipendiary magistrate or a justice of the peace. They are officers with different jurisdictions, and you must first define your territory and then appoint your officer. So in this case you must state the jurisdiction you expect your officer to exercise, whether that of local inspector or inspector in chief. These are such elementary principles in law that I thought the hon. gentleman would have caught on at once, and would have said : 'My duties as Minister of Labour have so occupied my attention that I have completely overlooked this particular matter.' I should have thought he would have thanked the astute counsel from Hamilton for having suggested so plain a matter to him. The next point raised by the hon. member for Hamilton was that you cannot appoint a sub-officer unless you have a chief. However, I will not debate that. There may be such a thing as appointing an inferior officer without appointing a superior. It would seem an extraordinary thing to appoint a chief without a sub, and equally extraordinary to appoint a sub without a chief. Ex necessitate the hon. gentleman appears to be wrong. But even if he got past all these difficulties, there is the certificate. I can understand that this law was very wisely framed. It anticipated the hon. gentlemen opposite coming into office at some time, and therefore it should be provided that this man should be examined as to his competency before he should be appointed. On these three points, I have no doubt that the hon. minister as a lawyer will say at once, 'peccavi.'

Mr. BARKER. I do not think you can pass this item, because it is contrary to law.

Mr. FRASER. We will take chances.

Mr. GOURLEY. We will not allow you. We do not want you to get into a law suit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a serious matter if it was our duty to appoint an army of inspectors, and we have neglected to do so; but for the present our

sense of economy would not permit us to appoint more than one. There is a great deal to be said for the hon. gentleman's argument that we are obliged to appoint a large number of inspectors; but do not ask us to commit ourselves to such a policy too early.

Mr. GOURLEY. That is not the point of my argument. You could not appoint anybody under the present state of the law.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That shows how the opposition are not consistent with one another. The hon. member for Hamilton says we cannot only appoint an inspector, but an inspector of inspectors, and keep on appointing them.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? I said you can appoint an inspector and a chief inspector, provided you follow the provisions of the Act, and I say that you have not followed the provisions of the Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Colchester says we cannot appoint anybody.

Mr. GOURLEY. Not until you plot the territory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, suppose we do plot the territory and appoint a large army ?

Mr. GOURLEY. But you cannot appoint anybody until you plot the territory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take that into consideration. We may make further appointments, but we do not think it is necessary at present. I do not like to throw down a valuable suggestion like that.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman seriously tell us that there has been any certificate from the body required to give a certificate under this statute? Does he tell us that this gentleman who is to be appointed is a proper person to be appointed under the statute ? Under the statute the government have no right to make such an appointment at all, and we object to it on that ground.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely there must be some satisfactory answer given to the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton, if he has stated the law correctly. We assume a certain amount of responsibility for this appointment, and we want to know the fact.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think we may regard the matter in a broader view than has been suggested here. I have not seen the appointment, nor do I know what principles have been observed in regard to it. The requirements of the statute may have been complied with or they may not, but the appointment itself could be made if there were no statute, the only question would be what powers the inspector would have. He cannot discharge any duty unless authorized to do so. But if in a general and informal way the government appoints this man to discharge certain duties and the twine manufacturer permits him to exercise those duties, and if that meets the requirements of the case, why put the country to the expense of the appointment of a large number.

Mr. GOURLEY. That would not follow.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes it would. You could not have a large number of inspectors without putting the country to a great expense. Suppose there were no statute at all and the government appointed a man to do certain work and parliament voted the money to pay him, and the manufacturers permitted him to inspect, the same end is obtained as by going to the expensive process urged upon us. If the law is that no inspector can be appointed for more than a limited territory and this whole Dominion is to be divided up into inspectorates, involving very large expenditure, it seems to me that the Act ought to be amended and made more in harmony with economy.

Mr. BARKER. The way to amend an Act of parliament is not by a resolution in the estimates. The Act of parliament requires a certain procedure before such an inspector as the one now proposed, may be appointed. The hon. gentleman says that the government may appoint certain officers; but when an Act of parliament intervenes, declaring how an officer is to be appointed, it does not rest with the government to appoint him in some other way. I do not think any hon. gentleman on the government benches would controvert that position. This is not a question of giving Mr. Haycock or any other gentleman a government allowance. This is a question of inspecting a certain matter of trade in this country. There are a number of articles that have to be inspected. There is the article of hides. It is very important that the inspector of hides should be competent, and it is impossible to get a man appointed inspector unless he undergoes a certain examination and obtains a certificate from a particular body that he is competent. Hon. gentlemen know that upon the certificates of such officers trade goes on throughout the Dominion. The certificate of an inspector such as the one to be appointed, is accepted in all the markets of the country. The inspector of hides at Hamilton gives certificates, which are accepted at Montreal, Quebec and Boston, as those of a person qualified for the work. People all over the United States and Canada deal to the extent of thousands of dollars upon that certificate. If the government can appoint Mr. Haycock without a certificate of competency, they might also appoint in the same way an inspector of hides and wheat and other articles, and thus disturb the trade of the whole country. The

statute provides that the inspector must have a certificate and we object to any resolution authorizing payment to any person who is not appointed according to the statute.

Mr. GOURLEY. There will be great difficulty in connection with this man. He will have important duties to perform, and if properly appointed his authority would be effective and valid, but if not, he will be simply a trespasser and be liable to be sued for trespass, and every body who sent him would be responsible. If not properly appointed, he could not act as an officer of Canada, he would be a pseudo officer, and have no authority at all. If it be the case that the stamp of our inspector of hides is received in Boston or in Montreal as official, is it not most important that the appointments of other inspectors should be perfectly regular ? What a scandal would it not be to allow a man to give an official character and market value to a hide and then have his appointment declared null and void. If the department has not observed the statute strictly, it is time it should do so. When an officer is properly appointed his district is prescribed and just as in the case of a judge. Imagine a judge being appointed and the territory of his jurisdiction not defined. The limits of this man's jurisdiction must be as strictly defined as those in which a judge exercises jurisdiction. If this man's territory be not defined, he can exercise no jurisdiction, and if his territory be defined he can only act within that territory, and any act outside it would be void and the department be responsible. We want to know whether this man's commission defines the territory in which he must act. The second point which my hon. friend from Hamilton made is that a deputy inspector shall be appointed only from among duly qualified persons. There may be, therefore, but very few people who may be appointed. The appointment is subject to extraordinary limitations. It is limited to very few political heelers, if men of that class are not wholly excluded. I think a man who could get an appointment under this statute would not be likely to be much of a political heeler. Perhaps he might be a divinity student, or a Ph. D., or an LL. D. This Act confines the appointment to 'qualified' persons. What that qualification is, I am at a loss to understand. And perhaps this should be submitted to the Supreme Court to get a judicial interpretation of the statute. The minister must understand it. I can only regard it with the eye of the student of language, and so regarding it I say that mountains of difficulty, difficulties alpine in their character surround the minister or the legal adviser of the department in connection with this question. Talk about standing on thin ice. Why, there is no ice here at all. A man would be in the water up to his neck when he attempts to make an appointment under this statute. It provides that 'they and their deputy inspectors shall be appointed only from among duly qualified persons.' I cannot understand what qualifications they must have. I would like to ask what qualifications the minister found in this man ? Were they scientific ? Were they religious ? Or literary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some say they were political.

Mr. GOURLEY. That would not do under the Act. I can see that my hon. friend, being much interested in politics, might think that this statute referred to political qualifications. But if he considers it as a student of literature, I think he will see that that is an error. I am sure, from the speeches the hon. gentleman has made in this House that his mind is illuminated with the classics, English, Greek and Latin. If a man's mind is so illuminated, he acquires the quality of realizing the importance of words. Why, a word appears as big as the side of a house to him. He notices differences that to others would be imperceptible. He is struck at once with an accusative, or a dative, or an ablative absolute. The student of words taking up this statute would be struck at once with this peculiar phrase, 'and they and their deputy inspector shall be appointed only from among duly qualified persons.' If I were in office and it were my duty to make an appointment under this statute, I would naturally touch one of these numerous bells that seem to ring all over the department and bring numerous officials to the minister's side. I would call one of these men, perhaps a literary man or a doctor of laws, and I would say to him, 'tell me what 'qualified' means in this statute. If he were a student of statutes and accustomed to construing them, he would at once see that these words do not relate necessarily to scientific qualifications, in short they are not words of nomenclature, therefore, they must be defined in the Act. Then I would look through the Act for a definition of 'duly qualified persons.' But looking through the Act I do not see any such interpretation. I am driven then to the conclusion that the words must receive the ordinary interpretation of these words in the English language. What, then, does duly qualified mean ? It may refer to a person who has been immersed—in that case he would be duly qualified to enter the Baptist Church, or if it meant duly qualified to enter the Church of England, it would require that he should be able to pass an examination in the thirty-nine articles. Of course, if he belonged to the church of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), he would have to be able to recite the shorter catechism word for word and letter for letter.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, and he would know that he must give an account of time; therefore, he would not kill time.

Mr. GOURLEY. And he must also be familiar with that stately confession of faith called the Westminster confession. But since that hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) has entered parliament, they are doing away with the confession of faith. I suppose that as the hon. gentleman has been so long supporting the government they find it necessary to modify it in order to retain him; for one could hardly support this government for such a length of time and be ready to accept the old confession. But I am making a strictly legal and technical argument, and the hon. gentleman ought to understand that I am approaching the question scientifically and as a lawyer. Can the hon. learned gentleman help me to find out what is a duly qualified person under this Act ? For, he will observe, if any other person is appointed, that appointment is illegal, and I am satisfied that the government would not wish to appoint a person illegally. I never saw a case beset with so many difficulties, and yet the minister seems never to have had one of them called to his attention. I venture to say that every one of the appointments made under the Act is irregular and void under this statute; and if the writs were sent to the Minister of Justice, that hon. gentleman would advise : You have not a shadow of a defence ; read the statute; and reconstruct your department. I would like the Minister of Justice to tell me what these words mean. He may say that this Act was passed under a Tory administration. If that is his answer, I can only say that the Tory administration had a poor draftsman. And, as to that, I think the draftsmen employed by this parliament are not good. You find singular provisions of the law clothed in different language. We ought to have an English draftsman, no matter what we pay him, so that when we wish to make a certain provision, it shall be clothed in the same language, every comma in its place. Then, when a section is judicially construed, it helps in the construction of every other. But in our country different language is used to express the same idea, or, if the words are not varied, they are used in varied connections. I am amazed at the difficulties one finds in turning over these papers. The Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) could never have read this Act, could never have considered these difficulties. I can understand why all these provisions were necessary.

You were appointing an officer with extraordinary power. For instance, you could put up the Minister of Labour. As for the Minister of Finance, I think he did it more as an ad captandum reply to our friends on this side, because he is a shrewd Nova Scotian, and he catches on quickly to a way of avoiding difficulties. But the Minister of Labour has seen fit not to reply, even by way of warding off attack. I have no doubt he intended to appoint more than one chief inspector, and perhaps one deputy. But I would not urge the second point. If he appoints one chief inspector in the province of Ontario, he must name the province. He can name the whole territory of Ontario if he likes. He can say that for the purpose of chapter 99 the whole province of Ontario shall be one inspectorial district. Then he could proceed to find out what a properly qualified person was, and having found that out, he could, from among these people, select one of them. You cannot say that 'qualified person' has no meaning, you have got to find a meaning for this phrase, and every word of that section must be read in connection with every other word. The human mind is supposed to be capable of interpreting fully even a statute of the legislature. Some statutes, I admit, are very difficult to construe, because they are often not drawn with much care. But the judge who interprets these will say, I do not know whether these men in the House of Commons knew what they were doing or not, but for myself I am bound to give this language the most reasonable interpretation I can. I am bound to assume that they did know what they were doing. A judge is bound to find a meaning for these words 'qualified person,' otherwise he will hold this officer to be improperly appointed. It is no excuse for my hon. friend to say that he appointed Mr. Haycock. He might as well have appointed a cock of hay, and attempt to justify it under this section. I think my hon. friend was illogical in another respect. He said that Mr. Haycock covered the whole field. Why, in Nova Scotia we have dozens of haycocks and they do not cover a field. So my hon. friend has not a nice sense of language. I think a minister of the Crown should select every word he uses with the nicest care, with the same care that the Roman senators used when speaking. Once a barbarian came from a distant province that had been conquered by Rome, and hearing one of the senators pronounce a speech, he returned to his barbarian home and told the people to submit at once to the power of Rome, because, he said, the senators were gods and spoke as gods. Now how could any uncouth, unlettered person come into this House of Commons, and, looking down upon the grave and reverend seigneur, the Minister of Labour, and hearing him, in his most inartistic manner, discuss this statute, how could he return and make to the people of his distant province such a remark as that which was made concerning the Roman senators ? Surely the people of Canada should require of their ministers language as precise as that of the Roman senator. I am bound to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that Rome never ruled over as much territory

as the parliament of Canada rules over to-day. At the proudest moment of Rome's power she never ruled over 3,000,000 square miles; whereas the hon. gentleman, by the extraordinary conduct of fate, is permitted to rule over 3,750,000 square miles of territory. Now I desire in the interest of Canada that the Minister of Labour, for whom I have the kindliest feelings, and whose fine ability I am bound to say—that is, I assume that he has a fine ability, because I assume that any gentleman who becomes a minister of the Crown has fine ability, although he may successfully conceal it from the public for a long time. But to-night I am going to assume on behalf of the cabinet of Canada—for I am bound to respect that body—I am going to assume, no matter how violent the assumption—we are commanded by law often to make violent assumptions—I am bound to assume that the Minister of Labour possesses that luminous mind that would enable him at once, when his attention is called to this statute, to give us all the benefit of a clear and distinct explanation. If he has it not at hand, he will send and get us the original records of his department in which these appointments were all pointed out, and show us, before he asks us to pass that estimate, that every condition precedent to a legal appointment has been made.

To cover law costs and other expenses connected with deferred payments of bounties on iron and steel, $3,879.39.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This item arises out of the fact that there was a difference of opinion between the department and the Auditor General with respect to the claim of the steel companies for the payment of bounties. The question at issue was whether pig-iron, in the molten state, should be considered to be pig-iron, whether it must first be allowed to pass into the form of solid pig, or whether it was technically pig-iron as it came out in a molten condition. The department took the view, under the best information it could obtain, that the parties producing this iron had a right to claim the bounty upon it in the condition in which the claim was presented. There had been changes in the method of producing pig-iron. Formerly pig-iron was cast into solid pigs and passed in that stage into the next process for the manufacture of steel, but with the advancing methods of manufacture, that process was abandoned. The Auditor General took the ground that inasmuch as this pig-iron, in passing into the next stage of steel, was not cast into solid pigs, therefore it was not pig-iron. The matter was discussed for some considerable time, legal opinions were taken upon it and finally it was decided to have the case determined by the Exchequer Court. The decision was in favour of the company and against the view taken by the Auditor General. Thereupon the bounties that were claimed were paid but in the course of this transaction legal expenses were incurred in trying the case and it is to pay these legal expenses that this vote is asked.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I remember when the bounty on iron came up discussing this particular phase of the question. There was a bounty on pig-iron and a bounty on steel. I asked the government at that time if the company did not convert it into pig-iron and then into steel they would get the bounty for pig-iron and also for steel. The answer, if I remember correctly, at that time was that they would get the bounty for pig-iron and also for steel. I also drew the attention of the government to the fact that in the modern method of manufacturing steel it did not go into the form of pig-iron at all, but that it was converted at once into steel, and I asked the question at the time whether they got the bounty for pig-iron as well as for steel. I do not recall the exact terms of the answer given, but it seems to me that it was that they would get bounties on both iron and steel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is possibly correct.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why did the government not appeal? I do not wish to reflect in any way upon the judgment of Mr. Justice Burbidge, but in a matter involving so much money I would have thought that the government would have appealed, because I know there has been a great deal of speculation at the bar in regard to whether the judgment was scientifically or legally sound. I am bound to assume, in deference to the judge who pronounced the judgment, that it was, but I was surprised that the government did not think it wise to appeal, so that the question would be settled by a full bench. As a matter of fact, the judgment of a single judge does not settle anything. Any lawyer has a right to differ from him, but we are bound to bow to the judgment of the full court.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Apart from the question of law, there was a question of equity in it. Suppose that it should be assumed for the moment that the judgment of the court was wrong, the company might have proceeded to convert this pig-iron into solid form for 24 hours, and then to have passed it on to the next stage. It would simply have imposed a little more labour and a little more expense upon them, and I do not know that we have any object in forcing them to go to unnecessary trouble of that kind.

Mr. GOURLEY. Would it not have lessened the bounty that the government had to pay?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. It would not have lessened the bounty, but it might have made it a little more expen-

sive for the company in the method of production, by obliging the company to go through the process in the old way rather than in the new. It would have made no difference in the amount of the bounty.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. minister remember what we are paying in iron bounties now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About $1,300,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. I understood that it made a considerable difference in the bounty. If it did not, I do not see why the company were so anxious to contest that suit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They found the modern method cheaper, and of course we might have forced them to adopt the old cooling process that had hitherto been followed, but it would have made it cost a little more in the production.

Mr. GOURLEY. If that is the only point, I agree with the view of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In the manufacture of steel by the modern method it is just as cheap to manufacture steel as pig-iron. You can bring out pig-iron in the same process as you can bring out steel, and the cost of manufacturing one is very little more, if any more, than the cost of manufacturing the other.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why these law costs when we have a Solicitor General's department to look after these matters? Why should we have paid these outside lawyers when we have the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Solicitor General? When hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House they took that ground.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We in the Department of Justice advised the Auditor General to the best of our ability. He refused to accept the opinion we gave and took outside advice. After he took the advice, we thought it better to allow the case to go to the court, as the advice he obtained differed from the advice we had given. The matter having been referred to the court, the result was that the opinion of the Department of Justice was sustained in its entirety.

Mr. GOURLEY. What were the costs?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $3,879.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There were experts brought from all over the United States to testify.

Mr. GOURLEY. That includes witness fees?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, some of these experts were paid as high as $150 a day.

Mr. GOURLEY. Does that include solicitors' and experts' fees.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, the whole business.

Inspection of Staples—Expenditure in connection with inspection of grain and flour under the General Inspection and Manitoba Grain Acts—Governor General's warrant, $16,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How was it that you required a Governor General's warrant?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was a case where the appropriation was found to be insufficient, and it was necessary to have an additional sum. As we had no provision to meet this expenditure, we had to obtain a Governor General's warrant. This service is self-sustaining. We have to vote the cost in the ordinary way, but the fees fully pay the expense.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount required for inspection?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $50,000 with the present vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What were the fees?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About $75,000.

Mr. GOURLEY. Will the hon. minister excuse me for asking one more question about the bounty on steel? What was the Auditor General's objection if there was practically no difference in the amount of the bounty?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose the Auditor General felt that it was his duty to give the treasury the benefit of all doubts, and having a doubt in his mind he took legal advice.

Mr. GOURLEY. If there was no difference in the payments that were to be made whether it was molten or solid, what doubt or difficulty could exist in the Auditor General's mind?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the court had sustained the contention of the Auditor General, the company could not have collected the bounty on iron at all.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He said that being in liquid form, notwithstanding that the ingredients were absolutely the same, it was not pig-iron. In order to be pig-iron, he held that it was necessary that it should go through the cooling process.

Mr. GOURLEY. With such astute officers, I think the revenue is safe.

Culling timber, $17,500.

Mr. INGRAM. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the usual vote, with some very slight change.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the revenue from this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About half of the cost is refunded by the revenue.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This expenditure, I think, is one that the timber trade ought to bear itself. This is for the purpose of paying cullers of timber down in Quebec and probably other places. The fees received for the culling used to pay the expenses and leave a surplus, but now there is a deficit.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We used to have twenty-eight cullers on the list, and twenty-two of these have been superannuated, which accounts for the increase in the superannuation allowance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no necessity at all for six cullers in Quebec; no timber goes there.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Very little.

Mr. INGRAM. Who are these gentlemen?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. All good old Tories. They have been in the service for a very long time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Notwithstanding that the trade is decreasing, the cost of the clerical staff has increased from $5,950 to $6,100.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are they Tories?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Every one of them. I do not think we need trouble very much about the salaries there, because the larger part of the amount is for the salary of the supervisor, Mr. Paton, who has been there a very great number of years, and for whose salary we may be providing for the last time. He is a very old man, and I am sorry to say that he is not likely to have another salary voted to him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose you find it almost impossible to dismiss civil servants or reduce their number in Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are very partial to the old men we have there.

Mr. EARLE. In connection with the items for the Trade and Commerce Department, I would like to call the attention of the acting minister to a question which was brought to the attention of the department last year. It has reference to the list of articles which are mentioned as entitled to preferential entry into the markets of France. Salmon is not mentioned on that list, but there was a shipment from our province accepted last year, while there was another shipment which they refused to accept. I would like to know if the deputy minister can inform the minister as to the condition in which that matter stands at present.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy minister informs me that the French government have not consented to take our view of the matter. They still adhere to their interpretation of the tariff as respects that item.

Mr. EARLE. There must be some misunderstanding about it, because one shipment that had been refused entry was afterwards accepted under the preferential tariff. The shipper himself informed me of that, and through me there was some correspondence on his behalf with the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was it by direct shipment?

Mr. EARLE. It was by a shipment which was accepted as direct. As you are aware, we cannot ship direct in a ship sailing to France from our province, because there are none, and the shipment would have to go by rail to some of the eastern ports. There have been several shipments made, some of which have been entered under the preferential tariff. My object in bringing the matter to the attention of the department is to point out that while fish is mentioned on the list, canned salmon is not mentioned, and the French authorities claim it is not entitled to preferential entry. I wish to know if the department has taken any steps to have salmon placed on the list; lobsters and other fish are on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection of the treaty is that it reads: 'Fish in its natural form,' or something like that. I do not think it specifically mentions the kind of fish, but I would not be sure about that. The main difficulty we have is the question of direct or indirect importation. If goods are sent by way of an English port and thence to France they do not treat that as a direct importation. If goods are sent by New York, strange to say, in the case of one line which seems to be recognized to some extent by the French government, the French Atlantic line, the French government have been willing to recognize goods carried by that line as a direct shipment. I am informed that the department has presented the matter to the French authorities, but so far without success.

Mr. EARLE. The shipment I refer to was made in the same way as lobsters and other fish are sent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was it made from a Canadian port?

Mr. EARLE. It was made from New York, by a French vessel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They do admit lobsters sent by the French line under the treaty.

Mr. EARLE. If you look at the schedule you will see that it specifies the fish by name.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps it does.

Mr. EARLE. At the time the schedule was arranged there was no shipment of salmon in view, and it is likely an oversight on that account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to it, and, of course, we are all anxious that the salmon of British Columbia should receive the benefit of the minimum tariff if we can get it.

Mr. EARLE. Very well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the supplementary estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals for the past year. In part I have been able to bring down the information which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) asked for, and the rest I will bring down at a later stage. I would be very glad that as far as possible hon. gentlemen opposite would facilitate the passage of these estimates, reserving to themselves the right to discuss similar items in the main estimates, which are yet to come, for the reason that the year has passed and gone and the accounts have to be closed up. It is of the utmost importance that these accounts should be promptly closed or otherwise the Auditor General cannot do his work, and the consequence would mean delay at the beginning of next year, I trust that hon. gentlemen opposite may be able to let the present estimates pass with as little discussion as possible, but, of course, I would not expect them to waive their right of inquiry or criticism.

Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, Prince Edward Island Railway, $450,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister was to bring down some information with respect to the Prince Edward Island Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman asked me to divide the item of $300,000 and show how much of it was for each branch of the service. It is as follows : For the bridge, $155,156.43 ; for the branch, $87,567.98 ; for rails, $45,000 ; for ties, $7,300 ; for rolling stock, $1,375.60 ; for land, $5,600. These items aggregate in round numbers $300,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount expended during the year under each head ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the year 1902-3 the expenditure was : On the bridge, $464,257.62 ; on the branch, $329,226.86 ; on the rolling stock, $9,515.52.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister promised to bring down information as to what the rolling stock was.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the contract dated July 2, 1900, the contractor is to have the free use of two locomotives and twenty-five cars for ballasting, track laying, surfacing and trimming. He has had these since last summer. They are not new locomotives or new cars, but the smaller ones which have been in use for some years. He applied for additional locomotives and cars in May, 1903. Two locomotives and fifteen cars have been hired to him at $5 a day for each locomotive and 30 cents a day for each car. He has therefore a total of four locomotives and forty cars.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. These supplementary locomotives and cars are not those to which he is entitled under the contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. He is hiring those at a price.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What possible object has the government in furnishing capital to this contractor, for which it receives an interest which is totally inadequate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course, under the contract he was to be allowed the use of these. The consequence was that his tender was lower than it would have been if he had to furnish them for himself.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister does not understand me. I am not referring to those to which he was entitled under the contract, but to those which were furnished to him subsequently at so much a day. Why do you furnish him with something that he is not entitled to under the contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The road is approaching completion, and we shall require this rolling stock for the road. We could not afford to wait for it until the last moment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It will be entirely useless when the road is finished. Is it sufficient justification to say that the rolling stock may be valuable after the road is completed, for purchasing rolling stock long before it is required for the road, and leasing it or giving it to the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The road can be finished probably this autumn down to Murray river, and we would not have the rolling stock on hand for any great length of time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No matter whether the road is finished or not, the minister must see that a wrong principle underlies this action.

Prince Edward Island Railway—to provide and lay steel rails, $13,400.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this the total amount that has been expended for steel rails during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are these rails used for—for the purposes of the contractor solely ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are not for the Murray Harbour road. They are for the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. INGRAM. What weight of rails are these ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Fifty-pound steel rails. It is a narrow gauge road.

North channel—forming channel and dam, $80,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The last time the estimate was up, there was some negotiation with the United States regarding the erection of this dam. What is the total amount expended ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter is making very satisfactory progress with the United States but is not yet settled.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are you making the dam without their consent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not for the dam, and the dam should not be included.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amount has been expended and what was the original estimate for that channel ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimated total of that work when completed is $1,354,410.42, including the dam.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount estimated before the work began ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The original estimate for 200 feet was $750,000. The width was afterwards increased to 300 feet. My deputy cannot remember the estimate made under the amended plan.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will this $80,000 complete it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a further appropriation of $18,000 asked in the main estimates. These two items will complete it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. $1,302,000 for a work entirely useless and not required at all for the navigation of the river.

Galops canal—enlargement, $25,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As this item will create a long discussion and the hon. member from that district is not here, I would ask to have it stand over. I would ask also that the next item, $25,000 for depening and widening Galops rapids be allowed to stand over as there will be a vote for the purpose of striking it out and a full discussion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Grenville informed me that he wanted this to stand as the money asked for has not been spent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My information is that the work was done some time ago.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There never was work done for the payments made there.

Items allowed to stand.

Welland canal—to lower mitre sills of lock two and guard gates, $9,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move to strike out that item.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know if the mitre sill is a foot higher than the navigation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there was a mistake made some years ago in the engineering.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Exactly the statement I made a couple of years ago when the item was under discussion, and I was informed that there was no mistake whatever.

Motion agreed to.

Welland canal—to remove obstructions and make other improvements, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is for deepening portions of the long level. The contractors have made better progress than anticipated, and a further sum of $30,000 is required to close the work to the 1st July.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What, for filling in the long level ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For removing obstructions and taking out centre piers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is an enormous sum for taking out piers, there must be something else.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are $95,000 in the main estimates. This is not only for the removal of piers but also for the putting in of new spans. The channel was found too narrow and those piers had to be removed.

Mr. LANCASTER. At what part of the canal are these ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is known as the Long Level. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) can identify it by that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That stretches over many miles. At what part of the Long Level is it ? If the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) were here, he could tell us.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I remember the hon. member for Welland urged

it as of great importance to the navigation of the district.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose it is in the town in which the hon. member (Mr. German) resides.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the name of the precise spot.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is only one spot where it can be.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is between Port Colborne and Welland, but the deputy cannot tell me the precise spot.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is between one extremity of the canal and the other. The hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Fielding) information is precise and to the point.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend is acquainted with the——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know where it is exactly. Better pass on to the next.

Welland canal—land damages, Grand river, $625.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely the land damages are done on the Grand river. This is of no use to the navigation of the Welland canal, and the sooner it is abandoned the better.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is because of damages to land by flooding caused by the construction of the Dunnville dam.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why, this dam was erected forty years ago, and there are land damages every year. Who are the parties ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One of the claimants is W. T. Anthony, $500 ; Phillip Dufford, $97.27.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He must have been kicking a good deal ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Was that the way in the old days ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the way now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Department of Indian Affairs had two claims of $14.63 and $13. I do not suppose that department has been kicking very much.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The sooner the government is relieved of responsibility in reference to this branch of the canal, the better. It is of no use to navigation, and has been abandoned since the Lake Erie level was adopted. The Grand river in connection with the Welland canal is a totally useless work.

Mr. INGRAM. And, so long as it is there, there will be land damages to pay, if the government is willing to pay them. Every one knows that this is a district of low level, and is bound to flood in some part every year.

Lachine canal—electrical appliances for operating lock gates, bridges and weirs, $20,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount of this improvement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to provide power house, flume, necessary machinery, power for work shops, &c. The expenditure up to 30th June, 1903, was $67,895 ; and the amount required to complete the work is $30,000, making a total estimated cost of over $97,000. I cannot explain why the appropriation asked is only for $20,000, making $87,000. However, that is an error on the right side.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Were these works only commenced last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the work being done under contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. There is one contract of $12,925, with Mr. Pringle, for electrical apparatus, and there are other items making up the total to over $19,000 out of the $20,000 we asked for.

Mr. FOWLER. Was the rest of the work done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the principle part of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What part was not done by contract ? One would think that all these electrical appliances would be supplied under contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All the electrical appliances, I am advised, were procured under contract. But there were a number of services and other supplies that could not be contracted for.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The total expenditure, including this vote have been $87,000. But what amount of that is done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was confining myself to an explanation with regard to this vote of $20,000, I cannot give the facts with regard to the previous expenditure, but I will get that information and bring it down.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think I ought to move to strike out this vote entirely. We often hear complaints made of tu'penny ha'penny expenditures on the harbours of Nova Scotia, and it grieves me to see millions of money thrown into these canals in Ontario.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is for Quebec.

Mr. GOURLEY. But it is necessary to and tributary to Ontario. I find that these canals have been squandering money for half a century to develop the trade of To-

ronto. Now, I am not sectional. I never uttered a sectional word in my life, and I hope I will be spared the necessity of doing so. But when I hear hon. gentlemen from Ontario begrudging, apparently, little trifles that we need for harbours and steamers in Nova Scotia, I am shocked when I see these extraordinary sums voted with such carelessness for Ontario. I think there must be an end of these enormous expenditures on these canals, unless there is some compensation given in some way to the maritime provinces. We are tired of these eternal expenditures upon Ontario. We in the maritime provinces are tired of being the milch cow of this Dominion. As some compensation last year I readily agreed to the knocking off of the tolls on this canal, because anything that would benefit the trade of Ontario benefits me. I represent Ontario as much as any of these gentlemen here. Yes, under the law of this country the Minister of Justice would tell you that I represent every foot of Ontario as well as my own county. Now I want the freight rates on the Intercolonial lowered as a compensation for doing away with the tolls on the canals. I cannot see why this Lachine canal should be free, why we should vote this enormous sum of money, $20,000, to make bright and beautiful this canal for these gentlemen from Ontario who sail through it in their pleasure yachts. The item reads 'Electrical appliances for operating the lock gates, bridges and weirs.' These gentlemen travelling down from the wealthy cities of Ontario cannot wait, apparently, to have these locks opened in the ordinary way; this country must furnish them with the most modern electrical appliances for that purpose. I suppose when the Minister of Customs desires to go on one of these pleasure trips down the St. Lawrence he cannot be bothered with having these opened in the ordinary way. That is all right, he wants to lead the strenuous life, I suppose. But at the same time I want to make the point that we must have some compensation for this extraordinary expenditure of money on these canals. We are getting tired of it in Nova Scotia, and we are not going to put up with it any longer. Therefore I think these gentlemen from Ontario should agree to cut the rates on the Intercolonial 50 per cent.

An hon. MEMBER. Make them free.

Mr. GOURLEY. The people of Ontario are not generous enough for that. We would be satisfied with a cut of 50 per cent. Or else I will move to strike out this item for lighting luxuriously the locks on the Lachine canal. It is the most extraordinary thing I ever heard of—electrical appliances for operating lock gates! I am told this is the latest and most modern thing in the history of canals. The people of Ontario are never satisfied with anything. They expect us in the maritime provinces to be satisfied with any old thing that happens to come along. We have been satisfied long enough, and now we want more railways. The province of Nova Scotia is practically without railways. If it had not been for the kindness of Providence in throwing the ocean around us, we would have been barbarians for the want of communication. But the sea has given us means of communication by which we have been enabled to keep in touch with each other, and keep our language and civilization in a measure intact.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the question.

Mr. GOURLEY. I move to strike that item out. I ask the Minister of Finance whether he is prepared, in compensation for these enormous votes that we are called upon to pay in the maritime provinces, to make us some compensation in the way of reducing rates on the Intercolonial.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want my hon. friend to prove his generosity by being content to take less than he thinks he deserves; I want him to be generous enough to withdraw the motion. When you want to do a generous and gracious thing, do it handsomely.

Mr. GOURLEY. I will withdraw it, assuming, however, that the acting Minister of Railways and Canals will take into consideration the proposition, and endeavour to do justice to the maritime provinces.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hear, hear.

Rideau canal—to complete Brasses' Point bridge, $2,750.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is that?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is at Brewer's Mills.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The appropriation to complete this bridge was found insufficient. It is a steel superstructure. The contract price was $8,950 and the contract was awarded to the Dominion Bridge Company, who were the lowest tenderers.

Mr. TAYLOR. They had trouble with the piers.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not see any item in the estimates for Poonamalee crossing which was recommended to the department a couple of years ago. I had expected to see an item in the estimates for the purpose of doing this work and I hope that before the session is over there will be a grant made to the township of Elmsley and to the other township in Leeds county which are practically interested in this undertaking. It is money that they are in

justice entitled to. On account of the construction of the Rideau canal part of the highway has been overflowed. It has been reported by the superintendent of the canal and it should be attended to without further delay. It really does not require an item in the estimates because the general vote for the Rideau canal will cover it. A petition has been sent to the department in regard to another matter in connection with the township of Montague and a deputation has been here to see the Minister of Railways and Canals. The representations of that deputation were promised favourable consideration, and the deputation went home believing from the courteous manner in which they had been received they had virtually received a grant for the undertaking. I hope the hon. minister will see his way clear to taking favourable action in regard to these two matters. Damages have been caused, something in the line of those caused by the overflowing of the Grand river in consequence of which money has been voted. As a result of the construction of the Poonamalee dam the parties living above it allege that the dam has been raised every year, that the overflow of water upon the land is greater every year and they claim that they are entitled to damages. It is a small amount that they require and their request is a legitimate one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will inquire into the matter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, yes, but inquiries have been made for a long time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will consider it. We must not make promises.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I should judge from that that there are to be further supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have some supplementary estimates to come down.

Welland canal—to complete dam and bridge at Dunnville, $12,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the most monstrous expenditure that I ever heard of the government making for a work that is not at all necessary. This dam is for the benefit of a lot of mill owners on the Grand river. I do not believe you collect the amount that they promised each year for the use of the water for running their mills and to make an expenditure of $12,000 for a purely private undertaking for the benefit of these parties without a particle of benefit in it for the country at large is most unjustifiable. You might as well give me a present of $12,000 as make such an expenditure as that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I want to reduce that item to $3,001. At the same time I would not be acting fairly by my hon. friend if I conveyed the impression that that was all, because there was an appropriation in the main estimates for this work. This is only the balance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount you are expending ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been voted $30,000 and when we reduce this amount to $3,001 it will make $33,001.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And that is only for the purpose of repair ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This finishes it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is being done by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is under contract. The contractors being Messrs. Hutchison, Lattimore & Lalor.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A great portion of it was done by day work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was there none done by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount of the contract is stated to be $39,069.96, let to the lowest tenderers, the gentlemen whose names I have mentioned. It is a schedule contract and it is estimated to figure out to that amount.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is all the expenditure under contract ?.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, that is supplementary to the work done by the day there. There has been a lot of work done by day labour. There have been parties employed from 1896 down by the day for the purpose of renewing the dam.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In this case we are rebuilding the dam. The hon. gentleman is referring to some previous work of repair.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Rebuilding, is repairs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This was commenced last year out of the appropriation of last year.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the object of this dam to furnish water to the feeder of the Welland canal which is not used at all now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did Cayuga bridge cost ?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Paterson) ought to know because he criticised it very severely when it was up in the House several years ago.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How much did that cost ?

Mr. TAYLOR. About $4,700.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A little more than that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Look at the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is on the same ground. The river flooded the land.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the use of this dam to the public ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The information furnished me does not enable me to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is possible it may have some public utility but it is not apparent to any one who has visited the place. It may be apparent to the department.

Mr. COCHRANE. I must confess that we are passing these large items very flippantly. It was necessary at one time to have this as a feeder to the Welland Canal, but it is not required since the canal was deepened, and why should the ratepayers of my riding be called upon to pay $33,000 to keep up a dam which is absolutely only for the use of private individuals who have mills along there ? If these private parties want a dam let them keep it up themselves.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The water must be maintained there and these parties have leases and pay us a revenue.

Mr. COCHRANE. Let them have it free and keep the dam themselves.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It might be cheaper for the manufacturers to do that than to pay the considerable rental which they pay. We must remember that indirectly we are helping these manufacturers who have their works along the canal and who give employment to a large number of people. That is for the benefit of the public as a whole.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of revenue the government receives? There were two flour mills there, one of which was burned down, and the one remaining turns out about 20 barrels a day. There is also a company manufacturing light for the town of Dunnville, and that is all. What revenue is paid by these people to the government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have it looked up, and give the hon. gentleman the information later.

Intercolonial Railway, operating expenses, $800,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This simply refers to the increased volume of business.

Hon. Mr. PATERSON.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You want it to balance your books.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. I will bring down a statement of the receipts and expenditures later on, and we will pass the item with that understanding.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Very well.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the Minister of Finance be kind enough to state what business he intends to take up on Monday?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Monday being a private Bills day, and the Grand Trunk Pacific private Bill being on the Order paper, my expectation is that the hon. gentleman in charge of that will take it up. That with other private Bills may occupy some time. If we reach government Orders, we may proceed with some resolutions and Bills, and if we reach Supply, we will take up the main estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you proceed with Bills, will you take up the Redistribution Bill ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no instructions from the Prime Minister about that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We would like to have a special arrangement with reference to that Bill and a day fixed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will convey the hon. gentleman's wish to the Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. gentleman received a decision from the Speaker as to whether the National Transcontinental Railway Bill is to be introduced by resolution or not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolution stands on the Notice paper, and its formal stage will be taken on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, August 3, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order for :

Resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Campbell that Mr. Speaker do

now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 147) to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Speaker, it has been represented that some points that have been raised in connection with this Bill were not fully considered by the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and with the permission of the House, if it is agreeable to all parties, I beg to move :

That the order be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) if the proposition to refer the Bill back has been agreed to by both parties ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. I may say, for the information of the House, that there was considerable difference of opinion as to the merits of this measure. The right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and some of his colleagues received a deputation representing both parties, and the conclusion was reached that the counsel having charge of this measure should present to the government the case in support of the measure and that five days should be given to those who oppose it to make answer to the case presented on behalf of the promoters. Since that meeting was held, in so far as I am aware, those representing the municipalities opposed to the Bill in its present form have not been heard from, and I want to know if the action that is being taken meets with their concurrence ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) is aware, the invariable practice on both sides of the House, I think, is to support the report of a standing committee of the House when they have examined a matter that is referred to them by the House. Naturally, we come to the conclusion that they have given the best consideration to the question that is possible to give to it, and we are prepared to give to their report all due consideration. That rule of the House has been invariably observed, except where it has been shown that there has been misrepresentation, or that an important feature of the measure has not been examined. This Bill has been reported by the Railway Committee, but since the Bill has been so reported it has been represented to us that this was a matter which invaded provincial rights. Strong representations, as my hon. friend knows, have been made to us in that respect. It is difficult to come to a conclusion and to form a judgment upon the point so raised except by a thorough examination and discussion of the Bill itself and the effect of it. We have, therefore, without prejudging the question at all, thought it preferable to have the matter referred back to the Committee on Railways, so as to give an opportunity to all parties to have the matter thoroughly threshed out, and that is the reason we have come to the conclusion that it is better that this motion should be made and the matter again brought to the attention of the Railway Committee. I have received a long memorandum from the city of Toronto upon this subject.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the matter is taken up by the Railway Committee, will those who are opposing the Bill in its present shape be communicated with and be given an opportunity of being present so that they may be heard ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, certainly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know the views of either party, but I thought the best way to do was to give the parties an opportunity of being heard by the members of this House in the Railway Committee.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the committee the advisability of disposing first of the clauses of the Bill that stood for consideration, and then taking up the proposed amendments of which notice has been given by hon. members.

On section 11,

Mr. MACLEAN. I intend to take the opportunity of this motion which is now before the House to discuss the general proposition of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, both in the way of this Bill and in the way of the proposition made by the government the other day. I am quite within my rights, I think, in discussing it upon this question, and I propose to avail myself of the opportunity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, is it the will of the committee that this discussion should take place ?

Mr. MACLEAN. It is not out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes. You cannot discuss the principle of a Bill on one of the sections in committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. This is on the motion to go into committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. But we are in committee.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, I can hang on a discussion on this clause. I hold that at any stage of the Bill it is quite in order to discuss the general proposition.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not in order, but if the committee is willing I will bow to the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dropped.

Mr. MACLEAN. No time will be lost because the discussion has to come up and it suits by book to discuss it now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I appeal to the committee that there ought be some decorum and some effort to proceed in accordance to the rules of the House. There have been a number of opportunities for discussing the Bill and there will be plenty of other opportunities. If a transgression of the rules like this is to be allowed in one Bill why not in all Bills. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will see the necessity of proceeding in accordance of the rules of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A discussion on the principle of any Bill cannot take place upon the discussion of any one of its clauses. My ruling is that the discussion on the principle of the Bill is now out of order.

Mr. MACLEAN. To put myself in order, I shall have to move that the committee rise and report progress.

The PRIME MINISTER. That would not help you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member will have to confine himself to show why the committee should rise.

Mr. MACLEAN. With all due respect to the Chair, I can go into the whole question on that motion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You will have plenty of other opportunities.

Mr. MACLEAN. What is the difference?

Mr. FRASER. One is right and the other is wrong.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It matters not to me, but the rule is that if the hon. gentleman moves that the committee rise and report progress, he will have to speak to that motion. The hon. member knows that just as well as I do.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will appeal to the leader of the House to say if there is anything wrong in allowing a discussion on the general principle of the Bill now. I have not a great deal to say, yet I wish to say it, and I would like to say it to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The PRIME MINISTER. As my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has appealed to me, I must say that I deeply sympathize with him. I understand he has a speech on his stomach which he wants to be delivered of to-day, but unfortunately the rules of the House do not permit of it. I would advise him to wait until the proper opportunity arises which is not very far off. The best way after all is to abide by the rules of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am well able to take care of myself, but while I do not appeal from the ruling of the Chairman, I believe that I am quite in order in discussing the Bill now. As the Prime Minister has recommended a certain form or emetic, I would suggest to him that he tender it to some of his own supporters instead of to members on this side.

On section 11,

Mr. McCARTHY. The leader of the opposition suggested that the word 'common' should be inserted after the words 'amount of such' so as to make it read 'amount of such common stock.' I have consulted the parties interested, and I am prepared to accept the suggested amendment. This amendment would make the clause apply to common stock and not to preferred stock.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In the government Bill there is a class of stock which comes after the government guarantee and which is to be guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Can they issue this stock in payment of the guarantee for that other stock?

Mr. McCARTHY. I should think not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are quite sure that they cannot.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Get it defined if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is there any doubt about it?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This clause has to be considered in connection with other proposed amendments, one of which has reference to the power of the company to enter into an agreement with the government for the construction and operation of the line. Then there is a provision in the Bill submitted by the Prime Minister under which the Grand Trunk Railway Company is to acquire the whole of the common stock of this company. Taking this clause in connection with that provision, what is the effect upon the question of the construction of the railway from Moncton to Winnipeg? Is it the intention of these three provisions to which I have called at-

tention that this stock shall be issued under some arrangement between this company and the Grand Trunk Pacific and that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall construct that portion of the railway ? Is that not possible ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think not, because this section only applies to any payment for 'plant, rolling stock, docks, elevators, wharfs, warehouses, vessels or materials.' All the common stock is to be held by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, so that during the term of the lease for fifty years it is still in the hands of that company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let us see if it can be worked out. We will suppose that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company makes a contract with the government of Canada to construct a line of railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, and sublets that contract to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I do not know whether that can be done or not. I do not know what the powers of the Grand Trunk Railway Company are in that regard. Under the provisions of this clause this company might allot the whole of the common stock to the Grand Trunk Railway Company as part of the compensation for the construction of that line. I think that is possible.

Mr. McCARTHY. I submit that it is not possible, because under the contract with the government the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway stock of $25,000,000 is to be acquired and held by the Grand Trunk Railway Company ; so that for fifty years the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will not be at liberty to allot its stock at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That does not quite answer what I have said. I have said that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway make a contract with the government to build this line. There is a provision in the Bill for a transcontinental railway that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall acquire all the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Assuming that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has the power under its charter, it could acquire under the provisions of this Bill the $25,000,000 of stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in the way I have mentioned. I would like to know whether the Grand Trunk Railway Company has power to enter into a contract of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The only difficulty I see as to that is that according to my general knowledge of the Grand Trunk Railway Act, that company has no authority to build a railroad at all. I may say that this section is similar in terms to section 39 of the General Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is far wider. This provides that 'as consideration for rights, powers, and privileges acquired' the company may issue paid up stock. Under the Bill introduced by the government, it is provided that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall take stock in the new undertaking to the extent of $25,000,000. I could not understand where the company could get the money to take that stock. This section enables the new company to allot its stock to the Grand Trunk Railway Company as a payment for the guarantee of the transcontinental railway's bonds, or for the purchase of rolling stock for the new line.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to point out the word ? Is it in consideration for rights acquired, for powers acquired, for privileges acquired, that they can get that stock ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under which of the words could it be done ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Which of the words would cover it ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Any of them. A privilege is the endorsing of the bonds by the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would not surely be a privilege acquired. How could you call a guarantee given upon the second mortgage bonds a privilege acquired by the Grand Trunk Railway ? It would be a liability incurred by the Grand Trunk Railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely it is a privilege to the company that gets it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am sure that if my hon. friend will consider these words further, he will change his opinion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would it not be under services rendered ? Under this Act of incorporation the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway may issue paid up stock for the guarantee received from the Grand Trunk Railway on their second-class securities for the purpose of purchasing rolling stock for the two lines.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There must be somewhere in the Act of incorporation authority for the Grand Trunk Pacific to transfer these over to the Grand Trunk Railway or otherwise the Grand Trunk Railway could not take the stock. I do not think they could do it under this clause.

On section 26,

Mr. McCARTHY moved that section 26 be struck out and the following substituted therefor :

The company may construct, acquire and operate ropeways for the transportation of ores and other freight, and also tramways, not exceeding ten miles in length in any one case, to or from any point on its railway or any branch thereof, in the province of British Col-

umbia, and shall have all such powers for the expropriation of land requisite for the convenient construction and operation of such works as are given by the Railway Act to railway companies for railway purposes, but the powers conferred upon the company by this section shall not be exercised until a plan showing the route of the ropeways or tramways proposed to be constructed have been duly filed with the Department of Railways and Canals, and approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or such authority, tribunal or commission as is designated or constituted under any Act of the parliament of Canada, for the regulation or control of railways, and no such tramway or other way shall be constructed upon or along any street, highway or other public place within the limits of any municipality until the company shall have first obtained the consent of such municipality, within which such street, highway or other public place is situate.

2. Before such approval is given, notice of the application therefor shall be given in writing to every other railway company operating a railway in the said locality, and such notice shall be published in the 'Canada Gazette' for at least one month previous to the time named in the notice for the making of such application, and such notice shall state that all persons interested may appear and be heard on such application.

Mr. CLARKE. As this amendment covers mine, I beg to withdraw the amendment of which I gave notice.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this amendment affect a tramway which runs outside a municipality ?

Mr. McCARTHY. It applies to any municipality affected.

Mr. INGRAM. The consent of every muncipality must be obtained. But suppose a road runs between two municipalities, and one of them refuses to give consent, to whom is there an appeal for a redress ?

Mr. McCARTHY. We have no redress.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a remarkable piece of legislation to put a railway company in such a position that if a municipality objects to giving permission, the railway company has no alternative.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This only applies to the branches.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the general law in Canada be affected ?

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will remember that we had quite a long discussion when the Bill was in committee before, and it was explained that these ropeways and tramways only applied to the province of British Columbia. That is the intention of the promoters of the Bill, and I stated to the committee that that provision was thus confined. The hon. member for Victoria and the hon. member for West Toronto gave notice of amendments, and these amendments were considered, and the power which is sought to be embodied in this clause was understood by them. I see the point made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram). In the more thickly or densely populated section of the country it would be proper not to accept the amendment which I moved, but inasmuch as it applies to British Columbia, and the intention being only to run tramways or ropeways to or from a mine, for instance, I do not see that there would be any difficulty on our part. I quite see it might be a precedent that may do harm in the future.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not objecting so far as the present Bill is concerned, but in view of the future ; I am speaking of this parliament laying down a principle covering the General Railway Act of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. This matter has been discussed again and again in committee. The municipalities must have protection against these insidious attempts to promote legislation in this parliament to override provincial and municipal rights. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill understands the situation exactly. He has consented to an amendment to meet the views I have presented. We must guard against any action, under the guise of general legislation, that will give power to run tramways through the streets of a municipality without its consent. What this company desired was power to construct tramways on the streets and highways of a municipality without its consent. Will it be contended that the company should have power to run tramways through the streets of any municipality in Canada, if the municipality does not consent ? It strikes me that the power to authorize the operation of tramways belongs to the provincial legislatures, and not to this parliament.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It does not interfere with the main line at all, or their branches. The principle which my hon. friend from West Toronto is advocating so firmly only applies to rope lines to and from the main line of the road.

Mr. CLARKE. To all kinds of tramroads.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It only applies to lines of road in British Columbia. As amended it only applies now to those in British Columbia for the purpose of reaching mines of ore.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the amendment to section 26 is carried, I desire to move an amendment to that amendment, of which I gave notice. The object of my amendment is to prevent this company from exercising a power which I do not think has been granted to any other railway company, that is a power to build branch lines from branch lines, and thus extend their operations all over the country. As I read section 11 of the Act, I understand that the Grand Trunk Pacific Rail-

way includes the main line and the branches named therein. Now when we read section 26 we find that the company takes power 'to construct, acquire and operate tramways or other ways for the transportation of ore and other freight to or from any point on its railway or any branch thereof.'

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is not reading from my amendment, but he is reading from the original Bill. His point is well taken as to the original Bill, but not as to my amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will now read the amendment:

The company may construct, acquire and operate ropeways for the transportation of ores and other freight, and also tramways, not exceeding ten miles in length in any one case, to or from any point on its railway or any branch thereof.

Now it is quite clear to my mind that power is here taken to construct a branch line ten miles in length and then throw out another branch line ten miles from the first one, and so continuously; so that practically it is a charter that covers the whole country. Now I think there should be some limitation to bring it within the general scope of what parliament has allowed, simply branch lines ten miles in length from its main line.

Mr. McCARTHY. The proposed amendment to this section only applies to ropeways or tramways, and they are to be limited to ten miles in length. Such ropeway or tramway may start from the main line or from a branch line. Nothing more is asked for, it goes no further. The objection the hon. gentleman now makes is well founded as concerns the original clause, but not as concerns the suggested amendment.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me this section simply consecrates a principle which has been accepted in the Railway Committee, that tramways should not circulate through streets without permission of the municipality. The objection raised is that this does not give sufficient power to the municipality in case of conflict arising between the municipality and the railway company. I do not think that objection ought to be sustained, because if the municipality has a decided objection to the circulation of tramways upon its streets, I do not see that we have any power to interfere with the power of the municipality which, as I understand, we want to establish. Moreover if it only applies to British Columbia for the conveyance of ore, I do not see what objection there can be.

Mr. MACLEAN. The municipalities are not trying to block the great railway companies; what they are trying to do is to prevent tramways being forced upon them through a general Railway Act, without their consent. No municipality ever yet tried to block a railway in the manner suggested here to-day. They have not done it, and until such a case arises, I think we might just as well accept the clause as it is to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move in amendment to the amendment to strike out the words 'or any branch thereof' in the third line of the amendment.

Amendment to the amendment negatived.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY moved to amend section 1 by inserting therein the following names:

Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, C.B., G.C.M.G.; Lord Welby, G.C.B.; John A. Clutten-Brock, Joseph Price and Alfred W. Smithers, all of the city of London, England.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that in addition, or in substitution?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, in addition.

Mr. MACLEAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite in order in passing any remarks I choose to pass in regard to this Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will not the hon. gentleman wait and speak on the motion to report?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I would like to say now what I have to say. The whole principle was brought up by the names that are here proposed. We know now the men we are dealing with and we have the proposal the government made the other day. So, I am quite in order in going into the whole question, and I am going to do it. The cry of the west to-day is in regard to transportation. The cry of the west is: Help us to move our crops; we have abundant crops, more than can be handled by existing routes, and we ask the people of Canada to afford us relief from the present condition of things.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Will the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) allow me to put the motion?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Amendment was read.

Mr. MACLEAN. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the cry of the west is for help to solve the transportation problem. They say: We cannot move our freight; there are not sufficient elevators; there is not sufficient rolling stock; in every way things are not as they ought to be, and we appeal to the parliament of Canada for relief. In answer to that appeal a proposition has been made by the government, and this Bill has been introduced in the House. I do not think this Bill should be allowed to pass, for the reason that neither this Bill nor the proposed measure of the government deals with this difficulty in the right way. What the people want is relief in regard to transportation, and most

of all they want relief by means of a government-owned railway. The people of Canada say: If we pay for a railway, if we supply all the money to build it, let that railway be our own. In no way let that railway pass from us into the hands of private parties. And this is in accord with the cry of the west for relief from their transportation difficulties, and relief by a road owned and managed by the government. But the proposal involved in this Bill, the proposal brought down by the government gives no immediate relief to the people of the North-west. The proposal is to build a road through the wilds of New Brunswick, a road through the wilds of the Laurentian country in Quebec, a road through the wilds of Ontario, through the so-called clay belt, and so across the prairies and through the mountains to the Pacific coast. Outside of that part of the road in Manitoba and the North-west, there is not a single proposition in the whole scheme that aids in the solution of the transportation problem, or gives relief to the people of the North-west.

Now, in what way can relief be given to the people of the North-west under present circumstances? In one way and one way only, and that is by adopting the principle of government ownership. If the government were alive to the situation, the first thing they would do would be to build a railway to be owned and operated by the government from Port Arthur on Lake Superior to Winnipeg and so into the west. Some years ago when a proposition was made in this House to subsidize very heavily a railway called the Rainy River Railway and now a portion of the Canadian Northern, and owned by Mackenzie and Mann, I appealed to the government to nationalize that road. I pointed out that not only was a large grant being made by the Dominion, but large grants had been made by the province of Manitoba and the province of Ontario, the public moneys thus granted being, as I believed and contended, sufficient to build the road. And, as the public were paying for the road, I appealed to the government to nationalize the work. But they ridiculed the idea. And now we are told we are having government ownership. Within six years of the time when they ridiculed the idea of government ownership, they boast of adopting it. And I must say that the late Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) ridiculed the idea that I then brought forward, but he has since seen the light, and I hope he will support me in——

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) will permit me a word, I think that what he was then proposing was to nationalize all the railways in Canada. I raised no objection to the building of a railway through that country by the government—never in my life.

Mr. MACLEAN. What I say is that, when the Rainy river proposition went through, and the late Minister of Railways and Canals endorsed it, I appealed to him and to the government to nationalize that road in the interest of the country. At that time I entered into correspondence with Mr. Hays, who had recently come to Canada, and told him that, so far as I could see, the great aim of the Grand Trunk should be to get an entrance into the Canadian North-west, and the way to get in was to make such representations at Ottawa as that the government would throw out these subsidy proposals and would nationalize that road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, and to permit the Grand Trunk to get into that country. Mr. Hays at that time said he was seized of the idea, but he had other propositions before him and that he must defer dealing with the matter for some time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). How did the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) intend that the Grand Trunk should get into the North-west?

Mr. MACLEAN. The Grand Trunk today is at Midland. The Grand Trunk could, to-morrow, by a fleet of steamers, be at Port Arthur. Nationalize the Canadian Northern, as I say, or if necessary, nationalize the Canadian Pacific from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. Do this, and you have solved the problem. You can then extend a government-owned railway out into the prairies, or you can nationalize the Canadian Northern, and so reach through to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and, shortly, clear across the continent. That is the way to give immediate relief to the North-west. That is the way to give the people cheap transportation. It is simply a matter of nationalizing the 'spout.' Sir William Van Horne very aptly called that portion of the country between Winnipeg and Port Arthur the 'spout,' and my idea is that that portion at least ought to be nationalized, all other roads should be allowed equal right of way over it, and the tolls should be reasonable. Is there any other way to solve the transportation question except on the principle of 'the King's highway'? A great mistake was made in England when the railways were first built there by allowing those railways to become private roads. Like any other roads, they should have been retained as 'the King's highway.' The step that was then taken has been deeply regretted, and an effort is now being made in England to retrieve that mistake. We also could have saved ourselves by recognizing the principle of 'the King's highway.' If we had this road from Winnipeg to Port Arthur as a public highway, we could run the Grand Trunk over it, we could run the Canadian Northern over it, we could run the Canadian Pacific over it, and, best of

all, we could run the Intercolonial over it. We could have the four great systems working for the Canadian North-west, handling the traffic of that country, and, with the competition that would be assured, we should have a lowering of rates.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. By way of information, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) permit me to ask how he would get from Port Arthur to Midland over the Grand Trunk?

Mr. MACLEAN. For the present, I would get there by a line of boats.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not otherwise ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I might go this far—nationalize the Grand Trunk to North Bay, and, if the Canadian Pacific would not make terms, I would nationalize their line from North Bay to Port Arthur.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Then the nationalization of the line would be from Winnipeg to North Bay?

Mr. MACLEAN. It might be. But the way to give speedy relief is to invite these great railways to a conference, and tell them plainly what we propose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that he is out of order in discussing the whole transportation question upon any individual section of the Bill. It is wholly out of order, and I rule so.

Mr. MACLEAN. If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, the amendment is that the name of Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, the head of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and who is to be the head of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, be added to the list of incorporators. I think I am quite in order in discussing the whole question because the real crux of the Bill is in the men who are named here and I do not think we should deal with these men on these lines.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is quite clear that in Committee of the Whole each section of the Bill has to be taken up separately, and that the particular section under consideration is the only subject that can be discussed. That rule is well known to every hon. member of the House; otherwise, we would hardly know where we are at. We would have every section of the Bill being discussed at the same time, and I therefore call the hon. gentleman's attention to the rule which provides that a general discussion of the question cannot take place on any particular section.

Mr. MACLEAN. Surely, Mr. Chairman, you will not contend that I am out of order when we are dealing with the clause that names the men who are to form this company——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is my decision.

Mr. MACLEAN—and in view of what we have heard as to the relations of these men to the government. I do not think I am out of order with all due deference to you.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Then, you will have to appeal from my decision.

Mr. MACLEAN. I do not wish to be put in that position. There is a clause coming up in a few minutes saying that they may enter into negotiations with the government. That opens the whole question and if you wish me to repeat what I have taken ten minutes to say, I shall be obliged to do so.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is one of the most painful things I am called upon to do when I am obliged to call an hon. member to order, but I am here for the purpose of seeing that the rules should be carried out as nearly as possible so as to facilitate the despatch of business. The rule I am pointing out is well known to old parliamentarians and to my hon. friend as well, and I hope he will not insist on violating it.

Mr. MACLEAN. We are discussing a clause which names Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson as one of the incorporators of this company. I object to the man's name being in the Bill for the reasons I am about to give, I think I am quite in order and on that line I intend to proceed until I am called to order again and told to sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would lose my command of the committee altogether if I allowed any hon. member to deviate from the rule, and if I did not insist upon my rule being respected. It is far better if an hon. gentleman does not agree with the chairman to appeal to the Speaker and settle it at once.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Surely, the Chairman does not object to the hon. member (Mr. Maclean)——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am perfectly in order. Surely the Chairman does not object to the hon. member giving reasons why he objects to these names being added to this Bill ?

Mr. COCHRANE. What is the use of going into committee at all on the Bill if we have not the right to discuss it ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) that he appeal to the Speaker so that we may have it settled and so that we may have a precedent established for future discussions. My ruling is that the general principle of the Bill cannot be discussed on any one particular section.

Mr. MACLEAN. May I point out to the hon. mover of this Bill (Mr. McCarthy) has

said that certain names ought to be introduced into this clause, the names of men of great prominence in connection with this Bill and in connection with another great proposition and this brings the whole clause up. My contention is that the name of Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson should not go in for the reasons I intended to give and particularly because this man is not sound on great public questions. He is one of the contracting parties in connection with a further proposition. I am going to give my reasons and I will let the right hon. leader of the House express his opinion upon them, but, I think I am perfectly in order, and I think the right hon. leader of the House would be inclined to let me have the floor under the circumstances, especially as I think, I am right in this case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is not only the names that are included in the Bill itself, but, it is the addition of other names that is involved. The whole clause as amended will be put from the Chair for the consideration of the committee and the greater powers which are being granted are up for discussion under this clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is my ruling and probably it would be better for the committee to refer the matter to the Speaker and it would thus establish a precedent which would guide me in future.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will make a motion to that effect if you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, but I do not intend it in any way to be a reflection upon your judgment. Would you have any objection to referring the question to the Speaker without putting it to the committee ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am willing to get the Speaker as rapidly as possible.

Mr. HUGHES, (Victoria). On what ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On my ruling that the principle of a Bill cannot be discussed in Committee of the Whole upon any particular section.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would suggest that you refer to the Speaker the proposition that the whole of the Bill is up for discussion when the greater powers are being considered.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Speaker will understand that matter probably better than I will. Let us submit to the Speaker the ruling that the principle of any Bill in Committee of the Whole cannot be discussed on any particular section.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that that is the issue between the hon. gentleman and yourself. I do not think the hon. member disputes that it is a sound principle that you have just enunciated, but I understand the hon. gentleman to say that by adding new incorporators to those already named you involved the whole principle of the Bill. The question is whether the adding of these names does not open up the whole principle of the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the position taken by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is the right one. An amendment is moved to add certain names to the incorporators and the contention is made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that under the circumstances he has the right to discuss the whole principle of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are proposing to add to the incorporators named in the clause that is now before the committee. Then, can you not discuss everything that you could discuss without these names being added ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The point is whether the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to add certain names to the incorporators so enlarges the question as to give the hon. member for East York the privilege of discussing the whole Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is exactly in the same position as if we were taking up the clause for the first time. The question is whether if we were taking up the question for the first time it would be competent for my hon. friend from East York to make the remarks which he proposes to make.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would suppose that to be a matter to be decided by the Speaker. There is no discussion after the clause has been passed, but, it is now moved to reconsider it so as to add one or two names to the list of incorporators and under such circumstances the hon. member for East York claims that he has the right to discuss the whole Bill as if it were moved for the first time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To discuss the whole of it as if it were reconsidered.

Mr. HUGHES, (Victoria). I understand the position to be that the hon. member for East York takes the ground that there are new names being added to this Bill, that he wants to discuss the effect that these names have on the general principle of the Bill. He also wants to discuss the effect that these names may have upon a Bill before the House and the country, and he wants latitude to do that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think he wants more latitude than that.

Mr. BELL. I think it must be admitted that the whole clause is before the committee because I understand the present proceedings were introduced by a motion to reconsider this whole clause.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is for a purpose—for the purpose of putting in new names and nothing else.

Mr. BELL. Then, the clause, being amended by the addition of these names, must be before the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a question I have no opinion upon.

Mr. FRASER. Is there anything particularly sacred about the first clause that we can discuss the whole Bill under it? If there is not, we can discuss the whole Bill on the second clause and so on up to the thirty-third clause. Under this clause you can only properly discuss whether these men are suitable men to be incorporated—whether they have the necessary capital, and so on. You cannot discuss whether they are Pagans or Christians; that has nothing to do with the question. On the preamble we can discuss the whole Bill; but each clause deals with a specific subject, and the discussion should be confined to that specific subject.

Mr. CLARKE. This clause is of special importance and should be given special attention, for the reason that one of the names proposed to be added is that of a gentleman who is at the head of another railway corporation. The hon. member from East York proposed to discuss from a financial point of view the propriety of allowing him to be connected with this company.

Mr. FRASER. That is a legitimate subject of discussion.

Mr. BELL. Surely if it is proper to discuss whether a number of persons should be incorporated, it is equally proper to discuss what powers may be conferred upon them. One must follow the other.

Mr. FRASER. Certainly, but these powers are all in the Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. Suppose the Bill proposed that the name of Mr. Vanderbilt or Mr. Chauncey Depew should be included, would not the whole thing be changed? The whole thing is changed now. What I propose to do is to give a reason why Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson's name should not be included in the Bill and that involves the whole question.

The PRIME MINISTER. If it were proposed to add the name of Mr. Vanderbilt that might perhaps be a good opportunity for my hon. friend to show reasons why from a national or any other point of view it would not be wise to allow Mr. Vanderbilt to become a member of this company. But I do not think that would give my hon. friend the right to discuss anything that was not relevant.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for East York could discuss the question on the motion that the chairman do now leave the Chair. Such a motion has the same effect when the House is in committee as a motion for the adjournment of the House when the Speaker is in the Chair. If there were no other way for my hon. friend to deliver himself of his opinions, he could certainly do it in that way. However, it might perhaps be well to have the opinion of the Speaker as a precedent, and if my hon. friend desires to obtain the opinion of the Speaker, the proper way is stated by Sir John Bourinot in his book at page 483:

> If it be found expedient to refer a point of order to the Speaker, a member will move that the chairman report progress and ask leave to sit again that day. When the Speaker has resumed, the chairman will report that the committee wishes to be instructed as to the point in question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We discussed that question the other day, and the Finance Minister took the position that we would have to get the leave of the House by a vote on the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg pardon; that is what he stated. I took issue with him. I said that would give the majority of the House the power of refusing to allow us to get the opinion of the Speaker at all. I said the motion should be that the committee rise for the purpose of asking the Speaker his opinion on the subject. Then, if we differed from the Speaker, we could appeal to the House. But the Finance Minister took a different ground.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think my hon. friend confuses two things which are different. I understand that a point of order was raised, which was decided by the chairman. Then an appeal was made from the ruling of the chairman, and the committee had to rise without any motion, and the question had to be submitted to the House and not to the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The right hon. gentleman was not in the House at the time, or he would not make that statement. What did occur was this: A question was put to the chairman for his ruling, and he ruled in a certain way. The chairman then referred the matter to the Speaker. The Speaker said, 'I cannot overrule the chairman, but I will put the question to the House.' The motion was put to the House, but we were discussing an entirely different proposition, that was, how we could get the opinion of the Speaker on the question. I took the ground that the proper course was to move that the committee rise. Then, when the Speaker came in, the chairman, without leaving his place, would ask the Speaker for his ruling. The Finance Minister said that could not be done without a vote of the House, giving its consent to the committee rising. I said that that would leave the minority in a hopeless position. The Prime Minister and the chairman both now agree with me, that the minority have some rights, and that we can get the opinion of the Speaker without the consent of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend was right the other day he is wrong now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The proper procedure is this : If it is deemed expedient to get the opinion of the Speaker on this question, a motion is made in writing for the committee to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again to-day. The question has to be voted by the committee, because this is a reference, and not an appeal from my ruling. Then, when the Speaker hears the question discussed, he gives his decision, and the committee resumes. If the hon. member will kindly put his motion in writing, we shall have the question decided.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would not the hon. member for East York let us get on with the Bill, and make his motion at another stage ?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I am quite in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are taking up a good deal of time with an academic discussion.

Mr. MACLEAN. It is not an academic discussion. I beg to move :

That the committee rise and report and ask leave to sit again this day for the purpose of getting the Speaker's opinion on the point contended for by Mr. Maclean. That he is in order in discussing the general principle of the Bill on the motion to add certain names to the list of incorporators.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You will get a decision against you on that.

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, how will I put it ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Come on with your motion.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will put it in this way:

For the purpose of getting Mr. Speaker's opinion on the point contended for by Mr. Maclean that he is in order in discussing the Bill on clause one, on the amendment to add certain names to the list of incorporators.

Mr. FRASER. That is an absurdity.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is not at all the question raised.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely the hon. gentleman has a right to state his own point of order.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The trouble is that it is not his own.

Mr. INGRAM. How would something like this do :

That the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again this day and that a reference be made to the Speaker of the House for his decision as to whether the Committee of the Whole is in order in discussing the principle of Bill (No. 64) by reason of an amendment to section one of the Bill having been offered.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is all right.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Do you adopt that motion ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Ingram moves——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Ingram cannot move.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then I will move it.

And the motion having been put to the committee, it was agreed to.

The committee rose.

And, Mr. Speaker having taken the Chair, the Deputy Speaker reported the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Macdonald, of the committee of the Whole, reports that the committee has decided to refer to the Speaker for his decision : Whether the Committee of the Whole can discuss the principle of the Bill (No. 64) by reason of an amendment to section 1 of the Bill having been offered.

At the outset I may say that, generally speaking, the principle of a Bill should be discussed on the second reading thereof, but that rule is somewhat different in the case of private Bills and public Bills. In the case of public Bills, it is not in order to discuss in committee the general merits of a Bill on a particular clause ; but, in the case of private Bills, the rule, as stated by May, is as follows :

The second reading corresponds with the same stage in other Bills, and in agreeing to it, the House affirms the general principle, or expediency of the measure. There is, however, a distinction between the second reading of a public, and of a private Bill, which should not be overlooked. A public Bill being founded on reasons of state policy, the House, in agreeing to its second reading, accepts and affirms those reasons; but the expediency of a private Bill, being mainly founded upon allegations of fact, which have not yet been proved, the House, in agreeing to its second reading, affirms the principle of the Bill, conditionally, and subject to the proof of such allegations before the committee.

With regard to this Bill, its principle was considered when the motion was made in committee of the whole for the adoption of the preamble of the Bill. In the case of private Bills, the principle is supposed to be contained in the preamble, and when the preamble has been declared carried, then, according to my view, the principle of the Bill cannot be further discussed in committee. The Committee of the Whole is now considering clause 1 of the Bill, which contains the names of the incorporators, and on that clause it is not in order to discuss the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker then left the Chair, and the House resumed in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Chairman, in order to get myself before the committee—and I

accept the ruling that has been given—I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair, and, on that motion, I propose to discuss the general question. So, we have only lost forty minutes. I wish to discuss the whole question involved in this Bill, particularly in view of the fact that Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, the head of the Grand Trunk Railway, is now identified with this proposition for the first time, and it is proposed to make a deal between this new company and the government to settle the transportation problem in the North-west. I told the House some time ago that I did not think this was the right way to settle the transportation problem. I believe that the only way it can be solved is by the government ownership of the line that connects the main roads in Ontario with the main roads in the North-west, and my idea is to have a government-built and government-owned road from Port Arthur, or, if necessary from North Bay to Winnipeg. In that way the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway would be at once put into the North-west. Imagine what would happen in the North-west to-morrow if this were carried out. What the Canadian Pacific Railway fear to-day most of all, and what I thought the government were trying to accomplish, was to put the Grand Trunk Railway into the North-west to-morrow. Under the proposition we have now before us, the Grand Trunk Railway will not be in the North-west for six years, even if they are there in ten years ; but by nationalizing one of the roads between the main systems of the east and the systems of the west, you can have the Grand Trunk Railway in the west to-morrow. That is what the people of Canada want to see—they want to see the Grand Trunk Railway go into the North-west over a government-owned line, and over the same line they desire to see the people's railway, the Intercolonial Railway go. But we are told that the Canadian Pacific Railway have a special clause in their contract by which their rates are not to be interfered with until certain profits have been proved to have been made. The time came long ago when the cost of that road should have been investigated, and its rates brought under revision. But that has never been done, and I suppose it never will be done. But the way to regulate the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to its rates and to give relief to the people of the North-west is to put the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway, and, above all, the Intercolonial Railway, in competition with it. That is a way that has been found satisfactory in regulating rates—to have one road owned and controlled by the government fixing the rates. Real competition will bring down rates regardless of special agreements. As I pointed out not long ago, in dealing with another question, the railway passenger fares in the state of New York were settled by dealing with one railway. An Act was passed regulating rates on that one road, and while the other roads claimed that they had special privileges, yet, competition has compelled them to reduce their rates. So, the government could at once affect a reduction of the rates by proceeding in the right way. Negotiate with one of the big roads, or, if they will not negotiate, let the government build a new road and in that way give relief to the country. But I believe the building of a new road would not be a necessity. I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway would discuss this matter with the government and that the outcome of that discussion would be a determination to nationalize this railway through the country which Sir William Van Horne has called 'the spout.'

Now, what is a practical railway for the business that is to be done ? Clearly it is a high class road. The day has gone by for cheap railways. You must have a high class railway ; you must have a double track railway ; you must have a road without curves and without grades. With that, you will be able to carry wheat at the lowest possible rates, and so give the people relief. You can build as many one-horse railways as you like, and they will do very little good in these days. We have built many of them, and built them with the people's money. But they do not solve the problem, for they are not in a position to carry freights at the lowest rates. My idea of a road to do that work is a road of the standard of the New York Central Railway, or better still, the Pennsylvania Railway. Such a road as that might cost $60,000 a mile or even more, but once built, it would carry immense trains at a very low cost, particularly in connection with our navigation system. I will go further, and say that the moment that line had been nationalized between Winnipeg and Lake Superior, I would go to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and would say : Gentlemen, we want the wheat of the North-west carried at the lowest possible rates not only over this government road from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, but over the roads in the east ; therefore, we will assist you to straighten out your roads from Midland or Owen Sound to Montreal or any other St. Lawrence port. Government assistance given in that way would bind the provinces together as nothing else will. But you will never solve the transportation problem by a one-horse railway through the wilds of New Brunswick, through the wilds of Quebec and through the wilds of Ontario. But you can solve it to-morrow by nationalizing the road between Winnipeg and Port Arthur, building it to the proper standard and then straightening out the roads in the east from the great lakes to the sea-board. It may be that these roads would be willing to be

nationalized between Midland and Montreal, or between Owen Sound and Montreal and Quebec. Probably the best line for a high class road would be from Midland connecting with the Canadian Pacific Railway system to Quebec, or it may be over the Canada Atlantic Railway, which could be taken over by the government and made a portion of the national system. These lines would be all run as complementary of our navigation system. We have spent immense sums in this country building up our ports and harbours and making our canals. The men who own and control the railways to-day are to a large extent the men opposed to transportation by water. A system of railways owned and controlled by the government, and not handed over immediately to a private corporation, should be the complement of our navigation system. That is a thing which has been left out of view in connection with transportation in this country. The only way in which our railways can be made the complement of our system of navigation is by the government controlling and owning them. The proposition before the House does not begin to solve the question. All it is doing in the North-west is to give another one-horse railway to reach our prairie sections. It does not touch the vital issue at a single point. It is not going to reduce the transportation of grain a dollar in years to come. It is possible that negotiations may be going on to bring the Canadian Northern into this deal. I would like to see the Canadian Northern brought in this proposition to-day, and it may be brought in later on, but I would wish to see it brought in under the control of parliament and not of the Grand Trunk Railway. I am only indulging in guess work, but I am inclined to believe that the Canadian Northern Railway would be ready to make a deal of that kind. If we did that, it would grant immediate relief to the North-west. Is not that something worth striving for?

I am told that government ownership is not a desirable thing. The right hon. gentleman made the confession here the other day—and I very much regretted to hear him make it—that because he stood once on the bleak shores of Georgian bay and saw all the work which Mr. Booth had to perform to make traffic for his road, from that moment he lost faith in government ownership. Was there ever a more humiliating confession? He did not give any study to the question; he did not inquire where government ownership had been tried; he did not go into any details; but just because a fit of despondency came over him as he stood gazing around the bleak shores of Georgian bay, he made up his mind that government ownership was not a success. But had he inquired, he would have found that wherever tried it has been a success. It has solved the transportation problem in many countries. The people of England to-day are of opinion that government ownership must come there, because the transportation charges there are higher than anywhere else. The people of the United States are coming to the conviction that there must be a grand trunk railway between the east and the west owned and controlled by the federal authorities. With a road of that kind, all the other roads would be regulated by it. In Germany, Italy, Russia, Australia, Africa, government ownership has been tried and has succeeded. It is found to be the only system which gives the people satisfactory service at the lowest rates. Take the experience in Austro-Hungary. They have government railways in that country, administered by the government, and the constant aim of the government commissioners is to run the railways so as to give the lowest transportation rates, and you will find the lowest transportation rates for passengers there of any country of the world. If by government ownership you mean the kind of ownership we have in this country, I do not believe in it. The Intercolonial Railway, as it is administered, is not my ideal of government ownership. But if the Intercolonial Railway were taken out of politics, it would, if it were administered by commissioners independent of politics and members of parliament, do you mean to say that it would not make a better showing? I would like to see a man like Sir Thos. Shaughnessey or Mr. Hays given control of our Intercolonial with instructions to run it in the interests of the people and keep it free from politics altogether. If that were done, it would give the best solution of the transportation problem. Instead of building rivals to the Intercolonial Railway, keep it as it is, take it absolutely out of politics, put it under the administration of a man like Mr. Hays, and tell him to go ahead and extend it into the North-west and run it on such lines as to force every other company, the Canada Atlantic Railway, the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, to give the lowest possible rates. In that way relief would soon be accomplished.

You could nationalize a sufficient portion of our railways for my present purpose for a comparatively small sum. $20,000,000 will do it. But I do not believe that $100,000,000 will build the road proposed by the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How could you nationalize the three roads you have named for $20,000,000?

Mr. MACLEAN. You could nationalize the road from Winnipeg to Port Arthur for $20,000,000 or less.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman proposes to nationalize the Grand

Trunk Railway from Midland to Montreal, the Canadian Pacific Railway from Owen Sound to Montreal, the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg—could all that be done for $20,000,000 ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Very largely.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Those four roads?

Mr. MACLEAN. If it is more than $20,000,000, what are we to think of the hon. gentleman's proposition, which he says would only cost $13,000,000, running from ocean to ocean? But the proposition submitted to the House, I submit, involves an expenditure of over a hundred millions. We are committing this country to a proposition involving an outlay of a hundred million dollars, and we are not to get anything for our money, but are immediately to give the road away to the Grand Trunk Railway. Thus we are not solving the problem but only buildidng a one-horse railway.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is the Grand Trunk Railway a one-horse railway?

Mr. MACLEAN. It will be from Moncton through the wilds of Quebec. No reason was given for it other than it would be a colonization road. The place to test government ownership and the building of a road by the government is the fat part and not the lean. Government ownership has been tried in this country always where it must fail. Politics have been mixed up with it, and it has been tried besides in an unproductive, bleak part of the country. But try it in the province of Ontario. What would the people of Ontario say to-day if the government came down with a proposition to parallel the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Toronto and to Niagara and the Detroit river and Georgian bay. That is a road which would furnish the key to the lock. The people of Ontario would like to see a hundred millions of their money spent in paralleling these roads in the province of Ontario, because such a road would run through the heart of the traffic and bring the other railways to time. That is what I would like. But I am now asking for a very modified form of government ownership, which would put the Grand Trunk Railway into the North-west to-morrow, which would give the Canadian Northern Railway an opportunity it has not now of developing and expanding in the North-west, and above all, would bring the Intercolonial Railway into the North-west. The principle of government ownership is one which will find approval among the people. That is the kind of ownership which the people want and the kind of relief which the people of the North-west want. It would not cost a great deal and would solve the problem right away. The proposal now brought down does not involve government ownership, although we are asked to support it because it does. As soon as the road is constructed, the government will give it away. Why should we give these railways away? If we build them, why should we not own and control them and give every railway that desires it running powers over them by our leave, and not by the leave of the Grand Trunk Railway ? I want to see these railroads run over this new road, and have running privileges, but I wish the control of the road to be in the hands of the government, and not in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway with power to discriminate against any outside road that may desire to use it.

There is another thing in respect of which I think the proposal involved in this Bill is an extraordinary one. I believe that in some way there are men associated with this scheme who hope to make money out of it in some way, who are seeking to take advantage of a large grant of public money in order to make fortunes for themselves. Whether that is so or not, I cannot tell at the present time, we must wait and see. But my idea is that whatever money is spent on that road should be spent by the government in the interest of the people, and without any regard to the interest of private individuals who are seeking to make fortunes out of it. The history of railroad building in the past in connection with subsidies from parliament, irrespective of party, I make the broad statement, has been to build up the private fortunes of individuals. We don't want any more of that in this country; and yet I am afraid that in this bogus proposal which is said to involve the principle of government ownership, there may be a great deal of that. I want to see this road built by the people and owned by the people, in such a way that no private fortunes are made out of it, that no great grafts are to be worked, as we see they have been worked in the past. The suspicion is that they are being worked to-day, and that the project is brought forward in the interest of men who have had large experience in exploitations of various kinds. I do not know how much truth there is in that, and I am not going into it to-day. But in the light of the history of the past, all that should be avoided, and the people, for their money, should get a people's railway. They should get for their money a road that will bring relief to the people of the North-west to-morrow. The proposal of the government will only bring relief after ten years. The government should bring down a scheme that would put the Grand Trunk into the North-west to-morrow. I believe the Grand Trunk desire to get into the North-west to-morrow. I do not believe they desire to build this line through Quebec, or through New Brunswick ; and I believe there is a clause in the Bill which says the Governor in Council may suspend

operations in connection with that if they see fit.

Now, what the Grand Trunk desire, I believe, is to get into the North-west at the earliest possible moment; but certain parties, for reasons of one kind or another, are forcing the Grand Trunk to go through the bleak portions of Quebec and the Laurentian country, and through the wilds of New Brunswick. I do not believe the Grand Trunk themselves desire this proposal for one moment, but they do wish to devote all their energy to getting from North Bay, and as best they can, into the North-west and from there to the Pacific. I want to see the Grand Trunk get into the North-west, and the people of the North-west wish to see it there. But they wish to see it get there in the most desirable form. They do not wish to see it get there in this form, they do not wish to see that great railroad tied up to the obligation of building a road, as is proposed, a road in Ontario, of building a road in Quebec, of building a road in New Brunswick. That won't solve the problem in the least, and it will take ten years to accomplish it. But the project suggested here today will solve it at once. What I suggest is that the whole energy of the Grand Trunk be devoted to getting to the Pacific. I believe in getting to the Orient by a new railway. I believe there is lots of traffic west of Winnipeg, lots of traffic through the Peace river country, lots of traffic in that district for a Canadian railway taking Canadian products to China and Japan. But the way to do that is to allow the Grand Trunk to devote its whole energy to getting to the west, not in building these roads at the present time to the north of us. They are not going to settle the transportation problem one bit; but building the road on the lines I have suggested will do it immediately, and will put the Grand Trunk where I believe it wishes to be put—in the North-west to-morrow. As I said before, the Grand Trunk put in the North-west to-morrow, it may be over the Canadian Northern for the present, will be an immediate competitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and you will have the Canadian Pacific Railway changing its attitude and trying to serve the people of the North-west and cutting down rates. But as it is to-day, the whole energy of this parliament, and of the Grand Trunk, judging by the Bill as it now stands, are to be frittered away in building these roads through the wilderness of the eastern provinces.

Now, Mr. Chairman, later on I intend to discuss the question again, and to go perhaps more fully into it. But at present I only take the opportunity of entering a solemn protest on behalf of the people of Canada, and of the people of the North-west in particular, against this proposal. I do so because it does not give immediate relief to the North-west, it does not solve the problem, and it entails great expense upon the country, and in every way is not in the public interest. I say now, in order that the Prime Minister may hear me, that what he should have done was to bring the great railroads into consultation, and say to them: We will nationalize our spout, we will allow you to run over it, we will let the Intercolonial run over it, we will make the Intercolonial a competitor of your road, we will fix the pace, and you must dance to that tune, if it is in the public interest. All that could have been done, all that could be done now. It could have been started five years ago. But all we are told is that the proposition to avail ourselves of this opportunity of government ownership is a mistake. I think it is no mistake. I think the one solution of the problem is government ownership, or at least government competition; and on that line I enter this protest against the proposal. I think it is a wrong policy, I think it is a bad policy, I think it is against public interest, and it is not in the line of the progress that characterizes all other countries to-day in dealing with these great questions. Russia is building an immense railroad; it may be primarily for national reasons, but it is also for transportation reasons. Australia is building up railroads all the time; all the nations that have gone into public ownership are extending their systems, they are satisfied that they are right. We alone are going back on that principle. The right hon. gentleman, in this proposal, is going back on the principle of government ownership, because he proposes to denude in some way the Intercolonial. He is giving it a rival at its most important point, a Grand Trunk string to the Intrcolonial bow at very large cost and will effect but a small shortening of the distance. An hon. gentleman said the other day that he does not think it will save more than sixty miles. We have the Intercolonial to-day which is available; it ought to be extended, it ought to be strengthened and improved; it ought not to be run down by a competitor put alongside of it. It should be extended to the west through the province of Ontario. That would make it a great railroad, that would make it a people's railroad, then you would help the people of the North-west to solve the great transportation problem and give them immediate relief. By controlling the terminals you would control the whole situation. These terminals make the strength of a railroad's position. We are gradually spending immense sums on them. In that way you will bind the provinces together.

The right hon. gentleman, when he brought down his proposition the other day, said there was danger of the withdrawal of the bonding privilege. Is it not a fact to-day that we have an all-Canadian road from Halifax to Vancouver? Suppose the Americans deprived us of the bonding privilege to-morrow, we still have a Canadian railway in our own territory, controlled by this

parliament; and we will be no better able, when we have this new line of the government, than we are to-day to withstand any pressure that our neighbours may put upon us in connection with the bonding privilege.

So, that argument falls to the ground. We have an all-Canadian route to-day and we are spending $100,000,000—it may be $150,000,000—to get a road that will do nothing more as far as the bonding privileges are concerned than the roads we have to-day. As far as the sentimental reasons given are concerned, we will not have any better means of transportation than those existing by means of the roads we have now. They will bind the country together and the way to bind the country together is to reduce rates over these railways so as to give an opportunity to the community of exchanging their views and becoming acquainted with each other by means of travel. The people of the North-west Territories have to pay four cents a mile to travel on the railway and they cannot under those circumstances come east. The policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway is to take people into the North-west at one cent a mile and to charge them four cents a mile to bring them out again. That is not good public policy. In the province of Manitoba they have a three-cent a mile rate and railway competition made it. Probably the agreement that the Manitoba government made with the Canadian Northern may have had something to do with it. Governments are in a position to do different things to alleviate the grievances of the people in connection with transportation, but they must go the right way about it. In this case, the right way to go about it is not to devote ten years to the building of a new railway through the wilderness but to do something immediately right in the places where traffic is congested and right in the populous centres. There is one way to regulate traffic on railways and that is to regulate one road or to have a government-owned road in operation in competition with private-owned roads in the populous parts of the country because the effect of that competition will be to regulate traffic charges. The people of the North-west Territories not only want a reduction in the traffic charges, but they want increased accommodation for moving their freight. They say they have a congested state of affairs up there. They never can get rid of that congestion of traffic by the adoption of the proposal of the government which is now before us because there can be no solving of the problem by the building of a road through the wilderness. If the government study the question they will see that their proposition is not feasible, they will withdraw from their present position and they will begin to negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the Canadian Northern Railway, and if they do negotiate and do get possession of a road do not let them give it away the moment they get it, but get it for the people and keep it because it will have a regulative influence upon all the roads. If these negotiations are going on, as I believe they are going on with Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, they ought to be absolutely based upon the principle of government ownership of the Canadian Northern Railway, and if we have that we will have the Grand Trunk Pacific in the west to-morrow, we will have 1,700 miles of railway competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway and we will have the resources of that great road extending its line across the plains and getting to the Pacific ocean, and in securing that we will be doing something for the people of this country. That is the issue between my idea and the idea submitted by the government. I believe my idea is one that will meet with the sanction of the people. It is an idea that I have been following very closely. I have been studying the question, I have been listening to men from all portions of the country, I have been reading the press, and if there is one thing to-day in the public mind more conspicuous than another, it is that the solution of the transportation problem whether by railways or waterways, is from the adoption of the principle of government owership, the building up of one system of railways and making the rates on this system as they ought to be so that other roads operating in competition with this government road will have to come down to these rates and give equal treatment and facilities to the people. Mr. Chairman, I beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion (Mr. Maclean) withdrawn, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. McCARTHY moved:

That section four be reconsidered for the purpose of amending it by substituting the word 'forty' for the word 'seventy' in the first line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is, I suppose, in view of the proposition that the company shall build only from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean. What will the length of the line be?

Mr. McCARTHY. Between 1,600 and 1,800 miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This will give a capitalization of how much per mile?

Mr. McCARTHY. A little less than $30,000 per mile—$27,000 or $28,000 per mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the estimate of the cost of these 1,600 or 1,800 miles?

Mr. McCARTHY. My information is that the cost will be $20,000 per mile on the

prairie section, and $50,000 per mile on the mountain section.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This will include rolling stock ?

Mr. McCARTHY. My information is that in addition to that there will be about $7,000 per mile for rolling stock, so that the cost will be $27,000 per mile on the prairie section, and $57,000 per mile on the mountain section.

Mr. INGRAM. What does that include in the shape of rolling stock ?

Mr. McCARTHY. My information does not go as far as that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We were informed that the cost for the prairie section would be very much less than the hon. gentleman states when we were discussing another matter this session. Is that estimate based upon any reports of engineers ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot say as to that, but I can say this that the railway to which the hon. gentleman referred has only built a 56 pound rail, and the intention of this railway is to build an 80 pound rail which will make a very great difference. The cost of a standard railway will be much higher. The requirements of the contract are that as far as practicable the railway is to be built to equal the line of the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Toronto.

Mr. MACLEAN. What is the weight of that rail ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Eighty pounds, I understand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the location of the railway between Winnipeg and Edmonton ?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is set out in section 12, of the Bill.

> To a point at or near the city of Winnipeg ; thence westerly and north-westerly, passing through or near Battleford, Edmonton and Dunvegan, or by such other more feasible route as is hereafter located, but following in a general direction that herein indicated, and by way of either the Peace River Pass or the Pine River Pass.

There is another clause which requires the line to be located in a specific way, and, of course, it is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the proposed line run north or south of the proposed Canadian Northern Railway line ?

Mr. McCARTHY. North, I understand ; but, of course, that is not settled. The committee spent several days considering the question as between the three railways, and finally a clause was added that at no point they are to be closer than 30 miles.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) mean to say that this road is going to run north of the Canadian Northern Railway to any extent after it passes Winnipeg ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot say.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). As outlined on the map, if that is any guide, it runs between the Manitoba and the north-west branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Northern Railway runs far north of the Manitoba and north-western branch. After it passes Portage la Prairie at any rate it surely must run south, and very far south of the Canadian Northern Railway.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) knows the country very much better than I do, and, it would be idle for me to state where the railroad is going to run. The ordinary observances have been followed in this charter, stating that it shall start from a point at or near a certain place, and then run to a certain other point. This charter is subject to more restrictions than other charters in respect to this 30-mile limit ; it is subject to the general provisions of the Railway Act, and it is also subject to the Governor in Council deeming its location reasonable. Until it is absolutely located, one cannot speak definitely as to whether it will be north or south of either one or the other line.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). If it runs south of the Canadian Northern Railway it ought to be a much cheaper road to construct than the Canadian Northern Railway. When I took exception to the estimate of $19,000 per mile for the Canadian Northern Railway, the reason given for the high estimate was that it included several expensive bridges. If $19,000 was sufficient for the Canadian Northern Railway, including bridges, this road going considerably south would be an easier road to construct, and yet we have an estimate of $27,000 per mile, including $7,000 for equipment. I think that estimate was exaggerated.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman knows that I am not going to construct the road, and that I am merely giving the information which I have. Let me call attention to the fact that parliament is only guaranteeing on the prairie section a maximum of $13,000 per mile. If seventy-five per cent of the cost is less than that, then the guarantee is only up to seventy-five per cent. Whatever it costs will be ascertained and be subject to the control of the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the hon. gentleman mean to intimate that it is no concern of this House what this road shall be capitalized at ? Surely it is important to the

people of the country whom we are supposed to represent to know whether it shall be capitalized at a larger amount than is necessary to build the road, because they would be entitled to charge rates according to the amount of their capitalization. It is, therefore, important to know this. The hon. member (Mr. Roche) has said that this road which is going to go south of the Canadian Northern Railway would be a much easier road to build, and it seems to me that $20,000 per mile is a larger capitalization than should be allowed. That with $7,000 a mile for rolling stock is simply absurd.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With respect to the amount stated for rolling stock, I may say that when the contract was about to be entered into with the railway company, it was thought advisable to have the opinion of Mr. Schreiber, chief engineer of government railways, and he told us that a proper equipment for such a railway would amount to $6,000 or $7,000 a mile. We, therefore, give my hon. friend the expert opinion of a man who is qualified to speak on the subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it in writing?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have no doubt that we can get it in writing. It was given to the acting Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in my presence. I am not sure whether he asked it in writing, but I will ask for a certificate from Mr. Schreiber.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The estimated length from Edmonton to the coast is about 1,000 miles, and the length from Winnipeg to Edmonton 600 or 700 miles, making 1,700 miles in all. Why does the Minister of Justice require that the first equipment of rolling stock shall the $15,000,000, apportioned to the western section ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We estimated the length of the road and multiplying it by seven, it came to $18,300,000 and we put it down at $20,000,000, and the company agreed. Of course, if my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) wishes to set up his opinion against that of Mr. Schreiber he is perfectly free to do so, but we took the opinion of a man, who in our judgment, is competent to advise.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am not talking about my opinion at all, but I say that 700 miles at $7,000 per mile would not be $15,000,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It would be $11,900,000 on those figures.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The government saw that the estimate would be more than sufficient, but they only apportioned $5,000,000 of it for the whole line from Winnipeg to Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is in the Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman has not read the contract. The $5,000,000 with respect to the eastern end is especially apportioned for the purpose of being security to us for the operation of the road. That is to say, of the $20,000,000 for rolling stock, we ear-mark $5,000,000, apportion that to the eastern end and hold that as a special guarantee. That does not mean that the $5,000,000 is the extent of the equipment ; it is the extent of the guarantee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the whole stock of the road is security for the running of the road.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. For the first issue of bonds the whole stock is security on the western end, but with respect to the eastern end, we have to take a special security, because in that case they are only our tenants, and we ear-mark $5,000,000 of that stock which is to be apportioned to the eastern end, and will be security to us for the due performance of all the work.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you get a first or second mortgage on that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We get a first mortgage. We first take security on the whole $20,000,000 on our guarantee, and with respect to the $5,000,000 in addition to the fact that it is a security to us for the guarantee of the bonds at the western end, we take it as a special security in connection with the eastern end.

Mr. CLARKE. There seems to be a considerable lack of information as to the location of the line west of Winnipeg. Is that indefiniteness due to the fact that negotiations are going on for the acquirement of the Canadian Northern system by the new company ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all. It is simply due to the fact that we are observing with reference to this railway enterprise all the rules that we observe with reference to other companies which come before us for charters. When a charter is granted to a railway company, it comes under the operation of the general Railway Act, which provides that all maps, plans, and profiles of the road shall be submitted for the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council; and here special provision is made for the location of the western end, which is to be subject to the approval of the government.

Mr. CLARKE. I am informed that it is impossible for this company to comply with the condition that the line running westerly and northerly from Winnipeg to Edmonton shall keep 30 or 40 miles from any other line. I want to ask if negotiations are going on between this company and the

Canadian Northern ? If so, we can understand why there is such indefiniteness in the Bill. If this company acquired the Canadian Northern, it would not be paralleling its lines.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend must not be too inquisitive, and ask us to tell him what negotiations are going on between two railway companies. As to what may be going on between the Grand Trunk Company and the Canadian Northern, we know nothing. It is not to our knowledge that any such negotiations are going on. We assume that such an important corporation would not undertake to build a railway through a country where they could not locate it.

Mr. CLARKE. I am given to understand by those acquainted with the country that it is physically impossible to build this railway 40 miles north of the Canadian Northern Railway.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am sure that the railway company will be impressed with this discussion. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have a knowledge of the country because they have surveyors there now locating the line.

Mr. CLARKE. We have the assurance from one high authority that no survey has yet been made.

The PRIME MINISTER. Surveys have been going on for the past six months.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the right hon. gentleman any information with reference to the passes ? The company has power under the Bill to take the Peace river or the Pine river pass, and to go to any port on the Pacific.

The PRIME MINISTER. They have to go to Port Simpson.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If that is so, that virtually locates the line. The Bill says at or near Port Simpson or Bute Inlet or any other port on the Pacific.

The PRIME MINISTER. The intention certainly is to go to Port Simpson unless very cogent reasons are brought to the contrary. There is no doubt whatever, from the explorations we have had, that Port Simpson is decidedly the best harbour we have in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think so myself.

Mr. INGRAM. When this Grand Trunk Pacific Bill was before the Railway Committee, several hon. gentlemen refrained from discussing the merits of this railway on the promise of the Minister of Finance, acting Minister of Railways and Canals, that when the government scheme for assisting the Grand Trunk Pacific should be submitted to parliament, the government would be in a position to state definitely what the route would be. That was the pledge given to the Railway Committee by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not at all.

Mr. INGRAM. I pledge my word of honour that that pledge was given, and if it is not carried out now, it only shows that we cannot rely on a pledge when it is given.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me, taking this clause in connection with clause 13, that the capitalization of the company is pretty large—in fact, very excessive. Under section 13 you have $20,000 per mile of bonds authorized on the prairie section and $50,000 on the mountain section ; and you have, under section 4, $45,000,000 of capital authorized for a road between 1,600 and 1,800 miles in length. Has my hon. friend who is moving the Bill made any estimate of what the total capitalization would amount to ?

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend will remember that we discussed this fully before the committee before. I am unable to apply the term capital in the way he does. I cannot understand the bonding privilege as capital. A bonding privilege is something that may be executed to its fullest extent, or it may not be. I have therefore made no calculation, and am unable to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suppose that capital, in the sense in which I am using it, would include the expenditure of money raised by bonds as well as the expenditure of money raised by the issue of capital stock. This railway might be built altogether, as many other railways are, with the money raised from the sale of the bonds. Suppose the common stock of this company were $50,000, and it were given bonding power sufficient to build the whole road ; would not the question of capital in that case be involved in the amount of the bond issue ? It is none the less involved because you fix a substantial sum as the capital stock of the company. The result will be that you will have this company capitalized, including the bond issue, to the extent of some $57,000 per mile, and my hon. friend does not pretend that the road on the prairie, including equipment, will cost more than $27,000 per mile. I am still of opinion, notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary, that a capitalization of that kind may interfere to a great extent with the control of the rates hereafter. It is impossible, looking at the conditions as they are, to say that the amount of outstanding bonds and capital stock in the hands of bona fide holders will not affect the question of the control of rates in the future. These mat-

ters will be looked at by the tribunal, whatever it may be, which has to deal with the question of control of rates in the future.

I may say further that it is remarkable we have not a more definite statement as to where the location will be. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) has said that it will be very much cheaper if built south of the proposed line of the Canadian Northern Railway than if built thirty miles north. But the promoter of the Bill is unable to say whether or not this company proposes to build north or south of the Canadian Northern Railway. I should think that some member of the government should be prepared to make an announcement on that point, in view of the fact that the government has introduced a measure which contemplates assistance to this company of a very substantial amount, not only on the mountain, but the prairie section as well. Surely the government takes some interest in this question of capitalization. It is a question of practical interest to everybody throughout the country. The people believe that a high capitalization will materially interfere with that control of the rates which is desirable we should have. The information of my hon. friend is extremely indefinite and based on such insufficient data that we are not very much inclined to accept his estimate of the cost of the road across the prairie section. We have no information before the House in the shape of engineers' estimates that I am aware of, and we know that railways have been built on the prairie section for very much less than the hon. gentleman suggests. It is quite true that the standard of this road may be somewhat higher, but we are merely guessing unless we have some information of the kind to which I have referred. Why should this road have a capitalization of $57,000 per mile ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is on the mountain section.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I am speaking of the whole road. On the mountain section, you have not only the capitalization included in the stock issue, but a possible capitalization of $50,000 per mile of a bond issue as well. We have no exact information as to the length of the mountain and the prairie section. We may presume that the prairie section will be 1,100 long and the mountain section 600. That is the nearest approach we can make to it, from the somewhat indefinite statement made by my hon. friend in charge of the Bill.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that the promoter of the Bill should give some reasons why he is making this reduction. What is the basis upon which he is working ? The original Bill required a capital of $75,000,000. He has struck off $30,000,000 and made the capital $45,000,000. According to the position presented by the First Minister, the company are to be rid of the building of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. This would be the more expensive part of the line. Under the first arrangement, they were to build from Moncton to the coast. They are getting rid of the more expensive portion and yet their capital is allowed to remain at considerable more than half the original amount. This committee should have the basis on which the hon. gentleman makes his deduction. The hon. gentleman declines to answer. That is just what I expected. There is evidently no basis. They have simply lumped the matter just as they did the whole transaction. They have gone into it without any information. The very gentleman who promoted this Bill before the Railway Committee and who has been lauded as such a railway builder, did not actually know anything about the country. He did not know where Lake Nepigon was ; he did not know the length of the line and the nature of the country, and was simply taking a leap in the dark. We need not ask for definite information, for we are not given even indefinite information. But it seems to me that when the government is going to give such substantial assistance to the enterprise, these men who are promoting the Bill should have the information we are asking for.

The PRIME MINISTER. The committee has already had a good deal of information. It is provided in the contract that the mining section is to be assisted by the guarantee of the government to the extent of 75 per cent on its cost, and the liability of the government is in no case to exceed $30,000 per mile in that section. It is assumed that the mountain section is between 600 and 700 miles in length. It is not possible to say exactly, but it will not be less than 600 or more than 700. Suppose it is 600. The bonds to be guaranteed by the government to the extent of 75 per cent will cover an amount of $18,000,000. The other twenty-five per cent will bring the amount to $24,000,000. This is a very low estimate, but that would be the lowest cost of the mountain section. It is estimated that the prairie section will be between 1,000 and 1,100 miles long. On that section we guarantee that bonds of the company to the extent of 75 per cent of the cost, our liability not to exceed $13,000 per mile. As to that we have some data, because some time ago we had a Bill passed in this House under somewhat similar circumstances over the same prairie section, in which it was agreed that we shoull guarantee the bonds of that body. It seemed a fair arrangement, and therefore, taking the cost of that part of the road at $13,000,000, as regards the government guarantee, you will have the whole cost of the prairie section between $16,000,000 and $17,000,000. Add $25,000,000 for the mountain section and you will have a total

cost of $42,000,000. Then you must add $20,000,000 of rolling stock, which brings the amount to $62,000,000. My hon. friend knows well that the stock to be issued by the company is an unknown quantity, as regards the amount which it will realize. As my hon. friend knows, it would not realize one hundred cents on the dollar, but only what the confidence of the people and the state of the market may fix. Under these circumstances, the company must have some leeway. In all cases in building a railway like this, you must give power to issue bonds and stock to a certain extent above the par value. If you knew that you were going to get exactly the face value of these securities you could calculate in that way what you would require. But you are not able to do so, consequently you must fix a wider limit.

Mr. FOWLER. The bonds are not counted in the capital stock. You must have capital to cover the margin between the seventy-five per cent guaranteed by the government and the cost of the road. On the mountain section there will be $6,000,000 and on the prairie section about the same—at any rate a total of $11,000,000 or $12,000,000 as I remember it. But, if you require $12,000,000 to make up the difference between what will be realized from the sale of the bonds guaranteed by the government and the actual cost of the road, what is the need of this capitalization of $45,000,000 ? It seems to me, that the public would have more confidence in this enterprise and also would give a higher price for the stock if the authorized issue was not so large. For, if $45,000,000 of stock is issued, as this will not increase the earnings, you have that much less security for a good return to the persons who invest. Then we must consider the people who are to be served by the line. There can be no possible question that that is a matter that will be taken into consideration when the tariff of tolls is to be fixed for this road by the Railway Commission under the Act now before parliament. The question will be asked : What is the capital of the road ; what interest must be paid to those who have invested their money in the enterprise ? For that reason it is very important that we should know somewhat accurately the basis on which this calculation has been made up. If it is reasonable that a capital of $45,000,000 should be allowed, this committee will cheerfully grant it. But, until the information is before it, the committee ought not to be asked to authorize such a capitalization as is here proposed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Further than that, the right hon. gentleman has dealt only with the bonds guaranteed by the government. But that does not touch the question I was dealing with, the amount of bonds and capital stock the company is allowed to issue—$50,000 of bonds per mile on the mountain section and $20,000 of bonds per mile on the prairie section. Let us see, taking the estimates given by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), what the road is to cost. He says it will cost $20,000 a mile for the prairie section. That, I believe is excessive. Then, he asks $7,000 a mile for rolling stock which is also pretty liberal. That makes $27,000 a mile for the prairie section of say 1,100 miles, or a total of $29,700,000. Then take the mountain section. It is said that this would cost $50,000 a mile, add $7,000 for the rolling stock and you have $57,000 a mile, for say 600 miles, or a total of $34,200,000. So, the cost of the whole road, even on these pretty liberal estimates would be $63,900,000. How do you propose to capitalize the company in view of that ? In the first place you give $45,000,000 of stock, and bonding powers amounting to $52,000,000, or a total capitalization of $97,000,000, which is $33,000,000 more than the whole cost of the road, even according to the very liberal estimates of the hon. member for North Simcoe. It may be true, as the right hon. Prime Minister (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said, that you must give some leeway. But what excuse is there for a leeway of $33,000,000 on a total estimated cost of $63,900,000 ? What excuse is there for that ? Does the right hon. gentleman pretend to say that that very extravagant capitalization, when the securities have been sold and have passed into the hands of bona fide purchasers, will not exercise an influence upon the control of rates upon that ? I believe it is bound to exercise a very considerable influence, and I protest for my part, against this excess of $33,000,000 over the very liberal estimates submitted to the House by the hon. gentleman who is promoting the Bill.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister whether, as a matter of fact, it is not the intention of the parties to these negotiations that the Grand Trunk Railway Company—not the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the Grand Trunk—shall receive a present of $25,000,000 of this stock? Under the 27th section of the agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific, it is provided that the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall acquire and take $25,000,000 of the stock, and shall also hold it during fifty years. It strikes me that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would find it rather difficult to raise $25,000,000 to pay for that stock, unless they could afterwards sell the stock, and under the contract this is just what they cannot do, for they must hold it. I doubt whether there is any intention as between the two companies, the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, that the Grand Trunk shall pay a dollar on that stock. I think it will turn out that this stock is to be given as a recompense to the Grand Trunk for guaranteeing 25 per cent

of the cost of the road. They will get that for their guarantee, while the country will get nothing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) point out in this Bill where there would be any authority for the Grand Trunk Pacific to do what he suggests ?

Mr. BARKER. I only read from the section of the contract which says :

The company undertakes——

That is, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company undertakes, for the Grand Trunk undertakes nothing——

—that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall acquire and take the said common stock to the amount of twenty-five million dollars, except shares held by directors not exceeding one thousand shares, and shall hold the shares during the term of the said lease, and so long as any of the bonds guaranteed by the government under the terms of this agreement shall remain outstanding and unpaid.

Looking at that from a common sense standpoint and in view of the fact that it is much to be doubted whether the Grand Trunk Company could afford to pay $25,000,000 for that stock—I do not suppose the Grand Trunk Pacific expect the Grand Trunk Railway Company shareholders to acquire so much stock and remain liable to be called upon to pay one hundred cents on the dollar—I infer that there will be what is commonly known as a dicker, and the money advanced on the bonds will be apparently advanced on the stock. By some of the ways unknown to dealers in stock the Grand Trunk Railway Company will get the stock without any liability ; there will be, as I said, simply a present made to the Grand Trunk of $25,000,000 out of this $45,000,000 of stock.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no limit to assumptions, except the imagination of the gentleman who makes them. But I would repeat my question and ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) to point out where the Grand Trunk Pacific would have the authority to make such a 'dicker' as he speaks of.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask a question that I was about to ask when the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) rose, and that is, what the government proposes that the Grand Trunk shall pay for the $25,000,000 of stock that they are supposed to acquire. If the Grand Trunk is coming into this thing, it should show its good faith. We ought to have some assurance that, if that company acquires $25,000,000 of stock, it will pay for it. If it pays for it, this country will be relieved to that extent of the actual cost of the road.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Irishman-like, my hon. friend answers one question by asking another. I would like the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) to answer the question I put.

Mr. BARKER. The minister has heard of the various methods that have been adopted in the past in ordinary commercial companies, and in what are called industrial companies, by which an immense amount of stock is placed upon the market as paid-up stock when not a dollar is paid upon it. There are various ways of doing it. We know that there have been large manufacturing concerns in which a million or two millions of stock have been issued as paid-up stock and never a dollar has been paid upon it, and yet it has gone out to the public, and the public have bought it as paid-up stock, and to all intents and purposes, it is so far as legal obligation goes, paid-up stock.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Joint Stock Companies Act is known to us, the Railway Act is known to us all, and I would like the hon. gentleman to point out in the Joint Stock Companies Act or in the Railway Act anything that will justify the statement he has made.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman mean seriously to assure this House that under this contract if the Grand Trunk Railway take twenty-five millions of that stock, they are going to pay for it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not here to say what I think, I am here for the purpose of applying the law. The hon. gentleman has made a statement, and I want him to point out by what law he justifies that statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why can it not be done under section 11 ? The question has already been asked.

Mr. MACLEAN. I press for an answer to my question.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) to point out any section of any law that justifies his statement.

Mr. BARKER. I know this, that bonds can be sold for what they are worth, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company can take stock at one hundred cents on the dollar and take bonds at five cents on the dollar, and buy both. The hon. gentleman has heard of such a transaction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As to bonds, yes ; as to stock, no.

Mr. BARKER. Very well, if some people in the same transaction want to buy both bonds and stock, they can buy very little in bonds and a great deal in stock. Very much like the old well-known practice under the Duncan Act, where a man paid five cents for a bit of ginger bread and got whiskey free.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think we have any law in this country which says that those who subscribe for stock must pay for it.

Mr. MACLEAN. What are the Grand Trunk Railway to pay for this $25,000,000 of stock?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. So far as I am concerned, under the law, they have got to pay full value for it.

Mr. MACLEAN. As a member of the administration, has he made a contract with this road, or does he know that they intend to pay the cash ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I know what the law requires of them, and I expect them to comply with the law.

Mr. MACLEAN. Here is a contract involving $25,000,000, and we have no assurance from the government whether this $25,000,000 is to be in money, or whether it is to be practically a gift to the Grand Trunk Railway.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 4,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the amendment be adopted?

Mr. MACLEAN. We were to have had some explanation about that. We would like the promoter of the Bill or some one representing the government to tell us what is to be done with this twenty-five million dollars worth of stock that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are to take up, when they are acquiring it what they are to give for it, and if the money that they give for it is to be devoted to the purpose of constructing the road. If that is the case it alters very largely the financial aspect of the proposition. Before the committee rose at six o'clock, when that question was up, we were expecting some information on that point either from the government or the promoter of the Bill. I ask again for that information.

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot understand the difficulty that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) sees in the matter. There is no difference in this Bill from any other Bill respecting capital stock, and I am at a loss to understand how you can mix the privilege of issuing bonds and debentures with capital stock. The issue of bond or debenture requires the placing of the assets of the company of a mortgage, and that mortgage must be paid off in this case within fifty years. If that mortgage is paid off, the company are relieved of their obligation, but if it is not paid off, then the mortgagees have the right to foreclose the mortgage on the road. How you can mix up with capital the placing of a mortgage on the assets is more than I can understand. This is capital stock to be issued for ordinary purposes. It is not an exorbitant sum. It is greatly reduced as compared with the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway company that ever asked for corporate powers from this parliament, and upon this clause I cannot see how you can mix up the capital stock with the bonding privilege. This is a fair capitalization. I have not heard any criticism of the amount of the capitalization except by joining it with the bonding privilege. I cannot understand the view which hon. gentlemen take, because every bond issued is secured by a mortgage. On one side of the ledger you have the assets, on the other side you have the mortgage, and you cannot make the capital any better or any worse because one balances the other.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think that any one desires to mix up the capital stock of this company and the bonds except the promoter himself, and it appears to me from what he has said now and said before, that he is rather desirous of confusing our minds upon this question. The stock of the company, we are told, is to be $45,000,000, and of that $25,000,000 is to be acquired by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. What we want to know is what becomes of this $25,000,000 after it is acquired by the Grand Trunk Railway Company?

An hon. MEMBER. They have to hold it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it intended that they receive that as a gift for promoting this gigantic scheme? Is it intended that that $25,000,000 is to be divided amongst the provisional directors as their compensation for promoting this gigantic undertaking ? Is it intended that they shall purchase it, and if so, at what price shall they receive it—25 cents on the dollar or 50 cents on the dollar, or will they get par for it ? I am very suspicious that this $25,000,000 is to go to the Grand Trunk Railway Company to be divided amongst the directors as compensation for promoting this scheme. There is certainly something mysterious about it from the peculiar wording of the resolution and from the peculiar manner in which the promoter has endeavoured to answer the questions that have been propounded from this side of the House. I think we must have some specific declaration as to what will ultimately become of that $25,000,000, whether the par value of the stock is to be realized from the Grand Trunk Railway Company and whether the $25,000,000 goes into the construction of this road.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am rather surprised that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson), if he has read the contract,

should make that statement. I think we have a right to assume that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company subscribe for this stock they will carry out their agreement according to law. It will be fraudulent to subscribe for this stock in some roundabout way, and to obtain it in a manner not in accordance with the laws of the country. My hon. friend suggested that they might dispose of this stock to some other parties. It is clearly agreed that they are to hold this stock as the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and they cannot dispose of it. Having entered into an agreement with the parliament of Canada to hold the stock, it would be a violation of the whole agreement should they attempt to dispose of it. I suppose they would be liable to all the penalties that would be incurred for a breach of contract. There might even be a foreclosure of the mortgage. I do not think there is anything but what appears to be a straight business contract according to the laws of the country, and we have every reason to assume that a large and responsible company such as the Grand Trunk Railway Company would carry out any agreement that they entered into. I would be very sorry to think that there was anything in the Bill or the contract that would appear to be otherwise.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention that the Grand Trunk Railway Company in taking up this $25,000,000 of stock shall practically furnish $25,000,000 towards this undertaking? If that is the intention it would appear to be a bona fide transaction, but I confess from the manner in which the promoter answered the questions on this point it led to a great deal of doubt in my mind as to whether this was the intention or not.

Mr. McCARTHY. Has the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) any idea that if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company were to be wound up, the shareholders of that company would not have to pay 100 cents on the dollar, and if he has not any doubt upon that point he cannot have any doubt upon the question he is asking. When he endeavours to charge me with mixing up the bonding privileges and the capital stock, I absolutely repudiate his statement. I did not mix them up. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when the discussion was up here the other day, sought to add the capital stock and bonding privileges together, to divide the mileage of the road into that and to show that this road was capitalized by the result per mile. That is absolutely foundationless. The premises are not correct. A bond that is issued cannot be said to be part of the capital stock of any kind of a company, because every bond is secured by mortgage. You have the assets upon one side and the bonds upon the other, and if the bonds are not paid the right of foreclosure can be exercised in this case at the end of fifty years. This is the ordinary case of a company asking for incorporation. When a railway company comes here asking for incorporation, it has its capital stock and it has its bonding privileges. We have never heard of this discussion before. We have never heard of the process of adding bonding privileges and capital stock together and saying that the capitalization of the company is the result of that addition. I do not think, in business parlance, that that is a correct way of stating the case. I think it is absolutely incorrect, and the question is whether $45,000,000 is a fair capitalization for the company or whether it is not. The Canadian Pacific Railway, which will possibly have twice as much mileage as this road, have a capitalization of $85,000,000. In addition to that they received $25,000,000 in cash, $35,000,000 of railway constructed, and 25,000,000 acres in land. I am not charging that the aid which was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway was improperly given, but when you put the two cases in parallel columns, it cannot be argued that the capitalization of this company is unfair or that it is inadequate to the requirements of the company. The bonds must be met in fifty years and it is not fair to mix capital stock with bonding privileges.

Mr. MONK. I do not think this Bill is to be considered as an ordinary Bill going through the House under the same circumstances as most Bills, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) does not quite seize the sense of the argument on this side of the House as regards capitalization. The object of this great enterprise is to reduce rates, and that consideration was given to the bonded indebtedness of the company, and the argument founded upon that was that the capital should not be made too large, because, if the bonded indebtedness represented a very large sum requiring payment of interest and it was necessary to pay interest upon an exorbitant amount of capital stock, the real object of all our efforts would not be attained ; that is to say, the payment of interest upon the bonded indebtedness and the payment of dividends upon the stock would prevent our attaining a great reduction of the rates. That is the way I understood the argument. As to an enterprise of this kind having a great effect on the reduction of rates, experience has proved the contrary ; experience has proved that when there are rival companies rates are not reduced. There is increased accommodation, greater conveniences and more comfort, but an arrangement is generally arrived at between rival lines so as not to reduce the rates, at all events to such a degree as that provision will not be made for the payment of interest on the bonds

and also for doing justice to the shareholders of the stock of the company. It is therefore very natural to say that the bonded indebtedness being so much per mile and there being a second mortgage authorized, you will find that if you have a capital of $45,000,000 you will not be able to give to the western people that reduction of rates which they have a right to expect. I have an open mind on the question whether it will not be necessary for the company to have a capital of $45,000,000. I take it that the company will have to expend, over and above the bonds which it is authorized to issue, a sum approximating $10,000 per mile for the mountain section, because the report of the engineers made in 1877 for the route which the company has chosen to Bute Inlet represents an expenditure of $60,000 per mile, covering 523 miles. The authorized bonding in that region is only $50,000 per mile, so that the company will have to spend $10,000 per mile at least, if we are to have the standard railway that is stipulated in the contract, without taking into consideration the terminal facilities which the company is obliged to provide at Fort Simpson. In addition to that, the amendments which have been adopted to-day authorize the company to build branch lines to North Bay, to Montreal, to Port Arthur, and also tramways each not exceeding ten miles in length in British Columbia. I doubt very much if the company will be able to give us a line of railway in the prairie section of the standard required by the agreement for $20,000 per mile. It may be so, but there are a great many rivers there and one or two watersheds, and the land is not absolutely flat. For my own part, I have an open mind on the question of the $45,000,000 capitalization. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has raised a question of very great importance, and one which was probably suggested by the latitude found in section 11 of the Bill. He asked for distinct information as to whether the Grand Trunk Railway is going to put into this company cash or its absolute equivalent to the amount of $25,000,000. That is a very important question, because the agreement made with the company, and which was emphasized by the Prime Minister, requires the company to put $25,000,000 into the enterprise. If the company is to get $25,000,000 in any other way; if it is to get it in the way of a gratuity for promoting the Bill, or if it is in any way permitted to not carry out what seems to be the letter and spirit of the agreement, then it is a very important matter upon which we should be fully enlightened.

Mr. WADE. There is a feature of this discussion which is somewhat novel. Gentlemen on the other side contend that freight rates are fixed in consideration of the amount of capital in the way of stock or bonds that is put on the market. I would ask these gentlemen opposite, if any one of them has ever had anything to to do with the fixing of rates upon railways, and if so can he tell of one solitary case where the capital stock or the bonds that were issued entered into that consideration in the slightest degree. I submit that the fixing of rates on railways is determined upon a different basis altogether. It seems to me that we would be mere children to suppose that the tribunal which has the fixing of the rates would take into consideration, not the dollars and cents that the road costs actually in money, but the amount of stock and bonds that have been put upon the market. I make bold to say that no such consideration has ever prevailed yet in the fixing of rates upon a railway.

Mr. MONK. I think a great many examples might be given.

Mr. WADE. Can the hon. gentleman give me one case in which it has been done?

Mr. MONK. It is certainly an important element in determining the rates on a railway like this.

Mr. WADE. Can you give me a single case?

Mr. MONK. There are many cases which might be mentioned in the United States, but without going further than Montreal, I might say that in the case of the Montreal Street Railway that was an element in determining its rates. It was alleged by the Montreal Street Railway Company—that their rates could not be made lower and a reasonable dividend paid to the holders of stock, and so the amount of the stock was taken into consideration. Also, in the case of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company, it was urged that the rates could not be made lower on account of the large capitalization of the company, which, I think, is $17,000,000. It is a question frequently raised on behalf of the company when a company is called upon to reduce its rates.

Mr. WADE. I do not see wherein the statement of the hon. gentleman has the slightest bearing on the case we are discussing. I repeat my statement, that I do not believe a solitary case can be cited in which the railway authorities in fixing rates on a railway, have taken into consideration the amount of stock or bonds that had been issued. I am speaking in the presence of the late hon. Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart), and he can correct me if I am wrong. We have nothing to do with railways in the United States, and I am not speaking of street railways; I am speaking of railways which are under the control of this government. I would refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) to the 29th paragraph of this agreement, which says:

The rates and tolls to be levied and taken by the company on any part of the said rail-

way shall be under the control of the Governor in Council or of such authority or tribunal as is designated under any Act of the parliament of Canada for the control of the business of the railway.

Surely, any person who takes any of the bonds or the stock of this railway, takes it with a full knowledge that the government, or the tribunal that is constituted by this parliament for that purpose, has the absolute control over fixing rates. Does he mean to tell me that the government or the tribunal which is constituted are foolish enough to have their decision warped in the slightest degree by the amount of stock or bonds put on the market ?

Mr. MONK. Most decidedly.

Mr. WADE. Then I must say that he has small confidence in the government, at which I am not surprised, and small confidence in the tribunal that will be organized; but surely the hon. gentleman who sits beside him will not agree with him in that assumption. The hon. gentleman knows that if the company place the stock at anything less than par, under the law, the holders of the stock will be liable to pay the balance in case it shall be necessary. In this case, in order that the government or the tribunal may not be deceived, the 19th section of the agreement gives the government the most absolute power to investigate in any way they see fit, by the employment of engineers, accountants and inspectors, to ascertain just how much money has been put into the construction of the road. In addition, they have a director sitting at the board of the company, and having access to all its books. If $25,000,000 of this stock were allotted to the Grand Trunk Railway Company on payment of 10 per cent, they would be liable, in case of necessity, to pay the other 90 per cent, and there can be no injury to anyone.

Mr. MACLEAN. Let me point out an instance which will meet the hon. gentleman's argument. If the government undertook to regulate the rates of this road, it would be in the way of the company being cited to show cause why the rates should not be reduced. The company would say, ' we have issued $45,000,000 of stock.' This may have been purchased by investors for little or nothing ; but in the meantime it may have changed hands, and the old argument of the widow and the orphan would come up again. The Toronto Street Railway pays dividends on $6,000,000 of watered stock, and that fact is the great stumbling block in the way of a reduction of fares. We have asked what consideration the Grand Trunk Railway Company are to pay for this stock. If it is the intention that they shall pay cash for it, and that the money shall go into the treasury of this company, it will go a long way towards building the road. If the money goes in, value will come from it ; but if it is to be watered stock on which dividends are expected to be paid, there will be very little hope of a reduction of rates subsequently.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has apparently examined the proceedings before the Railway Commission of the United States, or he would not have made such a sweeping statement as he has made.

Mr. WADE. On the contrary, I said I was not referring to any proceedings in the United States, but I was confining myself to the proceedings in Canada. I am not familiar with the laws or practice in the United States.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) While the hon. gentleman asserts that it would be childish to take that argument into consideration, American publications say that it is an argument that has been made there again and again before tribunals having power to fix rates, and an argument to which effect has been given. Therefore, when he makes the broad assertion that no one but a child would rely on that argument, he is casting an imputation on gentlemen who have as much familiarity with railways and as much capacity to make an argument as any hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. McCARTHY. If a man gets any of this stock for nothing, he has notice that there will be control over the rates, and the fact that he holds a par value of $100 for which he gave nothing cannot be given as a reason for keeping up the rates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should not think the question of notice would arise in such a case at all. Every one holds stock subject to the general law of the land.

Mr. McCARTHY. And surely subject to a specific contract under which the stock was purchased.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot grasp my hon. friend's point. All I am suggesting is that when this matter comes before the tribunal having power to deal with rates, this argument, which has been made over and over again in the past, will be repeated, namely, that the company whose rates are sought to be controlled is capitalized at such an amount, and that it is fairly entitled to have its rates fixed, so that it can pay a legitimate profit to the persons who hold the stock. That is an argument which is not affected by any question of notice, so far as I understand it. With regard to the other point, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company are bound to pay $25,000,000 in cash in any possible event, I do not see how that can be made good, in view of the fact that section 11 provides exactly the contrary—that there may be some cases in which stock can be given for considerations which are not cash.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no statute requiring the rates to be fixed according to the amount of the capital stock. Therefore, the only reason why the tribunal would take the amount of the capital stock into account would be that the tolls or rates should be put at such a level as to enable the capital put into the undertaking to be remunerative. If that be the reason, is it not open to the tribunal, which we appoint to fix the rates, to ascertain the true amount of capital and not take the nominal value, especially when those who take the stock take it knowing that a contract exists between the company and the government, providing that the tolls shall be regulated by the tribunal and that the government shall have power to investigate in order to ascertain what the true amount of the investment is. With respect to the contribution, I do not think it is argued that the contribution should be in cash for the stock. It may be in the equivalent to cash. The company will have to give something equivalent to cash in return for the stock.

Mr. MACLEAN. What is that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Plant, rolling stock, elevators, wharfs, warehouses, vessels or materials of any kind. That is what the statute says. If they do not give an equivalent in cash they would have to pay the cash.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend has made it very plain now. The intention is exactly what we suspected all along. They are to give the capital stock in return for rolling stock, vessels and services and so on, due regard being had to the market value of the stock. And if the stock would not have any particular market value they could give $25,000,000 of stock for almost nothing and no one could find any fault. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has made the matter extremely plain.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If I have satisfied the leader of the opposition, I am quite happy.

Mr. BARKER. I desire to call attention to a provision which was in the General Act respecting railways as first introduced, but which was subsequently struck out by the committee, and which is now in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill with a very significant addition. In the General Railway Act, as originally introduced, there was this clause, which was struck out after discussion in this committee.

59. The directors of the company, elected by the shareholders, may make and issue, as paid up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over such stock in payment for right of way, plant, rolling stock or materials of any kind, and also for the services of contractors and engineers ; and such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company, and such stock shall not be assessable for calls.

After discussion, that clause was struck out. But now we find in this special charter that same clause, which was considered improper to be inserted in the General Railway Act, and in addition certain very significant words :

11. The directors of the company, elected by the shareholders, may make and issue as paid up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over such stock in payment for plant rolling stock, docks, elevators, wharfs, warehouses, vessels or materials of any kind——

Now comes a very important addition :

Or as consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired and also for bona fide claims, &c.

I need not go on with the clause, but here are the significant words : As consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired. Why, Sir, does this House overlook the fact that the board of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the board of the Grand Trunk Railway are one; that when the president of the Grand Trunk Railway sits in his office and shakes hands with the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, he shakes his own hand ; that when these two companies sit down together, under another clause of the General Railway Act, and make arrangements for the interchange of traffic and all those other things so common among railway companies, the one company can give to the other rights, powers and privileges, the value of which no one can estimate or weigh ; that if they agree that these rights and privileges are worth $25,000,000 or $25 no man could say it was right or wrong, and that the Grand Trunk Railway may stipulate, in any traffic arrangements which it shall make with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, that $25,000,000 of common stock of the latter road shall be transferred as a consideration for entering into the agreement. How is any railway commission to say that such a bargain is fraudulent or that they paid more or less than the value of the bargain ; and yet, under this clause, with these words in it, which was rejected from the General Railway Act, these two companies may agree that $25,000,000 of common stock shall be considered the equivalent of the contract entered into between them and be considered paid up stock not assessable for calls.

Mr. McCARTHY. My hon. friend has discovered a mare's nest. He knows that this same clause was standing in the old Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) stood up in his place, when this clause in the General Railway Bill was objected to, and said that it was similar to the one in the Railway Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have added words which make it entirely different.

Mr. BARKER. The words I have quoted are not in the old Railway Act, namely, 'in consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired.' These have been inserted for the purposes of this Bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. My friend knows that when this clause was before the committee, the point now taken by him was not urged. The clause was in the General Railway Bill and also in this Bill, so that the point sought to be made by the hon. member for Hamilton that it was specially introduced in this Bill to make up for something that has been struck out of the General Railway Bill is incorrect. Although there have been some words added, they are simply words which require to be added because this company, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has pointed out, is going to erect docks, warehouses and vessels. Therefore the clause is not a departure from the law as it has been since 1888, in section 39 of the Railway Act, which was passed in that year. This company is to provide terminal facilities both upon the Atlantic and upon the Pacific. Therefore, the bonding privilege and the stock they ask to be allowed to issue is not exorbitant. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) seeks to draw a red herring across the scent by speaking of the president of one company making a bargain with the other company simply by shaking hands with himself. Why, what has been the clamour in the country up to the present time until this contract was announced to the public? It has been that irresponsible people were behind this scheme. We had it day after day in the press that the Grand Trunk Railway Compapny of Canada was not prepared to back this scheme financially. And now this is answered conclusively when it is shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is behind this scheme financially and every other way. Why, then, should we have the hon. gentleman saying that a bargain between these two companies will be made by the simple process of the chairman of both shaking hands with himself? This is entirely opposed to the criticism to which the Bill was subjected in the committee. And it is unfair criticism. The desire of the whole country was that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada should take part in this scheme and give it stability. What we have before us is not section 11 or section 13; the question is whether $45,000,000 capitalization—having regard to the general legislation which has passed this parliament—is fair or unfair in the case of a company such as this. And hon. gentlemen are discussing extraneous matters in trying to lead us to the consideration of other sections of the Bill, which have already been discussed and passed.

Mr. BARKER. I thought I was discussing the question of the capital stock of the company, and I am very much mistaken if I have said a word outside of that subject. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) says correctly that in the General Railway Act, as introduced, there was the clause that I more than once called attention to in this House as a very objectionable one, as enabling a company to issue capital stock without getting any money for it. After lengthy discussion the Minister of Railways voluntarily withdrew that clause as one that he did not think it proper to allow to remain in the General Railway Act. But the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) rather gets outside the line of the argument. He says that that clause was in the General Railway Act during the discussion of the clause in this Bill in the Railway Committee, and therefore there was nothing extraordinary in that clause. But the hon. gentleman has overlooked that I pointed out to him that there were very important words incorporated in this clause in this special Bill that was never in the General Railway Act at all; and it happens that the very words that are introduced into this Bill that are peculiarly fitted as between two railway companies allied as these two are, to enable one to issue a large amount of capital stock to the other without getting a dollar out for it. The particular words I referred to were not in the General Railway Act at all; they are 'or as consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired.' That is, one railway company may issue stock as fully paid up when it acquires from the other powers and privileges. Why, that is the very point we are raising, that the Grand Trunk Pacific, by entering into an arrangement with the Grand Trunk may acquire privileges of unknown value, and as consideration for them may hand over its common stock. You cannot measure in dollars, or in any way, the value of privileges accorded by one great company to another for the interchange of traffic, the use of terminals and all the other things that a company fifty years of age can offer to a youngster just coming into existence. And, I ask, when these hon. gentlemen were drawing a clause in the terms of the General Railway Act and for this very purpose, why did they not adopt the clause in the General Railway Act as it stood at the time. They inserted all the provisions there, and they added these particular words that never appeared in the General Railway Act. If they have any object at all, it is to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to give this enormous amount of common stock as compensation for the privileges they propose to gain from the Grand Trunk. Now, I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy), as

he is so ready to answer me and so ready to charge me with using unfair arguments, to explain how these words came to be inserted and who inserted them. Was it the hon. gentleman himself? He introduced the Bill and has been in charge of it; perhaps he will tell us with what motive these particular words were inserted. Surely the clause that had been in the General Railway Act since 1888 was sufficient for all purposes. Why did they want to insert these words in this particular Act except for the purpose that I have suggested? And if they wanted the power to deal with the rights and powers and privileges that one company can accord to the other, I think it is a reasonable argument for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—particularly when you take this provision in connection with the fact that $25,000,000 of common stock is to be acquired from one company to the other company—that this stock is to be given, and, on the other hand, this clause 11 provides for the consideration.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I desire to say just a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman for Annapolis (Mr. Wade). I am glad to see that that hon. gentleman has arrived at the same conclusion that I have often expressed in this House, that the Railway Commission which we are creating will be empowered to inquire into the actual cash expenditure on the road, and fix the charges on that basis. But the hon. member differs entirely in his conclusion from the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock). How often, before the Railway Committee have these hon. gentlemen urged the reduction of the powers to issue stock and the bonding powers of the several railroads under consideration on the very principle that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has urged—that the amount of capitalization, including bonds, would be a consideration with the commission in fixing the rates of the road. I have again and again contended for what the hon. member for Annapolis now says, that the issue of bonds and the issue of stock is an internal affair that concerns the company itself and is independent of any legislation that we may enact in reference to fixing of rates; that the true criterion is the amount of cash expended on the road, and that on the basis of this cash expenditure the commission should fix the rates. I do not say that the capitalization of this road is too large when we consider that all the rolling stock of the road is to be arranged on the western section, and that the powers of bonding are confined to that section. They have to build the section of the road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, they have to build the connection between the main line and North Bay, and—whether they ever intend to build it or not—to make the connection with a railway that centres in Montreal. If they intend to do all these things the capitalization is not too large. But, unfortunately for the consideration of this subject, the hon. member who has charge of the Bill did not explain that feature of it. He confined his explanations to the government section of the road, and the road which the company intend to build from Winnipeg to the ocean. He did not seem to know that capital was required for the purpose of building these sections of the road. I am not opposed to the Bill at all. Give the Grand Trunk Railway Company the fullest power to enable them to fulfil the bargain they have entered into with the government. When you give them that power, then we will discuss the bargain they have made with the government. But, we cannot shut our eyes to the statement of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), where he draws attention to the extraordinary powers given in section 11. I have stated before that it empowered the Grand Trunk Railway Company to make an arrangement with this new corporation which enabled them, in exchange for the guarantees which they give for the rolling stock that is put upon the road—or, as my hon. friend says, in pursuance of any other family or private arrangement made between the two companies—to give this stock over to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Now, the question must occur, how is the Grand Trunk Railway Company to raise the $25,000,000? The Grand Trunk Railway are in this position, that the common stock is the only thing they have, with the bonds of the company. What is the value of that stock? What is the value of our claim that we have against the Grand Trunk Railway Company for nearly $30,000,000? That precedes the common stock of the company, it comes after the other securities to which we have given a preference, and if that security which we have at present is not worth a cent, what is the value of the promise of the company to fulfil these conditions? Nothing whatever. That is the position of the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway. They have to raise money outside this scheme to build that portion of the road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. On the road that proceeds from Winnipeg to Quebec it is a necessity for them to have a branch to Lake Superior. They have to raise that money. They are unable to give a security upon that portion of the road to the parties who invest money in it, as it is a purpose independent entirely of all the other undertakings. All the branch lines, not exceeding six miles in length, are liable to be hypothecated by this new company as security for the advances made for the purpose of building these particular sections of road. As I said before, the capitalization, to my mind, is not too great. But let the House remember that we know exactly what is the

value of the powers of clause 11 in the agreement, that it enables this company to give the Grand Trunk Railway Company the whole of this stock for any reasons which come within clause 11, and these reasons may not be binding upon a commission if the views of the government are taken, if the views of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals are taken, if the views of the Postmaster General are taken, that in consideration of the fixing of rates on the railway the capital and bonding powers of the road are to be taken into consideration. As I said before, I am with the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) in thinking that the commission's duty, if it is not clearly defined in the Bill, is to look into the expenditure of cash put into the road for the purpose of construction, and on that they should act, not on any watered stock, not on any stock given away for promotion, or for any of these other purposes. As the leader of the opposition says, these matters are considered by railway commissions in the United States at the present day—the amount of capital stock, no matter how much it is, and the amount of bonds issued upon the road, because the innocent holders of bonds do not know whether they have been watered or not. It is a fair consideration for the commission to see that not more of a bond issue or stock issue is made upon the road than what the road requires for actual construction.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think the leader of the opposition said exactly what the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) attributes to him. I listened carefully to his statement, and I did not understand him to say that the commissioners are guided by the amount of capitalization. I think it would have been a mistake if he had said that the commission, in settling freight rates, were very materially influenced by the question of the capitalization of the company, because so far as I understand these questions, these fixed charges do not very materially enter into the question of what the freight rates shall be. The freight rates may be made to depend upon cost of service into which the question of capital of course enters, but I think they are based more frequently upon causes other than the amount of capital invested in the road. They may in some cases be based upon cost, but more frequently they are based upon the traffic that is carried over it. They do not enter into the question of how much capital is put into the road, but whether it charges more for freight that is to be carried than the traffic will bear. It may be that the question of over capitalization would enter into the fixing of freight rates, and the question of stock watering might also enter into the fixing of a rate. But I am satisfied that those questions enter only to a small extent into consideration. If I may quote the language of one of the best authorities on that subject on this continent, the extent to which stock watering ever does enter into the fixing of rates has been much exaggerated by the popular imagination. I am quoting substantially the words of Professor Hadley, who has given this whole subject of railway transportation a more scientific consideration than perhaps any other writer on this side of the Atlantic. Speaking of the matter of stock watering in the fixing of rates, and of over capitalization which is the same thing in another form, he says :

> Its influence in this matter is very much exaggerated in the popular belief. A railroad, as we shall see when we come to consider the attempt to base rates on cost of service, does not take its fixed charges into account in making its rates. It tries to arrange matters so that on each class of business it shall make as much money as it can above operating expenses. If it makes a mistake in one place it is so much loss to the stockholders. It is not a thing which it can try to make up at some other place ; because, by supposition it would in any event try to make all it could at that other place, and to raise rates there would do more harm than good. To make the most at all points put together, it tries to make the most at each point.

In a foot note to this passage he says this, which I think is very relevant to the point made by my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade).

> The railroads which have high capitalization on the whole do business at lower rates than the cheaply built ones. During the last twenty years while rates have been falling so rapidly, the average capital account of railroads per mile has been increasing. The railroad men often try to make their capital correspond to their profits ; but they do not try to make their rates correspond to their capital.

And they could not make their rates correspond to their capital if they did try, because these are determined by other considerations. Therefore, I am doubtful whether any commissioners in any of the states ever have undertaken to settle the freight rates by a consideration of what it has cost to build the road, and I do not think they could successfully do so if they tried.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With all due deference to the authority that my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) has cited I think it hardly bears out his conclusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I intended to allude to the very striking difference of opinion between my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and the very much higher authority on railway questions of the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sorry that my hon. friend forgot that because it was a great oversight on his part. He cites an authority which says that while railway companies take the view that their profits bear some relation to their capital, their rates do not bear any relation to their capital. Inasmuch as their profits must de-

pend upon their rates one would naturally suppose that the latter must equally have some relation to the capital stock. Therefore, the authority which my hon. friend has cited has not been of very much assistance to him. Notwithstanding what has been said, I think it would be a very difficult matter fifteen or twenty years from the present time for a commission to embark upon an inquiry to ascertain what has been the cost of this road, and the amount of capital that has been put into the road. Particularly when you have a clause like this under which $25,000,000 of stock can be handed over in consideration of certain rights, powers and privileges. It would be a most difficult thing for a commission to inquire, twenty-five years from now, whether these rights, powers and privileges were worth $25,000,000 of stock. It has been suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) that my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is a high authority upon these questions, and I recognize as much as the hon. member for Hants the authority which his opinion bears upon matters of this kind. It has been suggested that the difficulty which I brought to the attention of the committee could always be got over by an inquiry as to the actual cost. I say with all deference to my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), that such an inquiry would be attended in the ordinary course with very great difficulty after the expiration of a period of years. It would be an inquiry which would envolve an enormous amount of work and it would be an inquiry which in the end would probably be futile. It would be almost impossible to make such an inquiry in a case of this kind where we should have to deal with transactions under section 11. However much my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) may think you can work this matter out, on a strictly logical basis, or that you will not have to consider the amount of bonds and the stock outstanding, I say that taking things as they are in this world, and dealing with matters of this kind before the members of a Railway Commission you will find that such questions as these will have more or less influence. Therefore, I say that the question of capitalization must, in my own opinion, have some effect upon the control which parliament may be able to exercise in regard to rates in the future. I think my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has made a better answer than the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in regard to capitalization. I have not examined the particulars of this section providing for these additional lines, and I am not aware whether it is compulsory upon this company to undertake the construction of these lines but it is only optional upon the company to undertake the construction of the lines that have been referred to, you may still have the same difficulty that the company may not see the advantage in future of constructing these lines, and nevertheless you raise this capital to $45,000,000. These lines must be of considerable extent if they cover the whole of the excess of the capital to which I have referred, because we find the company with a capitalization of $97,000,000, and we find there an excess of $33,000,000 approximately over the cost as estimated by the hon. member for North Simcoe, which estimate was based upon $20,000 a mile for the prairie section, $50,000 a mile for the mountain section and $7,000 per mile for the cost of equipment, which I am sure every hon. member who has considered this matter at all would regard as an exceedingly liberal estimate particularly for the prairie section. But, taking that estimate as approximately correct you have the sum of $33,000,000 by which this company is capitalized over and above the estimate of cost put forward by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). I therefore still think that the capitalization of this company is not upon a proper basis and I am still of the opinion that the excessive capitalization may in future exercise an influence upon the rates which shall be charged by this company.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. McCARTHY moved :

That section five be reconsidered by the committee for the purpose of amending it by adding after the words 'capital stock' in the seventh line thereof the following ; 'not exceeding twenty million dollars or the equivalent thereof in sterling money.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They may issue the whole of the stock as preference stock or any portion the company may determine. This is to limit to $20,000,000 the amount of preference stock they may issue.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 9,

Mr. McCARTHY moved :

That section nine be struck out.

He said : This is covered by the terms of the General Railway Act and there is no necessity for it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before this is struck out let me draw the attention of the committee to the fact that two of the members of this incorporated company are members of the Senate—George A. Cox, and Wm. Gibson, of Beamsville. How is it possible that that company can contract with the government when the new Bill introduced into the House the other day provided that no member of the House of Commons or of the Senate shall be interested in any way in this undertaking or Bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. After the Bill has passed and the company becomes organized, then I presume, it will become

necessary that these two gentlemen shall both disappear from the company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would it not be a great deal better to strike them out at the present time ? Here is a contract being entered into between the company and the government of the country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The agreement has not yet been sanctioned by parliament.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have no financial interest in it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, if you are determined to leave them in, let them be left in.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I move that in lieu of the section which it is sought to eliminate the following clause be inserted for the protection of the government :

The government of Canada may from time to time appoint a director for such period as it deems proper as provided for in the agreement referred to in the schedule of the National Transcontinental Railway Act, 1903 ; who shall not be required to hold any shares in the said company to qualify him to act as such director, but shall be entitled to exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges of a director elected by the shareholders.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. gentleman given notice of that amendment ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have not. I am presuming on the indulgence of the committee to allow that amendment to go through. It is for the protection of the government.

Mr. BARKER. Is there any reason why that director should not be appointed by the Governor in Council ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The government of Canada means the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the idea of appointing this director ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The proposed agreement provides for the appointment of a director in order that the government of Canada, which will have large interests in this concern, should have some one on the board in a position to inform the government of what is going on. That really is the object. We have authority under the agreement to appoint engineers and expert accountants and auditors to examine the books, but by having a director who shall not be the holder of any stock and who shall be exclusively under the control of the government, we think we would be in a better position to control the operations of the company and to understand all they are doing.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should not the amendment provide that this director shall not be a holder of stock in the company ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It does.

Mr. FOWLER. No. It says he shall not be required to hold any shares, but he may hold shares.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We will make it to read ' who shall not hold any shares in said company.'

Mr. FOWLER. That is what I want.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the section be amended by striking out the words ' be required to.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 12,

Mr. McCARTHY moved to amend section 12 by adding :

Provided also that should the government of Canada undertake the construction of a line of railway from the city of Winnipeg to the city of Moncton, and the company not exercise the powers hereby conferred upon it in respect to the construction of the eastern section, the Quebec section and the Woodland section, the company shall nevertheless have power to build branch lines from points on the line of railway so to be constructed by the government to a point at or near North Bay, Nipissing Junction or Gravenhurst, and to Port Arthur and Fort William respectively, and also to a point on the Montreal and Western Railway or to the city of Montreal, and all the powers by this Act conferred upon the company with respect to branch lines authorized to be constructed from its main line of railway to the said points respectively shall fully and in all respects apply to branch lines constructed to such points from the said line of railway to be constructed by the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the length of these lines ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Some of them would be pretty long. The one from the main line to Montreal would be pretty long ; the one to join the Témiscamingue road would be about 90 miles, and the one from the main line into Port Arthur and Fort William would be in the neighbourhood of 150 miles.

Mr. CLARKE. How far north of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at North Bay will this line run ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Two hundred miles approximately. I think the Témiscamingue road is about 100 miles north, and this line may be 90 miles above that.

Mr. CLARKE. How far north of Ottawa will this line be ?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would be in the neighbourhood of Lake Abittibbi ; it would be about 200 miles.

Mr. CLARKE. And how far north of Montreal ?

Mr. McCARTHY. From 130 to 150 miles north of Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The branch line to Port Arthur and Fort William is to be about what length ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think from 100 to 150 miles from the main line.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That will be about 430 miles from Winnipeg ?

Mr. McCARTHY. About that.

Mr. MONK. It is a peculiar feature of this Bill that we do not know exactly where the Quebec section is going to be, and that is an element of some importance, in considering the length of these branch lines which we are authorizing the company to build. Will the Quebec section follow about the line of the proposed Trans-Canada Railway ?

Mr. McCARTHY. No, away south of that.

Mr. MONK. Will it go in a direct line from Quebec to the eastern limit of the province of Ontario ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, as far as possible.

Mr. MONK. Even if it goes in a straight line, that portion north of Montreal from which a branch line can conveniently be built into the city of Montreal, will be away north of Lake Nominingue. Even if it goes in a direct line from Quebec to Lake Abittibbi, it will deviate considerably from the Trans-Canada line, and it will be at least 80 miles north of Lake Nominingue, or over 200 miles north of Montreal. But owing to the many lakes in that district, at least 20 per cent would have to be added for curvatures, so that I think we may assume that it will be at least 200 if not 250 miles from Montreal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No such distance.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Does the promoter of the Bill say that this road is to be run north of Lake Nipegon ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). About how many miles north of Fort William will it be ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I said that the branch to Fort William would be between 100 and 150 miles long.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). How would the mileage from Fort William to Winnipeg compare with that of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot say.

Mr. MONK. If the main line passes south of Lake Abittibbi, it will be very important to know where the branch to Montreal starts from.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I presume that it would start from the most convenient point on the main line to reach Montreal, because of course it would be impossible to ignore so important a centre as Montreal in connection with such a line as this.

Mr. CLARKE. According to the statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe, this line will run 400 miles north of Toronto. The city of Toronto is as large a distributing centre as the city of Montreal, and how does the hon. gentleman say that it will reach that city ?

Mr. McCARTHY. We come down by the Temiscaming road, now being built by the Ontario government to North Bay, and thence over the Grand Trunk Railway from North Bay to Toronto, which is the shortest possible route, and which is now being used by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLARKE. The point of junction is four hundred miles north of Toronto, or only one hundred miles less than the distance from Toronto to Quebec, and people in Ontario who want to use this new road had better go to Quebec from Toronto.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course, Toronto has been entirely overlooked in connection with this enterprise.

Mr. CLARKE. I would not have the hardihood to say that Toronto and the whole population of that part of Ontario has not been neglected by this Bill.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill provides for Ontario what it has not had in the past, an opportunity to go into the North-west.

Mr. CLARKE. I hope that the hon. gentleman's knowledge of Quebec is better than it appears to be of Ontario. This railway will run 400 miles north——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). North-east.

Mr. CLARKE. North of Toronto, and will be of no value to that section of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What about North Bay ?

Mr. McCARTHY. How much shorter can you get to North Bay than by the present Grand Trunk Railway road ?

Mr. CLARKE. I will tell you. One of the absurdities of your proposition is that the Grand Trunk Railway itself intended to run from Gravenhurst west. The promoters have been compelled to shift their eastern terminus from Gravenhurst, the present northern terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway proper—they have been compelled to shift it first of all from Gravenhurst to Montreal, then to Quebec, and then to Moncton. The original proposition was to run north-west from Gravenhurst to get into Manitoba.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. CLARKE. It is being compelled now to go 300 miles further north from Toronto than Gravenhurst.

Mr. McCARTHY. How can you get from Gravenhurst to the west unless you go around lake Nipissing ?

Mr. CLARKE. The Grand Trunk Railway is at North Bay now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, 250 miles north from Toronto. We have to go that distance now any way.

Mr. CLARKE. You are at North Bay.

Mr. McCARTHY. And you are bringing the terminus about 100 miles south of that to Gravenhurst. If you make Gravenhurst the terminus, how much shorter would it be than going by North Bay, if you have to go around by Lake Nipissing to get west ?

Mr. BARKER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that you have to go around Lake Nipissing to get west ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If he does not know better, somebody should send him a map. Why is this amendment proposed to run from Gravenhurst ? Take the line from Gravenhurst to Sudbury, it will be a saving of upwards of 75 miles when the new Canadian Pacific Railway is constructed, as it will be in a short time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is intended as a great trunk line.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Which line, you have two or three ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The main line from the Pacific ocean to the east is a trunk line.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But the hon. minister must look at the amendment. He is proposing by it to abandon the eastern section :

> Provided also that should the government of Canada undertake the construction of a line of railway from the city of Winnipeg to the city of Moncton, and the company not exercise the powers hereby conferred upon it in respect to the construction of the eastern section, the Quebec section and the Woodland section, the company shall nevertheless have power to build branch lines from points on the line of railway so to be constructed by the government to a point at or near North Bay, Nipissing Junction or Gravenhurst, and to Port Arthur and Fort William respectively, and also to a point on the Montreal and Western Railway or to the city of Montreal, and all the powers by this Act conferred upon the company with respect to branch lines authorized to be constructed from its main line of railway to the said points respectively shall fully and in all respects apply to branch lines constructed to such points from the said line of railway to be constructed by the government.

So that, after all we are going to Gravenhurst. As between running to Lake Abitibbi through North Bay over this road on the one hand, and the line from Gravenhurst north-westerly to a point on the main line on the other, there will be a saving of at least 250 miles from Toronto. Yet we are told by the promoter of the Bill that this is the shortest way to get into the North-west from Toronto.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We could not build a trunk line and make through connection at many different points. That would destroy its character as a trunk line. The various provinces must make connections. If my hon. friend is right in saying that it is 250 miles from Toronto to North Bay, and this line will pass 400 miles north of Toronto, then it means that it will pass, 50 miles north of North Bay.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman dispute that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, but you cannot have the main road running down from Toronto and at the same time have a transcontinental trunk line. You have to choose whether we shall have a main trunk line, which will be a benefit to all the provinces, or confine its benefits to one particular province. If I were looking at the matter entirely from an Ontario standpoint, I might be anxious to see the road terminating at a point in Ontario, but it is a national trunk line, and the provinces will have an opportunity of making connections with it, and I trust there will be many such connections, among them a connection at North Bay. It is not unlikely there will be a cut-off on the trunk line westerly of the Temiscamingue road, going down to Sudbury, and in that way connecting with the existing Ontario system. In a like manner the city of Ottawa will make its connection with this line. It will no doubt extend one of its lines now running northerly from the city of Ottawa and make connection with the trunk line. No doubt, also, it will be the object of Montreal to extend the line now running to Labelle so as to connect with this trunk line. Similar connections will take place in Ontario. And before it reaches Moncton, no doubt, there will be connections with the city of St. John. Thus each province will connect with the trunk line. If it is to be regarded from a sectional standpoint, and should have to go down to the different provinces, it would entirely lose its character as a trunk line. We cannot have it both a local line and a trunk line as well. It is not intended to side track any province or give any one province any undue advantage, but should be considered in a broad, fair spirit with due regard to the interest of the whole Dominion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This Bill is simply an empowering Bill giving the Grand Trunk Railway the power to build these branch lines. Unfortunately, it is not provided in

the agreement that lines are to be built to Lake Superior, North Bay and Montreal. All the other provinces in the confederation are provided for. The Dominion government builds a line from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton, but this present Bill is only an empowering one. It is not one of the conditions with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway that they shall build one mile of branch line in the province of Ontario, or towards North Bay, or Lake Superior or the city of Montreal. They are simply empowered to do it, if they choose. If this is to be a trunk line, why should it not be a part of the agreement that the company should make connection with Toronto and Lake Superior? Why should it not be part of the agreement that they shall connect with Montreal? Every other province of the Dominion is provided for but the province of Ontario. But equally neglected is that part of the province of Quebec between the main line and the city of Montreal.

Mr. WADE. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) allow me to interrupt him to point out that no provision is made for connection with the city of Halifax or with the city of St. John.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is already made.

Mr. WADE. It is only an enabling power, the same as it is in the case of Montreal and Toronto.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. member (Mr. Wade) pretend that there can be any route from Moncton to Halifax shorter than the Intercolonial?

Mr. WADE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does he pretend that there is any shorter route from Moncton to the city of St. John than the Intercolonial?

Mr. WADE. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is the point of Chipman on the road between Quebec and Moncton from which a shorter route could be had to the city of St. John. But once you go to Moncton, there is no possible route to St. John shorter than by the Intercolonial Railway. The whole of the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are provided for by the Grand Trunk Railway, but there is only an enabling Act to allow the Grand Trunk, if they choose, to build a line to Lake Superior from North Bay, or to build to the city of Montreal, or to reach Toronto by connecting with the Northern or North-western Railway running south. Instead of merely empowering the company to do this, it should be part of the agreement. Every other part of the Dominion is provided for except the province of Ontario and the great commercial centre of the whole Dominion—the city of Montreal. For the eastern provinces the road is to be built by the government, and for the rest, from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, it is provided that the road is to be built by the company.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is not doing himself justice. He says that when the road reaches Moncton there is no shorter route than by the Intercolonial. The same observation could be made with regard to Montreal. The main line will run some miles north of Labelle. Supposing we say that if it goes to Quebec there will be no shorter way to Montreal than by Quebec. Why go to Labelle or to Moncton, if by branching off at an earlier point you can reach other points, as the city of Montreal and St. John? But in any event, the hon. gentleman will admit this—that however the road may be located under our Bill it will be far better for Ontario and Quebec than the line he would locate, for he would take it to Hudson's bay. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) wants it brought down to Toronto——

Mr. CLARKE. I dispute that. The hon. gentleman has no authority for making that statement as coming from me.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has argued that this road ought to go to Gravenhurst to connect with Toronto. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has argued that it should go to Hudson's bay. How can we please both of these gentlemen?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I notice another point in connection with this wonderful resolution. They are going to give the Grand Trunk power to build branch lines 800 miles from the nearest point of the Grand Trunk Railway system. They are going to allow them to build a branch line from this government road to Port Arthur and Fort William. I have never seen such legislation in this House, allowing a company to build 'branch' lines hundreds of miles away from where it has a dollar's worth of property. Does this mean that the government intend handing over this whole property to the Grand Trunk at the end of fifty years, or even before that? If not, what do they mean by authorizing the Grand Trunk to build branch lines from a government road?

Mr. HACKETT. I heard the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) say that all the provinces were to be served by this railway. I would ask him what provision is to be made to connect Prince Edward Island with the road? I asked a few days ago if it was the intention of the

government to build a steamship which would cost only $250,000 to keep up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and the reply was that there was no such intention. And yet the government ask us to contribute to the building of this railway, while they will not give us any of the privileges of connecting with it.

Mr. MONK. I submit that in reference to to the branch to Montreal, we ought to know, within a couple of hundred miles, where that branch is to be. I do not know of any other case in which parliament has authorized the building of branch lines without determining, to a certain extent, through what part of the country they are to pass. There is already a great deal of the element of vagueness in this scheme. I think it will be possible to tell every man in the country, wherever he may be, that this line of railway is going to pass right through where he lives. But with respect to Montreal, my hon. friend, by his amendment, asks that we give the company authority to build a branch to connect with the Montreal and Western Railway, or to build to Montreal. These are two very different authorizations. A branch that would connect with the Montreal and Western would be a branch of extreme length. It would put Montreal 250 miles from this main line of railway, bring it as far south as you can. If it passes 50 miles south of Lake Abittibbi, and even if you give it a curvature towards the inhabited portion of the province of Quebec, if you connect with the Montreal and Western, you put Montreal 250 miles from that main line. If you ask authorization to connect with Montreal direct, you can do it over a distance of 100 or 125 miles, by going through the first inhabited place, St. Michel des Saints, in the county of Berthier, and so direct from Montreal. Which of these lines are we authorizing the Grand Trunk to build ? I do not refer to the main line ; that is not in question this evening. I refer to this branch line, which has not been discussed in committee, and of which my hon. friend gave notice only when the Bill came back to the House. I think that we in the city of Montreal have a right to know by what means you are going to connect, and from what direction. Are you going to reach Montreal by the Montreal and Western, or are you going to go by the most direct route ? It makes a difference of 150 miles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. MONK. It does.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What map has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) ?

Mr. MONK. This is a map upon which I have drawn a line from 50 miles south of Lake Abittibbi, the point indicated by the Prime Minister when he introduced this Bill, straight to the city of Quebec.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If that is the map that the hon. gentleman sent me a moment ago, I scaled it from the line the hon. gentleman has placed, and it only makes 50 miles north of the terminus of the railway that runs into Montreal.

Mr. MONK. It may be only 50 miles, if the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock) scaled it correctly, but that only brings him to the end of the Montreal and Western.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It brings you to the line that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has fixed as the line of the proposed Grand Trunk.

Mr. MONK. I think the hon. gentleman is not correct. But whether he is right or not, have we not a right to know whether a branch road is to be built to connect with the Montreal and Western and so reach Montreal, or whether a branch is to be built to Montreal direct. In other words, have we not a right to know where that branch is going to be located ? The same remark applies to every other branch, but I am particularly interested in knowing how Montreal is going to have communication with that main line.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By running that branch of 50 miles.

Mr. MONK. Then why do you not authorize the building of a branch from the main line down to the terminus of the Montreal and Western Railway ? We ought to compel the building of that branch. Are we goind to depend entirely upon the good will of this new company as to whether we are going to have any connection between Montreal and the main line ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that a great trunk line such as this would pass within a few miles of the city of Montreal and not make connection with that great commercial centre ?

Mr. MONK. Then if the hon. gentleman's argument is correct, we should impose the obligation and not merely give them the choice.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Self-interest will be the best compulsion.

Mr. MONK. Let us make no mistake. There is not a distance of fifty miles, nor of one hundred miles from this main line. The distance exceeds that by far. When we come to examine the agreement—which is not now submitted for consideration—my hon. friend will find that that main line runs at least 250 miles north of Montreal, if we are to give any credence to the vague description of that line as it was given by the Premier.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Postmaster General takes a map and he draws a line on it, and looks at the scale and figures up the distance. He has never traversed that country up north. We have heard the statement made by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) who, though speaking in favour of another road, said it was impossible to cross the line of country south of the height of land on account of the mountains, that it was impossible to get a line to run east and west, and that the only possible route from Quebec to the great west was away north of the height of land, 100 miles north of the line drawn by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The Postmaster General, I suppose, takes a line from the end of this Montreal and Western Railway to the point drawn on the map by the member for Jacques Cartier, which is 75 miles by the scale, and you can easily add 20 per cent to that for the devious windings of the hills. There is another point. Why should the government employ a roving commission to build a line from Gravenhurst to some imaginary point on the Grand Trunk Railway through a country over which they already have a road to North Bay, a country in which construction is now going on in connection with the James Bay Railway, and in which the Canadian Pacific Railway is at present, it may be, preparing to construct a railway ? In other words, they are going to endeavour to cripple both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the James Bay Railway ; and even if this branch from Gravenhurst is never built, it will be held as a whip over the heads of these other two companies in order to depreciate their bonds in the markets of the world. Why should the government insert that word 'Gravenhurst' in this agreement ?

Mr. FOWLER. In looking over this agreement I fail to see any provision made for a connection with the city of St. John, except the connection by way of the Intercolonial by Moncton. I understood, when the matter was discussed before, that there was to be a connection in another way, by Chipman. I would like to ask from the promoter of the Bill what is the intention, why that was left out, or whether it was an oversight.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no information.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that is rather an important matter. The city of St. John is one of the most important of our Atlantic seaports, and if this railway is to be any good at all it should give the shortest possible connection with the sea, and that certainly cannot be made by going away round by Moncton. I understood both the member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) and the Minister of Justice to say that the shortest way to get to St. John from Moncton was not by way of the Intercolonial, but by way of Chipman. I would not think so much of that, coming from the Minister of Justice, because living so far away from New Brunswick, he would not be well posted in the geography of that province. But the member for Annapolis surely would be expected to know something about it, and according to him it is easier to go to St. John by way of Chipman than by way of Moncton, direct by the Intercolonial.

Mr. WADE. What I said was that there was a shorter way over this line of railway to St. John than by way of Moncton to St. John. I mean that you go off the main line at a point near Chipman, and go to the nearest point on the Intercolonial on its way to St. John, which is a point about 33 miles to the east of St. John. Norton is the name of the place.

Mr. FOWLER. There is no such provision in this agreement.

Mr. WADE. Is there any provision that it shall go to Halifax ?

Mr. FOWLER. I think I was right in understanding that the intention was not to take any shorter course from the main line of this road to St. John than by going to Moncton and from there down by the Intercolonial.

Mr. WADE. You would save 50 miles.

Mr. FOWLER. It is possible to save fifty miles.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Assuming that we have power to build from Lévis to Edmundston, then starting from Edmundston, would it not be almost a direct line to go by Chipman, which would be a common point to Moncton and St. John ?

Mr. FOWLER. No, you could make it much shorter by not going to Chipman at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the committee would allow me, I would add a clause to build from a point on the government line so as to approach Chipman, or if necessary, go to St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not provide to go to St. John by the shortest possible route from Edmundston, if you want to strike St. John by the shortest line ? Why not cut across, because it would be much shorter than to go around the triangle ? If you take your route from Edmundston and go down the St. John valley you will get a much shorter line.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) have stated emphatically that the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax is the shortest possible route. There are eminent engineers whose names I might mention who would state emphatically that the road could be shortened at least fifty miles. The road was run up to the Springhill Mines, where it hugs the side of the mountain for the purpose of being near the

mines. Then, it went down to suit the interests of Peter Mitchell to Chatham and Newcastle.

Mr. KAULBACH. The Grecian Bend.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Yes, the Grecian Bend. If you follow that route on the Grecian Bend you can stand on the platform of one of the front cars, and you will see the cars behind, because the road is so crooked; whereas, if the line had followed the valley below, it would have found a natural level country to traverse. I know something about the history of that road. If Sir Leonard Tilley had had his own way the road would not have been built by that route, and it would have been shortened considerably, but Peter Mitchell was one of those Scotchmen who was bound to have his own way, he had a following from northern New Brunswick, and the road was diverted away from the proper route. Those who will assert that the road from Moncton to Halifax is the shortest possible route are speaking of something they know nothing at all about.

Mr. FOWLER. The Mitchell influence which the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) refers to certainly would not affect the route from Moncton to Halifax. That influence would only secure the adoption of the route along the north shore instead of down the valley of St. John, where Sir Leonard Tilley wished it to go. But, as far as the route from Moncton to Halifax is concerned, if you take the map and draw the straightest line that you can from Moncton to Halifax, you cannot affect a saving of fifty miles or anything like that, and of course, there are engineering difficulties which would prevent you from making a straight line if you wanted to.

Mr. WADE. On the contrary, you will escape the engineering difficulties.

Mr. FOWLER. Not at all. It is about 180 miles, or under 200 miles, from Moncton to Halifax, and you cannot affect a saving of anything like fifty miles even by following a straight line. As far as the southern district is concerned, if the promoter of the Bill wishes to add an amendment, the only amendment that would be practicable would be one providing for a route starting from Edmundston and going in the most direct course to the city of St. John.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I have the authority of the most eminent engineers for what I have said.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Do I understand from the promoter that the contract entered into between the company and the government does not compel the building of a branch line to the head of Lake Superior?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think the contract refers to it at all. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) has the contract before him.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). If the contract does not provide for connection with Lake Superior as far as this road is concerned, it will not fill the bill as affecting the movement of wheat from the west, because an all-rail route cannot hope to compete with a rail and water route, and there will be mighty little grain to come down over this all-rail route to an Atlantic seaport. Unless there is a connection with Lake Superior, it will not afford the relief to the western people that it is supposed that this road will afford. Even with connection with Lake Superior, it will be at a disadvantage, because the route as mapped out north of Lake Nepigon is 100 miles or 150 miles north of Lake Superior. If there is not going to be compulsory connection with Lake Superior, in so far as the commercial aspect of the line is concerned this route will not relieve the congestion of the grain traffic that we have been feeling for the last two years in the west, and the people of the west will not approve of this large expenditure of money when it will not afford them the relief which they so much desire.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche, Marquette) seems to be labouring under a misapprehension. There is no doubt that it is the intention to build to Lake Superior. That was provided for in the original clause, but since the main line is to be built by the government it is necessary to amend it so as to give this company power to build a branch line to reach Lake Superior. It is clearly the intention of the company to build a branch line to Lake Superior.

Mr. FOWLER. Do I understand the promoter does not propose to make this amendment in respect to St. John? The hon. gentleman has changed his mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not say that I could ask for any amendment other than I have asked for now unless it was prepared by the solicitor for the company, who knows what the railway company wants and the amendment which the company wants is the amendment which is now before the committee.

Mr. FOWLER. But the amendment which is before the committee does not speak of St. John at all.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. FOWLER. What amendment did you propose to offer? You say that I am asking too much because I want you to go by way of the shortest line. Do you propose to amend the section by making the route shorter, but not the shortest? I cannot understand the position which the hon. gentleman takes. Have I wounded his feelings in any way by standing up

for the best interests of the province which I represent, or does he refuse to grant that measure of relief to the people of St. John which a moment ago he himself admitted that they deserved? Surely my hon. friend does not consider the matter in any personal way. I was trying to promote the interests of a portion of the people of the province of New Brunswick and of St. John, and it does seem to me that the hon. gentleman, who was going to grant this measure of relief, should not withdraw it simply because I asked more than he is willing to grant.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman overpowers me with the greatness that he seeks to thrust upon me. I am only in charge of this Bill in the House. The amendment which the company thought would afford them the relief they desired is before the House. I have nothing to do with it. All I have are the instructions which I have received as to this. Personally I would be glad to grant relief to the whole Dominion, and particularly to the part which the hon. gentleman represents, but I have nothing to do with it. The amendments are making necessary corrections in the original line which was approved by the committee, of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but by reason of the government undertaking the building of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton, I have to get this proviso inserted allowing branch lines to be built. That is all that is asked for by the company.

Mr. FOWLER. I was not thrusting any greatness upon the hon. gentleman. There are said to be three classes, some who are born great, others who achieve greatness and others who have greatness thrust upon them, but the hon. gentleman belongs to a fourth class. He assumes greatness. The hon. gentleman said that he would amend his amendment by providing that there should be a branch line from some point on the main line leading from Moncton to St. John. But, now he goes back upon that, and the reason he gives for going back upon it is because I suggested to him that instead of branching off at Chipman, he should branch off at the main line before he came to Chipman, because in so doing he would get a shorter route to the city of St. John. The hon. gentleman has given a puerile reason for now refusing to grant the small measure of relief which he was willing to give some time ago. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman may have been inspired by an authority higher than himself to change his mind. I hope it is not because of a whisper from the Minister of Justice nor the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Labour by whom he is surrounded.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We must start with the idea that it cannot be left to my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) or to any other member to determine what we shall have or what we shall not have in the Bill; the committee must take upon itself to decide that. The situation is this: It is the intention of the government to construct the line from Winnipeg to Moncton and in connection with that line it was thought desirable to give to the company the right to construct branch lines for the purpose of reaching commercial centres. The first of these centres after leaving Winnipeg, is Fort William, then Port Arthur and North Bay, and finally Montreal. When we leave Quebec after crossing the river, the line goes to Edmundston and from Edmundston to Moncton, and between these two points there will be a branch to the city of St. John just as there is a branch to other cities on the western end of this section. I understand that has been in the mind of the Minister of Finance for some time. It has been considered and discussed, and I cannot see any reason why, if the committee wishes it, we should not authorize that company to build that line to St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. I am very glad to have the support of the Minister of Justice for my contention.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a very serious proposition. The government proposes to build the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, but the Bill now before this committee is not the scheme that we considered in the Railway Committee. To-night we have before us a railway to be constructed by the government and to be owned by the government from Winnipeg to Moncton, but the scheme before the Railway Committee was a proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to build a national transcontinental railway. It is now proposed that we should give our sanction to the building of a number of branches, and that is altogether outside of the line of the project which was reported to this House by the Railway Committee and which I submit is the only subject which this House has now a right to consider. We are not in a position to-night, and we will not be in a position to decide on any such scheme as is now proposed until this Bill goes back to the Railway Committee and is there considered in its new aspect. The branches were not included in the Bill which we considered in the Railway Committee and their consideration is not properly before this House to-night. All that is left of what went before the Railway Committee is the building of the line by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Winnipeg west to the Pacific ocean. Ill-defined as the whole scheme is, more ill-defined still is that scheme to build branch lines, and yet we are asked to sanction this indefinite scheme although it never came before the Railway Committee of this House. I do not want to throw any barriers in the way, but I want to have the question treated in a logical sense and in the light of the responsibility which we owe to the people. If

the government is going to build the line from Winnipeg to Moncton why on earth can not they build the branches as well? It was said the other day that we had a hybrid scheme before us, but what kind of a scheme is this which comes up for consideration to-night? We have the trunk line from Winnipeg to Moncton built by the government; we have the western end built by the Grand Trunk Railway, and we have proposed to-night a lot of little feeders to be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to the national line constructed by the government. I venture to say that the feeders in the end will be the people of Canada and not the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Therefore, I protest with all the force I can against this uncertain and indeterminate kind of partnership and mixup which is proposed between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to ask that the word 'Gravenhurst' be dropped out of the proposed amendment, inasmuch as there is one line of the Grand Trunk Railway already constructed to North Bay, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are about to complete their own line from Toronto to connect with their main line at or near Sudbury. Then, there is still another road under construction, the James Bay Railway, from Toronto to Parry Sound, and connecting with the Northern road a little west of Wahnapitae. The insertion of this word 'Gravenhurst,' giving this company a roving commission to construct a line from that point to some point on their main line, will materially affect these other companies when they go to the markets of the world to raise money. I presume that the hon. member in charge of the Bill has no objection to drop the word 'Gravenhurst.'

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot consent to the hon. gentleman's suggestion, in view of the suggestion of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that this road is not the shortest route from the west to Toronto, and for other reasons.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The cut-off from North Bay to this Arctic road would answer as well as a cut-off from Gravenhurst. I am satisfied that if this Bill went before the Railway Committee, that committee, with the non-partisan spirit it has always displayed, would not allow it to parallel all these other roads; and if the hon. member in charge of the Bill will not consent to withdraw the word 'Gravenhurst,' I will ask the sense of the committee upon the question, and will move that this Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee, which I am satisfied would not tolerate any such iniquity.

Mr. McCARTHY. Looking at the map, I cannot see that the proposed road will parallel either the Canadian Pacific Railway or what the hon. gentleman calls the James Bay Railway, which I presume is a part of the Mackenzie & Mann proposed transcontinental line, which I understand is neither under construction or located to Winnipeg. It will not parallel these lines, but will cut across them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman, I suppose never took a prize in geography. Certainly the knowledge he has displayed in geography would not entitle him to rank as first-class.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not if you were the examiner.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have myself seen the survey parties of the Canadian Pacific Railway within the past six weeks, and I learned from them that their work of locating their line was nearly completed. I dare say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with a little more foresight than this government, make surveys before they undertake to construct a line. The hon. gentleman speaks of the James Bay Railway as not being surveyed. It is surveyed to upwards of a hundred miles north of Wahnapitae. I move that the word 'Gravenhurst' be omitted.

Mr. LENNOX. What the hon. member who has just sat down has said has emphasized the necessity of pressing on the committee the point I take. I understood that the proposal to charter the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Moncton to Winnipeg was struck out of the Bill. I am told by a member of the committee who has followed the discussion this afternoon, that this is not the case, and that it is proposed to charter this company to run a line from Moncton to Winnipeg. I ask the promoter of the Bill if that is correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I presume the hon. gentleman has read the amendment?

Mr. LENNOX. I understand, then, that that is not the case. But it does not alter the position I took. Hon. members of the committee should keep this fact clearly in mind, that what was first proposed to the House and discussed in the Railway Committee was not the construction of feeders or branches, but of a national highway from ocean to ocean. If there had been a question, in the Railway Committee, of constructing these feeders, we would then have considered the question of paralleling or interfering with existing charters. We would have considered the whole question on a broader basis than was necessary under the Bill as presented to the Railway Committee. The committee have referred to this House the Bill to build a trunk line from ocean to ocean, and we have not now the right to initiate what is, to all intents and purposes, a new Bill, but must confine ourselves to the proposition debated

in the Railway Committee. All that we have the right to deal with is that portion of the road which the government have not decided to build, namely, from Winnipeg to Port Simpson. These branch lines are, therefore, out of the question. The government does not propose to build from Winnipeg to the Pacific, so that that portion of the charter is properly before this committee. This is the crucial point, namely, that the question of building these branches was never brought before the Railway Committee and never considered by them.

Mr. McCARTHY. Look at the main clause.

Mr. LENNOX. If it was considered by the committee, why bring in an amendment now? If it was considered by the committee and rejected——

Mr. McCARTHY. Never.

Mr. LENNOX. Then there is no ground for bringing it in.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will look at the main part of section 12 he will find that the idea was that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway should construct from Winnipeg to Moncton and build branches. But now that the government are going to construct from Winnipeg to Moncton, it is deemed necessary to provide that these branch lines should be built.

Mr. LENNOX. I cannot see it in that light, because if it were considered by the Railway Committee and not rejected by that committee, it would be in the Bill as reported by that committee to the House, and there would be no necessity for that amendment. But what the promoter of the Bill is proposing is some scheme that was never considered by the Railway Committee, I therefore must protest against any such attempt in the strongest possible manner.

Mr. EMMERSON. A suggestion has been made to the effect that a line should be provided from Edmundston to St. John. That, in my judgment, would be very impracticable, and would not serve the interest of the city of St. John as they would be served by the amendment I am about to propose. Chipman is a common point, and from that point it would be in the interests of the country to reach St. John by the nearest possible route. From Chipman there is today a line connecting at Norton on the Intercolonial Railway with the city of St. John. I would move that these words be added to the section:

> Also build a branch line from the main line at a point at or near Chipman to St. John, or to acquire any existing branch lines which may serve the same purpose.

That amendment would be in the interests of the whole Dominion as it would give the shortest possible route to an Atlantic port.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. KAULBACH. I must take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland. His amendment would be most unfair to the province of Nova Scotia inasmuch as Chipman is very far south of a direct line drawn from Edmundston to Moncton, and that point (Moncton) could be reached very much more conveniently by a shorter line which would cost the government less than the route which the hon. member proposes.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the company, not the government.

Mr. KAULBACH. The government have to pay for it all the same. I know very little of New Brunswick as respects the route which the proposed company intend to take, but I gather my knowledge from a geographical sketch taken from the map of New Brunswick and Quebec. There are very many engineering difficulties almost insurmountable on the route between Quebec and Moncton. First of all, I would say, I am utterly opposed to the Intercolonial Railway being paralleled. Again I am opposed to that proposed line of road between Quebec and Moncton running to Edmundston, because it brings us too close to the American border. I object to it for the same reason that I object to the Canadian Northern going through the state of Minnesota to the city of Winnipeg. But, if the proposed road is to be taken from Quebec to Edmundston, I do not see why the Intercolonial should not be utilized as far as River Du Loup, and then take the Témiscouata road to Edmundston and in a straight line from Edmundston to Newcastle and then utilize the straight line from Newcastle to Moncton. If you look at the map, you will see that this is almost a straight line. But if you take the road to Chipman, you make an angle, and a divergence which would be saved in taking the line from Edmundston to Moncton via Newcastle. Going from Edmundston you will reach Newcastle almost as quickly as you reach Chipman, and the distance from Newcastle to Moncton, I think, is no more than 70 miles.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. KAULBACH. If I am not keeping within the rules, Mr. Chairman, I am wiling to take my seat, but I think I am not digressing more than some hon. gentlemen who have preceded me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not call the hon. member (Mr. Kaulbach) to order.

Mr. KAULBACH. I thought the voice was yours, sir. I think that my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) is quite wrong when he asks that the road should go to Chipman, because it would make the road from Chipman to Moncton considerably longer than if it ran direct

from Edmundston to Newcastle and thence by the Intercolonial to Moncton.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not understand why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson), if he is sincere, if his solicitude for the best interest of the city of St. John is as great as it appears, should object to this branch road going from Edmundston to St. John. Take your main line from Moncton by the most direct route, but let the branch line from Edmundston go down the valley of St. John along the old line of the Intercolonial, the line approved by Sir Leonard Tilley, but in which he was overruled by Mr. Mitchell, according to traditions of those days. Let your branch line run from there, and you need not deflect your main line from Chipman at all, but go by more direct route, as the hon. member from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has pointed out, than if you deflected your main line in order to strike Chipman. That would serve the interest of St. John better, and that large and important section of the province which has now no railway, the valley of St. John, it would serve efficiently, and would be found perfectly practicable and would give a shorter route to St. John than if you go across the province to Chipman and thence to St. John. You have to go by Norton and down to St. John by way of the Intercolonial, which is a long way, making two sides of a triangle, whereas if you go direct from Moncton you make only one side of the triangle.

Mr. EMMERSON. I took the trouble, on a former occasion, to demonstrate to the committee discussing this matter that if you were to attempt to go to St. John by way of Chipman, you would have to travel only 37 miles more than you would if you were to follow the valley of St. John and go into St. John, landing on the west side of the harbour along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I also endeavoured to show that when you reach the western side of the harbour you are in a place where the harbour rights and terminal facilities are almost exclusively held by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that for such a road as this it is absolutely necessary to get access to the harbour of St. John on the east side, in what is known as St. John East. In order to get harbour facilities and terminal facilities in St. John, it would be necessary to utilize the property on the east side of the harbour. Hon. members know that there is a bridge company which controls the bridge over the falls. That has been a great barrier to the traffic of the city of St. John. The tolls have been very large, as they have a monopoly, and have a branch line running from their bridge into St. John. This has been considered a very serious obstacle to the trade between St. John and the western section of the country. To go by way of Chipman would be only 37 miles farther, and it would bring you into St. John on the east side of the harbour, where there is every opportunity for terminal and harbour facilities. I would say to my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) that it was only within a very few years that a survey was made by, I think, the Temiscouata Railway, and under the direction of or in connection with the Grand Trunk, as I understand. That survey, the latest made of that country, shows the selected route from Edmundston down to a point at or near Chipman and running across from Chipman to the Intercolonial somewhere between Moncton and Salisbury. That route is considered the shortest, though it is not the best route that is to be found. My hon. friend from Lunenburg speaks of going down to Newcastle. But he must realize that the topographical conditions would make that utterly impracticable. He would find obstacles like the Nipisiquit lakes, and the Bald mountains, and others between the waters of Tobique and the Nipisiquit rivers. If you could go as the crow flies, it would be all right. But you must recognize the topographical conditions in the way and, recognizing these conditions, I think that all hon. members of the committeet will realize that the only route possible would be from Edmundston down more through the centre of the province. You could not deviate to the north to any great extent. My hon. friend from King's knows that, and he knows also that any line down through the centre of the province would bring him near Chipman——

Mr. FOWLER. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. It might be a few miles away. But when they were seeking the shortest line they located it a few miles back of Chipman.

Mr. FOWLER. A long way.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have seen the survey, and I have discussed the matter with the gentlemen on the survey, so that my information is direct. So it would be at a point at or near Chipman. There is a wilderness between Chipman and the head of the waters known as the Salmon river, on the main highway between Chipman and Harcourt, on the road leading to Richibucto in the county of Kent. I have travelled over that line and am familiar with the topography of the country; I know the conditions which would make it necessary to pass in the vicinity of Chipman. Now after reaching Chipman, it would be in the interest of the company operating that line to take a cut of 70 miles to the city of St. John rather than go a like distance to Moncton and then travel back over their tracks 89 miles to St. John. If you went from Chipman to Moncton and turned back to St. John you would go a distance of 150 miles. By means of this branch which the company is seeking power to build, or acquire, they can go into St. John from Chipman, a distance of about 70 miles, saving 90

miles in reaching St. John. To go by the line indicated by the hon. member from King's (Mr. Fowler), you would travel down the valley of St. John to Fredericton, then there would be two ways open for you if you wished to keep on the western bank of the river St. John. You might follow down the western bank by Gagetown as far as Hampstead, and there you would meet barriers all the way which would lengthen your route. It is an impracticable route, as my hon. friends know; there are hills and mountains to overcome, and there are low lands submerged a month or more every spring, and even during the autumn freshets. Then there is another route by following the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fredericton down to St. John. There again you are met with another difficulty at St. John. You do not shorten your distance, and you are met with the bridge barrier at the harbour; you are met with a condition of things which make it impossible for this company to secure terminal facilities. The Canadian Pacific Railway have control of what is known as the Carleton branch, they have control of the terminals there, and you would have to go away out into the open, down towards Duck Cove, if you wanted to get larger facilities on that side of the harbour. Now, by this proposed route, if you were to go to Chipman and go down by way of this branch to St. John, you would bring St. John 204 miles nearer to the bridge at Quebec than it is to-day by means of the Intercolonial Railway. You annihilate a distance of 204 miles, and you bring St. John and Quebec that much closer together.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman is altogether astray in his mileage.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can prove my figures to a mathematical demonstration, because I know whereof I am speaking. I am calculating from Chaudière, from a point where the bridge will cross the river at Quebec, and I am showing that from that point to Moncton is 498 miles. From Moncton—and my hon. friend can add the figures together—to St. John is 89 miles. The sum total of that exceeds the distance from Chaudière—

Mr. KAULBACH. What is the entire distance to Chipman?

Mr. EMMERSON. To St. John 383 miles by way of Chipman?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman cannot make it within 425 miles by way of Chipman.

Mr. EMMERSON. The distance by way of the Intercolonial Railway from the point where this bridge crosses the river at Quebec, to St. John, is 587 miles. The distance by the surveys which have been made from that point down to Chipman, and from Chipman down to St. John, is 383 miles. The difference between 383 and 587 is 204; that is the saving in distance between those two points. This only goes to show, however, that even if there were a variation of a few miles, there is an annihilation of 200 miles as between these two cities, by the proposed route by way of Chipman, and then down to Norton, thence down to St. John. This amendment proposed by me makes it possible for the company to secure these rights, it makes it possible for St. John to have the advantage of being that much nearer the trunk line, and it makes it not only possible for her to be that much nearer, but it ensures to that city a large proportion of the freight traffic that would come down over that route. Certainly the interests of St. John would be in that direction, the interests of no other section would be injured, and the interests of the company itself and the interest of the transportation facilities of this Dominion are best served by the operation of this branch line.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman that from Edmundston it is necessary to parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway all the way down to Grand Falls. You have got to go to Grand Falls before you can get away from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The topography of the country between Edmundston and Grand Falls is such that it would not permit the construction of a line northward or eastward.

Mr. FOWLER. Exactly. I quite understand the reason why. Topographically the country is such that you could not get away from it and you must parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway down almost to Grand Falls. You would need to parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway, also for a short distance going down the western side of the river. As far as terminal facilities are concerned what my hon. friend says respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway having absolute control of the terminal facilities on the western side of the harbour of St. John is scarcely correct. I do not think the Canadian Pacific Railway have any such rights as the hon. gentleman has just stated. The control of the terminal facilities which belong to the city of St. John is in the hands of the city of St. John and these facilities are not under the absolute control of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. The city handed over the Carleton branch irrevocably.

Mr. FOWLER. That is very true, but the wharfs and docks which are terminal facilities after all, are still under the control of the city of St. John. There are two elevators belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but there is ample room on the western side of the harbour for facilities for both, and it is only a question of money. As I understand this agreement, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway are obliged to provide the necessary terminal facilities at all

ports on the Atlantic and Pacific to which their lines run. Therefore, the argument which my hon. friend has made does not affect the case at all and the interest of the port of St. John, which is the commercial centre of a very large portion of the province of New Brunswick, and in the welfare of that city a very large portion of the province is intimately concerned—the interest of the port of St. John will not be served by this road unless it branches off at Edmundston instead of Chipman, as suggested by my hon. friend. I see the hon. member for the county of St. John (Mr. Tucker) in his seat—unfortunately the hon. member representing the city of St. John is not present, but I think the hon. member for the county of St. John will bear me out in the statement I have made. I do not think that hon. gentleman will be so recreant to his duty as to agree with the hon. member for Westmoreland that the route which he had proposed by the way of Chipman would be so advantageous to the city of St. John or so advantageous to those represented by himself as the route from Edmundston direct to the city. I quite understand why the hon. member for Westmoreland is so desirous to have this deflection made at Chipman. My hon. friend represented the county of Westmoreland. Moncton is the chief town of that constituency and it is only natural that he should wish that this road should not be lessened in its importance as far as Moncton is concerned by having a shorter route to St. John. By the route which he proposes the line will be ten or fifteen miles nearer to Moncton than to St. John, and that, perhaps, may to some extent account for the desire on the part of the hon. member for Westmoreland to have the branch line start from Chipman rather than from Edmundston. The hon. gentleman must realize himself, if he is honest, that he is influenced by that motive, because such motives do affect us imperceptibly notwithstanding the fact that we may believe we are taking a fair and impartial view of the question. As far as I am concerned, I have no such interest affecting me because my interests would be the other way. If the deflection is made at Chipman a portion of the road would run through my county from Chipman to Norton, and I am looking at what is going to be for the best interests for the country at large, uninfluenced by sectional interests. We want to get the western produce forwarded by the shortest possible route to the Atlantic ocean, and that object can only be achieved by adopting the route which I have suggested, and I suggest to the hon. gentleman that he amend his amendment by striking out the word 'Chipman' and inserting 'Edmundston,' and by striking out all after the word 'St. John' in his resolution. That will cover the whole case. The Grand Trunk Railway line will go to Moncton in order to suit hon. members from Nova Scotia, and the hon. member for Westmoreland, but let it branch off at Edmundston and both purposes will be served, besides which the best interests of the province will be served.

Mr. EMMERSON. It may not be known to the members of this committee that there is already a line from Edmundston to St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a line from Quebec to St. John.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a line direct down the river St. John from Edmundston to St. John.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is there not a line from Lévis to Edmundston.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a line from Rivière du Loup.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is a line from Lévis to Edmundston.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there is one thing that the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler) has entirely overlooked and it is a matter which is very material in the discussion of this question. It is of the greatest importance to have a railway that will open up and develop the coal areas in the vicinity of Chipman and it is of vast importance to the city of St. John that there should be a direct communication such as would be afforded by this line I have suggested in the amendment I have proposed. The hon. member for King's, of course, is very heroic. He does not think of the interest of his constituents. I confess to a desire to contribute in every possible way to the advancement of the section of country from which I come. I do not want it to be done at the sacrifice of any other portion of the Dominion. I want it to be done in the general interest, and the general interest in connection with the transportation facilities of this Dominion demands that there shall be the shortest possible route from Quebec to Moncton affording facilities for the transportation of freight and passenger traffic. The natural outlet for that traffic, or a large portion of it at least, would be by means of a deviation at or near Chipman. Whether it is at Chipman or five miles farther, it makes no difference. The nearest point to the city of St. John is secured by the branch which I have suggested in the amendment now before the committee. It is hardly necessary to take up any more time in the discussion of this matter. The interest of St. John requires it. It would be folly to think of building a line from Edmundston following the route of the present Canadian Pacific Railway. You can go to-day by two different ways to St. John. You can either go down by the Gibson line, on the eastern side of the St. John river, or you can go out from Wood-

stock by way of McAdam Junction. These lines connect with Edmundston ; they connect direct with the city of St. John ; and we will simply be building a long line of railway following the tracks of the other line, and we will be affording facilities which are now accorded for transportation between Edmundston and the city of St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. It is a strange thing that you should call a railway a transcontinental line which ends at Moncton, which is not a seaport at all. My hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) has said that you must not build this branch from Edmundston, because there is already a line of railway from Edmundston. Well, there is already a line of railway from Chipman to the Intercolonial Railway at Norton ; there is a line of railway already projected and chartered this session to connect Chipman with Moncton ; there are lines of railway connecting Quebec with St. John ; there are lines of railway connecting the west with the east ; but is that any argument why there should not be another line of railway ? I am surprised at the very fallacious argument which my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) has advanced. He says he is prompted to work on behalf of his constituents. So am I. But when the good of the greater number is concerned, then the good of the smaller number has to give way. It is the duty of a representative of the people in parliament to advocate the best interests of the whole country rather than of any particular section, even though that particular section happens to be the section which he represents, so long as no great injury is done to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. You would even shut out King's county ?

Mr. FOWLER. It is impossible to do that. King's county occupies such a central position in the province of New Brunswick that it has got to be heard from, whether in this House or outside the House.

Mr. KAULBACH. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) is a little astray in his arithmetic with regard to distances.

Mr. FOWLER. In his geography, too.

Mr. EMMERSON. You are a poor schoolmaster.

Mr. KAULBACH. I confess that I have not that knowledge of the province of New Brunswick that my hon. friend possesses, but at the same time when I look at the map which I have before me, I cannot for the life of me understand how he can say that the shortest line from Quebec to Moncton is via Chipman.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me ? The shortest practical route, according to the surveys, is a line through Chipman. As the crow flies possibly you could get shorter, if you built an air line.

Mr. KAULBACH. What surveys are you referring to ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am referring to the last survey made by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Témiscouata road, which I think is the very latest survey, and which was made some eight or ten years ago.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am safe in saying that if you take the distance from Edmundston down to Chipman and then back to Moncton, that the present Intercolonial Railway is equally as short. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman would want to go down to Chipman. There is no reason why we should make that diversion and lengthen the distance to Moncton from Edmundston. According to the Intercolonial Railway time-table, the distance saved on the entire proposed new line from Quebec to Moncton is only about 44 miles.

Mr. WADE. Where did you get that on the Intercolonial Railway time-table ?

Mr. KAULBACH. By going by way of Rivière du Loup and the Témiscouata road, which you would have to take, because you cannot get through the Alleghany range of mountains——

Mr. WADE. The Alleghanies do not reach there.

Mr. KAULBACH. There is a line of mountains between the St. Lawrence river and the St. John river of that name.

Mr. MORIN. And these are the Alleghanies.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am therefore correct. If you want to overcome that range of mountains you must come by Rivière du Loup, take the Témiscouata to Edmundston and straight over as well as you can to Newcastle on the Intercolonial Railway. Then you could utilize the Intercolonial Railway from Newcastle to Moncton. If that course is taken, and I am informed by those who know the country, that it is practicable, it would be the better course to pursue. If my hon. friend will look at the map he will see the distance from Edmundston to Newcastle is shorter than by going to Chipman. The distance from Chipman to Moncton is greater than if you go from Newcastle to Moncton. Under those circumstances, my view is correct as to this route being the shorter of the two.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I take the liberty of submitting some figures which I have obtained from the most accurate reports available. First I take the figures given by the Prime Minister the other day from Moncton to Edmundston, which he said was on the authority of some survey which I have been unable to find a trace of, but I presume the hon. member for Westmoreland

(Mr. Emmerson) furnished these figures. The Prime Minister stated that the distance from Moncton to Edmundston is 209 miles. The shortest distance to Lévis is 196 miles, and adding 10 miles to reach the bridge that would give you at least 415 miles from Moncton to the Chaudière bridge. I venture to say that you would have to add at least 10 per cent to that for the 209 miles from Moncton to Edmundston, which would give you 20 miles more, making the total distance 435 miles. Every one who has been in the central part of New Brunswick knows that it is a sea of hills which are worse to get over than mountains.

Mr. WADE. How do you get your figures from Moncton to Edmundston ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Prime Minister stated in his speech that it was 209 miles. It is much more as a matter of fact, but I take his figures. The present Intercolonial Railway is 577 miles from Lévis to St. John. Via Chipman the route will be 196 miles to Edmundston from Lévis, or 206 miles from the Chaudière bridge to Edmundston and 209 from Edmundston to a junction above Chipman. Then you will find that it is 15 miles farther from Chipman to St. John than it is from Chipman to Moncton, and the road will cross 20 miles north of Chipman. No one pretends that the main line will run into Chipman. Therefore, the saving from Quebec to St. John by the new route compared with the old route will be, at the outside, only 127 miles, and to the city of Moncton a saving of only about 48 or 50 miles.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to move an amendment, that all the words in the amendment of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) after the word 'Chipman' be struck out, and the word 'Edmundston' be inserted, and that all the words after the word 'St. John' be struck out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that the hon. member who has charge of the Bill gave notice of his amendment, which is amendment No. 1, and that of the hon. member for Westmoreland is amendment No. 2. My hon. friend puts in a third. I think we shall have to get rid of one of these amendments before we can take up another. I do not wish to press the point, but I think that is the rule.

Mr. FOWLER. If the Chair is to stand to the strict rules of order, I think the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), did not give notice of his amendment, and therefore it is as much out of order as mine.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My interpretation of the rule is that notice has to be given of an amendment, but that amendments to that can be moved without notice.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood that the motion made by the hon. Minister of Justice was a substantive motion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is an amendment to the clause as it stands. Even an addition is an amendment. I have no desire, however, to see the rule pressed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Logan). If I am compelled to rule, I must rule that the amendment of the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Fowler) is out of order.

Mr. FOWLER. The point I take is that you will have to rule on both amendments.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In any case, I think, we can all agree that we do not want three amendments before us at one time, and I do not think any good purpose can be served by my hon. friend pressing that point. When the amendment of the hon. member for Westmoreland is disposed of, my hon. friend can move his.

Mr. FOWLER. But suppose it is adopted ?

Mr. WILMOT. I must say that in listening to the discussion to-night concerning this very important measure, I am impressed with the profound ignorance that prevails regarding the location of the line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I presume that the principal object in view is to find the shortest route. So far as New Brunswick is concerned, I know that the line which keeps to the western part of the province is the most direct line to the seaport of St. John. I have collected figures concerning the different routes through the province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend who represents Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) had a Bill before parliament relating to the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway. That railway was to run from Quebec to Connors, where the New Brunswick system of railways terminates, at the extreme north of the state of Maine. The distance from Quebec to Connors I find is 134 miles ; from Connors to Edmundston, 32 miles ; from Edmundston to Grand Falls, 38 miles ; from Grand Falls to Andover, 22 miles; from Andover to Woodstock, 54 miles; from Woodstock to Fredericton, 65 miles ; from Fredericton to St. John, 65 miles; making a total distance from Quebec to St. John of 410 miles. From Quebec to St. John via Chipman is 461 miles. Taking Fredericton as the common point, it is 460 miles via Chipman to St. John, as compared with 410 miles by the valley. From Fredericton to Chipman, there is a line of road surveyed, subsidized and partly built. I suppose that, in the interest of our Nova Scotia friends, use should be made of that line from Fredericton to Chipman and thence direct to Moncton. That part of the country is well adapted for building a railway. I have been over every foot of the ground myself and therefore can

speak from personal knowledge. A considerable portion of that road will go through the county I represent. There is another fact I would point out. This route, the St. John River Valley, is covered by a road owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think it is beyond possibility that the government could acquire that road. It is already being built down the valley of the St. John by the shortest route to the sea, and I think it is a very reasonable proposition that the government should acquire that road, which, I believe, it could do at one-half what it would cost to build through the centre of the province. As regards the line spoken of by the right hon. the First Minister, from Edmundston to Moncton, in a direct line through the centre of New Brunswick, no man can tell what difficulties would be met in its construction. I have no personal knowledge of the northern part of New Brunswick, but a great many young men who live in my county are employed lumbering in that district, and they all inform me that it is a very rough country indeed. The right hon. gentleman stated to the House that the distance would be 209 miles. That may be correct; but, in view of the difficulties that would have to be encountered, it would be much more expensive to build and operate a road there than the one I have mentioned. The distance to St. John via the Intercolonial Railway is 577 miles. By the St. John valley route it is 410 miles, and by Chipman 461 miles. I think therefore that the suggestion I have made is one that should be adopted and which would satisfy our Nova Scotia friends. Considerable money could be saved by acquiring that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway which runs through the valley of St. John and the upper St. John and the government could acquire at the same time the road from Fredericton to Chipman and Moncton. That would affect a saving of money as compared with taking the centre route. My hon. friend from Westmoreland spoke of the difficulty of going down the St. John's valley from Fredericton. There is no such difficulty as he imagines. I know every foot of the route. If we followed the bank of the river all the way down, then difficulties would be met such as he suggests. But I would make a straight line and go down to Gagetown and through the Nerepis country to Westfield country. My hon. friend knows we could get a shorter line by Fredericton going that way than by following the bank of the river.

Mr. MORIN. I think we are wasting our time in this House by this discussion. In the first place, to whom are we talking? We are talking to a government which does not know what it wants. Have they got an engineer or a map or any one that can tell them what they want? The other day the right hon. the First Minister read what he had to read. Previous to that he had written to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and all that he wrote was not based on any reliable information. He gave the distances from place to place, and I can prove that his figures were not correct. We are thus all discussing this matter in the dark. Why does not the government postpone this Bill for another six months or a year and in the meantime send out engineers with instructions to run a line from place to place and find out the best route. Until this is done, we are not in a position to intelligently discuss this matter. Each hon. member talks in favour of his own county or town, and what is the government to do amidst so many contradictory and confusing suggestions and opinions? Take the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill. He has frankly told us that he does not know what to do or what to say. He is simply the promoter of the measure and does not care how it goes. Not long ago I was talking with a gentleman and he said to me plainly: 'We are in the hands of the Vanderbilts, the Morgans and the Hays.' He told me as plainly as possible—this was six months ago in the city of New York—that the road would be built whatever way Morgan and Hay and Vanderbilt wanted it, and there was no use of our thinking that we had any say in the matter. Is the government going to throw itself into the hands of the Morgans, Hays and Vanderbilts? If the government allows itself to be dropped into such a mud hole, you will see American engineers over here bringing their own men and running that road wherever they choose; and if anybody else interferes or writes to the government protesting against this as not being right, the government will be as dumb as an oyster, and the first thing we know the road will be built just where Morgan wants it. It is time for us to have a little light thrown on this matter; and while I have no intention of taking up the time of the House any longer to-night, I shall have something to say later on.

Mr. EMMERSON. I made a statement not long ago with respect to the distances. I wish to verify that by giving the details. The distance from Chaudière to Connors Station is 130 miles.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where does the hon. gentleman gets his figures?

Mr. EMMERSON. From the Railway Department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is no survey in the department of any such road.

Mr. EMMERSON. I secured the figures there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They guessed at them. There are no such figures in the Railway Department.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are in connection with a railway which was projected,

and incorporated under the laws of the Dominion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I know all about it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am giving the hon. gentleman some information. The distance from Chaudière to Connors Station is 130 miles; I won't take off a mile; I won't add a mile.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) is right——

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Logan). Order.

Mr. MORIN. I was only agreeing with what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. (Mr. Logan). I must call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thank my hon. friend (Mr. Morin). I want somebody to help me out. The distance from Connors to Edmundston is 32 miles; from Edmundston to Nashwaak Bridge is 123 miles; from Nashwaak Bridge to Chipman, 32 miles; from Chipman to St. John, 66 miles; total, 383 miles from Chaudière to the city of St. John. Now, to St. John from the same point by way of the Intercolonial is 587 miles. That makes a difference of 204 miles. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) says that, instead of departing from the main line at Chipman, you should leave the main line at Edmundston and build down the valley of the St. John, although there is a large system of railways over that route now. I am going to show that the distance would be greater from Chaudière to St. John by the route the hon. member for King's proposes than by the other. From Chaudière to Edmundston is 162 miles. I am now giving you actual distances. From Edmundston to Aroostook Junction is 57 miles; Aroostook Junction to Woodstock, 53 miles; Woodstock to Fredericton, 60 miles. That makes a total of 332 miles from Chaudière Junction to Fredericton over a located railway.

Mr. WILMOT. No, 345 miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. If it makes 345 miles, I am willing to take that. From Fredericton to St. John is 66 miles, making a total of 398 miles from Chaudière to St. John by the proposed route of my hon. friend from King's. By way of Chipman it is only 383 miles, or 15 miles in favour of the Chipman route. Surely the amendment of my hon. friend will not hold water in the light of these facts.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the distance by the Intercolonial from Lévis, or from Chaudière Junction, to St. John?

Mr. EMMERSON. From Chaudière it is 587 miles, and from Lévis some miles less.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. From Lévis it is 578 miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. The bridge will cross the river at Quebec, and I think that is the correct point from where to start. The traffic comes across this bridge and the route would start from that point and go through the parishes back of Lévis.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. gentleman the distance from Fredericton to Moncton?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have it from Nashwaak Bridge to Chipman, 32 miles, and from Chipman to Moncton, 51 miles.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know where the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson, got his figures, and I do not care. If his figures are correct, then the maps that have been furnished officially and have heretofore been regarded as correct, are entirely wrong. Moreover, if the hon. gentleman's figures are correct, the rule of mathematics which declares one side of a triangle to be shorter than the other two sides is all nonsense. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to talk glibly about the distance from this point to that when there are no engineer's reports on the subject. Of course, we are bound to accept in a parliamentary sense the hon. gentleman's statement. And we do accept it in that sense.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am glad for even that small measure of credit.

Mr. FOWLER. It is quite as much as the hon. gentleman deserves. But if the hon. gentleman will look at the map he will see whether it can be possible that his statements are borne out by the facts. This is an official map issued by the department over which, we all hope, the hon. gentleman will soon be called to rule. So, we must accept it as being absolutely correct. Also the rule of mathematics to which I have referred and which was taught us in childhood we can hardly deny now. But the acceptance of the hon. gentleman's figures is a denial of both. I do not say that he is making up these figures, but I say that the source from which they are compiled is wrong. It must be wrong, because it is absolutely impossible that a line from Edmundston to St. John—or from St. Leonards, because you have to follow up the line that distance, as I understand, before you branch off—it is impossible that such line to St. John can be longer than if you go across the province of New Brunswick to Chipman, then strike across to Norton on the Intercolonial and back by the Intercolonial. In such a route you are going west, then south-west, and then east.

Mr. EMMERSON. The distance from Chaudière to Connor's Station, 130 miles, is the only section in which there has not been a survey, except the survey made in connection with a railway that was incorporated by this parliament. From Connor's to Edmundston, according to the mil-

eage given by the Canadian Pacific Railway booklet——

Mr. FOWLER. Your trunk line follows that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am giving the figures showing the actual mileage from Edmundston to Nashwaak bridge. From Edmundston down to Grand Falls or near there, you have the actual mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the located line. Beyond that you have an actual survey that was made a few years ago, and the mileage was secured by me from data furnished as a result of that survey.

Mr. FOWLER. By your proposition you do not go to Fredericton.

Mr. EMMERSON. I go to Nashwaak bridge, which I think is nine miles from Fredericton. All these distances are absolutely correct from surveys which have been made, or from located lines. So there cannot be any error with respect to the distance of 383 miles. Now as to the 398 miles, I have given a less distance than is given by the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Wilmot). He makes the distance over 398 miles. Therefore, it is longer by that route than it is by Chipman, that is, the route that was surveyed a few years ago in connection with the proposed line of railway through the heart of the province.

Mr. FOWLER. How far is it from Fredericton to Chipman by the hon. gentleman's figures ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From Nashwaak it is 32 miles, and 66 miles from that point into St. John.

Mr. FOWLER. Sixty-six miles from Chipman to St. John and 32 miles from Nashwaak to Chipman makes 98 miles. Now this Nashwaak bridge is nine miles from Fredericton, and Fredericton is 66 miles from St. John, and 66 miles and nine make 75 miles, and 75 from 98 leaves 23, which is the advantage of the route I speak of. Out of the mouth of the hon. gentleman have I proved that his statement with respect to distance is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. FRASER. You cannot prove the whole by showing that a part is less or more.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has made just the statement that a man makes when he jumps in, knowing nothing at all about the case. Now my statement is absolutely correct. The hon. gentleman says that from Nashwaak bridge it is 69 miles to the city of Fredericton. By his own admissions he shows that the route I have been favouring is some 23 miles shorter than the route he wishes to take to go to St. John by way of Chipman. I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman should be opposing this. It is surely in the interests of Moncton, and it should be the object of the hon. gentleman as a representative from New Brunswick, and it is in the interest of the whole country, to reach an Atlantic port by the shortest possible route. It has been pointed out to the people of St. John that they are going to have all the freight while the passengers will go to Halifax. Well, if you save 23 miles by going to St. John rather than by going to Chipman, why not choose that route ? It is not going to affect our friends from Nova Scotia, it is not going to injure anybody, and it will materially benefit the port of St. John. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman should withdraw his amendment and allow mine to pass.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman has referred to the River Valley route, and I pointed out that that route, going down from Woodstock to Fredericton and thence on to St. John, would be a distance of 398 miles. I pointed out that the other route by way of Nashwaak bridge would be——

Mr. WILMOT. At what point is that bridge—directly opposite Fredericton ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend does not know every foot of that country. There is the covered bridge and the Nashwaak bridge.

Mr. FOWLER. They are both on the Nashwaak river.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are both on the river. What is known as the Nashwaak bridge is up the Nashwaak river. By this route which is an entirely different route from the river route the difference is fifteen miles. It is a question as to whether the river route or this one is the better. As far as the Nashwaak bridge is concerned it is nine miles from Fredericton. It may be more. It is more than twenty miles, my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Gibson) states. That does not alter the point raised by myself in respect to these different routes. The Nashwaak bridge route is one and the river route is another. The Nashwaak bridge route is the one that is the shortest.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), I will not say endeavoured to mislead the committee, but he certainly placed his figures before the committee in a very equivocal manner, saying that he had obtained figures from the Department of Railwayss and Canals showing the distance from Lévis to Connors to be 136 miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. One hundred and thirty.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). My hon. friend is a little astray. He should have put the six on. These are the figures given by the promoters.

Mr. EMMERSON. My information is 130.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Even these, as the hon. gentleman must know, are short of the true figures. There has never been a survey of that route. Yet, to stand up and give imaginary figures is asking us to accept something that should be taken only with a grain of salt. More than that, no survey for a railway can be run there. It is possible to have a survey for a wagon road, but you cannot have a route 136 miles long or anything like it.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. TALBOT. Probably the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) would be surprised if I could read to him reports of three surveys that have been made all the way from Chaudière to Edmundston, which is thirty miles beyond Connors.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They have certainly been made, but not to Connors—and not for this route as proposed.

Mr. TALBOT. Beyond Connors.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There have been no surveys made for the routes spoken of. I care not what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman does not know all that there is in the Railway Department.

Mr. HACKETT. A short time ago I asked the government what they contemplated doing for Prince Edward Island in connection with this matter. I received no reply. Whether they desire to treat us with silent contempt or not I do not know, but I am here to raise my voice in favour of the people of Prince Edward Island, and I take the position that the government should do something in connection with this Bill which is now before parliament. We know very well that the company is a mere shadow, that the substance stands behind in the shape of the government, and I would like to ask the government what they contemplated doing for Prince Edward Island in connection with the matter ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that there is anything in this Bill showing what the government are going to do for anybody. This Bill is to incorporate a company. There is absolutely not a word in it stating what the government are going to do.

Mr. HACKETT. I have an amendment to move in connection with this matter.

Mr. McCARTHY. There are three amendments before the Chair now.

Mr. HACKETT. Dispose of one or two of them and then I will bring my amendment forward.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Emmerson) agreed to.

Mr. HACKETT moved in amendment to the amendment :

The company may acquire and operate the railway from Sackville on the line of the Intercolonial Railway to Cape Tormentine in New Brunswick, and in the event of so acquiring the said railway shall construct a pier at Carleton Point in Prince Edward Island, place suitable steamships on that route and maintain efficient communication summer and winter between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. An amendment must be relevant to the clause under consideration. This amendment is not relevant.

Mr. HACKETT. I must submit to your ruling, but is it the desire of the government that my amendment be overruled ? I invite the Minister of Finance to come to my rescue. He knows very well how matters are in Prince Edward Island, because he has been there, and he has made very strong promises to the people. This company is only the shadow, the government is the substance. In the Bill the company is empowered to acquire railways and build steamships, and it is most unfair to me that I should be ruled out of order, when my amendment is perfectly germane to the whole Bill, and also, I believe, to the clause under discussion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

That the amendment be amended by striking out the words ' or Gravenhurst.'

If you pass this clause without striking out ' Gravenhurst,' it will give power to the Grand Trunk Railway Company to interfere with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Toronto to Sudbury and the James Bay Railway from Toronto to Wahnapitae.

Amendment (Mr. Hughes) negatived.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Inasmuch as there are some radical changes in this Bill, it should comply with the rules of the House and be referred back to the Railway Committee.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Mr. WILMOT moved :

That after the word ' Moncton ' on page three, line eleven, the words ' or the city of St. John ' be added in section twelve.

Mr. McCARTHY. When the hon. gentleman gave notice of this amendment it was understood that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway were going to build the Quebec and Moncton division. In view of the fact that the government is going to build the section this amendment will come more properly as an amendment to the government measure.

Mr. WILMOT. Is it to be unchangeable, like the laws of the Medes and Persians ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This matter was fully threshed out before the committee and voted down, and I do not

suppose we will want to discuss it again at this late hour.

Mr. WILMOT. The Minister of Finance is incorrect in stating that I moved this amendment in the Railway Committee. My amendment in the Railway Committee was that it should be built to St. John, and this amendment makes it Moncton or St. John.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I accept the correction, but the substance is the same.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Now that the government is to build that division of the railway, this amendment would come more properly as an amendment to the government measure.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It would do no harm to move it now.

Amendment (Mr. Wilmot) negatived.

Mr. MONK. One of the reasons given by the Prime Minister for the building of the eastern section of the main line by the government was that it should be thrown open for the use of other railways as well as the Grand Trunk Railway. Does that apply to these branches which are to be built in Ontario, Quebec and New Bruns-wick by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway? Will other companies have running powers over these branches ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract has no reference to branch lines ; it only refers to the main line. The branches will come under the General Railway Act.

Mr. CLANCY. These lines are in no sense branches of this railway as a government road. They are really main lines constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I rather object to discussing the government scheme on this Bill ; but I may anticipate the discussion to the extent of saying that they will be branches of a leased line. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have a lease of that line, and as lessees they desire to construct branches.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that you might as well say that any road that crosses the Grand Trunk to-day and that is leased by it is a branch. It is not a branch at all, but another road.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume that the interpretation is that the government may also build these and make a present of them to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will think of that by and by.

Mr. McCARTHY. The next amendment of which I have given notice is as follows, which I move as an additional clause :

The directors of the company shall have power to enter into an agreement or agreements with the government of Canada or with commissioners authorized to enter into such agreements on behalf of the government of Canada, respecting the construction and operation of a line of railway, or any portion thereof, to be the property of the government, between the city of Moncton, in the province of New Brunswick, and the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, provided, however, that such agreement shall not take effect until it has first been approved of by a majority of the votes of the shareholders of the company, present or represented by proxy at any annual meeting or at a special meeting of the shareholders duly called for the purpose of considering the same.

That is simply conferring upon this company the power to make the lease provided for in the government scheme.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the usual course is to require a two thirds vote of the stockholders.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I wish to add an amendment giving the company all the powers necessary to carry into effect the agreement entered into between them and the government.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to add a clause of which I have given notice. I beg to move in amendment that the following clause be added :

That all freight originating in Canada and received along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, intended for export across the Atlantic, shall be shipped through Canadian ports, when the route is not otherwise specially engaged by the shipper, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway shall carry all freight to an eastern Canadian sea port as cheaply as to any American port on the Atlantic sea board.

There is in the agreement, I understand, a clause to that effect, but not in this particular Bill. As the government has seen fit to recognize this proposition as a good one by adopting it in the agreement, no doubt it will be accepted in this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is one of several matters which were mentioned before the Railway Committee, and the view that I took and others was that they were probably matters to be considered in connection with the government contract, but not to insert in a private Bill. The matter has been fully dealt with in the government contract, quite as fully as my hon. friend desires, and I do not see that any good purpose could be served by putting in to this charter the clause he suggests.

Mr. FOWLER. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. He claims that the government have provided in the agreement a similar clause, but, we have the absolute right to attach this condition to the charter. The company are asking for a charter, and this

committee has the right to impose any obligation we may consider in the best interest of the country. The hon. gentleman has not given any reason why this amendment should not be accepted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are two points in opposition to the hon. gentleman's view. If it were necessary and proper to put this condition into the company's charter, I should prefer other words. The words in the agreement serve the purpose much better than those of my hon. friend, and if we had to put this in the company's charter, I would like to see the words more carefuly chosen. My other objection is that they are out of place in the charter. We cannot reasonably impose this obligation on the company except in connection with government aid. I do not say that we have not the power, but it would be unreasonable to use it. It is only in connection with the government aid that it would be reasonable to impose a condition of this character. And in the Act giving government aid the matter is dealt with.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). But supposing the company runs branches from all along the leased line or from the line west of Winnipeg, according to the logic of the minister, this clause would not apply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As a matter of fact, this does apply to branches too.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Branches constructed without government assistance ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Without having anything to say as to whether government assistance is given or not.

Mr. HACKETT. Before the Bill is reported, may I ask, Mr. Chairman, what became of my amendment ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There were two objections to it—one that no notice had been given of it, the other that it was not relevant, in my opinion, to the question under discussion.

Mr. HACKETT. Will you allow it to stand as an order for consideration ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) could give notice of it for the third reading.

Mr. HACKETT. I will leave it in your hands as a notice, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOWLER. I think there were some other amendments of which hon. members gave notice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The mere giving of a notice does not bring these amendments before the committee.

Mr. FOWLER. But, Mr. Chairman, you read some that were not moved.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I presented Mr. McCarthy's, because he is the promoter of the Bill. But if hon. members absent themselves from the committee, and expect that I will place their amendments before the committee, they are likely to be disappointed.

Bill, as amended, reported.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FERRY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 180) to incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—Mr. Emmerson.

On section 14,

Mr. FOWLER. There is a phrase in that relating to these mortgages—'not inconsistent with law.' That seems to suggest that otherwise these people might make a mortgage inconsistent with law. It seems to me this phrase should be eliminated.

Mr. EMMERSON. These are the usual clauses put in steamship incorporation Bills, and they were put in by the committee.

Mr. FOWLER. That does not seem to be a justification for putting in words such as these.

Bill reported, and read the third time.

Mr. EMMERSON moved that the Bill pass, and the title be 'An Act to incorporate the Maritime Railway and Transportation Company.'

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

CAPTAIN DIXON, CANADIAN CONTINGENT.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked :

1. Was Captain Dixon, sent to South Africa with the First Canadian Contingent, commissioned to write for the government a record of the Canadians in the war ?
2. If not, what were his duties ?
3. Has that officer yet furnished the government with an historical record ?
4. If so, will the government have it laid on the Table of the House, with a view to its being perused, and if deemed advisable, printed for distribution ?
5. Is Captain Dixon still in the Canadian service ? If not, when did he leave it, and where is he now serving ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden):

1 and 2. He was sent to South Africa as historical recorder.

3. No.

4. When received, if deemed of sufficient importance, it will be laid on the Table of the House.

5. He is on the reserve of officers. He has not been in the pay of the Dominion government since his arrival in South Africa.

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria) —asked :

Have any trespasses been made and complained of on the Dokis Indian reserve, French river, during the past five years ? If so, by whom ; and have damages, and to what extent, been paid therefor ? If any amount paid, what disposition was made of same ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton):

The only trespass of which the department have received notice is a trespass made by the Hardy Lumber Company on the Dokis Indian reserve, French River, during the winter of 1899. The quantity of timber cut was 1,129 saw logs, containing 172,336 feet board measure, for which the department charged and collected $1,034.02 for timber and damages, which sum has been placed to the credit of the capital funds of the Dokis band.

PARDON OF RUDOLPH HETU.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria).—asked :

1. Has one Rudolph Hétu been lately pardoned ? If so, on whose recommendation ?
2. For what offences was he sentenced ? For what term was he sentenced ; and how long has he served thereunder ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. C. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1. Yes. Upon the recommendation of the Minister of Justice founded upon medical certificates to the effect that confinement was rapidly developing tubercular consumption for which unless the patient were released, little could be done in the way of treatment.

2. Hétu was sentenced for forgery and electoral frauds ; for the first mentioned offence he was awarded twelve months imprisonment ; for the second a fine of $500, or in default of payment, six months imprisonment.

He had served seven months and one day.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In the absence of the Prime Minister, I move that the House go into committee on the following resolution, to-morrow :

Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with the Bill now before this House, respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, to ratify the agreement set forth in the schedule to the said Bill, entered into on the 28th of July, 1903, between the government and certain persons on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by parliament at the present session thereof, and to authorize the government to do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said Bill and agreement.

I may say that His Excellency the Governor General has been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, and recommends it to the House.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be the business to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Justice will take up the resolutions respecting judges, and we may proceed with the iron and steel bounties. It was the intention of the Prime Minister to proceed with the Grand Trunk measure.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, August 4, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT—MR. LOY, M.P.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis) presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows :

Tuesday, August 4, 1903.

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections beg leave to present the following as their second report :

In obedience to the order of reference dated 22nd July, 1903, your committee have inquired fully into the allegations therein in reference to George M. Loy, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Beauharnois ; they have investigated all the circumstances connected with the acquisition by the government of Canada, of the property therein referred to, and all matters mentioned in the statement therein contained ; they have also heard the statement made under oath, by the said Geo. M. Loy, Esquire, as well as the evidence of all the witnesses who appeared before your committee, and have examined all papers, documents and exhibits produced, and beg to submit the following as the result of their inquiry, viz.:—

1. The statements contained in the first seven paragraphs of the said reference have been substantially established, but your committee cannot discover that the said statements have any bearing upon the charge made against the hon. member for Beauharnois of a violation of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

2. As to the allegation in paragraph eight that 'from the time that the said Geo. M. Loy handed his property to Archambault up to the day of the sale of the said property to the Crown or government of Canada, he never ceased to be the proprietor of the said property,' your committee find that under the law of the province of Quebec, as applied to the circumstances proven before your committee, Mr. Loy had ceased to be the owner when possession was taken of the property by Mr. Archambault, under the said agreement with Mr. Foy, dated January 4th, 1898, and that the property reverted to Mr. Loy on or about the 15th of June next following.

3. As to the further statement in the said paragraph eight that 'at the time of the sale of the said property on the 20th January, 1903, the said Robert Bruce Johnston was merely

acting for and on behalf of the said Loy, who in said manner did indirectly sell the said property to the Crown in violation of said chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes,' your committee find that the said Robert Bruce Johnston was not at any time, nor in any sense, acting for, or on behalf of, the said Loy; but the said Johnston represented to Mr. Loy that he was purchasing the said property on his own account for commercial purposes, and Mr. Loy when he agreed to sell the said property to the said Johnston believed the said statement to be true, and he parted with the title to the said property in favour of the said Johnston without any knowledge or notice that the same was not required by the said Johnston for the purpose for which he had so represented; and the said Johnston according to the evidence adduced, was not an officer of the government and was not aware when he made the purchase for Mr. Dandurand that the property was required for purposes of the Crown, and your committee find that there has been no violation by Mr. Loy of the said chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada 'An Act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons.'

4. As to the statement in paragraph nine, your committee find that while the assessed value was as therein stated, the same furnished no criterion of the actual value of the property, inasmuch as it was shown that the assessments in Valleyfield are based on ratios varying from a half to two-thirds of the actual values, and your committee find that the price paid for the property did not exceed its real value.

5. As to the statement contained in paragraph ten, your committee find that at the time of the said sale there was no property owned by the Crown in Valleyfield available and suitable for the purpose for which the said property was acquired.

6. The evidence given by Mr. Loy, under examination, was not contradicted in any particular by that of any of the other witnesses, but was supported and corroborated by the other parties who had knowledge of the transaction.

In accordance with the instructions received, your committee herewith submit the evidence taken before them, together with the exhibits and all their proceedings on the reference.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) F. B. WADE,
Chairman.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). If I am in order, I beg to move that all the evidence and all the proceedings of the committee, as well as the reports, be printed for the use of the members of this House. The evidence is considerable, covering about 250 pages of closely typewritten matter, and I presume that the House will not be able to pass judgment upon the two reports, namely, the report presented by the majority and the report of the minority, without examining the evidence. As a matter of fact, I believe that the evidence has not been read by any member of this House or by any member of the committee. Those who followed the proceedings of the committee very closely were not enabled to take communication of the evidence, and, a fortiori, those who have not attended the meetings of the committee will require to look at that evidence before deciding on the reports. The matter is a very important one; it concerns the privileges of this House, and I think I am voicing the sentiment of every member of the House who will be called upon to pronounce upon that question of privilege in making this motion, seconded by the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart).

Mr. SPEAKER. I would wish to have the opinion of the House with reference to rule 94 before I put the motion. Rule 94 says:

On motion for printing any paper being offered, the first shall be first submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing for report, before the question is put thereon.

According to the rule, I would be inclined to believe that the matter should be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing before a decision is made by the House.

Mr. MONK. If it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, I move that the rule which you have just quoted be suspended in this case. It is a pressing matter, both for the member concerned and for the House itself, and I believe that I am conforming to the usual practice in moving in the sense in which I have moved.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I take objection to the motion unless I am informed beforehand what is the necessity for printing.

Mr. WADE. The matter of printing the evidence was considered by the committee at two or three of its meetings, and it was almost unanimously resolved that it was not necessary. The story of this transaction, as it was told by Mr. Loy, was confirmed in every particular by every witness called who had any knowledge of the transaction, and there was no dispute whatever as to the facts. It is a very simple matter. The committee were of opinion that the real question to be determined was whether the statute was violated or not upon the admitted testimony of Mr. Loy, and the opinion of the committee was that it was not. I think that any hon. gentleman discussing this question would say that the evidence agreed with the statement made by Mr. Loy on the floor of the House.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat make the statement that there was a unanimity of opinion in the committee as to the non-printing of the evidence. Surely the hon. gentleman must have been awake during the proceedings of the committee, and if so, he must have noticed manifestations of opposition to the suggestion that the evidence should not be printed. Moreover, there was this striking fact, that it was before the committee got fairly launched on its work and before two-thirds of the evidence was taken, that the majority in

the committee took the ground that the evidence should not be printed.

Mr. WADE. I did not say that the committee were unanimous. I said that they were nearly unanimous. I believe three were of the other way of thinking. But the question of printing the evidence was put to the committee on three separate occasion, and the strongest possible expression of opinion was given by the committee on the line I have stated.

Mr. CHARLTON. I can see no reason why the House should not conform to the regular usage and to the rule laid down for cases of this kind. I see no reason why we should not refer the question to the Committee on Printing in the regular way, and let that committee decide whether this evidence shall be printed or not. That is my opinion as to the proper course to pursue.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have followed the sittings of the committee from the beginning, and I may say that this morning a vote was taken on the minority report presented by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and there were only two to vote for that report—my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Therefore, it seems that the committee are practically unanimous in favour of the hon. member for Beauharnois.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I was in the committee this morning, and there was no vote at all taken in the committee.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call attention to the fact that the first person to move that the proceedings of this committee be printed was the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell). He moved at the very beginning of the proceedings that all the evidence and proceedings should be printed for the use of the House. He was induced by some hon. gentlemen behind him to let the motion stand for further consideration; but the fact that he thought at the time that the evidence should be printed is some indication of the proper course to pursue. I presume that the minority report, as well as the report which has been presented by the committee, will be laid before the House in some form, and I do not see how this House is to decide between the two reports, or as to the facts set forth in the minority report, without seeing the evidence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the course of the government in declining to have this evidence printed is one of the most unusual occurrences that I have ever witnessed in this House. I have had some experience in the committees of this House, and I have never heard any such question raised before. I do not know anything about the evidence myself. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the meetings of the committee, although I believe I am a member of it; but I can say to my right hon. friend that in the inquiry with regard to the Drummond Counties Railway there was not the slightest question raised about printing the evidence from day to day; in the inquiry about the alleged election frauds in West Huron and Brockville, the evidence was printed as a matter of course almost from day to day; in the inquiry with regard to the emergency rations, the same course was pursued; and indeed in all the cases with which I have been familiar since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, there has never been any such question raised. What is the objection to printing the evidence? Surely there cannot be any well-founded objection. The members of the House are supposed to have some knowledge of what they are voting about, and if they are to have a knowledge of the facts and to be in a position to vote intelligently one way or the other, there cannot be any objection to having the evidence in such a shape that they can read it, understand it, and come to some conclusion about it. I have not the slightest idea of the nature of the report or of the conclusion at which the committee have arrived; I know nothing about the nature of the evidence; but I do submit to my right hon. friend that this is a most unusual departure from the ordinary mode of procedure. It is not a matter that requires to be sent to the Committee on Printing; it is a matter that will have to be discussed and considered by the House; and we know as well as the Committee on Printing can tell us, that we cannot properly understand or weigh the evidence unless we have it in printed form.

Mr. RUSSELL. Reference has been made to the motion I made at an early stage in the sittings of the committee that the evidence should be printed from day to day. I moved that purely as a routine motion, so that there would be no question about it. Then it was suggested that as there was nothing very serious in this case, as it was similar to the case we had before with reference to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell), it might be waste of time and trouble to print the evidence. Therefore, I did not press the motion, thinking that if it should be thought necessary later on, the committee would decide the matter. I do not understand that anybody is objecting to the printing of the evidence. The question is whether it would be well to suspend the rule. My opinion is that it would be well to suspend the rule and come down to the plain question whether we ought or ought not print the evidence. The reason I suggest that is that an hon. member whom we all respect is out of his seat while we are considering whether we should print the evidence or not instead of determining the main question. My opinion is that we might as well dispense with the rule requir-

ing the Printing Committee to consider the matter, because that committee has no better light for considering it than the House has this afternoon. The Printing Committee will not examine the evidence to ascertain whether it is important that it should be printed. The hon. member for Annapolis can inform the House better than the Printing Committee. As to the main question, that comes up later on, and is another question.

The PRIME MINISTER. My reason for the attitude I have taken in this case is simply this, that I desire to act in conformity with the rules of the House. The position has invariably met the approval of the House that the report of a special committee ought to be confirmed by the House, as we presume the committee have considered the matter. In this case the question of having this evidence printed was considered by the committee more than once and the committee decided that it should not be printed. In the cases referred to by my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition —the emergency rations, the Brockville and West Huron elections and some other matters—the committee itself passed resolutions to have the evidence printed and its report was adopted by the House. In this case, however, the committee did not think it advisable to have the evidence printed, after fully considering the matter, and I think we ought to adopt its report. But the matter may be referred to the committee on printing whose decision will guide the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the motion, I think it contrary to rule 94, which I quoted a moment ago, and which provides that no motion can be made for printing documents unless on the report of the Joint Committee on Printing. The suggestion had been made that the rule be suspended. This can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there any objection to the motion that rule 94 be suspended.

The PRIME MINISTER. I take objection.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then I declare the motion out of order.

Mr. MONK. May I not amend my motion and ask that reference may be made to the Joint Committee on Printing ? I understand that the Senate has adjourned for a considerable time, and it was in order to hasten the matter that I asked to have the printing ordered directly.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is moved by Mr. Monk that the report of the evidence and proceedings of the committee be referred to the Joint Committee on Printing of parliament.

Mr. WADE. Would it not be more in order to reserve that motion until there has been a motion for concurrence in the report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MONK. I now give notice that I intend to move that the said report be not adopted, but that the draft reports marked 'B,' drawn in the following terms, be adopted and laid on the Table of the House.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) moved that the House do now concur in the sixth report of the select committee appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would ask my hon. friend to allow this motion to stand as the Minister of Finance is not present.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. There is an amendment to be proposed to a clause in the report which we might dispose of.

Motion withdrawn.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 228) for the relief of Stephen Wilson.—Mr. Wade.

Bill (No. 229) for the relief of Ellen McDermid.—Mr. Wade.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT MR. LOY, M.P.

Mr. WADE. I beg to move that the second report of the select standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be concurred in.

Mr. MONK. I take the point of order that this motion cannot be made the day the report is received.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under ordinary circumstances the point of order would be well taken, but we must not forget that we are dealing with a question of privilege, and in such questions no notice is required.

Mr. MONK. This is not a question of privilege but a question of concurring in the report of the committee which has just been laid on the Table. I submit that a motion to adopt that report, made five minutes after the report was laid on the Table, is out of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The rule you have laid down, Mr. Speaker, would enable the committee to proceed without giving notice to its members. A question of privilege may be brought to the attention of the House without previous notice for the very good reason that it must be placed before the House at the earliest opportunity, but when once brought before the House then the subsequent proceeding must follow the ordinary rule. Otherwise it would be absolutely impossible to deal with the matter in the committee or in the House upon any intelligible or reasonable basis.

The PRIME MINISTER. In matters of privilege the rules of the House are suspended, and they may be sprung on the House

without notice, but I would suggest that this motion be held over and the discussion adjourned.

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

FISHERY RIGHTS OF DOMINION AND PROVINCES.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) moved :

That an order of the House do issue for a memorandum on the status of the question of fishery rights between the federal and the provincial governments.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Prime Minister whether or not there is any truth in the report that has been made public in the press here in Canada that the imperial government have asked the various colonial governments, including that of Canada, for permission to make public certain proceedings before the colonial conference which have hitherto been regarded as of a private nature ? Has such a communication been received by this government, and have the government come to any conclusion as to the reply they will give to the communication ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). These are questions as to which I can give no answer until I have had communication with His Excellency the Governor General. I shall communicate with His Excellency at the earliest possible moment, and shall give my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) the answers to his questions to-morrow or the day after.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES.

House in committee on the following resolution :

That it is expedient to enact as follows :

1. The Governor in Council may authorize payment of the following bounties on the undermentioned articles manufactured in Canada from steel produced in Canada from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig-iron made in Canada, viz. :

(a.) On rolled, round wire rods not over three-eighths of an inch in diameter, when sold to wire manufacturers for use in making wire in their own factories in Canada, a bounty of six dollars per ton ;

(b.) On rolled angles, tees, channels, beams, joists, girders, or bridge, building or structural rolled sections, and on other rolled shapes not round, oval, square or flat, weighing not less than thirty-five pounds per lineal yard, and also on flat eye bar blanks, when sold for consumption in Canada, a bounty of three dollars per ton ;

(c.) On rolled plates not less than thirty inches in width and not less than one-quarter of an inch in thickness, when sold for consumption in Canada for manufacturing purposes for which such plates are usually required and not to include plates sheared into plates of less width, a bounty of three dollars per ton.

2. The Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intentions of the foregoing section.

3. That chapter 8 of the statutes of 1899 be so amended as to provide that the bounties on steel and iron authorized by chapter 6 of the statutes of 1897 shall be continued until the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and seven, and that the rates of such bounties shall be as follows :

(a.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and three, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and four, both inclusive, the bounties shall be ninety per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter 6 of the statutes of 1897 ;

(b.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and four, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and five, both inclusive, the bounties shall be seventy-five per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter;

(c.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and five, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and six, both inclusive, the bounties shall be fifty-five per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter ;

(d.) From the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and six, to the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and seven, both inclusive, the bounties shall be thirty-five per centum of the amount fixed by the said chapter.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The House has had before it from time to time during the present session the question of granting some aid to the iron and steel industry. The government have come to the conclusion to propose certain legislation as set forth in the resolution now before the committee. The reasons which have led the government to prefer to grant aid in this shape rather than by making material changes in the customs tariff have been explained in previous discussions on the question of bounties. The resolutions now before the committee deal with the bounty question in two forms. First, we have certain resolutions dealing with the bounties which are already on the statute-book, and then we have a further resolution by which we propose to grant bounties for new forms of the steel industry which are not at present in operation in Canada. Dealing first with the question of the bounty as provided by existing legislation, I may remind the House that in the year 1897, the bounties were fixed at $3 per ton on steel, $3 per ton on pig-iron made from native ore, and $2 per ton on pig-iron made from imported ore. By subsequent legislation, a sliding scale of bounties was provided whereby the bounties fixed in 1897 should begin to diminish. That sliding scale took effect last year, and last year the bounties were payable on the basis of 90 per cent of the bounties as established by the Act of 1897. Provision was made that these bounties should be further decreased in the follow-

ing year to 75 per cent, then to 55 per cent, then to 35 per cent and then to 25 per cent. What is proposed in the present legislation touching bounties on pig-iron and steel is that we shall suspend for a year the operation of the sliding scale, so that, for the present year, instead of paying on the basis of 75 per cent of the bounties as at first established, we shall continue to pay for this year 90 per cent of the bounties fixed in 1897, the same as last year. The manufacturers will thus receive for two years 90 per cent, instead of one year 90 per cent and the other 75 per cent. As a means of forming some estimate of the probable difference this will make to the steel industry in the current year——

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. Finance Minister if it makes any difference whether it is manufactured entirely from Canadian ore?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bounties on iron established in 1897, as I have said, were at certain fixed rates, one on native and one on imported ore; but the reduction was on the basis of a percentage which applied to all. From a statement made a short time ago as to the amount paid in bounties in the past year, it appears that that amount was $1,098,359. This was on the basis of 90 per cent of the bounty fixed in 1897. Some accounts will probably come in later which will increase that sum, but we are speaking now entirely of the approximate estimate which I had the privilege of presenting to the House some days ago.

Mr. WILSON. That is not the statement that appears in 'Hansard' in answer to the question asked.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) will find that the figures given in 'Hansard' included some balance from the previous year. Am I not correct?

Mr. WILSON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am dealing with the operations of last year with a view to getting an approximate estimate of what the difference is to be. As shown in 'Hansard' the payments are somewhat larger than I have given, and they include some bounties earned in the previous year. And it is only fair to say that there will be some later payments to add to the figures I have given for the past year. All I can give now is an approximate statement. On the assumption that the sliding scale would remain without change, and that the output would be the same, we should pay to the companies for the coming year, on the basis of 75 per cent, $915,299. But, instead of paying them on the basis of 75 per cent, we pay on the basis of 90 per cent; and, assuming that the output is substantially the same, they will receive for the present year the same as they received for last year. If the output should increase, the amount they will receive will increase proportionately. On the basis of the figures I have given, the difference would amount to $183,059, that being the difference between paying on the basis of 90 per cent, as paid last year, and 75 per cent, as would have been paid this year had we made no change in the regulation. We do not by this resolution increase the period of bounties, but we change the percentage in the way I have described. So much then with reference to the difference it will make for the present year.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman not increase it one year by reason of repeating the 90 per cent, and then continuing the balance of the year on the sliding scale, as was formerly provided under the statute? Is there not an increase of one year by that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, not of time, there is an increase in the amount payable, because in the original arrangement the five years would end with a payment on the basis of 25 per cent; as it stands now, by the suspension of the operation of the sliding scale for one year, in the final year they will receive a payment on 35 per cent. For the present year and for each of the succeeding years, payments will be made at a higher percentage than was contemplated by existing legislation. I have given the whole difference it will make for the current year, it will make for each of the succeeding years a difference to the extent of the variation of the percentage in each case. By moving the sliding scale forward you pay them at a higher percentage than you would pay them by adhering to the present sliding scale.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For the subsequent years then there will be an increase of the bounty to what was proposed under the statute.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There will be in the percentage. But while the starting period remains the same, we will this year pay them 90 per cent of the total instead of 75 per cent, as now provided; we will next year pay them 75 per cent of the total instead of 55 per cent; in the following year we will pay 55 per cent instead of 35 per cent; and in the final year we will pay them 35 per cent instead of 25 per cent. The effect therefore is that you move forward the sliding scale one year. You give them, during each year, a higher rate of percentage than you would otherwise, terminating with 35 per cent instead of with 25 per cent as provided in the existing legislation.

Then, Sir, beyond that we have made some proposals with respect to articles which are not now manufactured in Canada. It was thought desirable that, if we were to grant further aid to the iron and steel industry, we should not only have

regard to the manufactures which are now in progress, but we should endeavour to secure some advance in the manufacturing industry by the production of lines of goods not at present produced in Canada. We have therefore proposed to grant additional bounties to the extent set forth in these resolutions on three classes of goods, one upon wire rods, an article which is used largely in making wire, and ultimately in making wire nails and manufactures of that character; and also on certain structural steel and steel plates. These things are not now made in Canada. They are consumed to a large extent, and the manufacturers have been very desirous that we should so frame our legislation as to encourage the development of these lines of industry. Therefore, instead of dealing with the tariff as already mentioned, we propose to make grants of bounties on the articles which I have named: On rolled round wire rods not over three-eights of an inch in diameter, when sold to wire manufacturers for use in making wire in their own factories in Canada, a bounty of $6 per ton. Then we proceed: On rolled angles and other forms of structural steel and large steel plates a bounty of $3 per ton. In the adjustment of these bounties regard is had to the existing conditions of the tariff. Whatever differences of opinion we may have as to the effect of duties, I suppose it will be generally acknowledged that the duty is an advantage to the manufacturer, and if he does not get it in the form of a duty but in the form of a bounty, he certainly receives considerable advantage. If he is already receiving a large advantage in the shape of the tariff, then there would be less reason for giving him a large advantage in the shape of bounties. In dealing with these articles we are dealing with items which are either on the free-list, as in the case of wire rods for the manufacture of wire and wire nails, or as in the case of structural steel and plates where the duty is a low one of ten per cent. We have reason to believe these grants in aid of the iron and steel industry, while they may fall short of what some manufacturers desire—for it is too much I suppose to hope that we should be able entirely to satisfy applicants who come to us in matters of this sort—we have some reason to believe that these grants will be regarded by the manufacturers as a moderately satisfactory encouragement. At all events they will serve the purpose of enabling industries whose position was somewhat in question a short time ago, to continue their operations, and not only to produce pig-iron and steel as they have been producing in the past, but also to make some progress in the more advanced operations by turning out these wire rods and the other items mentioned in the resolution.

I have already indicated what the charge upon the treasury will probably be by reason of the change which we are making in the bounties as respects pig-iron and steel. What the charge will be for these new bounties which we are providing, is not easy of determination. The best we can do is to call attention to the imports of these articles, and perhaps we can form some estimate of the quantity of the goods which are likely to be manufactured in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the Minister of Finance if that includes every thickness of wire and steel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, if my hon. friend will read the resolution he will see it is very carefully drawn in that respect; it is drawn, as I have already said, with regard to existing tariff legislation. There are some forms of steel which have a considerable duty upon them, and we do not in that case propose to allow any bounties. There are others which are either on the free list or subject to quite a low duty, and it is in such cases that we are allowing these bounties. There is a difference in the matter of plates as to the size. Now, as to what the probable charge will be, the only method that we can have of forming an opinion is by taking the imports of the articles in question, and forming, if we can, some estimate as to what proportion of these articles will be made in Canada instead of being imported. I have prepared a statement of the imports of these articles which will show approximately the probable amount we might make in Canada. The imports last year of wire rods amounted to 55,182 tons; the imports of structural iron and plates amounted to 47,512 tons. What proportion of this we might be able to manufacture in Canada is of course a matter of conjecture, it is difficult to form any understanding.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do steel rods include steel nails?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the wire rod is the first form towards the production of nails. We pay no bounty except upon the wire rod itself.

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the hon. Minister of Finance to give us the values as well as the tonnage of these articles imported?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The value of heavy angles, structural steel as it is generally described, imported during the year 1902 was $789,644; of plates imported, $571,291; and of wire rods imported, $1,523,792.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the hon. gentleman leaves that I would like to ask a question. He gave us a statement of 55,182 tons which I understand applies to paragraph (a) of the resolution, and he gave us 47,512 tons, but I did not quite understand whether that applies to paragraphs (b) and (c) together or only one of them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it includes everything except rods amounting to 55,182 tons. The other item covers the remainder of the resolution.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You have separated (b) and (c) as to values ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I have a statement showing the values, the figures of which I have just given. If we manufacture in Canada one-third of the quantity of these articles which were imported in the year 1902 then we shall pay bounties to the extent of $150,000 a year. If we manufactured two-thirds of the amount we imported we would pay bounties to the extent of $300,000 a year. Some little time will elapse probably before the manufacturers will have their mills equipped for the manufacture of these articles and I think we are probably within the mark when we say that the current year's output will not exceed one-third of the import. That is only a matter of judgment and perhaps a matter of guess. Hon. gentlemen who have the information before them may form an opinion as to whether it is correct or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no period of time during which the bounties shall continue fixed by the resolution ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, we have thought it better for the present that we should not name the period and for this reason, that where you name the period of the bounty you, in a sense, create a contract with the parties entering into these operations under which you would feel that you were bound to continue these bounties for the full term of the contract so called. We have thought it better to leave the matter indefinite so that the House will be entirely free to deal with the question at any future date in connection with any revision of the tariff that may be made. On the whole we think it is better that this bounty should not be offered for a specified time because it might create something like a specific contract. Our impression is that considering that it will take the companies several months before they can get into operation to earn these new bounties we probably would not be very far astray if we were to say that they will not during the current year produce more than one-third of the quantity imported during the year, the figures for which I gave, and if that is so we will pay about $150,000 in the form of bounties on the new articles, and there would be the increase already spoken of in the bounties on pig-iron and steel. These are the leading facts of the matter and with this statement we beg to submit the resolution to the consideration of the House.

Mr. WILSON. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give us a statement of the changes made since the present government came into office in the bounty on iron and steel and the change in the duty if any ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In 1897 there was an increase of the bounties on pig-iron and steel at which time there was a reduction of the duty—I cannot give the exact figures in regard to all the details—but there was a reduction from $4 to $2.50 a ton on pig-iron and of course a further reduction under the preferential tariff. The bounties at that date were increased to compensate the industry for the disturbance which otherwise would have been created by a reduction in the duties.

Mr. WILSON. Would the hon. gentleman bring down a statement of those changes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be glad to bring down a statement in detail showing the change made in each of these items.

Mr. KEMP. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance why it was that he came to the conclusion that the items of plates, steel ingots, puddled iron bars, and pig-iron should be dealt with on the bounty basis instead of by imposing a sufficient duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because, as I stated earlier in the session, a change in the duty on articles of this kind which are the very basis of a great many manufacturing industries, would probably involve material tariff changes and we did not deem it in the interest of the country to make such changes at present.

Mr. KEMP. Shall we draw the conclusion from that that later on these articles may be protected by a duty and the bounties taken off ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter will be purposely left entirely open to the House so that it may deal with it in that way. It is quite possible, but of course, we can make no undertaking in regard to the future.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure that we can all congratulate the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) on having awakened to a realization of the condition of the iron industry in this country. He did not seem to be very fully alive to it at the commencement of the session when we were told that the only difficulty in regard to all our Canadian industries was that there were not sufficient men for the purpose of carrying on the work and that the warehouses were not large enough to contain the manufactured product.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not as to all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a pretty vivid recollection of what the hon. gentleman stated and I do not remember any ex-

ception. If he made any exception I am sure he will be glad to correct me as he will have an opportunity of doing so. I think we may also congratulate ourselves that the right hon. leader of the government as well as the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, those redoubtable free-traders, took occasion to leave the House while the hon. Minister of Finance was making his statement, realizing no doubt that a bounty is the most extreme form of protection and that the measure which is now being brought down by the hon. Minister of Finance is absolutely out of touch with the principles which these right hon. gentlemen up to a very late date, in fact up to the present session, have announced to the House and to the country as their political creed. Under the tariff which was established by the late government when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Finance, some progress was made in the iron industry and I have no doubt a very much greater development would have taken place except for the fact that the price of pig-iron fell all over the world and the development of this industry which might reasonably have been expected in Canada at that time did not take place. This government introduced its tariff in 1887 and I have already given the House the particulars of the decreases made in the iron duties at that time so that it will not be necessary to go over them again. It is sufficient to say that the decrease was very considerable in regard to many of these items. For example, on pig-iron there was a reduction of $1.50 per ton ; on scrap (cast) a reduction of $1.50 per ton ; on billets and blooms a reduction of $3 ; on scrap (wrought), a reduction of $3 ; on steel bars a reduction of $3 ; on steel bands a reduction of $3 ; on steel fish and ties plates a reduction of $2 ; on plates a reduction of $3 ; on shaftings and forgings, a very considerable reduction, and so on through all the list which I then read to the House.

Very shortly afterwards this government came to the conclusion that so serious a reduction in the duties on iron and steel was a mistake, and that that mistake might be remedied by a continuation of the bounties ; and the measure with regard to the bounties was brought down, although in proposing it the government went back on all previous professions of policy which it had preached to the country for eighteen years in regard to bounties. I need only, in that connection, refer to the language of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), both with regard to duties on iron and steel and with regard to bounties. In 1890 the Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright said to this House :

> I doubt exceedingly whether among the many injurious duties which the policy of the present government has heaped on the producers of this country, there is one which is calculated to do more harm on a larger and wider scale than the enormous duties which have been placed upon iron.

Then this government, having reduced the duty on iron, proposed immediately afterwards to neutralize to some extent the advance which they made in that direction by bringing down their bounty scheme a few years ago. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce, on the occasion to which I refer, continued as follows :

> There is just this advantage in the proposition that to a certain extent it enables the people to see more clearly than in other cases how much the exchequer has been plundered because plunder it is, and how much the people are being inpoverished by this policy.

It is pleasing to know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, at the present time—I regret he is not here to-day—joins most heartily and cordially in this measure for the impoverishment of the people in placing bounties on iron and steel. The Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright continued as follows :

> This is merely a concession to certain favoured individuals, or certain favoured corporations to be paid for in all human probability by contributions to election funds, just as we know that other combines are in the habit of earning the gratitude of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Well, I do not know whether any comment is required on this or not. It would be, I suppose, out of place to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance whether there is any connection between the bringing down of this measure now and the reported approach of the general elections, having special regard in that behalf to the language which I have quoted from the Minister of Trade and Commerce. When it came to a question of bounties four years later, in 1894, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) thought the proposition was so absolutely absurd that he refused to discuss it at all. He said :

> I am not going to raise a discussion now as to bounties on pig-iron. I disapprove of the whole business altogether.

And he brushed it aside with a wave of his hand, and now his colleague, the Minister of Finance, brings down this resolution with the approval of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but happily in that right hon. gentleman's absence at the moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The late Conservative government, and particularly Sir Charles Tupper, when he was in that government, were extremely anxious that this industry should be developed in Canada ; and I have more than once referred, not in this House, but out of this House, to an incident which took place when Sir Charles Tupper was made aware that the government proposed to give bounties to this industry. I remember very well the occasion,

and I remember very well what Sir Charles Tupper said. He said he was glad that the government had done it, and he added with some emphasis: He was glad indeed that the government had done it, even though it should have the effect of giving them another five years in power. That is the aspect in which Sir Charles Tupper looked at this industry in this country, and it is not out of place at the present time to say that Sir Charles Tupper, by the stand which he took with regard to this industry at that time, both openly in this House and by means of negotiations outside of the House, contributed very largely to the establishment of these bounties, and in that way to the development of the iron and steel industry in the maritime provinces. And, as some time ago, I think at the very time these bounties were introduced, there was certain correspondence read in this House, by means of which it was sought to discredit Sir Charles Tupper's statement as to the part which he had taken in this matter, it is not out of place now for me to read a communication addressed to Mr. Henry M. Whitney, whose name was brought into that discussion; and addressed to him, not at the instigation of Sir Charles Tupper, but quite independently of him, by a gentleman who had very excellent means of knowing what share Sir Charles Tupper had in these negotiations—I refer to Mr. Graham Fraser, whose experience in the iron industry, and whose efforts in developing that industry in the maritime provinces are well known throughout Canada. This is the letter to which I refer:

New Glasgow, N.S.,
September 5th, 1900.

H. M. Whitney, Esq.,
95 Milk Street,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Sir,—In the Halifax 'Morning Chronicle' of Saturday, September 1st (cutting from which I mail herewith), I notice an article referring to a discussion carried on in the Canadian parliament, Ottawa, during last session by the Hon. W. S. Fielding and Sir Charles Tupper relative to the extension of the iron bounties, &c.

Owing to my absence in Great Britain when the discussion took place, I knew nothing of it until reading the article in last Saturday's 'Chronicle.' As my name comes up somewhat prominently in the matter, and as I think your letter is hardly fair to Sir Charles, I consider it my duty to state the facts as I know them.

By referring to my notebook, I find that on November 24th, 1897, I met you at your office in Boston, when we had some conversation relative to a supply of coal for a furnace plant which the Nova Scotia Steel Company proposed to establish at Sydney or Louisburg. On November 25th I went to Philadelphia and returned on Saturday the 27th, and again met you in your office and then gave you some figures as to the cost of making iron in Cape Breton. You then suggested a larger plan than outlined in our proposal. On Monday, November 29th, I saw you again, when you spoke in a very enthusiastic way of the proposed blast furnace project, and we then arranged for 10,000 tons of Cape Breton coal for coking test at the Ferrona works. At that interview you stated that if the test proved satisfactory and we could get the Dominion iron bounty extended for five years from the time the furnaces went into blast, you would join us in the enterprise and help us get the necessary capital. This was said in the presence of Mr. Windsor, then vice-president of the Dominion Coal Company.

The 10,000 tons of coal was shipped to Ferrona, the test proved satisfactory, and on January 25th, 1898, I again met you in Boston, when the results of the coking tests were submitted to you. You then suggested that legislation be at once got from the government of Nova Scotia incorporating a company and that in the meantime the Nova Scotia Steel Company should, through their solicitor and agents, do all they could to induce the Dominion government to extend the bounties.

We did secure from the Nova Scotia legislature an Act incorporating the company (The Nova Scotia Steel and Iron Company, Limited), but entirely failed to get during that session of the Dominion parliament any legislation extending the bounties. And on June 4, 1898, I wrote you as follows: 'I regret to inform you that we did not succeed in getting the Bill through parliament extending the bounties on pig-iron; so the matter of erecting furnaces at Sydney or Louisburg is, I suppose, off for the present.'

I heard nothing more from you until I received a telegram asking me to meet you at Syduney on the 17th of August, which I did. You then stated that you thought we had better go on with our new works as you did not believe the Dominion government would extend the bounties, and as Sir Charles Tupper was going over to England you would get him to introduce us to parties who would find the capital. In reply, I said: 'If you begin to build the large plant you are talking of, I do not believe the bounties will ever be extended. Sir Charles came in later, when you repeated to him our conversation. Sir Charles then said: 'Mr. Fraser is quite right about the bounties. You should get the Finance Minister to get an Order in Council passed extending the bounties before starting your works—it will be a great help in getting the capital. I will see that there will be no opposition to it from the Conservative party, and I will see Mr. Fielding and take up the matter personally.' When I saw Sir Charles about a month later, namely, September 16th, at the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, in the presence of yourself and Senator Mackeen, he told us that he did see Mr. Fielding at the Royal Hotel, St. John, and had a discussion with him in regard to the matter of extending the bounties.

Now, in view of the above facts you can hardly say that you were not interested in the iron and steel business at the time Sir Charles Tupper referred to, namely, August 17th, 1898. While we personally did not visit Ottawa to interview Mr. Fielding on the bounty matter, he was approached at your suggestion by the agents of the Nova Scotia Steel Company and also, I understand, by Messrs. W. B. Ross and B. F. Pearson, of the Dominion Coal Company, but without result at that session.

I well know that you are a busy man and unlikely to recall conversations such as referred to with the dates on which they took place, but when I repeat them to you as above you will, I think, recall them and agree with me as to their accuracy, and I know that you are fair enough to give Sir Charles credit for the part he took in securing such bounty legislation as

was finally passed, although it is not as favourable as you asked for, namely, 'five years from the date at which the furnace went into blast.' as provided by the Bounty Act introduced by the late Finance Minister, Hon. George E. Foster, during the session of 1894.

The difference it would make to your company you can no doubt appreciate, as it would have been unnecessary to rush construction at excessive cost.

Don't you think that some acknowledgment should now be made to Sir Charles ?

The favour of your early reply will oblige,

Your respectfully,

(Sgd) GRAHAM FRASER.

To that letter Mr. Whitney sent the following reply :

Boston, September 7, 1900.

Graham Fraser, Esq.,
New Glasgow, N.S.

Dear Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 6th instant, I have to say that I am well aware that Sir Charles Tupper was always friendly to the extension of the iron and steel bounties and gave to the proposed bounty legislation his hearty support.

The statement which I felt obliged to correct in my letter to Sir Charles was that Mr. Fielding was unfriendly to the matter and that I visited Ottawa with you and implored Mr. Fielding 'to extend that measure of assistance necessary to the organization of this great enterprise and that we went home utterly discouraged.'

As you yourself say this was not true of either of us ; and, so far as my expression goes, Mr. Fielding was, as I stated in my letter, 'friendly to the matter of the extension of the bounty period from the time of my first mention of the subject to him.'

Yours truly,

H. M. WHITNEY.

I thought it was only fair to Sir Charles Tupper that this letter, written not at his instigation, written entirely without his knowledge, should be brought to the attention of the House, as other correspondence from Mr. Whitney was at the time introduced into this House for the purpose of somewhat contradicting Sir Charles Tupper as to the share he had taken in the legislation at that time.

Now, coming to the proposal of the government, I regard it as a mere makeshift, a mere temporary expedient. I believe the iron industry of Canada can never be put upon a permanent basis until the duties are so revised as to give the home market, to a large extent at least, to our own people. That the government's present proposal will not do. The effect of a bounty and the effect of customs duties are very distinct. If by means of customs duties you can give the home market to our own people and in that way build up the production of iron and steel in Canada, the result will be that the competition thus stimulated in our own country will reduce the prices of the products to a fair and reasonable basis, and eventually there will be no burden on the people at all, because they will get their iron and steel manufactures and goods in Canada as cheaply as they can get them in any other country. But the effect of bounties is precisely the opposite. The more you develop the industry by means of a bounty, the greater burden you impose on the people. If you increase the production four-fold by means of a bounty, you increase the burden of the people four-fold. Now, there is good reason, it seems to me, for endeavouring to give our people the home market in respect to this great industry. I do not disguise from myself, nor does the hon. Minister of Finance disguise from the House, the necessity, in case the duties on iron and steel are revised, of revising the duties on other articles which are intimately associated with the use or the production of iron and steel. But is our home market worth anything ? It is estimated that we used during the past year more than 800,000 tons of iron and steel, of which we imported 544,547 tons direct products of blast furnaces and rolling mills of other countries. Surely there should be some opportunity for our own manufacturers to acquire the control of a market like that. We imported last year $33,681,625 worth of iron and steel and manufactures thereof. A considerable portion of those goods could be and ought to be manufactured in Canada. But I submit to the House, and particularly to the Minister of Finance, that it is impossible to give to our manufacturers the home market by a simple system of bounties such as that which he is proposing at the present time. My hon. friend has referred to a possible revision of the tariff in the future. Indeed, he has put these resolutions in such a form as, coupled with his remarks, to suggest that possibly he may be looking forward to a revision of the tariff at an early date. I would have thought, as I suggested at an early part of the session, that it would have been better to make a revision of the tariff at once, and not resort to this mere makeshift and temporary expedient, which will have to be abandoned if the iron and steel industry of Canada is to be put on a permanent basis. If that result is achieved, it can only be done by a very thorough revision of the tariff on these articles. I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Finance has any understanding with the manufacturers of iron and steel with regard to that. The way in which he has dealt with the matter in the House would seem to give colour to that supposition. While I am glad that these resolutions have been brought down and that this small measure of protection has been given for the purpose of aiding and developing this great industry, nevertheless I regret that my hon. friend has not seen fit to adopt the only means by which in my opinion this industry can be put upon a permanent basis in this country, that is, a revision of the customs tariff in such a way and to such an extent that the Canadian producers will enjoy the Can-

adian market. I still trust that the government will take the very earliest opportunity —I am afraid they will not have any opportunity if they do not begin very soon— to give adequate assistance to the iron and steel industry in the way I have mentioned.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Mr. Chairman, once more we are not doing the right thing. The Minister of Finance is asking this side of the House to place at his disposal a large amount of money, so that he may pay that money into the hands of manufacturers of iron and steel. The hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion, not because, I suppose, he is convinced that protection is good policy, but because some of our industries had very nearly gone to the wall. In other words, he gives relief once more to some industries when he cannot help himself. Public opinion has forced my hon. friends on the treasury benches to do what they had made up their minds not to do at the beginning of the session. I am very glad that public opinion has forced my hon. friend to do something, but he has not done the right thing. His policy is a policy by piece-meal. It is a retail policy, and I suppose that should some other industries, before the end of the session, be threatened with destruction, my hon. friends on the treasury benches will come again to the House and ask for bounties. I share the views of the hon. the leader of the opposition.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Of course.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend from Victoria says, of course. I do not know what views my hon. friend holds on this subject. He interrupts us very often when we address the House on questions which we believe we know as well as he does and to which we have given as much study, if not more, and his interruptions he is unable to substantiate by any arguments. I am glad to share the views which the hon. leadof the opposition has just expressed when he congratulated the hon. the Minister of Finance on doing something. I happened in September last year to have read an article published in the 'Weekly Sun,' which claims to be one of the organs of the farmers of Ontario. In this article comparisons were made between the prices of wire in this country and the United States. I addressed myself to one of the largest manufacturers of iron and wire in this country, and I shall take the liberty of reading the statement which he then sent me. I think it will convince even my venerable and hon. friend from Victoria, because the figures are there and the statement is as clear as the sun on a bright day :

The determination of the Canadians' price of wire is to Canadians a mystery. If a Canadian should want information with regard to the constitution of the wire market, he must address himself to the American Steel and Wire Trust, who, by reason of the discrepancy in the Canadian tariff which allows barb wire and Nos. 9, 12, 13 galvanized wire to come into this country free, has complete control of the Canadian market.

The American trust has complete control because we have no tariff on those articles.

Last year Canada imported 31,324 tons of wire. Of this 27,908 tons came from the United States, of the remainder about 3,500 tons was made in Canada by the Canadian firm under privilege of the American Steel and Wire Trust. Every year the emissaries of the trust come to Canada and determine the prices which will rule the season in the Canadian market, and even at which wholesale dealers will sell. All wire sold in Canada is sold f.o.b. at Cleveland whether it comes from a Canadian factory or wholesale house.

This is a fine state of affairs. No doubt the free traders in this House are pleased with it. The American trust not only controls the prices of wire, but insists that Canadian wire is sold as Cleveland. Is not that a fine policy ?

Under the free trade tariff the Canadian wire trade is under the complete control and manipulation of the American trust, and the money of the Canadian farmer goes to swell the dividends of the American millionaires. Before the duty was removed, Canadian trade was being supplied by thirteen Canadian factories. The Canadian wire manufacturers have engaged themselves if given due protection to sell their products not above the ruling United States price plus the freight.

This would give the Canadian farmer his wire at as low if not a lower rate than he is getting it now. It would be made by Canadian workmen and it would develop a Canadian market for wire rods which our steel companies should soon be able to manufacture, filling up the gap that now prevents the Canadian farmer from getting his wire from Canadian ore.

After having read this statement, let me compare the prices here and in the United States of some articles which are protected to a reasonable degree by our tariff. Bar iron is protected by our tariff of 1897 to the extent of $7 per ton. The current prices in the United States are given at $2.25. A Canadian paper gives it at $1.95 to $2 in Montreal and in Toronto. These were the quotations in September 1st. On iron pipe we have a duty of 35 per cent to pay, is it possible that free traders will stand by a government which imposes a duty of 35 per cent ? Is it logical on their part ? They are free traders, yet they support a government—and I was part of it when this good bit of business was done—which imposes a duty on certain articles a duty of 35 per cent. Our free trade friends are mighty glad when there is no duty and when the Americans slaughter our Canadian market they cheer, but when there is a duty of 35 per cent they cheer again. How do the prices compare in the case of iron pipe, on which there is a duty of 35 per cent ?

	Canadian price. Per 100 feet.	American price. Per 100 feet.
½-inch..	$ 2 85	$ 3 57
¾-inch..	3 65	4 02
1 inch..	5 20	5 77
1¼-inch	7 35	7 87
1½-inch	8 95	9 45
2 inch..	12 55	12 60

In all that list of prices, the Canadian manufacturer is the lowest, and that is due to the protective duty of 35 per cent. The result has been, as the leader of the opposition has just pointed out, that competition has been keen between Canadian producers, and so we have the reduction of prices to the Canadian consumer. Now, let us look at another article. Take the item horse-shoes, on which we have a duty of 30 per cent. As a consequence, all the horse-shoes used in this country are made within our own territory. They are sold from the factory at $3.35 per hundred pounds, while, if we had free trade or a lower tariff, the American firms would first slaughter our Canadian market and then we should have to pay the American price, which, at the date when this memorandum was placed in my hands, was $3.85. The same is true of horse nails. The cheapest No. 7 in Canada cost $6.90, against $8 to $9 in the United States ; or $11.98 for the best No. 7, against $14 in the United States. What is true of these articles is true of everything else. In other words, if we had a tariff which would protect the industries that could be worked out successfully here, we should have competition and lower prices. Now, the Minister of Finance has told us that last year we paid over $1,000,000 to the manufacturers of iron. If, instead of that system of bounties, we had adopted a protectionist tariff, let us say of 35 per cent, we should not have been obliged to pay that amount of money. And, instead of importing over $30,000,000 worth of iron manufactures, we should have imported not more than half that quantity. We should have circulated from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 in this country to the benefit of our farmers, our working men, our merchants, our railways—everybody. In the face of the facts that I have given, in face of the prices I have quoted—and which are not the only ones I could quote—how is it possible to explain the refusal of the government of this country to come to a reasonable and Canadian policy ? Yes, a Canadian policy ; for a policy that allows American manufacturers to cross the line and dictate to our manufacturers, and even our merchants, the prices at which they shall sell, is not a Canadian policy,—it is a Yankee policy and nothing else. If there is another name for it, I am quite ready to accept it ; but I cannot find any other name for a policy—I say it again—which allows American manufacturers and American combines to tell our people : You shall not sell for less prices than those we fix for you. I say it is a policy I cannot understand, a policy I cannot explain—and a policy I cannot support, of course. The Minister of Finance is coming to the rescue of an industry which deserves every consideration at our hands. The nations that possess iron ores are happy nations indeed. We have the advantage of possessing ores and everything else that would lead to a large production of this important staple ; and we have only to adopt the right policy to see this great industry developed as it should have developed long ago. I repeat what I said the other day,—that, being unable to secure the duties, we are obliged to accept the bounties. At the same time, we know that these bounties will not serve the purpose as the duties would have done. From some of the people interested in the iron industries I have learned that, since the Minister of Finance has submitted the bounty policy, that they are in the same position that I am in to-day ; being unable to obtain what they know to be right, they have to accept what is given to them. But, of course, they will not invest a great deal of money. They know that the bounty system cannot be a permanent policy. They know that my hon. friends on the treasury benches give relief to industries only when they cannot help themselves. Consequently those industries that are helped to-day by the system of bounties will simply live from hand to mouth ; they will not develop ; they will not do what they would do if they were certain of the home market. Not being able to do better, I content myself with offering my protest against the policy which is being adopted now, because it is not the policy that ought to be adopted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's (Hon. Mr. Tarte's) figures respecting prices are very interesting, and assuming—as I have no doubt I have the right to assume—they are accurate, very valuable. I understand my hon. friend to quote a number of leading articles in which the prices, notwithstanding the changes made in the tariff, are higher in the United States than here.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Articles protected by 35 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, articles on which we levy a duty of 35 per cent, and which we are getting cheaper than the consumer in the United States can buy them. And my hon. friend has told us repeatedly that the American tariff is higher than ours. What, then, becomes of the argument that if you have a sufficiently high tariff, you will have a measure of home competition which will bring down the price of the goods ? My hon. friend has simply proved that high tariff means high prices. Prices of the goods he has referred to are higher in the United States than in Canada, and the reason is not that there is a lack of industrial development, or a lack of competition in the United States, but simply and solely

that their tariff is higher than ours. Their tariff is high and their prices are high. Our tariff is somewhat lower and our prices are somewhat lower accordingly.

Now, just a word, if the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will permit me, in relation to the four-year-old letter he has read in relation to the part played by Sir Charles Tupper in connection with the iron and steel industry. Sir Charles Tupper is out of politics now, and nothing was further from my thought than that I should endeavour to discredit any part he has had in public affairs. As he has retired I would rather—as would all Canadians—seek the good things he has done than seek opportunity to find fault with him. Let us attack those who are in the battle, not those who have passed out of it. I regret that the hon. gentleman has conveyed the impression that I have, in some way, tried to discredit the part played by Sir Charles Tupper in the matter of the iron industry. There is no foundation for that idea. I have sent for 'Hansard' but have not yet received it that I may refer to the passage. But with the help of the quotation the hon. gentleman has given, I can recollect the facts. Sir Charles Tupper, in a discussion which took place, I think in 1890, was not content to claim whatever credit he might fairly claim in connection with the policy of developing the iron and steel industry, but he went further and was ungenerous enough to state that I had been opposed to granting these bounties, that Mr. Whitney had come to me at Ottawa, and that I had sent him away telling him that I would do nothing. I asked Sir Charles for his authority at that time, and he stated that Mr. Henry M. Whitney was his authority. I said nothing on the subject, but I wrote to Mr. Whitney calling his attention to Sir Charles' statement. Mr. Whitney wrote a letter in reply in which he said that Sir Charles Tupper was mistaken, and he used the words which my hon. friend has used, the words in the letter to Mr. Graham Fraser, that in all negotiations in the matter with me he received every courtesy and consideration, and found every manifestation of a desire to assist him. These were the facts connected with the discussion which took place in the year 1900. However, I only allude to it now to show that neither then nor now was it my desire to make any reflection upon the part played by Sir Charles Tupper. He has passed off the stage of active political life, and I am the last man who would say anything which would deny him any fair share of credit which he may deserve in relation to this or any other matter in the history of Canada, during the long period that he was connected with public affairs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I read the letter because it indicated that the view which had been expressed in the letter of Mr. Whitney read in this House by my hon. friend, was a view which did not commend itself, in some respects at least, to the recollection of Mr. Fraser, who was as intimately connected with these negotiations as was Mr. Whitney. The letter itself shows that on the first occasion when application was made to the government during 1898, I think, the efforts of Mr. Ross and some other gentleman to prevail upon the government to adopt the system of bounties, were absolutely unsuccessful.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the letter showed that, and it could not show it for such was not the fact.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) When the hon. member for the division of St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was speaking, he mentioned that he was going to support the views of the leader of the opposition, and I, in my innocence, just remarked in a kindly spirit, 'of course you do.' Well, the hon. member turned on me rather unkindly for that expression. I may say to the House and to him that it would be well for him if his political life had been as consistent as mine, if it had, he would not be in the position he is in to-day. Now let us review his position. When he was a member of the government there was nothing that could be said about him by the opposition which was not said. They did not say that he had committed murder, or seduction, or anything of that kind; but there was scarcely a sin you could think of that he was not charged with by the opposition. He turned against his own government, and then the opposition with open arms were willing to receive him. Well, they are welcome to him, so far as the Liberal party is concerned. His position, Mr. Chairman, puts me in mind of a certain species of snake. When they find that the animal is rather too large for them to swallow, they slime him all over and then they can swallow him. That is what the opposition have done with the hon. member for St. Mary's, and they are now welcome to have him to assist them in every way they wish. But coming to the question under consideration, I am not so sure but it would have been well if the iron industry in this country had been allowed to go into liquidation, and that other people had built on its ruins. But we are told by very good political economists that these are infant industries, and since they are, I am willing to sacrifice some of my own principles to support them—not so much on behalf of the men who have invested their capital in them, as on behalf of other industries that are at stake all over the Dominion of Canada, in Prince Edward Island, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in Montreal, in Quebec, in Toronto, and I may say in every other place in Canada. But there is one thing about this industry that I must mention. I am speaking now of other interests in Cape Breton. They are without a manager, and I fear they will never succeed

until they have a proper manager. We had some experience with the sugar refinery that was started in Halifax. A large amount of capital was paid into that enterprise, and they got a manager from Brooklyn, and he landed them $70,000 in debt the first year of his engagement. Now, I have a rather kind regard for Scotchmen generally, and I think if these iron and steel people had sense enough to correct their errors the same as was done in Halifax, by sending to Scotland and getting a manager, they would probably have succeeded. There was any amount of extravagance committed in connection with this enterprise in the Island of Cape Breton. Columns and columns, and pages and pages, were written about the profits that were going to be made; you would think that half the iron industries of the United States were to be closed up by this one industry alone, and they induced, or seduced, innocent people to take stock in the company, who are to-day to a large extent ruined. It puts me in mind of a story of the Duke of Breadalbane. I do not know that a good story has been told in this House for a long time. The Duke of Breadalbane, like all noblemen of Scotland at that time, had a highland piper. One day the clergyman, in going around, regretted to find that the piper did not have much knowledge of Scripture, and he asked him if there was any part of Scripture that impressed him. Yes, says the piper, that golden image on the plain of Dura. When the order was given that at the sound of the harp, the sackbut, the cornet, the flute, the psaltery, the dulcimer and all sorts of musical instruments, they should all fall down and worship the image, if they had had a highland piper there none of that nonsense would have happened, because, instead of being down on their knees, they would all have been dancing. So in this instance, if the people down in Cape Breton had a prudent Scotchman to manage their affairs they would be successful to-day, as was the case with the sugar refineries in Halifax under the management of a Scotchman; they succeeded and are succeeding to this day. One of the greatest difficulties that I see in connection with assisting these iron and steel industries is that they are without a proper manager to look after their affairs. Now let me read from the St. John 'Telegraph' of an interview with Mr. Buell.

Mr. Buell said the facts were that three months ago he made a proposition to James Ross, president of the company, who was then in Europe. The proposition, if accepted, would have brought the business to a better condition than it is to-day. He decided that he would not remain there subject to the conditions then existing, and he proposed that he administer the business, and he felt sure he could bring about better results. As an alternative, he said that if his proposition were not accepted, he would resign his position, to take effect in three months. It was not accepted, and so he did resign and gave up his position this week. Mr. Buell says the natural basis for a big successful business is still there as good as when Mr. Whitney started the works ; there is the location, the materials necessary in the manufacture, all good, but it is the human factor of management of the enterprise which did not bring success for, said he, the people of Canada don't have to be told that the business is not a success. Were his proposition entertained, he felt sure there would have been different results.

There was one observation that my hon. friend from St. Mary's made, that nations that could produce iron and ore were all happy. I think that Spain is the largest exporter of iron ore of any country that we know of and I do not know that the condition of Spain is much happier than that of any other country in Europe.

Mr. GOURLEY. I feel great sympathy for the clergyman mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross). He regretted that the piper of the Earl of Bredalbane was not more familiar with the scriptures. I have a similar regret that the government of this country are not better acquainted with the Holy Scriptures. I feel that if the government were, and especially if the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) were, considering his conduct towards the iron industry of this country, instead of making the speech that he did this afternoon, he should have arisen and humbly followed the splendid example of the psalmist who declared, 'I acknowledge my transgressions and my sin is ever before me.' I feel assured, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. Minister of Finance had done that, the Liberal-Conservative party would have been prepared to give him that generous forgiveness that Ezekiel promised to the whole world when he said, 'When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed and doeth that which is lawful and right he shall save his soul alive.' If the hon. Minister of Finance wants to save his political soul alive, he must turn away from the sins he has committed and which he has committed especially in regard to the iron industry. I am deeply concerned in the iron industry of this country. I am more concerned in those industries which prosper and give character to Canada than in any political success that may arise out of the matter. I am deeply concerned that Canada shall be a great manufacturing country, and that this country shall acquire the wealth which springs especially from the iron industry. It is well known that the success and wealth of any country are based upon the manufacture of iron, for iron calls into its production the mining of coal and the mining of other minerals all of which industries give character to the country. In my own county we had an iron industry at Londonderry called the Steel Company of Canada. That industry flourished under great difficulties for twenty-five years and it gave to the county of Col-

chester great prosperity. Farmers within a radius of twenty or thirty miles found a splendid market in consequence of it, and farms that had been uncultivated, farmhouses, and barns that were mean and unsightly gave way to the beautiful homes and fine outbuildings that grace the countryside. Any person who drove through that country could not but see that some magic was at work, and that magic was the successful working of the iron industry there. The Conservative party, opposed as they were by these gentlemen opposite, were cowardly to have listened to their arguments at that time, they should have felt themselves to be more assured of the ground upon which they stood and they should not have hesitated before the carping criticism of these hon. gentlemen. They never gave the iron industry that powerful support which they should have given it. However, they came forward and by the aid of bounties and by encouragement in the shape of tariff legislation, they gave it the lease of life which it previously enjoyed. In reference to the price of goods in a protected country, I must say that I thought the doctrine that duties increased the price had been exploded long ago. I really felt sorry for Nova Scotia that the hon. Minister of Finance, with whom I have no quarrel and of whom I have always spoken kindly, should seek to lower the intelligence of the distinguished province of Nova Scotia by the adoption of that argument which I thought had been given up by intelligent men twenty or thirty years ago. If the hon. gentleman had been addressing some audience in Timbuctoo or some audience in Algiers, or in some undiscovered territory in Africa, if there is any undiscovered territory in Africa, I could understand him repeating the argument that a high tariff makes dear goods. The hon. gentleman should be familiar with the history of Canada when cotton and sugar were protected in this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite wasted days and weeks of the valuable time of this parliament in asserting that cotton and sugar would be dear just in proportion to the duties imposed upon these articles. Yet, in four or five years you could buy cotton and sugar cheaper than it had ever been known to be in the history of Canada. What happened in the United States ? They protected steel rails by imposing a duty of $22 a ton. There is one thing about the people of the United States which we cannot help but admire, while not admiring many things characteristic of their system of government, diplomacy, or public life, and it is the splendid courage that they display when they attempt to deal with a question such as this. They make up their minds, and after having made up their minds, they fear the opposition, neither of their own citizens nor of any nation abroad. They wanted to manufacture steel rails. They were building railways all over the United States, until a few years ago they were sending millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to the old country and draining their own country. They imposed a small duty for a little while, but they found it did not avail. At last they put on a duty of $22 a ton on steel rails while steel rails were selling at $27 or $28 a ton in England. They put on by way of duty almost the entire value of the rails and in five or six years rails were selling in the United States at $18 per ton, or $4 less than the duty imposed. How could the duty be added to the price in this case ? This question was threshed out all through the United States by the most competent and logical minds in the United States, men like Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, men possessing the most astute and cultivated minds, men with syllogistic minds, whose reason could not be satisfied with a non-sequiter. These men, having threshed it out from the beginning to end settled the question for ever that there was no connection between duties and prices, but the question was regulated by competition. I thought the hon. Minister of Finance would not have introduced into the House of Commons an ad captandum argument which would only be fit for a public meeting and a public meeting of very ill-informed men at that. I always listen to the hon. member from Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) with great pleasure, because he has convictions. What we want in Canada are men of convictions, men, who having convictions, will stand by them at whatever hazard and not only stand by them, but seek to impress them upon their fellow-Canadians, feeling that if their convictions are honest and right, they should dominate the whole public opinion of the country and determine the policy of the whole of Canada. I have come to the conclusion, after watching the hon. gentleman's course in this House, that he is sincere and thorough Canadian, although I told the House a few days ago that I had a different opinon a year and a half or two years ago when the hon. gentleman made those unpatriotic speeches in the great city of Paris. I want to tell the hon. member from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) that it is not wrong for a man to change his mind. Only very little and very narrow men pretend that they never change their minds. If I am wrong in the morning I will change my mind fifty times to get right by noon, and if I am wrong at noon, I will change my mind fifty times to be right at night. I would change my mind every hour of the day to be right, until I could lie down at night feeling in my heart that I was at last right. Instead of it being a criticism against a public man that he has changed his mind if his motives are right, it should be a credit to him. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast that they will not change their minds, although they have changed their policy.

The trouble with you gentlemen is that you are in a continuous state of mental hypocrisy. When you gentlemen were in opposition, you permitted your leaders to force you into a false position. You should have stood up like men and said to your leaders: In this new country these old fogey notions of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) can have no place, and you must adopt a policy consonant with the building up of Canada. If the younger men and the stronger men of the Liberal party had not permitted Mr. Blake and Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Fielding and men of that kind to dictate a policy that they must have known was unsuitable to the conditions of Canada, you gentlemen opposite would not be in the pitiable position to-day of constantly trimming your sails to meet every adventitious wind, but instead you would present yourselves to the country as a strong government with a strong policy. I am opposed utterly to this bonusing, except as a temporary measure. I suppose that when you have your head in the bear's mouth you have to take any kind of treatment the bear gives you, but if I had my head out of the bear's mouth in connection with the iron industry I would say that this bounty system is a most unscientific and ungracious way of treating the iron industry of this country. We have before us the splendid example of the United States in dealing with the iron industry. In 30 years the United States have sprung into competition with the greatest manufacturing countries in the world, until to-day they are challenging the mother of manufacturing in the products of steel. Yet, in face of this splendid example, this government is foreswearing the whole experience of this continent, and running amuck against the experience of every able and accomplished man, in attempting to assert this bounty doctrine of theirs. Gentlemen, when your Finance Minister proposed this bounty in your caucus, there should have been some of you strong enough to have said: We are wearing false colours, we are driven to the wall by the arguments of the iron manufaucturers of this country, let us be honest and say that the course we have pursued for 20 years in denouncing protection, is a wrong course, and instead of adopting this makeshift policy of bounties, which is only an attempt to square ourselves with the policy of protection, let us give that industry the ample protection it needs. Gentlemen on the other side know very well that a policy of protection would really benefit the steel industry, and would not take the taxes out of the people as this bounty system does. By imposing this bounty system you are not giving the iron industry of Canada one-tithe the assistance that a scientific policy of protection would lend it. You have in the United States a tariff on iron and steel scientifically arranged; it was made by experts from France and Germany, and other countries who assembled at Washington and framed it on scientific principles. With that American tariff scaled down and adapted to the wants and needs of Canada, you would place Canada in a very short time in a proud position, and enable her to cope not only with the United States, but with England and Germany as well. Look at what a mean and miserable policy this government has pursued. When they made up their minds to encourage the iron industry in this country, why did they not grapple with it in a straight forward and honest way, and not in the niggardly fashion which has given a staggering blow to the investment of foreign capital in Canada? Enormous quantities of capital have been lost in Nova Scotia and in Canada by this makeshift policy. If we had been bold and strong a few years ago, to-day we would have had an iron industry in Canada that would have given character and wealth and power to this country, and would have made us known the world over. In 1894 we commenced by giving a bonus of $2 upon puddled iron and steel ingots made in Canada. That went on till 1897, when the bounty was increased to $3, and then in 1899 this sliding scale was introduced. Just as our iron industry was getting on its feet and gaining strength, the Minister of Finance, as if he were angry that the iron industry was progressing, introduced a sliding scale by which 10 cents were cut off the bounty the first year, 15 cents the next year, 25 cents the next year, and in five years the bounty was to disappear altogether. Whether the Minister of Finance understood it or not, it was the most malicious attack upon the iron industry of Canada that could be conceived by mortal man. I am in a position to say that so soon as this policy was introduced the Canada Steel Company, of Nova Scotia, gave up the struggle. They struggled on for 20 years, hoping that the government and the people of this country would grow up to a strong scientific policy for the protection of the iron industry, but so soon as this policy was proposed, the Canada Steel Company went into liquidation, and that great industry which had spent some $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 of English money in Colchester county became inoperative, and last fall the Drummonds of Montreal came down and bought for $300,000 that property which had cost the Englishmen some $2,000,000 or $3,000,000. How can we hope to encourage capital to come to this country when all that the shareholders get out of an investment of $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 is scarcely enough to pay the costs of winding up the concern? Is it any wonder that they leave Canada damning the country, and protesting that they will not invest another dollar in it or permit any friend to invest a dollar in a country that pursues such a vacillating policy. That was the condition of affairs

when the Drummonds came down to Nova Scotia and bought that property, and now they are endeavouring to work it up. I know that these gentlemen were here since they have acquired the property, endeavouring to induce the government to enter upon a policy of protection. I have no warrant to speak for them, but I know that they do not want bounties, because I feel that the bounties are little good to the iron company of Londonderry. It may be some good to the Sydney people, although judging from the quotation of their stock and their financial difficulties, it is not much good to them either. It was thought that the announcement of these iron bounties would strengthen the financial position of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, but instead of that it seemed to injure the company, and now the coal company has been divorced from the steel company, I fancy preparatory to some further ill-luck happening to the steel company. Now, Sir, I do not wish anything to happen to that steel company, because it would be of untold misfortune to the iron industry of Canada. It would publish to the world that there is something unsuitable in the conditions of Canada for the manufacture of iron and steel, and besides it would give to that imfamous cad, Carnegie, an opportunity of boasting that he had sized up the iron conditions in Canada better than any other. I call him a cad advisedly, because I do not fancy the fellow can either read or write or has the slightest training, for if he had, he would not be guilty of the low and offensive remarks he made with reference to Canada.

When these bounties were announced some days ago, I thought they were adopted to improve the condition of the iron industry of Sydney. I understood that they would not assist the iron industry of Londonderry to any considerable extent which is not engaged in the manufacture of the particular class of iron protected by theses bounties. But these indstries do not want bounties. Why do we indulge in that unscientific way of helping industries ? I find that last year we imported from the United States $25,000,000 worth of the manufactured products of iron. What the iron industries of Londonderry and Sydney want is to be making and selling those products in Canada and getting that $25,000,000 which we now send to the United States. After depriving the manufacturers of this country of the home market, with which no other market is comparable, these hon. gentlemen tell them to go and compete with the foreign manufacturer in the markets of the United States or England or Germany. That is a poor compensation for the loss of their market at home. It must be an aggravating thing for a man who manufactures in this country to go to Montreal or Toronto to sell his goods, and find there some Yankee stealing away the markets of his country, which he has helped to make. It is one of the basest betrayals a government was ever guilty of to force the manufacturers of this country to see their own markets stolen from them, and then to tell them to go and see what chance they have in foreign markets. Well, we have to take this dribble, and I take it without thanks ; I take it as not worthy of thanks. But I suppose that until a great wholesome sentiment is created in this country, strong enough to sweep away these gentlemen, we will not do better. But if I judge the signs aright, I warn these gentlemen that the deluge is at hand, and that the whole manufacturing interests of Canada are not going to be imperilled to give these fourteen or fifteen gentlemen high offices. I would rather let them get out, and give my share to maintain them all their lives with splendid pensions and put in a government that will advance the interests of Canada. I fancied that the day was gone when a minister could call on his supporters to sustain him, no matter what his principles were, and no matter how much he was injuring the great interests of the country. The Finance Minister should have said : 'I have been wrong in my political teaching ; in my early days I was a pupil of Alfred Jones, of Halifax, one of the narrowest men who has ever lived in the Dominion, or in any other part of the world ; my young mind was moulded by this man before it was able to stand alone, and I should not be judged for my errors, because they are an inheritance.' If the hon. gentleman would say that, I would say to him : 'If you intend in future to do right, accept absolution, not only from myself, but from the Liberal-Conservative party, which has always been generous in forgiving its bitterest foes.' I saw in a Montreal paper the other day the statement by some gentleman that he had the assurance from the government of Canada—he did not say from whom—that in the near future a tariff would be submitted that would amply and sufficiently protect the iron industries of this country. I do not know whether that statement was made with authority or not ; but I saw it, and was glad to see it, because I thought in some way it was inspired. But if the Minister of Finance will get up and say : 'We have sinned, but we intend to do better—because it is human to err, and it is God-like to reform and get on a higher platform—and we will give you the bounties to-day as a temporary measure, but before next session we will seek the assistance of experts and will give ample protection to the great iron industry of Canada, which will give this country character and wealth in the coming years.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The hon. Minister of Finance has answered the statement I made in a very peculiar way. I quoted the prices of articles which are protected in this country to the extent of 30 or 35 per cent. I have

shown by those prices that the theory which we hear so often that when there is a high tariff prices are high, is false. My hon. friend answers me by calling my attention to the fact that in the United States these articles, which are protected there to about the same extent, sell at a little higher price. My hon. friend knows the condition of things in the United States ; he knows that wages are higher, the prices of farm products are higher, so much so that during the last five years they have increased in value 49 per cent, and everything else is higher. But that does not prove the contrary of my statement. When an article is sufficiently protected, there is enough competition to ensure reasonable prices. I expected somewhat the answer my hon. friend has given me, and I was prepared for it ; I know his trend of thought. My hon. friend would perhaps like to know what happens when there is no duty at all. I have proved that when we have sufficiently protected our manufacturers they are able to sell cheaper than their American competitors. Now, let me quote the prices during the past year of No. 9, No. 12 and No. 13 wire, which are free of duty. They are not manufactured here ; we do not manufacture a pound of them. What was the result ? It was very clear, because all the wire consumed in Canada is manufactured and sold by the Americans. They have two prices, one for their own citizens and another for Canadians. The price of No. 9 was $2.60 in the United States and $2.85 in Canada ; No. 12 was $2.75 in the United States and $3 in Canada ; and No. 13 was $2.85 in the United States and $3.10 in Canada. In other words, when they have slaughtered one of our industries, they charge our people more than they do their own citizens. And we are pleased with that state of affairs ; and because I happen to share the views of those who do not believe in a policy which has that result, venerable men like my hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) lecture me. He invites me to remember that some of my hon. friends on the other side of the House were some time ago saying a lot of hard things about me. A lot of things have been said about me during the last thirty years that I have been a newspaper man. I was not killed by those weapons, I am still alive, and I do not care much what is said about me, when I am sure I do not deserve any censure. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has alluded once more to what he calls my Paris speeches. He read them in the English language. I am sorry he is not a French scholar.

Mr. GOURLEY. I will read them in French.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I invite him to read them in French and not in distorted reports in English, and I say without hesitation that they might have been made by any English citizen sitting in parliament. This little incident being closed, let me say only one word more. When there is a sufficient Canadian tariff, we are able to compete with our American friends and neighbours. We are able to sell to our own customers as cheap as, if not cheaper than they sell to their citizens. The reasons are obvious. They have a condition of affairs which does not exist here. There, wages are higher and the cost of living higher. We have everything here necessary to build up large industries, to develop our cities, to furnish home markets to our farmers, and we are doing none of these things. When my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was asking me to believe that a high tariff increases prices, I was very nearly getting up and begging the hon. Minister of Customs to come to my rescue without any delay, because he has allowed—and I am equally responsible with him—an increase in the duties on several things. Let us take cement, he has increased the duty on cement. What has been the result ? Several new factories have sprung up and we are manufacturing first-class cement. We are manufacturing it more and more. What is true of cement is true of everything else.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend gave us some interesting figures a few moments ago, which seemed to bring out very clearly some important facts showing the effect of a high tariff. He has now added to that information something equally important. He has quoted facts in connection with the wire industry, and has shown that the manufacturers of wire in the United States are charging excessively high prices for that article. He has thus proved that in an industry probably protected to the extent of fifty per cent or sixty per cent or seventy per cent, in the United States, the manufacturers are able, through the operation of a high tariff, to create monopolies, trusts and combines, which enable them to dictate prices to their customers.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. My hon. friend knows political history better than that. He cannot ignore that there are more monopolies in free trade England than in the United States. When a free trader is put to the wall by a sound argument, he is able to do anything.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). What is desired is to give immediate relief to the iron industry, and the question for us to consider is whether this bounty is more likely to be of immediate benefit to that industry than would be an increased duty. The point to decide is whether an equal amount of bounty in money will assist the manufacturers as well as an equal amount derived from a protective duty. Let us suppose that the manufacturer makes his iron or steel as cheaply as he can, he will have in addition a bounty which will enable him to compete with any other producer. On the other hand, if I

understood my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, he said that a duty would create greater competition and consequently reduce prices. But our object is to give the manufacturers a higher price or more money; and if you reduce the price at which he sells his article, he is losing money. What then must he do ? He cannot reduce the prices of the raw material or the machinery, and he will have to fall back on his unfortunate labourers and reduce the wages paid them. That is one of the effects of the custom system. The bounty gives immediate relief to the manufacturer, and behind that is the question which will benefit the customer the most. But as the question before us now is the giving of immediate aid to the manufacturers, that aid will be most readily given through the bounty system.

Mr. MONK. As there are iron industries of importance right in my county, I am not disposed to warmly congratulate the government on the assistance given this particular industry, although I am glad for the parties concerned that their important industry has been saved from distress. I do not think however that the system adopted by the present government will have any effect in the way of protecting, as should be done, the great iron industry, which is the basic industry of this country. If we wish to preserve that very important industry in our midst, we will have to follow the example of the countries which have created it among themselves. We will have to follow the example of Germany, Belgium and the United States, whose tariff has been prepared with the greatest care—with such care in fact that it enables that country to dominate us completely in the production of iron. My hon. friend from St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has referred to the wire industry. We in the county of Jacques Cartier, before the elections of 1896, had an excellent manufactory which produced numbers nine, twelve and thirteen wire. These three were drawn and were excellent wire, and moreover, that important manufactory produced nearly the whole barb wire required in this country. What happened ? My hon. friends, in conformity with what they preached on every hustings before 1896, when they declared that we were paying exorbitant prices for barb wire and that the duties should be abolished, carried out their policy in the tariff of 1897.

The consequence was that we became dependent on American producers for products of iron and steel. The barbed wire factory at Lachine had to give up the manufacture of barbed wire, and for No. 9, No. 12 and No. 13 wire, we became dependent upon the Americans. As a result, we have dearer barbed wire since, and wire of inferior quality, as everybody knows and we are entirely under the control of the American industrials for that wire. It is humiliating to hear it mentioned in this House that 26,000 tons of wire were imported into this country last year. It is humiliating to think that over $30,000,000 of iron products were brought into this country last year. As a matter of fact it is well known the Americans import from here steel and iron ingots upon which they pay $6 a ton duty, and, after they have manufactured them into all sorts of articles, they sell them back to us. The manufacture of these ingots is carried on in bond, and the manufacturers get a rebate of $5.99 per ton when the material is sent back to this country in a manufactured state. That is the condition of affairs in my own county ; and, without having had occasion to consult these very important manufacturers who have invested millions in this industry, that they have developed in the county of Jacques Cartier, I question very much whether in the case of the great factory that used to manufacture wire and barbed wire and has been obliged to confine its operation to the manufacture of steel nails, depending entirely upon the American manufacturers for wire, this resolution will benefit them in any way. The fact is that it is generally claimed by those well acquainted with this industry that what we require is a remodelling of our duties in such a way as to protect every line of production, because new lines have arisen in the past ten years. If we wish to make that industry our own and not be dependent on the Americans—who would never for a single instant be dependent upon us for such a production—we must remodel the duties from end to end. Only then shall we become, in respect to this industry, a really independent people. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has spoken of the higher prices in the United States. It is well known that the reason of that is the existence in the United States of these immense trusts, combinations that, not content to control the prices in the United States, tyrannize over us in Canada in regard to these prices. We are the slaves, in respect to certain articles, of these gigantic trusts of the United States. As an example—and many others might be given—it is sufficient to point out what condition our tobacco growers and our tobacco merchants are reduced to at the present time through the dominating influence of the American trust. In the province of Quebec that trust is doing incalculable harm to the manufacturers, who cannot resist its influence, and even to the tobacco growers. Anybody who wishes to convince himself of the truth of what I have said has only to read the report of Judge MacTavish, who was charged by the government with the duty of investigating this subject. It has become necessary for the government, in order to protect the tobacco growers of our province and of the province of Ontario, actual-

ly to introduce an amendment to the Criminal law, to free us to a certain extent, from the domination of these American invaders of our country. What has been never explained to me, and what I can never understand, is why, in the matter of bounty—to my mind, though a convinced protectionist, a most disastrous system of protection—a difference is made between the producers of iron and those engaged in other lines of industry. Why is it, for instance that the cotton manufacturers, who are afflicted with the British preference, are not aided at the present juncture in the same way as the iron producers are aided? Why is it that the woollen manufacturers, who have suffered great injury by the present state of the tariff, and particularly by the British preference, they who have been, in many instances known to hon. members in this House, forced to close their manufactories, are not assisted? Why is it, for instance, I would ask the Minister of Finance, that the producers of paper in this country are not assisted in this way? If it is impossible to come to their relief by changes in the paper duty, by which we could not only give to these producers the markets of this country, but give them great influence in the markets of the world, why is it that they are not assisted by bounties, since we are obliged to resort to the pis-aller in the way of assistance to certain producers? Throughout the province of Quebec—I do not speak of Ontario, though I believe that there analogous conditions exist—we have untold wealth of pulp wood. But through the treacherous policy of our provincial government our pulp wood lands are depleted, and our pulp wood is sent to the United States to be manufactured into paper and sold back to us, the whole profit going to American workmen and to American capitalists. Yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, if I mistake not, less than a year ago reduced the duty on certain classes of paper, thereby giving still greater advantage to the American industrials. We are the laughing stock of the great American industrials in this respect. Has my hon. friend the Minister of Finance read the very able exposition of his case by Mr. McGibbon, manager, I believe, of the great pulp mills of Shawinigan? The conclusion at which he arrives, and which is absolutely irrefutable, is that if we had a proper policy with regard to that line of industry, before ten years the Americans would construct over $100,000,000 worth of factories throughout Canada, and would be paying more than $4,000,000 a year in wages to our Canadian workmen, instead of the whole profit of that industry being taken by American capitalists and American workmen. And so convinced are our American neighbours that eventually we will realize our position and carry out a more patriotic policy in this respect that, as Mr. McGibbon points out, they are purchasing our best water-powers. They are preparing for the time, which they feel will come before long, when, if they want to manufacture, deprived as they are of pulp wood in their own country, they can come into Canada and establish the factories which Mr. McGibbon tells us they would already establish if a wise policy were carried out by our government.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. Minister of Finance referred to the trusts of the United States, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has also spoken of these great combinations. The bounty system of the European continental nations, such as Germany, Belgium, and France applied to the item of sugar has wiped out the sugar refineries of Great Britain. The manufacturers of this country, a great proportion of them at least, are just as thoroughly under the influence of the great American trusts—and will be more so as time goes on—as the British sugar refiners were under the influence of the bounty fed sugar of continental Europe. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier referred to a certain industry in his constituency which got its raw material in the shape of wire for the manufacture of wire nails from the American trust. I should not be surprised, nor, I suppose, would the proprietor of that institution—though I am not more familiar with the circumstances of the case than I have learned from my hon. friend—if that proprietor were to find on his desk some morning a letter from the trust in the United States, who are supplying him with wire, to say that the trust had made up their mind to advance the price of wire, or, even, in the future, themselves to supply the Canadian trade with wire nails.

I have myself seen letters of that kind from these American trusts, and I wish to say in this House that there is no body of men, not including the government of the United States, that are so tyrannical in their methods of operation and so selfish as the United States trusts. It will be necessary for the government of this country, whether Liberal or Conservative, so to arrange our tariff that they will be able to defeat the objects of these wealthy and enormous United States trusts. I fancy that a good deal of pressure must have been brought to bear on the Finance Minister in regard to these iron and steel bounties. I cannot understand what different pressure could have been brought to bear upon him than that which was brought to bear upon him from other industries in this country, some of which have been mentioned. From the remarks of the hon. gentleman the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) I should take it for granted that so far as he was concerned he expected that the government in future would deal with the tariff on the bounty basis. If that is the case, I do not see how they are going to carry out any

such policy. I believe, as others have said, that it is a piecemeal policy; more than that, it is uncertain and indefinite. We want an adequate protective tariff in this country, a stable tariff, so that people will know what they have to calculate against so far as European and United States competition are concerned.

What I have to complain about more especially is the indefinite position of the government in regard to this bounty question. In 1897, the Minister of Finance, in introducing his budget, and in changing the tariff to some extent, gave his views in regard to fiscal questions, and he laid down certain principles upon which we expected that he intended to be guided in the future. It seems to me, as it must appear to every member of this House, that he does not entertain the same views in the year 1903 that he did in 1897, and I hope for the good of the country that he will continue to entertain different views from those of 1897. He was very severe upon the manufacturers of this country. Who are the manufacturers of this country? Where does the money come from that the manufacturing industries are carried on with? I have heard it stated on good authority, on the authority of a supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite, who is a manufacturer and well posted, that three-quarters of the capital invested in manufacturing industries in this country is borrowed capital. The manufacturer is there to defend his calling, to pay 100 cents on the dollar, and to pay his banker, or whoever he borrows the money from, a proper rate of interest. Now, upon this bounty question the Minister of Finance appears to have had, the session before last, entirely different ideas from those he has to-day. In 1901 he did not appear to be under the impression that this government would in future adopt an extension of the bounty system. Let us call the attention of the committee to a debate which took place in 1901, introduced by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). That hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, said this:

> What I wish to draw the attention of the government to is this, that the Dominion of Canada stands to pay out a very large amount of money in the way of bounties, and I would like to know whether it is too late for the government to take such steps as may, while not invading any vested rights, at the same time prevent further vested interests growing up under the Act.

The Finance Minister in the course of his answer, said:

> There is that comfort to us in the first place. There is the further comfort that even if this system should result in the payment of large sums of money, that payment will speedily come to an end, because at the very time we provided the scale of bounties, we stated that it was regarded by us as of vital importance that the bounties should be gradually reduced by the terms of the Act itself; so that after a term of five years, beginning on the 1st of July next, the bounties will cease to exist. If, therefore, for a short time we should be called upon to pay even a large sum for the development of these industries, we would have the comfort of knowing in the meantime that as a result of that experiment there must grow up a vast amount of business in the Dominion which would not probably have grown up except for that development; and that if the bounty should be large, it can only continue for five years, when it will be wiped off the statute-book.

Now, it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this government are not only uncertain in regard to the tariff, but they are uncertain in regard to the bounties, and in regard to the whole fiscal question. The government this session have dealt with specific items in the tariff, with binder twine, lead and steel, and in regard to all these they have dealt with them upon a bounty basis. I have watched with some interest the remarks of the Finance Minister when dealing with these questions; and I do not know whether other hon. gentlemen have noticed it or not, but I have noticed that he is very careful how he uses the word 'protection.' In fact he scarcely ever uses that word. I noticed that in referring to the steel rail question, or the protection on steel rails which the Governor in Council was empowered to make, he referred to that, not as protecting the steel rail industry, but he called it tariff encouragement. Just think of having to use two words to express one word. Protection is an old, well known word, but he would not use the word 'protection.' He uses the phrase tariff encouragement enjoyed by other industries. The hon. gentleman also, in apologizing for protection, used the words: 'Approach the subject with moderation;' 'approach the subject with caution;' 'the government desire to avoid extremes;' 'they wish stability in the tariff.' Now all this is intended no doubt to appeal to the electorate. But that does not meet the situation which exists to-day, and which is bound to exist in the future. Have we not arrived at the time when we must have an adequate protective policy in this country? The Minister of Finance, in introducing his budget this year, said that we must watch how our opponents played the game. It did seem to me that he was just then balancing himself, uncertain whether he ought to become a protectionist or remain as he was in the past, a sort of free-trade-protectionist—I do not know what not. Now I would like to draw his attention to this fact, that our opponents are practically playing the game to-day the same as they have played it for many years past. They are playing it to-day the same as they were playing it in 1897, and it is the false theories of hon. gentlemen opposite that have been knocked out. Our opponents are playing the same game in regard to the tariff that they have played for many years past. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I do not think this

bonus or bounty system is the proper one, I do not think any one can defend it. Here we are trying to give a bonus to all these different articles :

Angles, tees, channels, beams, joists, girders or bridge, building or structural rolled sections, and on other rolled shapes not round, oval, square or flat, weighing not less than thirty-five pounds per lineal yard and also on flat eye bar blanks, when sold for consumption in Canada a bounty of $3 per ton.

It seems to me that we cannot follow up this thing, that the government are going to become a sort of partners, or agents to investigate the business of these people, and it is a wrong principle. What I plead for is a decided policy on the part of the government. It is necessary at present in order that every one may know what it is, and that any one may safely go into an industry knowing that it is adequately protected. Before I resume my seat I wish to say that in the absence of adequate protection on these iron and steel products I approve of these bounties which have been granted to the steel industry. They will be of use to them, and will assist to some extent in maintaining their operations and building up the iron industry which we must maintain at all hazards.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. By granting these bounties a certain specified object is accomplished, and I therefore cannot agree with hon. gentlemen opposite in the view that it is an unwise proceeding. They say that they would have proceeded by way of a revision of the tariff. By granting these bounties we will give encouragement, if I may use that word, to this industry, we will secure the manufacture of those goods in this country which heretofore we have not produced. I think that we have the proof that it will bring about that end, and therefore, instead of viewing these propositions as ineffective, I think they will prove amply effective and more effective than if it had been done by way of a tariff revision. The works, as I understand it, that are to produce these articles are about to expend $1,500,000 for machinery and plant for that purpose. That expenditure made, the articles will without doubt be produced in this country and they will be for sale in this country and afford as they will the raw material of numbers of manufacturers employing in the aggregate, I venture to say, many times over the number of men that will be employed in this concern, and these manufacturers will not be burdened in the production of goods that they are now producing and confer a benefit upon the workingmen, and confer a benefit upon the whole country. This we are accomplishing in this wire rod business, for instance. When the tariff was revised it was considered wise as these rods were not produced in this country and as they were the raw material of other manufacturers employing a great number of men, to place them on the free list, with the result that the farmer who formerly paid $1 a keg duty upon his wire nails, now gets them at 60 cents a keg duty, or a 40 per cent reduction upon nails. Wire rods will be made in this country by the aid of the bounty, which will not increase the price of the wire rod by one cent to the wire drawer or to the manufacturer of nails. Whatever may be said in reference to whether it would be better to aid this industry by way of a bonus or tariff the question under consideration now is : Is this a wise step that we are taking? Are we going to get results from it ? I think hon. gentlemen opposite know from what they can gather from the newspapers that we shall have an established manufacture of these lines of goods of which there were large importations, that we will effect the manufacture of them in this country and that we will not burden the scores if not hundreds of other manufacturers employing not only thousands, but tens of thousands of men who use these products as their raw material and without burdening by one iota the consumer, who will get his goods just as cheaply as before. That is the proposition that is before us. I do not intend to enter into an argument as to the relative merits of protection or free trade.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who pays the bounty ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The community in general pay the bounty. There is no doubt about that. I shall not enter into that argument. I only want to ask hon. gentlemen opposite who are adopting a pessimistic tone that is calculated to affect the stability and spirit that is in our people : What industries are there in the country that are not thriving at the present time ? What industries are languishing ?

Mr. MONK. Woollens.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Woollens are not languishing. The hon. gentleman must not hold the government policy responsible for keeping every manufacturing industry on its feet. Because some industries in certain lines do not pay you cannot hold us responsible. If there are other industries and other men employed in producing the same line of goods making money and paying large dividends, the failure of one industry is not due to the tariff, but must be due to some other cause. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point me out a single manufacturing line in Canada in which some men are not making goods and making them at a profit to themselves ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question before six o'clock.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to oppose these resolutions, but in view of a great deal that has been said to-day, I do not think it would be fair to the interests which I represent if I allowed the discussion to end without giving expression to the opinions which I hold, and which I believe are held by a very large proportion of the people of this country in rgard to the subject under discussion. In presenting these views, it is desirable to place certain facts which do not seem to be generally known before the House and before the country. The discussion that has taken place in regard to the iron industry to-day and on previous occasions in the House, has proceeded under the assumption that the industry of producing iron and the separate industry of manufacturing iron are practically without the protection of import duties in Canada at the present time. It will surprise some people to know that to-day scrap iron pays a duty of one dollar a ton, pig-iron $2.50 a ton and steel ingots $2 a ton. That is the duty, truly it is only a revenue duty, but it gives the industry of producing iron that measure of protection. Then, after the iron has been produced; in the first stage of its manufacture, which merely consists of plain casting or the production of malleable iron in some form, I find that rolled iron not less than 35 pounds weight per yard has a protective duty—we can only call it a protective duty—of $7 a ton; bar iron or steel less than 8 inches wide and less than one-half inch thick has a duty of $7 per ton; iron or steel plates less than 30 inches wide, $7 a ton; railway fish plates, $8 a ton; steel rails other than the rails of steam railways, 30 per cent; cast iron pipes, $8 per ton; switches, frogs, &c., for railways, 30 per cent; steel castings in the rough, 25 per cent; stove plates, surely not an article that requires any great amount of labour in their production—25 per cent; cart or wagon skeins—a plain casting—30 per cent. I would like to know what that part of the industry which relates to the production of iron, and much more that part of the industry which relates to the manufacture of iron in its cruder form—I would like to know what these industries want. If they are not satisfied with the duty that is levied on the production of iron and the bounty that is given in addition to that duty, then certainly there must be something wrong with the iron industry in this country. It must then be the wrong country in which to enter into this industry, and it is better for the country at large, better for the manufacturing industry which depends on cheap iron, better for the agricultural industry, which depends very largely on cheap iron, better for the transportation industry, both on land and water, which essentially depends on cheap iron; it is better for these industries and for the country at large that the iron required for these industries should be imported rather than be manufactured in Canada. This is the wrong place for an iron industry, if that iron industry cannot thrive under the conditions which prevail at the present time. I have said before in this House, and I take the liberty of repeating it, that in Canada cheap iron is as essential to the welfare and the prosperity of the country as is cheap food to the manufacturing industries of England. We must have cheap iron or we cannot do business. On that point—just referring for a moment to the fancy picture drawn by the member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) as to what would be the result if we increased the cost of raw iron to our agricultural, manufacturing and transportation interests; and the tide of prosperity that would flow over this country—let me refer the House to the condition of affairs in this country when there was so-called adequate protection to this very iron industry. Where was the flood of prosperity at that time? What was the actual and absolute and necessary and unquestioned result of these high duties on iron at that time? It was the paralization practically of the greater part of our manufacturing industry, even though it also had high protective duties. If this were merely a matter of theory, if it were something that was in prospect, we might admit the arguments that have been put forward to-day; but when we have had a sad experience of these high iron duties, I cannot understand the propriety of the arguments that are put forward in favour of repeating the mistake that was made in those past years.

As to the question of bounties, and as to the difference between bounties and duties, some of our friends object to bounties because they are merely an expedient. My objection to the resolution now before the House is not because it is a bounty, or because as a bounty it is an expedient, but because it is not an expedient but a policy if carried to its legitimate and logical conclusion, according to the statements that have been made here to-day by the Minister of Finance, by the member for St. Mary's and by other speakers. Let me point out the difference between bounties as applied to the production of iron, and bounties as applied to the manufacture of iron. A bounty given for the production of iron is in itself an expedient; it is supported because it is an expedient and only because it is an expedient. Our condition in this country is that we have vast quantities of iron ore and vast quantities of coal. It must be evident then that if we can bring the iron and the coal together under such conditions as will permit us to produce raw iron profitably, a vast industry will be created in this country to the benefit of every one in the country. The con-

ditions are not, however, absolutely favourable. The coal is in one place and the iron is in another, and the experiment of bringing them together can only be undertaken at very considerable expense, and with a chance of very considerable loss. It is an experiment which capitalists may be slow to undertake. The government then comes forward and says: We will take an interest in this experiment, we will provide a system of bounties which will help to enable you to undertake this experiment; we will stand part of the loss. If the experiment proves that in Canada we can bring together profitably the iron and the coal in order to produce raw iron on the merits of the enterprise itself, then our money has been well expended and your industry may go on and thrive on its own merits. That is the principle as I understand it underlying the granting of bounties on the production of raw iron, and those bounties are scaled down from year to year so that after the experiment has had reasonable opportunities, if it turns out to be a success the bounties cease, and also if it turns out a failure the bounties cease. The capitalists who desired to invest in that industry are having their opportunity, and are having their assistance, and if success is attained, so much the better. There is nothing wrong in this principle. It is a common sense principle. It has nothing whatever to do with the principle of protection in connection with the tariff, and it will be observed that essentially and above everything it is an experiment; it is an expedient.

But the system of bounties which we have at present, and which the present resolutions propose to extend for a short time, and very properly so possibly under the circumstances, is different altogether in principle and ultimate conclusion from the other feature which it is proposed to introduce, that is to say, a bounty for the manufacture of iron in the country after it has been produced. None of the reasons which apply to the bringing together of the coal and the ore to produce the iron apply to the manufacture of iron into its coarser and rawer forms after it has been once produced. Either we have skill and enterprise and capital which will enable us to install machinery and to run that machinery to work up this iron after we produce it, or we have not that skill, enterprise and capital. If we have not got it, then we cannot afford to buy it at the price of paying more for that iron than it is actually worth. We need too much iron in this country, we need it for too many essential purposes, to afford the price which it is apparently supposed that this iron is going to cost us. For my part, I claim that there is nothing in the conditions or the facts, as we know them, to warrant the conclusion that we cannot manufacture the iron in this country once it has been produced, at any rate, under a reasonable and moderate revenue tariff such as we have to-day. If we can produce manufactured articles of the highest grade and quality, into which skill and industry and capital very largely enter, under the moderate protection of a revenue tariff, we certainly ought to be able to manufacture the coarser forms into which skill and energy do not enter nearly so largely as mere capital.

My view of this feature of the resolutions is this. We propose to give a bounty for the manufacture of steel wire, of heavy plates and of heavy structural iron. We import these articles very largely; we need them very largely; we must have them, or we cannot progress; and I think the government are doing very wisely in not putting a duty upon these articles higher than the present duty. The one is free and the others are under the very moderate duty of 10 per cent. But the government's proposition, as it is placed before the House, is to give a bounty on the manufacture of these articles. There is no proposition to reduce that bounty from year to year, as in the case of the bounty on the production of iron, so that it will pass out of existence by process of time. As the proposition stands, to my mind it is this. The offer is held out to manufacturers of iron to undertake the manufacture of these lines under the promise of the payment of a certain bounty. There is no indication that the bounty will at any future time be withdrawn. If those people purchase machinery and invest the capital necessary to enter upon these enterprises on the basis of the bounty that is given, I for one do not see very well how it would be fair or right to withdraw the bounty. Once we begin to pay it we must continue to pay it, or we are accused of unfairness to this investment of capital. So long as our manufacture of iron is small in proportion to our imports, it certainly pays better to give the bounty than to pay a higher duty. But so soon as our manufacture of iron increases till we are manufacturing more than we import, then it will be better for us to have a duty than to pay the bounty. It seems to me that is the natural and logical conclusion of the proposition now placed before the House. If it is right and proper to pay bounties and ultimately to pay duties on the manufacture of these classes of iron, of which I think it was stated that Canada now imports over $2,000,000 a year, there is no ground that I can see for not taking the same position in regard to other productions of iron; and I feel the duty and responsibility resting upon me, as a representative in parliament, to say to the government and the House that I do not believe that that policy can be pursued to its legitimate conclusion without the greatest possible damage to the best interests of this country.

It appears to me, from the figures which I have taken from the blue-books, that this proposition involves a sort of double bounty in addition to the duty which we also pay

on the iron. We pay now, I believe, a bounty of $2.70 a ton on pig-iron, and there is besides a duty upon it of $2.50 a ton ; so that our producers of iron have an advantage over their competitors, exclusive of freight rates, of some $5.20 per ton on pig-iron and $4.70 on steel. Then, when this steel is turned into wire rods, and they acquire the additional bounty of $6 per ton, they are winners to the extent of $10.70 per ton on steel wire rods as against their competitors from other countries. That is to say, we are paying something like $10 a ton more for these steel rods than we can buy them for elsewhere. On the heavy plates and structural steel the duty and the bounty are the same as on the production of the iron, and the additional proposed bounty is $3 per ton.

That is $7.70 per ton of an advantage on heavy structural iron and heavy steel plates, that is to say, on steel bridges and the plates which go to the building of vessels and locomotives. It is a tax then on the transportation of the country in the matter of steel bridges and in the building of steamboats and locomotives. I consider that the necessities of this country with regard to transportation are such as do not warrant our imposing any such tax on those industries. The same remark applies to the manufacturing industry at large, into which iron and steel enter so largely.

I just want to say a word with regard to the subject of bounties for the production of iron. I consider that these bounties are based on sound principles. They are not excessive. It does not matter to us whether they are extended a year or two or shortened a year or two, if we can bring about the result we desire, namely, make Canada an iron producing country. But I find, on looking over the returns, that so far from the bounties we are paying having the effect of building up an iron producing industry in Canada and developing our own iron and coal mines, for every dollar of bounty we paid during the past year for the production of iron from Canadian ore, we paid $2 for the production of iron from foreign ore. Out of every $3 that we pay in bounties for the production of iron supposedly for the building up of an iron producing industry from our own ore in our own country, we pay $2 for the production of iron from ore which comes from a foreign country. We are, therefore, paying this money out to no purpose, so far as the building up of an iron producing industry in our own country is concerned. Here are the figures for the past year of the bounties paid respectively on Canadian ore and on foreign ore to the various smelters :

	Canadian Ore.	Foreign Ore.
Midland..	$ 56,036	$ 24,109
Radnor..	15,580	2,722
Deseronto..	611	21,920
Sidney..	464	347,436
Hamilton..	119,879	39,795
New Glasgow	19,290	42,065
	$211,860	$478,047

That was for the year ending 30th June, 1902. For the year just closed, the total bounties paid amounted to $1,245,382. I submit that while we should do our share in the attempt to produce iron in Canada from Canadian ore with Canadian coal, it is not a business proposition on our part to bonus to such a degree the production of the iron mines of foreign countries. If this is the sort of home industry which the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to promote, I cannot see eye to eye with them. I do not think it is good policy to spend our money in such a way. I am out for the development of the legitimate industries and natural resources of this country, and I do not care what you call the means you take to produce that development. You can call it protection or free trade, high tariff or bounty, but I want to see that when we spend our money we get the desired result. I want to see that when we pay out one and a quarter million dollars to build up a Canadian iron industry, the money goes to build up that industry and not to the production of iron from foreign ores.

I do not know that it is necessary to say anything with regard to the fervid patriotism indulged in by the hon. member for St. Mary's division and other hon. members when endorsing a prospective policy of high duties. Canada for the Canadians is their motto. It is also mine. But I believe in Canada for all Canadians and not for only a section of them. That is the difference between their policy and mine. I believe in a policy that will build up legitimate, natural industres in this country, but not in a policy designed to make possible artificially, industries whch are not naturally possible. Such a policy is not a national policy, but a system of unjust taxation, unfair to the majority of the people and bound to result in any thing but the well-being of the country.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to say a word or two on this matter. Some hon. gentlemen on this side have expressed the hope that this is a measure which in the end will lead up to a legitimate measure of protection. If I entertained that view, I would probably take a somewhat different position from that which I propose to do. Had I any doubt about the matter, an incident of this afternoon would dispel it. I had the pleasure of hearing the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) read the hon. member the ex-Minister of Pubic Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) out of the ranks of the Liberal party. That, to my mind, is a very significant point at this time in the course of the warfare between the Conservative and Liberal parties as to the tariff that we shall have in Canada. For we must bear in mind that the only point of difference between the government today and the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, so far as we know, at all events,

is the question of protection or no adequate protection to our industries. I do not think we can assume that so venerable, so experienced a gentleman as the hon. member for Victoria, Nova Scotia, and a gentleman in such close touch with the cabinet could take such a step without having instructions from the ministers of the crown as to the attitude he should take. It, therefore, seems perfectly plain to me, and I think the country will not be slow to take the intimation that although the government would like, perhaps, to have it go to the country for the time being, at least to certain sections, that they are going to stand by a policy of free trade, and to other sections, which interviewed them from time to time by deputations and otherwise, that they propose to introduce such amendments to the tariff as will afford adequate and reasonable protection to the industries of Canada, yet those who have been promised a fair and adequate measure of protection have no reason to hope that such promise will be implemented by the action of the government. I therefore think that those who have indulged the hope have given the government credit for too great a degree of sincerity; and, so far as their action in connection with the tariff and the policy they have enunciated from time to time has enabled us to judge, I think we are not wise in coming to the conclusion that the country can expect any adequate relief so long as hon. gentlemen who at present administer the affairs of Canada are left in control. Now, the iron and steel industry is a most important industry to Canada, and I believe that the conditions of this country with regard to the quantity of raw material, the means of obtaining it, and the quality of that material when obtained, are such as to promise that we can develop a large and prosperous industry in this line of manufacture. Whatever will make for the success of that industry along legitimate lines, I am perfectly prepared to support. But, as regard bounties, I do not feel that this is the means by which we can give encouragement to the iron industry along legitimate lines. The iron industry should be developed side by side with the other industries of the country. One should not profit at the expense of the other. And, when I venture to oppose, as I intend to oppose in toto, the resolution introduced this afternoon, I shall do so with the full knowledge that, more than any other single cause, Great Britain owes the proud position she occupies to-day to the development of her iron industry. I recognize too, that, for the time being, it looks as if supremacy in the iron trade had passed across the Atlantic and remained for the present with the United States. But I look to the time when the centre of gravity will change again, and when in this Dominion, with its vast resources, with its energetic people and enormous territory, we shall develop an industry in iron and steel second to none in the world. But, whilst I recognize this, I am opposed to bounties on principle. In saying this, I have the sanction and approval of many prominent gentlemen on the government side of the House. I remember very well how eloquent they were in denunciation of protection, but not so eloquent as they were in denuciation of bounties, describing bounties—or subventions as some called them—as the most odious form of protection. I do not think that we can, by means of bounties, develop the country upon the lines of protection as understood by the Conservative party. I believe bounties are necessarily unequal in their operation. If, for instance all our industries were bounty fed, none would be bounty fed. It is seen at a glance, if you commence to analyze the question, the only conclusion that can be reached is that to give a bounty to every industry would be to tax every industry to raise that bounty, and so all would be on the same basis as before. But, to give bounties to some and not to others, must be detrimental to those that are not bounty fed. In other words, it is a means of robbing certain parties to give encouragement to the others. I submit, it is not a policy that we can safely or properly pursue in this country. It is more than this—it is a development of one section of the country at the expense of the others. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) referred to the question of bounties on raw material. I cannot at the moment recall the case of any industry which I would recommend the government to bonus. We had a question not long ago before this parliament of giving a bounty for the raising of the sugar beet. Perhaps, if there is any instance in which a bounty is justifiable, it could be better contended for in the case of a bounty which will lead to the production of raw material, because that is an enrichment to the country. If you delve into the bowels of the earth and bring up useful minerals of which the people previously knew nothing, you add so much to the wealth of the country. And, if that raw material cannot possibly be obtained except by the expenditure of some of the public money, perhaps there can be a reasonable argument advanced in support of the expenditure. And that argument applies with great force when the farmers of the country are approaching an experiment which it is hoped will lead to an industry for the benefit of the people as a whole. In such a case, there might be good excuse for considering and responding to their petition. But we find that the government refused to give them any relief at all, giving a miserable fraction of a cent, not to the farmers, not to the producers, not to those who made the raw material, but those who were in the case secondary parties in the transaction, the manufacturers.

I have heard it said this afternoon

that the bounty was a form of protection. I know that, speaking in a general way, without regard to exactness, perhaps even a Conservative might speak of bounty as a form of protection. I know that supporters of the government have been in the habit of speaking of it in that way. But I claim that a bounty is not in any reasonable sense protection of any kind. A bounty is merely the means of making a present to the manufacturer at the expense of the people at large. It creates no wealth in the country. It is a means of transferring money from the pocket of one man to the pocket of another; it is a means of compelling the people generally to enhance the profits of the manufacturer, to put into his pocket money that he never earned. A bounty therefore is a means of impoverishing the country as a whole. Protection, on the other hand, is but a legitimate form of self defence, a means by which we may secure the home market for the people of Canada, a means by which we may build up industries and make ourselves self-sustaining, a means by which we may increase the tangible wealth of the country and build up varied industries from one end of it to the other. If you want to ascertain whether a subvention or bonus does anything to add to the wealth of the country, take this illustration. Let there be a bounty of $1,000,000 distributed among the various manufacturers, a bounty of $1,000,000 a year distributed for 100 years, and what is the result? The result is that you have paid out $100,000,000 of the money of the people of Canada, and I ask you, although you have made millionaires of some manufacturers, have you added one dollar to the wealth of the country? Is the country at the end of a period of 50 or 100 years in any better position of self defence, in any better position to maintain its industries against the aggression of outside nations, than it was at the beginning of that period? Take away the bonus at the end of 50 years, take away the bonus at the end of 100 years and you are just where you were at the time that you began, with this difference, that the people are just so many millions worse off than they were at the beginning of that period.

I am not going to enter into the large question of protection at this time, but I want to make it perfectly clear the aim of this bounty, treating it in the abstract; and having regard too to the actual facts of the case. I would be very sorry to have it understood by the great agricultural classes of this country, I was in favour of bounties in any shape or form. I am not in favour of them, because I recognize that the system is unfair to the great agricultural class of this country. I recognize, as I say, the importance of the great iron and steel industry. But I recognize as of still more importance that the manufacturers should understand from whom their bread and butter is to come. I want these manufacturers to understand that they cannot play fast and loose with the Conservative party. I want them to recollect that it is the Conservative party to whom they are indebted for the measure of prosperity they are enjoying in this country to-day. I do not think that in the past they have shown that gratitude they should have shown. Be that as it may, I believe that the way to bring about a remedy for the state of things we have at the present time, the way to bring about an adequate system of protection in this country, which I believe is all important to our continued prosperity, is to let the manufacturers and merchants, and agriculturists all understand that there will be no special preference given to any one; that we are going to mete out equal justice to all; that we are going to recognize that no one industry stands by itself, and that whenever one industry has to be kept up at the permanent expense of another, there is something wrong. The great principle enunciated by the Conservative party in the past and by the Conservative party of the present, is that all industries shall work together, each one assisting the other; and that in this way, the only safe position we can take, the only safe position any man can take who believes that a protective system, reasonably high, is necessary in this country, is to say: You gentlemen want special favours, and although we would be glad to assist you, we cannot assist you unless you join with us in developing one great system upon general lines that will be fair to all the industries of the country.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance a question. This resolution which says, 'from steel produced in Canada from ingredients of which not less than fifty per cent of the weight thereof consists of pig-iron made in Canada'—what kind of ore must that be, Canadian ore or American ore?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is in the manufacture of steel?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While the question of ore enters into the manufacture of pig-iron, after the pig-iron is made in Canada there is no question of the ore as respects the bounty on steel. The question of native or foreign ore arises entirely as respects the manufacture of pig-iron.

Mr. BENNETT. But as the bounty is paid in respect of productions made from the steel, I think you should prefer the pig-iron that is made entirely from Canadian ore. That opens up this question: You may have smelters in Canada using Canadian ore and you may have them using American ore. Now if they use Canadian ore, that gives work for Canadian vessels in carrying that

ore from Michipicoten—which is practically the only point in Canada where we have iron at present on the great lakes; but, if you use American ore, that gives work to American vessels. In a concern where they produce both steel and iron as well, they would decidedly prefer to use Canadian ore if the preference was given to steel manufactured from Canadian ore by way of bounty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If they use foreign ore they suffer for it, if I may so speak, by reason of the lesser bounty they would get on pig-iron. It is at that stage of the process that the distinction is made. They will not get the same bounty on that pig-iron as they would if it were made from native ore.

Mr. BENNETT. But if this bounty was paid only on pig-iron that was made exclusively of Canadian ore, that would give a great impetus I contend to Canadian ore. It would result in the employment in Canada of a great many men in mining ore and as I before pointed out it would result in giving employment to Canadian vessels. The fact of the matter is that at the present time the Canadian shipping trade is greatly hampered owing to the fact that it cannot engage in the American ore trade which is one of the biggest interests that the American vessels have. The grain trade being at an end the American vessels can go into the ore carrying trade, carrying the ore from different points on the American side to points on Lake Erie. Canadian vessels, by reason of the coasting laws, are estopped from participating in that trade and they can only have recourse in a limited way to the ore trade in carrying ore from Michipicoten to Midland or from Michipicoten to Hamilton. I think this clause should be limited to pig-iron manufactured entirely from Canadian ore.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be an entire departure from the principle which has governed these steel bounties from the beginning. The only distinction we have made between imported and native ore is in regard to the manufacture of pig-iron and not in regard to the manufacture of steel, and that has been done from the beginning.

Mr. BENNETT. Whether it was right or wrong at the beginning I submit that this measure should be framed in such a way as to foster Canadian trade. If the bounties were made payable only on steel manufactured from Canadian pig-iron it will be to the interest of the manufacturer to use Canadian ores exclusively, but if a free market is given to American ore the result is very different. I grant that this may appeal strongly to the interests of the Sydney concern because the ore used there is known as foreign ore.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is from Newfoundland.

Mr. BENNETT. That is classed, I assume, as foreign ore. In that case we are discriminating practically against the balance of the Dominion or against the iron industries that are operating in other parts of the Dominion and against the ores of the upper lakes.

Mr. GOURLEY. I find in the Act of 1894 that the bounty is confined entirely to pig-iron manufactured from Canadian ore. Then in 1897 I find that the bounty is given to pig-iron manufactured from 50 per cent of Canadian ore. What led the government to make this discrimination?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My impression is that the distinction between native and foreign ore was made earlier than that. Possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Gourley) may be correct.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have looked at the Acts this evening.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend has looked at the Acts I am quite content to accept his statement. I remember at the time the bounties were dealt with that the only point of difference was that some hon. gentlemen thought that we should class Newfoundland ore as Canadian and treat it as our own ore.

Mr. KENDALL. Has the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) a case in his mind to illustrate the point?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, in Midland and also in Hamilton where they have smelters they use large quantities of the now celebrated Michipicoten ore which is brought from Lake Superior. Under this resolution it is immaterial whether the ore comes from Michipicoten or from Two Harbours or from any point on the American side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there is no distinction as regards pig-iron.

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly, but once done with pig-iron we come to the question of steel and the point is this: The bounty is payable in respect of steel produced from pig-iron. If that pig-iron is altogether made of Canadian ores you will give Canadian ores the advantage, but, on the other hand, if the pig-iron is made from American ore you are giving the American ore to that extent an advantage, because, I think I am correct in saying that the American ore is brought in free of duty. I say, in the first place, that if you were to state in your resolution that all pig-iron that enters into the constitution or make-up of steel must be made of Canadian ore, you are giving a premium on Canadian pig-iron, and you are going to encourage the mining of ore at Michipicoten and the development of other Canadian mines on the shore of Lake Superior which can be developed. By this resolution you are giving the Americans the benefit of our bounty system, and we are

now in this position on the upper lakes that Canadian bottoms can get very little to do. The grain season being at an end they are not allowed to participate in the American coasting trade by carrying ore, and the result is that Canadian vessels are to-day practically carrying for nothing to meet expenses. It is a well known fact that to-day Canadian bottoms are carrying grain from Fort William to Montreal at four cents a bushel, a rate which at one time was looked upon as being simply ridiculous. There are one or two courses open to them—either to tie these vessels up at the dock or to carry at these ruinous rates as they regard them. If we had these bounties on pig-iron produced from the ore found on the shores of Lake Superior we should develop the production of ore there as much as possible. Canadian vessels are not alone in carrying of this ore from Michipicoten to United States ports, for the reason that it is not a contravention of the coasting laws, but American vessels may indulge in that trade. In the first place you hamper Canadian bottoms by leaving this wide open to American as well as Canadian ore, and in the next place you prevent a larger user of Canadian ore by not providing that the pig-iron going into the steel to which the bounty applies shall be exclusively Canadian. I think that is a question that the minister might fairly consider and see if this cannot be done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), if he wants to present that view, ought to deal with the manufacture of pig iron and not with steel; whatever force there is in his argument is against the use of imported ore for making pig-iron.

Mr. BENNETT. I admit that we get the benefit of the manufacture of pig-iron, but I say we should go a step further and provide that the steel that is to earn this bounty shall be the product exclusively of Canadian ore and in that way you would increase the user of Canadian ore and give employment to Canadian vessels.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In so far as the use of Canadian products are required at all this requirement applies to Canadian pig-iron. The iron is made in Canada with Canadian labour at Canadian furnaces, and no matter what the source of the ore is it then becomes Canadian product. When you come to the next process, to the manufacture of steel, the pig-iron made in Canada, in Canadian furnaces and with Canadian labour, becomes to all intents and purposes a Canadian product, and must be so treated in the next stage. The argument of my hon. friend seems to be that in the manufacture of pig-iron we should either forbid the use of imported ore or make a larger discrimination than we are making.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me illustrate the point. At Collingwood I think at a very early date a steel concern is to be under way. Assuming that they wish to earn this bounty and assuming that the law should say that they should only use pig-iron which was composed exclusively of Canadian ores to entitle them to the bounty on steel and that if they use in the manufacture of that steel product any American ore, they would be estopped from earning any portion of the bounty, that ore would go either to the smelter at Midland or to the smelter at Hamilton, and they would say: We cannot earn the bounty on steel unless we use exclusively Canadian produced pig-iron; in other words pig-iron made from Canadian ores, the result would be that they would only buy pig-iron made from Canadian ore, but if it is left open as it is, it is immaterial to these producers of steel whether they buy pig-iron made of American ore or Canadian ore.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If it were necessary to mix it in order to make steel.

Mr. BENNETT. That opens up another field, and if there is to be a blending of ores then the bounty should be paid in respect to the Canadian ore only and not the American ore. But it might be possible to produce the steel from iron that was made exclusively from Canadian ore.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They are not doing it.

Mr. BENNETT. That is on account of the uses they put it to.

Mr. HENDERSON. I wish to ask the minister a question with reference to the amount of duty all told that would be paid on wire rods three-eighths of an inch in diameter. I understand that we did pay $3 bounty for the production of the iron, and $3 more for the production of the steel. Will these rods be made from this steel which has already received a bounty of practically $6 a ton? If so, the entire bounty on these wire rods would be $12.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend's calculation is quite correct except with regard to the first process. He has taken the bounty on the pig-iron at $3, but of course if it were made from imported ore it would be only $2. Subject to that correction, my hon. friend is substantially correct. Of course, the persons who produce these things are not the same in all cases.

Mr. BENNETT. If this is intended to give a preference to the Canadian ore entering into the production of pig-iron, why should it not be equally so in regard to the steel?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is some point in the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), but it is so radical a departure from the conditions in the past,

that if we adopted such a policy it might have a very serious effect on some of the furnaces. I am inclined to think that the Ontario furnaces would not use entirely Canadian ore, and we know that two of the large concerns in Nova Scotia depend wholly upon Newfoundland ore, and to say that they should be shut out entirely from the bounty on steel because they imported Newfoundland ore would be a serious proposition. Although my hon. friend may think there is some reason for it, yet the effect of it would be to close them up.

Mr. BENNETT. Conceding for the sake of argument that there must of necessity be a blending of American ore with Canadian ore to produce pig-iron, that would make steel, then there should be a higher bounty paid on the Canadian ore than on the American ore. The proportion of the bounty should be higher on the Canadian ore going into the manufacture than upon the American or foreign ore.

Mr. HEYD. What would be the effect of the application of that principle if we were to apply it to the coal that is used in the production of this iron? It is found in Cape Breton that they must import some portion of their raw material from Newfoundland, and they have gone as far as Spain and Norway for it. In the western part of Canada they get the iron ore from the Lake Superior region, but they get their coal from the United States. If you apply the principle that because a portion of the ore in eastern Canada is imported it should not be entitled to this concession, then it might be said that the iron masters in western Canada are not entitled to the concession because they import American coal for the purpose of manufacturing. I fancy that the object we have in view is to develop the manufacture of iron ore in Canada, and the place whence the ore comes is a matter of comparative unimportance, because the cost of the ore is a very small factor in the cost of production. Besides, we are not in possession of the expert evidence that was presented when this particular kind of legislation was first introduced into this House. The policy was adopted after most mature consideration, and after consultation with men who thoroughly understood the fluxing and manufacture of ores. I would look with considerable doubt upon any attempt to change a plan that was adopted after most mature consideration.

Mr. BELL. I think that possibly the discussion to-night has taken a much wider range than was expected by the Minister of Finance when he moved this resolution. No doubt, that is an indication of the general interest felt to-day in the wider question of protection. It would appear to me that the manner in which on every occasion when the opportunity arises, the discussion, beginning no matter where it may, always enters into the general question of protection, would seem to indicate very clearly that in the minds of the people of Canada the question of protection is to-day perhaps the most important, as to my mind it has been the most important for a great many years past. The action of the government in proposing this resolution seems to confirm that view and to show that not only the House and the country, but the government of Canada as well, is really impressed with the view that the country demands such adequate protection for our home industries as will enable them successfully to gain a footing, and enable Canada to become a protectionist country in all the leading lines of manufacture, so that eventually Canada shall take her place as one of the great manufacturing nations of the world. My only fear with regard to this resolution is that it may not be sufficiently far-reaching, because in reality while there can be no doubt—I suppose the matter is too well known to admit of it being treated as a secret—while there can be no doubt that the immediate cause of the submission of this resolution is the condition of business which affects a great company in Nova Scotia, I am inclined to fear that although the government has finally made up its mind to come to the assistance of that industry, the government may scarcely have done enough to make its interference on behalf of that industry as effective as it ought to be. After all, the concession that is here made by the government is not a very great one. They are extending for one year the payment of the bounties upon the production of iron and steel at the rate of 90 per cent of the original bounty, which was $3 per ton. Now, they do not absolutely give to these companies a gift of 90 per cent of the bounties, because although they have for the second year given them 90 per cent they have also cut off the operation of these bounties for the last year of the term. The amount of bounty to be granted in that year was 15 per cent of the total bounty, so that really what is given to the iron industries in Nova Scotia and elsewhere is 90 per cent less 15 per cent, or actually 75 per cent of the bounties. It is to my mind a comparatively small concession and if it should prove to be sufficient to relieve the company that is most seriously affected from the difficulty in which it finds itself, I will be surprised indeed. It is merely adding for this current year to the receipts of that company 15 per cent, or 15 per cent of $6. If we suppose that the whole product of the company shall be converted eventually into steel, this assistance will amount simply to 90 cents a ton on this year's product. That is an extremely small measure of assistance, but I hope it will be sufficient. I shall be exceedingly surprised if it will be sufficient to relieve the company of its difficulties. I am not forgetting that there is

in addition a bounty on certain classes of structural iron of $3 per ton, on certain classes of plates of $3 per ton, and on bar steel, suitable to be rolled or drawn into wire, of $6 per ton. There are no companies in Canada to-day, so far as I know, in a position to avail themselves of this concession. In order that they may do so, time must elapse, and the companies must expend large sums of money in the construction of buildings and the purchase and construction of plant. So that in reality the amount of assistance granted in this case by the government is not very material. I hope sincerely that it may prove to be sufficient; but I do not share altogether the confidence expressed by the hon. Minister of Customs, who spoke of this action on the part of the government as being effective. I am only too anxious to believe that he is right in his expectation; but when he recollects that practically all that has been done has been to add 90 cents per ton to the steel product of this year, and that the sum estimated by the Minister of Finance as likely to be paid of the other bounties for the current year is only $125,000, it will be seen that to a business of the extent of the Dominion Steel Company this addition is comparatively trifling. For the current year it amounts at the outside to only $300,000. That is, to be sure, a pretty large sum, but it is a comparatively small sum when you take into consideration the enormous capitalization of those works, their large plant, their enormous expenditure, and the fact that they have not yet succeeded in establishing a firm market for all their products, but are compelled from day to day to change their product from one form to another in order to secure a market for them. It is not a great concession, and I am sorry that the government have not seen their way to go further and grant such a form of aid as would, beyond any reasonable doubt, extricate this business from the unfortunate position in which it apparently is. At the same time, I congratulate the government on the fact that they have decided to come to the assistance of that industry, and in general to the assistance of the business of producing iron in Canada. Nothing could be more gratifying to a protectionist than to find that the government of Canada, as voiced by the Minister of Customs, is to-day prepared to grant assistance which it considers to be amply sufficent to extricate that industry from the difficulty in which it is placed. I am gratified that the government have gone so far; but when they are prepared to give a bounty which is equivalent to a protective duty of $3 per ton on certain products and $6 on certain other products, I cannot understand why they cannot make up their mind to do it in the form which I am sure the managers of that industry would prefer, of a change in the tariff. I am utterly at a loss to understand what the purpose of the government is in adopting a system of bounty or bonus instead of making a change in the tariff, which would have precisely the same result. I think the company would simply add to their receipts the amount of the bounty in the one case, as they might hope to add the same amount from a rise in the tariff in the other case. I am unable to understand why the government, having gone so far, have stopped short of taking the step which would fairly commit them to the position of a protectionist government so far as this iron industry is concerned. We know that when they came into power in 1896 it was under the assumption that they would not adopt a protectionist system; in fact, they were pledged to avoid a protectionist system; but they have not succeeded in doing so. In fact, they have been impressed with the view of the protectionists so far that they have in their tariff duties as high as 35 per cent, and since they have come into power they have added to that tariff certain bounties, for the purpose of giving that advantage to the manufacturers of this country which a protective tariff would give them. Why do the government hesitate to take such a position as would settle for all time to come their attitude towards this question? Would it not be far better for Canada and equally well for the government if they proposed from time to time to come to the assistance of industries which require assistance, and to do it in that fashion which has proved to be the most successful, by frankly modifying their tariff and placing it on a more protectionist basis? I do not see why they do not adopt that system, or why the Minister of Customs stated that in the matter with which they are dealing here they had a specific object in view. I cannot doubt that he was referring to the object of aiding an industry which was in difficulties. He said they had adopted the form of a bounty because it was a specific remedy for a specific complaint, and it would be an effective one. If they are going to resort to specifics, I would advise them that in medical practice the specific is generally looked upon with distrust.

Mr. KENDALL. Except for some diseases.

Mr. BELL. Medical men as a rule hold that specifics should be avoided as much as possible, and that general treatment is preferable.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some very good citizens sell them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And recommend them.

Mr. BELL. It is better to avoid their use, however, and therefore I believe that in this case the action of the government would be more satisfactory to the company

and to the country generally if they avoided what they describe themselves as specific treatment and resorted to good general practice. To my mind the hon. Minister of Customs has made a most complete and sudden volte-face. He turned a summersault of a most extraordinary character when, in justifying the course of the government in coming to the rescue of this particular industry and resorting to a specific treatment for the cure of a specific ailment, he declared, without a shadow of evidence, that so far as a great many other industries are concerned, which are complaining, their position was due to no fault on the part of the government or tariff, but entirely to their own lack of good management. Why did he not apply that rule to the specific case with which we are dealing? In this case he did not attribute any fault to the management, so that we may conclude that if other industries could make out an equally strong case, the government would not press against them this charge of mismanagement or lack of ability, but would provide a specific remedy to meet each specific case. The result would be that this government would stand prepared, in every case in which this tariff is proved ineffective, to come to the rescue of the particular industry in distress. If so, I would like to know how much further this government has to go in order to establish itself fully in the position of being in favour of protection to Canadian industry and the development to the utmost possible extent of such industries—in fact of going to the utmost length to which the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is prepared to go in doing everything possible in order that Canadians may supply exclusively the manufactured products we require.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But this is a new industry in the country. These articles are not yet introduced in the country.

Mr. BELL. These particular articles that are now being introduced—but how does that help the hon. gentleman? If he is prepared, in order to introduce into a manufacturing industry of this country, some new articles, to come to the assistance of that industry, is he not a protectionist up to the hilt?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I only mention that because the hon. gentleman was saying that other industries in existence, which were suffering, might as well come forward and be similarly dealt with. I point out that this is not a manufactory of certain goods, which has been in existence for years and is suffering, but it is an industry which is bringing into existence a new line of manufactured product.

Mr. BELL. This industry is simply producing a particular form of article which has not hitherto been made in this country, but it is not a new industry. If the hon. gentleman were to make in his establishment a new kind of biscuit or confectionary, he might just as well claim that he was establishing a new industry. This steel company is turning out steel billets, but these particular billets, to which this exceptional protection is to be given, are simply to be rolled to a rather smaller size, or, in the case of plates, they are rolled to a greater width and are a little more weighty. It is not a new industry we are assisting, but only varied products of an industry already established. Therefore, I think the hon. gentleman has been rather unfortunate in his interruption.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does it not bring into this country an entirely new class of machinery, which is not in existence at present?

Mr. BELL. No, it does not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, it does.

Mr. BELL. It simply means that whereas the company have been rolling their steel to a size of four inches square, they are about to take that four inch square billet and reduce it to a size of three-quarter inch round. That is all it means. And, instead of the billets being four inches square, they are to be passed through smaller rollers until they are reduced to a diameter of three-quarters of an inch. They have been producing iron of that size at New Glasgow. They have not been producing wire rods, and the only difference between the rod and the steel billet is that the rod is rolled a little longer to a smaller diameter. To pretend that it is a new product, one might as well say that a new pattern of calico produced in a cotton mill is a new product. It is merely a slight change from what the manufacturer has been making all the time. But the great point is this. Why does the government hesitate? Is it possible that the government hopes to deceive that great class of voters, the consumers, to whom they played during eighteen years of opposition? Is it possible that by refusing to change their tariff but effecting exactly the same purpose by means of a bounty they hope to delude the people into the belief that this government, so ready to go to the assistance of a suffering industry, is really a free trade government. To my mind it is impossible to find any other reason for their action in this matter. And while I am glad indeed, for the sake of an industry in my own province, which is of the very highest importance, and which both sides of this House will admit is one of the fundamental industries of any country that is going to develop manufacturing ascendency, that the government has adopted this course, but I would be much better pleased if it would do it in such a frank fashion as would rank it in the safe,

strong, defensible position of being openly and avowedly prepared to assist the industries of Canada, and enable Canada to develop from a mere producer of raw materials into a centre of varied manufacturing industries embracing every achievement in that direction possible to our natural resources and people. The criticism of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) condemning the government because it is treating this iron and steel industry in a friendly manner, and describing it as an industry which is not legitimate to Canada, is most amazing. In what country could the iron industry be more legitimate than Canada? We have every one of the raw materials which enter into the production of iron. We have a suitable climate, a people unexcelled in their adaptability to all industrial processes, and a climate that is favourable to severe labour. In fact we have an ideal country in which to produce iron. We are alongside a country which is leading in iron trade in the world, and has yet no greater facilities for that trade than we have. There is this one difference between the United States and Canada, and that is that in the one case, undiscouraged by the failures that attend its earliest years, the government of the United States went from one stage of protection to another, and by showing itself in favour of protection and pressing that remedy home to the last requirements of the industry, succeeded in establishing it in the unrivalled position in which it is to-day. There is no other difference between the two countries.

And there can be no question that if we stand as loyally, firmly and believingly at the back of the iron industry of this country as they did in the United States, we may hope at an early day to see Canada become what, so far as natural resources are concerned, she is calculated to become, one of the great iron producing countries in the world. No doubt, at the back of that, progress, will follow exactly what is being hoped for by the government in this matter. Here the government is helping not only the production of raw material, but also—a distinction properly drawn by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver)—the second industry of producing wire and nails from that iron. The government is not only offering assistance to the great company producing foundation article, the iron, but is also seeking to add another industry to the working outfit of this country, employing labour, adding new centres of population, increasing the home market for the farmers, adding to the imports, swelling the trade of this country. By this action unquestionably, if they stand loyally at the back of this industry and do it frankly as protectionists, they will add one industry to another until they will have added enormously to the productive powers and population of Canada, and we will have wiped out what, to my mind, is a reproach to Canada that, in an article which she could produce, she is dependent upon the United States. The government has entered upon a good work; let them go forward in that work. And I would suggest that it would be better, in the interest of the manufacturers, in the interest of the country, and better in order to establish that confidence which will attract foreign capital to come freely into this country and bring the necessary population with it, that the government should enter upon this course in such a fashion as shall convince all that their action is not merely temporary, not a mere specific for a special case of illness, but a carefully thought out policy which it is not only prepared to apply for the moment, but to guarantee interested parties in this country or out of it that it is ready and determined to continue as long it remains in power as a government.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that you have had the painful experience of seeing the Finance Minister standing face to face with the consequence of his own blunders. Nor is it the first time we have seen the Finance Minister asking the authority of parliament to pass the hat to recoup by bounties industries that have been injured by his policy. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), whom I see smiling as he always does, challenged this side of the House to point out an industry in Canada that was not prosperous. Any hon. gentleman might make that challenge. But let me remind him that, if our industries generally are prosperous, it is because he and his friends had not the courage to take away the protection that has been given to those industries by a previous government. But there are some exceptions to our prosperity, and those exceptions can be traced in every instance to the removal of protection by this government. I challenge the hon. gentleman to controvert that statement. I say that there is not an industry in which they have taken away substantial protection which is not suffering materially, or which is not coming here and asking for protection. But instead of giving the protection which his policy has taken away, he is asking the people to put their hands in their pockets and recoup those industries by bounties. The hon. gentleman said we must have protection or bounties. I would ask him how he would like to have protection taken away from the business that he has made a great success, partly by his ability as a business man and partly by the protection given to that industry, and an allowance of bounties made that would assist him temporarily and for the renewal of which he would be obliged to come and ask from time to time. If he would not consent to that, how can he approve of the proposition made by the Finance Minister to-day? The hon. gentleman tried to

draw a fine distinction based upon the idea that this is a new industry. But the government are giving bounties not merely to the new industries that are mentioned, but also to production of iron, which is an old industry in this country. There is absolutely no difference for practical purposes whether it is an industry which is being expanded and extended or a new industry that is to be built up. The hon. gentleman recognizes that, for he proposes to treat them alike. I do not know anything more at variance with the hon. gentleman's own experience as a business man than the policy of bounties. I do not know anything more at variance with the experience of every practical man. Of course, we make some allowance for hon. gentlemen brought up in what I may, without offence, call the narrow school. None doubt the sincerity of the Finance Minister. But many doubt his theories. The industries of the country have good reason to doubt his theories. He was brought up in a school whose chief idea was to worry and harass every industry in the country, to look with distorted eye, almost with a bloodshot eye, on every industry that received a particle of protection. Now, however, he finds himself face to face with the great responsibilities of the high position of Minister of Finance. He must deal with great practical questions. But he never moves from conviction, nor will he unbend any of the things he has learned. He moves under pressure. He still thinks that every particle of protection is an evil. The only thing that causes him to recede from his position is the strong pressure of the business interests of the country, whose dissatisfaction, he fears, will cost him some votes. Now, what would be an ideal man for Minister of Finance? If I were selecting a Minister of Finance, I should not select one different physically or intellectually from the one we have. But I would select one who would unlearn everything the hon. gentleman has learned. I would select one who would act from conviction, and who would be moved by the broad spirit of protection that pervades this country. That it does pervade the country we can see by the attitude of the hon. gentleman's own followers. We had, for instance, the example of wabbling of the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He found fault with everything and condemned everything, yet he was able to support the government. He told us that we must have cheap iron. The government some time ago took the duties off iron, one of the great errors they are trying to repair. And I would ask the hon. member for Alberta to point out a single instance where we have had cheaper goods as a result of the lowering of duty. I challenge the hon. gentleman to say that there has been a single article purchased cheaper by reason of the government having lowered the duties on iron. But the government have considerably crippled this industry. And what does the Finance Minister think will happen at the end of four years when these bounties shall cease? The hon. gentleman will have to mend his ways between now and then, if he is still Finance Minister. But if he does not mend his ways and the people will still be deceived, what will be the position of these industries? They must come back, every one of them, and ask for additional bounties. They cannot maintain themselves. They have lost their own market, and as a compensation we have to give them bounties instead of giving them protection, which would result, in a large measure, in supporting them at the expense of the foreigner. Now, what is the position of the workingman in this country? Under a proper system of protection he has a day's work, whereas under the present system it means that he is deprived of that day's work because he has lost the field, and he must put his hand into his pocket and contribute something to help his neighbour.

Now, I do not propose to offer any opposition to this measure, because I think it is necessary under the circumstances. At the same time, I do not think it is a wise policy, I think it an extremely unwise policy. It is merely a policy of shifting, merely a policy of expediency; an hon. friend near me says it is wabbling. It is not even respectable wabbling. However, I welcome anything that will for the time being give relief to this industry that the hon. gentlemen have in a sense destroyed. They have come down and have to some extent repaired the harm they had done, but at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. They did the same thing with respect to the binder twine industry. The duty was taken off the binder twine altogether, and after the hon. gentlemen had ruined that industry practically, they passed the hat around to help the manufacturers of binder twine. They are now passing the hat around again to help the iron industry. But this bounty system will not give them the home market. The American producer will still come in and sell alongside of them, as he does in respect to the binder twine industry. It is simply taxing our own people for the support of these industries instead of taxing the foreign manufacturer. It is about time, it seems to me, that we should shift the burden. I have only to repeat what I said at the outset, that I do not know of any more unwelcome spectacle than to see ministers sitting on that side of the House who came in seven years ago with a great flourish of trumpets, promising to reform the tariff, and they have not made a single reform. I challenge them now to point to a single substantial reform, a single change they have made in the tariff to compensate those from whom they took away protection. I am going to support the boun-

ty, not because I believe it is a wise principle, but because I think it is necessary to do something to keep this iron and steel industry on its feet.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I understand that these bounties are given in order to stimulate the industry of iron and steel, I do not understand that they are given for protection. I understand that the people who started this industry are not able to purchase the machinery and to carry it on successfully without some assistance from the country. In other words, this bounty is given as an encouragement to them in their work. Now, it seems to me that unless we have the raw material in our country, unless we have sufficient iron and coal in proximity, it is only a waste of money to give bounties to stimulate that industry. After you have encouraged this steel and iron industry by a bounty, after you have got it to work and it is then still unable to stand up on its own merits permanently, what is the use of giving the bounty ? As I say, in order that the industry may be permanently successful it must have the raw material, the coal and iron in proximity to each other. If you have to import the raw material you cannot be successful. I heard the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) complaining that they are paying duties on iron made from ore brought from the United States. Now, if you are going to bring ore from the United States and coal from the United States, you had better let the United States manufacture the iron, because you are only throwing away your money by giving it bounties.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the cotton industry in England ?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). They can get the raw material cheaper than any other country because they have got the shipping to bring it in cheaper than any other country ; that is why the cotton industry succeeds in England. The iron industry succeeds there because they have both the coal and the iron. But it is no use for us under any circumstances to try to bolster up manufacturers of raw material of which we do not possess within our own borders. I heard the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) say a few minutes ago that they had the grandest country under heaven for the manufacture of iron. If they have, then they must lack men of enterprise and intelligence to carry on the industry. If you have got the raw material and if you have got the right kind of men, you do not need any protection. I do not like the bonusing system, either in this or in any other industry. If you have got the right kind of men with any snap about them, they ought to make the industry a success without the assistance of bounties. Still, in this case, if these men are suffering, if they feel obliged to give up the enterprise and to take their money out of the country unless we help to set them on their feet, I am willing to help them, but all the same I say it is a wrong principle.

Mr. WILSON. I want to ask the Finance Minister a few questions. I would like to know how much of the ore that is manufactured or smelted in Deseronto is imported into this country. They make a different kind of iron to what is made in Nova Scotia, it is called charcoal iron. I would like to know how much ore they imported. I would like to know whether the increased amount of bounties you are proposing to give will be sufficient to tide the companies that are supposed to be in financial difficulty over the trouble they have got into. I think the Finance Minister ought to give us some information with respect to the reasons why he brought this up at so late a date. I have no doubt he has had interviews with the company, discussion and correspondence, and I think the House is entitled to that information. I presume it is not necessary to say anything with reference to the position of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, the Finance Minister is perfectly familiar with it. It is said they are in the best place in the world to manufacture iron. The town of Sydney gave the company 500 acres of land fronting on the harbour. The bounties they expected to receive would be sufficient to pay for the plant and to set them going in a successful manner. Now, if these things are true, if Cape Breton is the best place in the world to manufacture iron, there must have been great mismanagement in this matter. If there has been mismanagement in it why should the people be taxed to make right the mistakes that have been made by a particular company ? I differ entirely from my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I am not in favour of bounties.

Mr. CLANCY. Neither am I.

Mr. WILSON. You may not be in favour of them, but you are going to support them, and it looks as if you were in favour of them.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not say whether I was in favour of bounties or not. I say that on general principles I am opposed to bounties, but if hon. gentlemen opposite have destroyed industries by taking away their protection, I am willing to give bounties or anything else to help them out.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman only does it as the best thing possible, and not because he likes it. He is in favour of a fair measure of protection which I think is by far the better policy. I see that the president of the Consolidated Lake Superior Company has issued a circular letter which appeared in the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' of the 28th July, in which he says that unless the stockholders of the company take up the bonds amounting to $12,500,000 the

property will fall into the hands of the creditors. That seems to me to be a very strange condition of affairs. I would like the hon. Minister of Finance to tell us whether these bounties are going to be sufficient to tide these people over their difficulties. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company last year, according to the answer given by the hon. Minister of Finance, to a question asked in this House, received bounties to the amount of $885,963, and the total bounties paid last year on iron and steel were $1,245,382. It does seem to me that if we cannot manufacture iron and steel under such bounties as these it is folly for us to increase them, and if it is because of the bad management of these companies that they have had such poor success then I think they ought to be allowed to go to the wall and let other men take hold of the business who would be able to conduct it in a more successful way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the first question my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) asked was in reference to the operation of a charcoal iron furnace at Deseronto. I understand the ore is imported almost wholly from the United States.

Mr. WILSON. What bounty do they get per ton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Two dollars per ton on the imported ore and on any portion they make from native ore they, of course, get a higher bounty. In regard to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, I have had frequent communications with representatives of that company. I am not authorized to say that they will regard this as entirely satisfactory. I think it will enable them to continue their operations at present, and that they will regard this as meeting their difficulties for the time being.

Mr. WILSON. What proportion of the enterprise is in operation now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not had any very recent communication with them, but I have seen what appeared in the press. I understand that the other day they stopped a portion of the work, and I saw by a subsequent telegram that it was stated that they had resumed it, but I have no information upon that point other than what I saw in the public press. In regard to the operations at Sault Ste. Marie, there have been no representations made to us lately on this subject. The condition of the industry was presented to us at the beginning of the session, and a proposal was made in regard to steel rails, and the arrangement then announced respecting duty on rails was based on representations so made, although, of course, it applies as well to any other mill in Canada which may make steel rails. As far as I am aware, the mill at Sault Ste. Marie is the only mill which intends to make steel rails. I have had no communication from them lately, and I am not in a position to give any further information upon that point.

Mr. WILSON. Have they carried out their contract for the supply of steel rails ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, they failed to carry out their contract for the supply of steel rails during the time specified. They did supply a quantity later on, but they did not supply the quantity that the contract mentioned. They, however, supplied a smaller quantity. I am not able to say anything as to their future operations.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 238) respecting bounties on iron and steel.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 232) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Clifford Sifton) make some statement as to the Bill before it is read a second time ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When introducing this Bill I made a general statement in regard to its purport, and I think perhaps a detailed explanation would be more intelligible in taking the clauses up in committee. I may say in a general way that the Bill is a result of the experience of the last year or two in connection with the difficulties of handling grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. There has been a great deal of difficulty in connection with the transportation question for some years, and a condition under which practically the men who were in the elevator and warehouse business were enabled to compel the producers of grain to sell their grain to them directly, because of the fact that they were unable to procure cars for shipment themselves. An amendment was introduced a year ago, chapter 19 of the statutes of 1902, which was designed to meet that condition of affairs by permitting farmers to ship directly, giving them power to order their cars directly, and compelling railway companies to furnish cars directly to them. In addition to that a number of other changes were made concerning the regulation of the shipping business as originally provided in the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900. The Act of 1902 was largely experimental and it was known to be experimental at the time, because it was known that it would bring

about considerable changes in the shipping of grain, and it was not known until actual experience had demonstrated how the provisions of the law would work.

I may say that the provisions of the law of 1902 have given great satisfaction to the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I do not mean that the Act has been regarded by the farmers as being perfect by any means, but it has been regarded as being a vast improvement upon the legislation as it stood upon the statute-book before. The privilege which this Act gave to the farmers of ordering their cars directly and shipping directly is considered by them to be an extremely valuable privilege. The grain-growers of Manitoba and the North-west have formed an association and they have discussed this question of the shipment of grain at great length, and at the different meetings which they have held the representatives of the railway companies have been invited to meet them and the subject has been discussed very fully. During the present session of parliament the grain-growers sent a deputation to Ottawa and the grain-dealers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories also sent a deputation and they met here and fully discussed the proposed changes in the law. A short time ago they submitted to me a Bill which was practically the result of their deliberations and was in the nature of an arrangement which was agreed to by all parties. The railway companies have also been consulted in regard to the provisions of the Bill, and while the Bill does not absolutely meet the views of any of the conflicting interests, yet I am satisfied from the information at our disposal that it may be regarded as a satisfactory measure. The principal provisions of the Bill are: In section 3 to provide for the appointment of deputy warehouse commissioners. The original Act provided for the appointment of a warehouse commissioner and it has been found that owing to the duties that have devolved upon him and the enormous increase of the business of shipping grain due to the increased production, he has been unable to find sufficient time for the discharge of all his duties. It is certain that we shall require to appoint one or more deputy commissioners under this clause. The effect of the 4th section is to bring track buyers of grain under the provisions of the law which require licenses to be taken out by persons dealing in grain. The 5th section provides by an amendment to section 10 that the weighmasters and their assistants, in addition to the other information which they are required to report, shall report as to whether or not the cars which they examine are in bad order. Section 6 deals with the making of returns by the warehouse men owning or operating terminal elevators as required by section 24 of the Act. Section 7 gives the commissioner power to deal with disputes in regard to applications for sites for elevators and warehouses. The effect of section 8 is to require persons operating country elevators or country warehouses to receive as a matter of duty under the law the first six standard grades of wheat established and described in the general Inspection Act. Section 9 makes provision to exempt the elevator owner from receiving grain when he has not sufficient accommodation for that purpose. Section 10 makes provision which deals with the duty of the elevator man in regard to the shipments of grain when the owner desires it shall be shipped. The provision in the existing law was found to create a difficulty by reason of the fact that when a person who owned an elevator was unable to secure shipping facilities he was still compelled to keep the grain without making any charge for it. Section 11 provides for the amendment to section 34 of the original Act by adding a subsection the effect of which I will explain when we reach the committee stage. The effect of section 12 is to make an amendment to section 35 which provides for the giving of notice in case that grain goes out of condition in the elevator. Section 13 makes a change in section 39, the effect of which can only be shown by comparison and there are some verbal changes which I shall explain in the committee. Section 14 makes provision for the erection of flat warehouses which is substantially the same as in the Act of 1902, but the section is required because the repeal of the Act of 1902 does not bring into effect legislation which was repealed by that Act itself, so that we have to re-enact. Section 15 is new and it is simply to prevent a person getting a warehouse site from the railway company and allowing it to stand without proceeding with the work. Section 16 provides in detail for the construction of loading platforms. Section 17 deals with the duties of grain commission merchants. When they sell on commission, they are required to in a certain specified time report the quantity sold and render a statement to the consignor. One section deals with the necessity of their taking out a license. Section 18 is the same as the section dealing with the same subject in the Act of 1902. Section 19 amends section 50 of the original Act, and requires the chief inspector, in addition to making a report to the railway officials, to make a return to the commissioner. Section 20 deals with penalties. Section 21 makes provision with reference to the distribution of cars. This is the most important feature of the Act. Section 61 is new. It provides that the provisions of the Act shall not apply to grain which is shipped westward of the British Columbia boundary. It was found in actual practice that the result of the Act making provision respecting the distribution of cars was to prevent the railway companies, on shipping on British Columbia orders or on orders for the

orient, to supply the cars, because the law would not permit them to do so except in a certain way; and it has been agreed by all concerned that the Act shall be amended so that it shall not apply to the shipment of grain when it is consigned to any point west of the boundary line between British Columbia and the North-west Territories. The Bill as drawn says the Pacific coast, but I propose to have that amended by changing it to the boundary line of British Columbia. Section 62 deals with the licensing of track buyers. Sections 22 and 23 amend the forms of storage receipts in the schedule in compliance with the amendments to the Act in other places.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the minister make a short statement as to the actual condition of affairs in the North-west to-day—whether the car famine has been largely overcome, whether there has been an increase of elevators, and whether generally the grievances which formerly existed in connection with this matter have been ameliorated to any extent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My information is that at the present time there is no difficulty in regard to the shipment of grain, because practically the whole of last year's crop is shipped out. The difficulty as to car shortage will of course not arise again until the new wheat comes in, and what we are trying to do in this legislation is to provide a satisfactory method for the distribution of cars. This legislation will not provide any more cars or increase the quantity of rolling stock, but I think it will result in a far more satisfactory distribution of cars.

Mr. MACLEAN. Do the railway companies show a disposition to provide an increased number of cars for the trade? Has the situation been improved in that respect?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. My information is that the railway companies have shown a disposition to put on all the rolling stock they could get. That question was gone into very fully during the early part of last winter, at the time the car shortage was very acute, and I think everybody who had anything to do with the railway companies was satisfied that they were doing their best, although they were seriously to blame for not forseeing what was to come, and making adequate provision for it. Since that time they have been making every effort to provide adequate rolling stock and prevent a shortage in the future. Whether they will have sufficient cars to move the next crop it is difficult to say at present. That depends to some extent on the deliveries to the cars and to some extent on Providence as to the amount of wheat there will be to be shipped out. No one can form any very definite idea as to that until practically the last week of the harvest. My observation in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is that people have very little idea of how much wheat they are going to have until a few days before the wheat is ready to be cut. The climatic condition of the last two weeks practically decides whether the crop will be a phenomenal one or an average one. The present indications are that in the North-west Territories it will be very good, in some parts of Manitoba it will be very good, and in other parts somewhat light. On the whole it is not to be expected that it well be as large as the crops of the last three years.

Mr. MACLEAN. Has there been any improvement in regard to elevators and storehouses?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been an enormous increase in the amount of elevator accommodation. Elevators are being constructed rapidly all over the country, and the accommodation will be vastly greater than it was last year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I might point out also that a good deal of the trouble during the last two years was due to the increased acreage sown. Many of the farmers had no granaries, and as soon as they threshed their wheat they were anxious to put it in cars or in an elevator. In other words, they wished the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to furnish them with granary and warehouse accommodation at a moment's notice. That will of course largely improve itself as time goes on. Not only have a great many elevators been built by the grain companies at the railway stations, and the railway companies have increased their elevator accommodation, but many farmers have built granaries. At the present time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Montreal Transportation Company report that they are carrying cargoes westward, and are coming east light, because all the grain is out.

On section 3,

Mr. BOYD. Is it the intention to have those commissioners located at Winnipeg or to place them at other points throughout the province?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They will have to be located at outlying points. The difficulty which arises with the commissioner at Winnipeg is that he is liable to get demands from different parts of the country at the same time, which necessitate a very large amount of travel and delay. They will have to be located at points whence they can get readily to places where complaints arise. The commissioner at Winnipeg will have general supervision over their duties.

On section 9,

Mr. BOYD. Would the hon. minister please explain this section ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The law as it stood made some provision requiring the elevator men to take in wheat whenever it was offered. They claimed that they were liable—they were advised that they were liable—if they did not take the grain when it was offered, even if their elevators were full and they could not get cars to ship. This provides that they shall not be required to take the grain in when they have not room for it.

On section 10,

Mr. DAVIS. As I read this clause, only the farmer who has a full car load of grain can take advantage of this provision of the Act. Now, there are a great many people living at a distance from the railway who are entirely left out of the benefits of this clause. A man living within ten or twelve miles of a railway station can call for a car and load it. But the man living at a distance must use the elevator. Now, there are many new settlers coming into this country who have not 1,000 or 1,500 bushels of wheat to ship the first year. But if two or three farmers together have enough wheat of a certain grade in the elevator to make up a carload, why should they not be allowed to combine and order a car ? If this is not allowed, the elevator people, knowing that these small growers cannot get cars, will have them completely at their mercy, and will buy their wheat at what they choose to give for it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose that what my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) means is that if say three farmers, none of whom have enough grain to make a carload, could, by combining their warehouse receipts, make up a carload, they should be allowed to order a car to take the grain out.

Mr. DAVIS. That is exactly what I mean.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may explain that, as the matter stood under the Act of 1902, we had given the farmer the privilege of ordering a car to a loading platform or into the yard. But we did not give him the privilege of ordering a car to the elevator, even though he had his grain there. This is to cover that defect, and to enable a farmer who has his grain stored to order a car to the elevator and ship it himself and sell it direct. I do not know that there would be any objection to the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), but I would like to hear what the other members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories have to say about it before it is agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would remind the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that the parties to whom he refers are still able to combine, as many did during last season, and fill their car at a loading platform. But, as the hon. minister has stated, the defect of the Bill last year was that no farmer could compel the railway company to place a car for him at the elevator. The railway companies refused to place cars at the elevators, consequently elevators were not used in that way. This section has been introduced into the Bill to overcome that difficulty.

Mr. DAVIS. I would point out to the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) that a man living twenty-five miles from the railway station is not in a position to load a car from a platform, as is a man living near the railway station. When he brings his grain he has to put it in an elevator. If he is given the privilege of combining with others to ship it, I cannot see that anybody would be injured. And these are the people that require to be provided for. Very often, the first year, they have not large crops or large means. If the law can be so amended so as to secure for them three cents or four cents per bushel that they would not otherwise receive, it ought to be given them.

Mr. SCOTT. This matter was given very serious consideration by the delegates both from the Grain Dealers' Association and the Grain Growers' Association who have visited Ottawa since the commencement of this session, and who spent not only hours, but days considering the various points coming up under these amendments, and who are largely responsible for the shape in which these amendments now appear. The point raised by the hon. member for Saskatchewan was given the utmost consideration. As has been explained by the minister, an additional privilege is being given by this section. Under the amendments adopted last year the farmers did not have the privilege of ordering a car to be spotted at the elevator to be loaded direct there, but were limited, so far as direct loading is concerned, to the platforms and flat warehouses. The difficulty found in making the provision my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) suggests is this : It was recognized that this extra privilege that is being given to the farmers of loading through the elevators will open a pretty wide door for—I suppose we will have to use the word 'fraud,' through perhaps that is an extreme term—a pretty wide door for fraud on the part of managers of elevators. These men may easily make arrangements with certain farmers or other people to order cars to elevators—perhaps people who do not own grain at all—simply to get for these managers more cars to load than they are entitled to. In later provisions of this Bill, it will be seen that very strict regulation is made with regard to the

distribution of cars. The principle of first come first served is endeavoured to be followed in this amendment, as in the case of the amendments adopted last year. My hon. friend was at some of the meetings, with myself and other North-west members, that were held in this city by the delegates I speak of. Personally I quite appreciate the disadvantage accruing to these farmers who do not grow as much grain as a carload, and I would be pleased if some reasonable suggestion could be made to their advantage. But up to the present time I have been unable, and the delegates were unable to agree upon any suggestion to give to the farmers the additional advantage, those of them who do not grow as much as a carload of wheat, without leaving the door open for an abuse of the privilege which is being granted to other farmers who do grow more than a carload of wheat, and who will be able to take advantage of the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not understand the arguments of the hon. gentleman. He says the door has been opened to a certain extent by allowing farmers the right to ship from the elevator. If you are opening the door by allowing a man who has a carload of wheat to come in and ship out of the elevator, what difference is it going to make if you let three men put their wheat together, and to ship it as a carload? Where will you draw the line? If the object is to shut off fraud by not allowing elevator men to get more cars than they are entitled to, you give them as much opportunity for fraud when you give the right to get a car for one man who has a carload of wheat as for three men combined who have a carload. The only difference is that you are protecting the poor man as against the elevator man.

Mr. SCOTT. The elevator men do not put any farmer in that position, because he still has the safeguard of the flat warehouse and the loading platform.

Mr. DAVIS. As a matter of fact, the principle was introduced of allowing grain to be shipped through elevators in order to protect people a long distance from the railway. As the Act stood before, the only people that could take advantage of it were those living within 10 or 12 miles of the railway There are many people in the North-west who live 15, 20 or 30 miles away from a railway, and as the Act stood, these people could not take advantage of it. It is impossible for a man who has to get a car and hold it for 24 hours, to bring in his wheat 30 miles and hold that car. This was done to allow men at a distance to take advantage of this Act. The North-west Grain Growers' Association themselves proposed to give the elevators 25 per cent of the cars, or something to that effect, on account of their having to handle grain from a distance. This was introduced to meet that difficulty, but I want it to go so far as that the poor man can take advantage of it just as well as the wholesale man who has a carload of wheat.

Mr. BOYD. I had not the advantage of meeting the grain growers and the grain dealers in agreeing upon the amendments that have been proposed to this Act, but I do know that last grain season attempts were made, and in some cases succeeded, whereby the grain dealers were able to get men to have cars placed at the elevators for them, in cases where they merely held the grain a day or two. As I understand it, this clause is put in to prevent that sort of thing. I see later on there is a provision made for prosecuting any person that attempts to take advantage of the Act in that way. I understand that the dealers, or rather the farmers who have elevators of their own, or who were interested in farmers' elevators, wished that cars should be placed at the elevator. While I appreciate what the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) says in regard to the poor man, it is not very often that a man having three or four hundred bushels of wheat asks to have it stored, he usually sells it. It is the man that has a carload of grain that seeks to ship it himself, and if he has not enough for a carload, it is customary for him to get enough of his neighbours to combine with him to make up a carload. Now in order to do what the hon. member for Saskatchewan suggests, you will need to be very careful so that a man owning an elevator will not do as some did last year, and as many would like to do, that is, to get men who possibly have sold him 200 or 300 bushels of wheat to say, I have wheat at that elevator, and for that reason I want a car. The elevator man believes that, and he is enabled to get cars that he would possibly not be entitled to under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. DAVIS. If he was going to do anything like that it would be easier for him to get one man to do it than to get three. What is the difference? Supposing three men owned 500 bushels of wheat each, a car holds 1,500 bushels, and what is the difference whether one man has 1,500 bushels or three men, if it is all shipped out of the same car, if they are willing to put their wheat into the same car and ship it together? One man orders the car and I do not see any objection to that. If three men who have so much grain in the elevator—and they put it together and ship it, they are open to prosecution if they want to go together and produce their receipts, why should they not be allowed to do so? If you do not do that you are simply putting these men, who have a small quantity of wheat at the mercy of the grain dealer or the speculator. They know he cannot take advantage of the Grain Act to get the car. The man who has a

carload can get two or three cents more for it, and the poor man who has not got so much will get a lower price.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I understand that my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr Douglas) agrees with the views expressed by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), and the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), while for myself, of course, I only desire that the clause shall be satisfactory to the producers more especially. I can see that a difficulty might arise in the way suggested by the member for Macdonald. My hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) says that no difficulty can arise about three farmers who own wheat combining to make up a carload. No difficulty can arise when it is honestly done. If there are three bona fide farmers who have wheat in an elevator and they combine and order a car in good faith, no harm arises. That would happen in my judgment very seldom. I think, as the member for Macdonald has said that the case of a farmer who has less than a carload of wheat and puts it in an elevator is a very rare case, and it would not be likely to occur so often as to make a practical measure of relief necessary. Under any possible legislation we might provide there would be some cases which will not be adequately met. What we have to aim at in making these amendments is how best to enable the farmer to have complete freedom in shipping his grain. I confess that either way some difficulty may arise. But the cases in which the farmer would have so small a quantity of grain as less than a carload, and would have it stored in an elevator, would seem to be so few that it would be hardly necessary to make provision to meet such a case.

Mr. DAVIS. I am willing to admit that if a farmer knows he cannot take advantage of the Act he is not going to store his grain in an elevator, and he will sell his grain for whatever he can get for it.

Mr. SCOTT. If there is a flat warehouse he is not at the mercy of the elevator.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know how a farmer is going to be able to ship his grain from a flat warehouse.

Mr. SCOTT. We are talking about communities of farmers.

Mr. DAVIS. If a farmer knows he cannot ship it in that way he will sell it, but it does not follow that if he can use the privilege in such a way that he can take advantage of it, although if two or three were able to store their grain together they might take advantage of the Act and get a higher price for their wheat.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I would like to know whether the storage capacity has been increased since last year ?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, I think it has been to a considerable extent.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am sure the committee would like to know in what proportion, if some of our hon. friends from the west were in a position to tell us.

Mr. SCOTT. I have a very casual knowledge, but I should think possibly 20 per cent would represent the increase that has been made in the elevator capacity.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. There has been a very large increase at Port Arthur during the last year.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that the Canadian Pacific terminal elevator capacity will be almost doubled this fall as compared with last fall.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. If I am not mistaken the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern will have a capacity of 15,000,000 bushels this year.

Mr. McEWEN. I do not see any reason why, if three farmers have a carload of grain and they have three different certificates for that amount, two of them cannot assign their certificates to one of them and he cannot ship the grain.

Mr. DAVIS. Is there any legislation that prevents that ?

Mr. SCOTT. The trouble is that it would create a greater difficulty in preventing the irregular dealings that have been described by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). That difficulty is going to be serious enough as the section stands, and in the event of the adoption of the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) it would be simply impossible to procure conviction and punishment of this sort of violation of the law. I say that even as the section stands the difficulty will perhaps be great, and the delegates fully recognized the fact, but they deemed the provision necessary for the reason that without it the farmers' elevators are put out of business altogether. What are known as farmers' elevators are elevators put up by communities of farmers to enable them to ship their own grain from these elevators, and under the law as it stood last year they were not able to do business. The grain-growers while deeming this a proper provision, recognized that they were opening a door to irregular dealing, to the putting up of jobs whereby an elevator manager might enter into collusion with farmers outside to get more cars than he was entitled to in the car distribution. The case of the farmers' elevators was deemed by the delegates to be so important that they considered it necessary to put in such a provision, but although they gave the fullest possible consideration to the claims of the farmers for whom the hon. member for Saskatchewan speaks, and although these

farmers had the entire sympathy of the delegates, they were not able, nor were any of the members of parliament or senators who attended the meetings of the delegates, able to suggest such a provision as would not leave the door too wide open and make it absolutely impossible to prevent irregular dealing on the part of elevator owners.

Mr. DAVIS. It appears that there is a good deal in what the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McEwen) has said that if three farmers had a certain amount of wheat in an elevator and two of them sold it to the third one, he should have a right to ship it. But, where would he come in under this Bill as you have it now? If three men have a carload of wheat and two sell it to the third man, would the third man have the right to ship it?

Mr. SCOTT. I think so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I beg to move an amendment to section 11, as follows:

Provided that this subsection shall not be held to limit or curtail the rights of any applicant where such applicant has any grain stored or binned as above stated.

When this Bill was drawn it was suggested that the reading of section 11 along with section 58, which provides for the distribution of cars, might be held to imply an interpretation of the rights of applicants which is not intended. I am asking for this amendment simply to make it absolutely clear that section 58 is not intended to control the interpretation of section 11, which deals with the rights of applicants.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 12,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved:

That after the words 'in the' in the second line the words 'where the same first occurs' be inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move to strike out the words 'one month' in the 28th line and substitute therefor 'ten days.' When notice is given by the warehouse man that the grain is out of condition the law requires that it shall be removed by the owner within one month, but that is considered an unreasonably long time to keep the grain, and so ten days has been substituted.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 14,

Mr. DAVIS. Can two or more parties use that warehouse and still order cars to it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. I move that the words 'of not less than 3,000 bushels capacity' be inserted after the word 'warehouse.' That was in the old Act, and after full consideration it seems to me that it is not good policy to permit warehouses of less than 3,000 bushels capacity. Every member of the House whom I have spoken to on the subject agrees to that view.

Mr. SCOTT. I am bound to say that I do not approve of this suggestion. I do not think that we ought to commence travelling backwards in the way of restrictions, and last year it was the opinion of the North-west members and a very large majority of the people who advised them, that the old restriction with regard to the size of the flat warehouses should be removed. It was removed, and for my part I certainly do not approve of re-enacting it. So far as I know, there is no person in a position to make a complaint of the operation of last year's Act with that restriction removed. The question of granaries was raised by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) to-night, and it is a question that is very generally mentioned when we are dealing with grain blockades or any matter connected with the grain trade. I have before pointed out in this House that a farmer in the prairie country who is going to do his business to the best advantage cannot afford to have his granary on his farm, if his farm is far removed from the railway. He is bound to have his storage space right beside the railway in order that he may be at the best advantage. The provision for the flat warehouses as the Act was amended last year enabled any farmer, no matter what his output, to store his grain on the railway track, and those farmers, who were championed by my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) to-night, are those who are chiefly affected by this amendment. A farmer who grows 1,500 or 2,000 bushels of grain was permitted by the Act of last year to build his granary beside the railway, and that privilege enabled him to do his business most advantageously.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Do you know of any flat warehouses that have been erected of less than 3,000 bushels capacity?

Mr. SCOTT. Not that I am aware of.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am quite certain that I never saw one and I am quite sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) will never see one whether this law is changed or not. It seems to me that to give authority by an Act of parliament to require a railway company to give a site for a warehouse to hold grain of less than 3,000 bushels capacity, is an absurdity Suppose they started to erect small granaries of 1,000 bushels capacity, these would string out along the railway and fill up the sidings, and while it might be convenient for the farmers who happened to get in

first, it would be a great inconvenience to the general public, and would impede the shipment of grain and generally congest the business. The best proof that this is a sound view is that although under last year's Act there was no restriction, these small warehouses were not put up, because it would not pay, under the circumstances, to erect them. It may not be absolutely essential that there should be a limit, but it seems to me that the limit suggested is a reasonable one, and that it would be wise to insert such a provision.

Mr. SCOTT. When I come to think of it, I believe I can give the hon. minister instances of warehouses that have been erected of less than 3,000 bushels capacity. In Balgonie, McLean, Qu'Appelle, Indian Head, Sintaluta, and other points, there were last year and the year before scores of granaries put up by farmers for the purpose of getting their grain stored beside the railway track while the roads were passable. While I am not positive about the size of these granaries, I am pretty certain that scores of them put up at these towns were of a capacity of less than 3,000 bushels. My impression is that the average was 1,200 or 1,500 bushels capacity, and some of them were put right on the railway company's premises alongside of the track to save the necessity of more frequent handling than would otherwise be required.

Mr. DAVIS. I noticed myself in the riding of my hon. friend from East Assiniboia some of these so-called warehouses stretched out along the track and built something like a box car with a little round roof. If you are going to allow every man in the country to build one of these things on the railway premises around the station, I do not know how people are going to do business. The law requires them to cover them with metal, and that I suppose prevented them from building on the railway premises before. If a man wants to build a flat warehouse, if it is not going to hold 3,000 bushels of grain, he should not be allowed to build it on the railroad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the hon. member for West Assiniboia forgets that most of these temporary warehouses in my constituency are on sidings. This section requires them to be on a siding or on some switch in connection with the railway. Most of these temporary granaries may be on the railway property, but they are not on the track or on a switch. I should not oppose the utmost freedom. In the Bill of last year everything in the shape of a restriction was removed, and very largely at my suggestion; but I dislike very much to compel a railway company to provide such a number of sites on a common switch as might be in requisition. A building holding 3,000 bushels is a small building. I know that from personal experience, having built temporary granaries, and having shifted them from one part of the farm to another. Did I contemplate building a flat warehouse and asking that a site on a switch should be furnished by the railway company, I would not for a moment think of putting up a building that would hold less than 3,000 bushels. Some phraseology might be adopted leaving it largely to the discretion of the grain commissioner to determine the size of the building.

Mr. SCOTT. My own impression is that the railway company has very little to fear so long as we leave the restriction, which was the only one left last year, providing that the flat warehouse must be covered with metal. So far as I know, no complaint has been made on the part of the railway company that any person has built a flat warehouse and covered it with metal, of less than 3,000 bushels capacity. It is well known that a majority of these warehouses were not on the railway, simply because of that restriction. It would be a great advantage to those farmers who are compelled to haul their grain or leave it on the farm until the road breaks up in the spring, to have the granaries on the sidings. It would save them an extra haul.

Amendment of Minister of the Interior withdrawn, and section agreed to.

On section 17,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I wish to move to amend this clause so as to provide that the platform shall be eight feet wide and 54 feet long. The object of the change is to specify the size of the platform in the Act, which was requested by the railway companies, and I think it is reasonable. The height is left to be decided by the commissioner, because that is important with respect to loading. I also wish to amend the latter part of the section so as to provide that no loading platform shall be erected at sidings for crossings only.

Mr. DAVIS. Would that cover sidings outside of where there is a station yard? It is well known that on some portions of the lines running through new portions of the country there is a station every twenty-five miles, with a siding between from which the farmers ship their wheat. Would this cover that case?

Mr. SCOTT. I should think that if shipments of any class of merchandise are made at such a crossing, it could not be called a crossing siding, and the company would be compelled to erect a platform.

Mr. DAVIS. But it is only for the purpose of shipping grain at that season of the year. In my own district there are four or five of those sidings, and I would like to have it understood that these can be used.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The point of my hon. friend is this: That

where stations are distant some twenty miles from each other and the companies have a siding between the two stations, we should provide that the sidings may be used. I have no objection to that, and I would move that the clause be amended by inserting the words 'Or upon a siding where there is no station' between the words 'yards' and 'at.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 58, subsection 13,

Mr. DAVIS. Before that is passed, I would ask the minister if that would take in the sidings I mentioned a while ago? The agent in my town has a couple of sidings outside the town under his control. Does this section provide for orders for cars being left at these sidings? As the section reads, I do not think it does.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will look up that point and speak about it later on.

On section 58, subsection 4,

Mr. DAVIS. This section provides that a person failing to notify the agent has to pay car rental at the rate of 25 cents per hour for each hour the car is held for him. I think that is rather a heavy fine. A poor man may happen to be four hours late and there is a fine of a dollar, and a dollar is a good deal to a settler who is not well off.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A man cannot expect to have a car put on the siding for him and allow it to stand.

Mr. DAVIS. No, but the fine might be so much a day.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is to impose a penalty for delay which may be injurious to other people. I move that in subsection 13, after the word 'loading platform' the words 'or at any siding' be inserted. That will cover the point raised by the hon. member for Saskatchewan.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BOYD. What is the meaning of this subsection 2 :—

Applicants may make order according to their requirements, and where an applicant requires two or more cars, he shall make two or more applications as the case may be.

When may he order two cars or how?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He can order as many as he likes, but under a subsequent provision, he can only get one until all others are given at least one. My hon. friend will see that section 59 covers the point he has raised.

On section 61,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move to strike out the words 'on the Pacific coast,' and insert the words 'west of the boundary between British Columbia and the North-west Territories.' This is to enable a railway company to fill orders for grain west of British Columbia boundary line which they cannot do under the Act as it stands at present. It has happened during the last season that railway companies have received large orders for shipments from persons in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to some parts of British Columbia or the Pacific coast. Under the law as it was they were unable to fill those orders because they had to be shipped in large specified quantities, and they could not get cars all at the same time to any elevator or warehouse, and the result was that they could not take the orders at all. The railway companies were under a penalty if they furnished cars which they brought to the station in any other way than as provided by this Act.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 62,

Mr. BOYD. I want to move another clause, and I think this is the proper place to propose it. I will read it:

These commissioners shall semi-daily, as soon as possible after nine o'clock in the morning and twelve o'clock noon, on every day between the 31st day of August in each year and the first day of April the following year communicate by telegraph to the railway station agent at places in Manitoba and the North-west Territories where grain elevators are situated, the price of No. 1 Manitoba hard wheat and of No. 1 Northern wheat at Fort William, at the said respective hours, and each such agent shall immediately after the receipt of such telegram publish the same by writing it legibly on a blacboard in a convenient place accessible to the public at such station.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that if this was done, I think, it would to a great extent do away with much of this trouble that we have had as regards the loading of cars and the loading platforms. I understand that such a provision prevails in certain states of the union, and it has worked very acceptably. It is true there will be some difficulty in carrying it out, but there should be none, for the reason that in several of the towns in Manitoba and the North-west Territories the price of grain in Minneapolis and Chicago is telegraphed every half hour. Now if the farmer could go to the station and ascertain the price of these grades of wheat at Fort William, at nine o'clock in the morning and at one o'clock in the afternoon, he would know exactly what price he is receiving for his wheat, and what rate the elevator man or the track buyer is allowing him for it and what profit he is receiving. Then if he is satisfied with the profit that the grain dealer is allowing him he can sell him his wheat, if he is not satisfied with it he can ask for a car and ship it. I think if this system was adopted it would to a great extent do away with a great deal of trouble

we have had in the past with regard to this phase of the question. I brought this matter up before the minister last year and he requested me not to press it. I was not aware this matter was being brought up to-night, and in order to give him notice of it, I handed this motion to the clerk.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think there is something to be said in favour of the suggestion that the hon. gentleman has made. The difficulty is in carrying it out. If I remember aright, the objection which obtained in my mind to this proposition when it was made before, was in regard to the commissioner taking the responsibility of deciding what the prices were and sending them out, because the probability is that the community at large would regard the commissioner as being responsible for these prices, and in cases of dispute as to accuracy, no doubt the department would be held responsible. There may be some way to work out the plan which my hon. friend has suggested. I have not given the subject any special consideration since the matter was before the House on a former occasion. But there is this to be said against it, that while the matter has been discussed and while every conceivable phase of the Grain Act has been discussed during the last year very fully by the grain growers who certainly do not lack full knowledge of the situation and the difficulties that they have encountered up to the present time, I believe none of them have suggested that this particular provision should be inserted in the Act. However, I am quite willing that it should receive proper consideration and I will allow the matter to stand over, if my hon. friend agrees to that view. I will leave the Bill in committee, think it over in the course of the next three or four days and get such information as I can upon the subject. I will ask the opinion of the commissioner as to whether he thinks it practicable or not and bring it before the committee again at a later day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was endeavouring to assist my hon. friend from Macdonald in regard to drafting something that would cover the case, but I do not know whether it is in proper form, as it has been done very hastily. There may be some difficulty in this matter if the commissioner is not at some particular point all the time. Is the commissioner stationed in any particular point, or does he move around the country ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, he is not at any particular point, but that difficulty could be got over in this way: He has an office in Winnipeg, and he has an assistant there, and, of course, the prices are quoted there every hour of the day. There would be no difficulty from that standpoint, because his assistant could send out the prices as well as he could himself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty that the hon. minister speaks of as regards the question of liability would be a very serious one, and if the proposition of my hon. friend from Macdonald were adopted it would be very desirable to add, to the clause which has been drafted, some provision to the effect that neither the commissioner nor the government should be in any way responsible for mistakes, because mistakes sometimes occur in the transmission of messages. There will be no possibility of any wilful mistake, but it might occur, as the hon. minister says, in the transmission of the message or from wrong information received by the commissioner.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there is a very serious practical difficulty, with all due deference to my hon. friend from Macdonald. Some years ago, undoubtedly, farmers did suffer from lack of knowledge as to what was the price of grain, but I do not think it can be said at the present time that they have any difficulty in finding out what grain is selling for. When they come into town or come to a station, they have no difficulty in finding out what grain is selling for. The railway station agent is there and he gets the information, and there is nearly always more than one buyer. Still, I will go into it and see what can be done, if anything, to meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOYD. I think the hon. minister is mistaken in regard to that, because I know that there are times when as much as 10 cents a bushel was made by grain men in handling wheat. If the farmers knew what the price of wheat was, knowing the freight to Fort William, they would get cars under circumstances of that kind, ship themselves, and the dealers could not treat them in that way. The hon. minister says that farmers have no difficulty in ascertaining the price. The dealers themselves know the price. They get it from their houses every morning and every day at noon, and if the dealers can get that information there is no reason why the farmers should not have it from the commissioner. I have thought a great deal upon the subject, and I believe it would be a great benefit to the people of the North-west Territories, and I think if the hon. minister gives it as much attention as I have he will see that it is possible to provide for it.

Mr. DAVIS. If it is such a benefit as the hon. member for Macdonald says, how is it that the delegates of the Grain Growers' Association sent down here by the farmers did not advocate it ? They never made any suggestion in that direction, and I think they can be pretty well trusted to look after the interests of the farmers in a matter of that kind.

Mr. BOYD. I do no think that all the wisdom in the North-west Territories was

confined to the three or four grain growers who were sent down here. I have had opportunities of discussing this question with a great many farmers in the west, and they have expressed a desire to have such a provision as I have suggested.

Mr. DAVIS. The Grain Growers' Association represents the farmers of all parts of the North-west Territories. All the amendments to the Act that they desired were discussed, and when the delegates came down here representing the farmers, if they had required this amendment they would have asked for it.

Mr. BOYD. Probably if I had had an opportunity of discussing the question with them, that no doubt, the hon. member for Saskatchewan had, this amendment might have been engrafted on the Bill.

Mr. DAVIS. They were here for a week.

Mr. BOYD. I was not invited to take part in their meetings.

Mr. DAVIS. Neither was I.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was going to suggest that the hon. member for Macdonald probably had not an opportunity of bringing this before the representatives of the association, and that the hon. member for Saskatchewan, knowing that the hon. member for Macdonald had brought the matter up last year, in all probability overlooked or intentionally neglected to bring it to the attention of the delegates. I remember that this question was discussed here last year, and I thought the idea put forward by the hon. member for Macdonald an excellent one. It seems to me to be a grand thing that the farmers in the North-west should be able to get information not only once a day, but at all hours of the day as to the price at which grain is selling at Fort William or Winnipeg, or at leading points, so that he will know that he is not being taken advantage of. I am quite sure that the hon. minister can make provision for this, and I think the people of the North-west will be very much indebted to the hon. member for Macdonald for bringing this matter up.

Mr. SCOTT If my recollection is right this is not the suggestion that was made by the hon. member for Macdonald last year. I think he suggested last year that the railway companies should be compelled to furnish this information at every shipping point. This is a point that was not overlooked by the delegates from the Grain Growers' Association. It was discussed by them at various meetings, but was not pressed. They appeared to take the view that it was an unnecessary provision to add to the Act. I do not know what the custom, or practice, or system, may be which is prevailing in Manitoba, but in my own section of the North-west Territories the farmers themselves have taken steps to possess themselves daily of the information from Winnipeg or Fort William. As a matter of fact, the information comes from Winnipeg. They have certain arrangements made by which they are advised from time to time, sometimes more than once a day, when changes take place in the price. These delegates did not appear to wish that such a provision should be added to the Bill.

Section allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business shall be taken to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections is set down for to-morrow. For the government business, we shall have the resolutions and Bills which stand in the name of the Minister of Justice, and it may be that we shall be able to take the lead resolution.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, August 5, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT—MR. LOY, M.P.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis) moved :

That the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be now concurred in.

Mr. MONK moved in amendment :

That the said report be not adopted ; but that the appended draft report marked 'B,' be adopted by this House in lieu and stead of the report laid upon the Table of this House :—

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections beg to report as follows upon the question of the purchase of a post office site at Valleyfield :—

In the opinion of the committee, the following facts have been established by the evidence adduced before the committee, which is annexed to the report of the committee :

1. As far back as the year 1898, when Mr. George Loy was mayor of the town of Valleyfield, a petition of the citizens of Valleyfield to the government (exhibit No. 20), praying that a post office be built at the town of Valleyfield and on the property known as the Loy property, was circulated for signatures, and was forwarded to Ottawa and acknowledged by letter from the Department of Public Works to the mayor, Mr. George Loy, himself one of the signatories of the petition.

During the same year, the municipal council authorized two deputations to Ottawa to press upon the attention of the government the two

questions of sewers and post office building, and Mr. Loy, as mayor, formed part of both deputations.

(Evidence of Mr. Lavimodière, secretary-treasurer.)

2. After the election of Mr. George Loy, as member for Beauharnois, in the autumn of 1900, and at the first session which followed his election, a sum of $10,000 was appropriated by parliament for a post office at Valleyfield, Mr. Loy being, at the time of such appropriation, the sitting member for Beauharnois, wherein Valleyfield is situated.

3. Mr. Loy's election was protested and declared void, but he was re-elected at the by-election of 1902, and the sum of $10,000 was re-voted at the session of 1902 for the same purpose, the previous vote having lapsed, Mr. Loy being again the sitting member for Beauharnois.

4. On the 10th July, 1902, the Department of Public Works directed Mr. U. H. Dandurand, real state agent, of Montreal, to purchase the Loy property at Valleyfield, the instructions to that effect being conveyed in the following terms :—

(Translation.)

On Board SS. 'Stanley,'
July 10, 1902.

Mr. U. H. Dandurand,
Real estate agent,
Montreal.

My dear Mr. Dandurand,—My department requires a site upon which to construct a public building at Valleyfield. The locality most suitable for us is a property which belongs to Mr. Loy, on the principal street, fronting on the canal on one side and on a street at the rear part. The fact that this property belongs to the sitting member makes the purchase embarrassing for us. I request you, therefore, to purchase the property on the best possible terms. You have an extensive experience ; you will not say for whom you want to buy. I believe it was sold two years ago for $8,000. I fear you will not be able to have it for less than $10,000. You will, if you please, lose no time and obtain an option on this property without delay. I myself will pay you the usual commission. I have reasons for purchasing quickly.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

5. Pursuant to these instructions, Mr. Dandurand sent out to Valleyfield a sub-agent usually employed by him in similar cases, named R. B. Johnston, who arrived in Valleyfield in the afternoon of the 14th July, and on the same evening secured from Mr. Loy an option in the following terms :—

Valleyfield, July 14, 1902.

R. B. Johnston, Esq.

Dear Sir,—Confirming our conversation of this evening, I beg to say that I will give you an option until three o'clock, Wednesday afternoon, on the 16th instant, for the purchase of my property in the town of Valleyfield, consisting of a lot land situated on Victoria street and extending to the street in the rear, on which are two dwelling houses, i.e., one of stone and the other of wood, the price to be $10,000, payable in cash on day of sale, the buildings at present on the lot, one used as a storehouse and the other as a tin-shop, to be removed within sixty days from date of purchase. It is agreed that the present tenants shall remove within the sixty days before mentioned.

Notice of acceptance or refusal of option to be given to me in Montreal on above date, or left at the office of McIntosh & Hyde, there.

Yours respectfully,
GEORGE M. LOY.

While Johnston did not disclose to Mr. Loy that he was acting, in the purchase, for the government, Mr. Loy said to him :

'Well,' he said, 'now it is not for the government, is it ?'

I said: 'That, Mr. Loy, is a matter that interests me, whether I wish to deal with the outsiders or the government.'

He said : 'I would like to know.'

Question : Yes ?

Answer : I said : 'I have several.'—(Johnston's evidence, p. 129.)

6. Johnston returned the following morning and reported to Mr. Dandurand, and an acceptation of the option was prepared by Mr. R. A. Dunton, notary, of Montreal, acting under Mr. Dandurand's instructions, and signed by Johnston. It is in the following terms :—

Montreal, July 16, 1902.

George M. Loy, Esq.,
Care of McIntosh & Hyde,
Montreal.

Dear Sir,—I beg to accept your offer to sell me your property on Victoria street for $10,000, as contained in your letter addressed to me, dated July 14, 1902, upon the terms therein mentioned, deeds to be executed before R. A. Dunton, N.P., with due diligence and within fifteen days. Price will be paid in cash on title being found satisfactory and deeds executed by you. Please send all papers and titles to Mr. Dunton to prepare deed of conveyance if desired.

7. On the day of the acceptance of the option (the 16th July) Mr. Loy came to Montreal, went to the office of Mr. Hyde, inquired about Johnston, and Mr. Hyde, at Mr. Loy's request telephoned to Mr. R. A. Dunton, notary, as to Johnston ; later in the day the acceptance was brought to Mr. Hyde, with $100 to bind the bargain, by Mr. Dunton, said $100 being furnished by Mr. U. H. Dandurand, and Mr. Hyde forwarded the $100 to Mr. Loy.

8. The delay of fifteen days mentioned in the option expired, but nothing occurred according to the evidence adduced, until on the 8th September following when the secretary of the Department of Public Works wired Mr. Loy as follows :—

'Kindly see the city clerk and ask him to forward us by next mail, if possible, a copy of the plan of the city of Valleyfield, which is needed to complete the purchase of site for public building.

(Sgd.) FRED. GELINAS,
Secretary.

Mr. Loy sent up the plan called for with the accompanying letter :—

Fred. Gélinas, Esq.,
Secretary, Department of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Your telegram received last night. I send you herewith, inclosed, the only plan of the town which I could get. I am informed that Mr. Sullivan, the former engineer of the town has a new plan, but he is away from home to-day. I will see him on his return and if he will lend it I will send it or take it up to you. I would call your attention to the fact that at present there are two post offices in the town, one in the central part and another near

the Canada Atlantic Railway station, in Bellerive ward.

I am, sir,
Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) GEORGE M. LOY.

And this letter from Mr. Loy was acknowledged by the Secretary of the Department of Public Works, as follows :—

Department of Public Works of Canada,
Secretary's Office,
Ottawa, September, 16, 1902.

Geo. M. Loy, Esq.,
Valleyfield, P.Q.

Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th September instant, inclosing a copy of the plan of the city of Valleyfield, said plan being required by the department in connection with the purchase of Mr. R. B. Johnston's property.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
FRED. GELINAS,
Secretary.

9. On the 17th September, 1902, a memorandum for reference to council was prepared in the Department of Public Works.

It alleges as follows :

'That it is necessary to acquire a site for the public building which is to be erected at Valleyfield, P.Q., and for which parliament, at its last session, voted a sum of $20,000. (Should be $10,000.)

'That an officer of the department had examined the different sites available for this building, and has reported that the lot shown in pink on the sketch hereto annexed is the most suitable for the purpose. This lot is centrally situated, it runs from Victoria to Ste. Cécile streets and has a frontage on these streets of 77½ feet, and 163 feet deep.

'That the lot in question is owned by Mr. R. B. Johnston, who is willing to sell for $10,000 which price is considered reasonable by the officer who examined the site.

'The undersigned, in view of the foregoing, has the honour to recommend that the authority be given to purchase from Mr. R. B. Johnston the lot described above, and which is shown in pink on the plan hereto annexed, the said land being required for the purpose of a site for the public building which is to be erected at Valleyfield, P.Q., the price to be paid being $10,000.

This recommendation was adopted by council on the 22nd November, 1902.

10. On the 1st of December following (1902), the deed of sale from Mr. Loy to Johnston was ready for signature by the parties concerned, and then, for the first time since Johnston's visit to Valleyfield, they met, at the office of Mr. R. A. Dunton, notary, but the government cheque had not been issued, and it became necessary to procure money.

A note for $10,000 at one month was made by Johnston, and it was discounted by the Sovereign Bank, on representations made to the bank by Mr. Dandurand, the government agent, and the proceeds of the note in question were handed over to Mr. Loy on account.

Mr. R. A. Dunton gave the committee a statement showing how he subsequently disposed of the balance.

Here is the statement :

1902.

Dec.	1.	Net cheque amt	$9,600 00

Contra.

Dec.	1.	Paid Mr. Loy.....	$1,000 00
"	6.	N. Papineau	4,500 00
"	18.	Interest	731 90
		Paid R. A. Dunton, discharge.	7 30
		Paid balance, Loy	3,360 80

11. It will be seen that Mr. Loy only received, in reality, $9,700, Johnston having been allowed by Loy to keep (and Johnston having kept) $300 on account, as he represented, of trouble, &c., in negotiating to procure the amount.

12. The note of $10,000 matured in due course, but the government cheque not having yet arrived, it was renewed at fifteen days from 31st December, 1902.

Pressure seems to have been brought to bear to cause the official cheque to issue. The papers were in the hands of the Department of Justice for examination as to title.

The Deputy Minister of Justice, on the 17th January, 1903, wrote as follows :

Sir,—I have the honour to request that you will send me a cheque for the compensation money in this case in favour of Robert Bruce Johnston and Robert A. Dunton, agent of the Minister of Justice. I would be glad to have this cheque immediately, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has telegraphed, asking that the purchase may be completed to-day.

Finally, on the 19th January, 1903, a cheque for $10,000 issued from the Finance Department, payable to the order of R. B. Johnston and of Notary Dunton, who was to act as agent of the Department of Justice, specially appointed, and it was forwarded to Mr. Dunton, who caused it to be endorsed by Johnston and went with the latter to the Sovereign Bank to take up the $10,000 note previously discounted, and at the same time Johnston signed a deed of sale in favour of the government, the Public Works Department being represented by Mr. Charles Archer, advocate, of Montreal.

(Deed dated 20th January, 1903, similar in terms from Mr. Loy to Johnston, 1st December, 1902.)

13. 'Johnston's Interest.'—The only interest Johnston, the sub-agent employed by Mr. Dandurand, had in the transaction, was the remuneration given him by Mr. Dandurand himself, when Johnston returned from Valleyfield and made his report, as well as handed in the option to Mr. Dandurand (page 126). Mr. Dandurand is quite clear in his evidence on this point.

Johnston was paid a sum, between $50 and $100, for his services.—(Deposition of Mr. Dandurand, page 134.)

The reduction of $300 on the $10,000, obtained from Mr. Loy, whereby the price was reduced to $9,700, was without Mr. Dandurand's knowledge, and was a matter between Mr. Loy and Johnston only. In all other respects, in signing the deeds, in obtaining the discount of the $10,000 not, in signing cheques, &c., Johnston merely executed the instructions given him by Mr. Dandurand and Mr. R. A. Dunton.

Mr. Dandurand paid the notary $22, amount of his account, but his commission of $500, due by the government, is not yet paid.

14. 'Mr. Loy's Knowledge.'—It is difficult to understand, even outside of the documentary evidence, how Mr. Loy could be completely ignorant of what was going on in respect to his property from the time he received Johnston's first and only visit at Valleyfield, 14th July, 1902, until the day when he made the sale to Johnston, on the 1st December, 1902.

He never, as he admits, saw or endeavoured to see Johnston during that long period, until

he finally met him to sign the deed and draw money on the 1st of December, although in the interval correspondence passed between Mr. Loy and the government relating to the purchase of the Loy property.

He merely went to see a friend, Mr. Hyde, and had him inquire from Mr. Dunton if Johnston was all right.

The delay fixed in the option expired on the 30th July ; the Department of Public Works prepared its memorandum for Council, corresponded with Mr. Loy, the Order in Council was passed, there was a change of ministers, money had to be borrowed because the government cheque had not issued, the Loy contract had been delayed ; and of all this Mr. Loy states that he had no knowledge whatever, and never thought that the government was in reality the sole purchaser of his property.

The government part in the transaction must have been brought home to Mr. Loy when he received a formal demand from the Department of Public Works, on the 8th September, 1902, for a plan of the city of Valleyfield, which is needed to complete the purchase of site for public building.

Indeed, in his answer, accompanying the plan sent by him, Mr. Loy refers to the fact of their being two post offices in Valleyfield. Furthermore, information of a precise and definite nature was certainly conveyed to Mr. Loy, when the department, on the 16th September, wrote him officially that the said plan was required by the department in connection with the purchase of Mr. R. B. Johnston's property.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Loy could not have remained ignorant of the fact that Johnston, in the transaction with Mr. Loy, was an agent of the government.

In the opinion of the committee, the sitting member for Beauharnois was thus officially notified of the real state of affairs, and it became his duty not to carry out the sale of the 1st of December following, which he clearly was prohibited from doing under section 10 of chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows :

'10. No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or any agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the government of Canada, for which any money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House.'

In view of the fact, admitted by all witnesses, that the question of a post office site had been a burning question in Valleyfield since 1898, both while the property was held during four months by a Mr. Archambault, and since he retroceded it to Mr. Loy, after the four months, Mr. Loy cannot, in the opinion of the committee, plead ignorance of the real nature of the deed which he executed in December, 1902, and it appears to the committee that the law quoted above has been violated.

Evidence was adduced in regard to the value of the property, and also in regard to the availability of two government properties at Valleyfield ; but the committee confines its report to the facts which establish the violation by Mr. Loy of the law quoted above.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the House proceeds with the discussion, might I ask why we are expected to consider this report without having the evidence printed ? I have inquired for a copy of the evidence, and I am informed that it is not printed. While the report has been presented to the House, members cannot do justice to it if they have not an opportunity to examine the evidence.

The PRIME MINISTER. Question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before touching, as I will as briefly as possible, upon the evidence adduced before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I would like to say a word of explanation in regard to the bringing before the House of the question of privilege which the House is about to consider. I have found it stated in the press and heard it stated elsewhere, and it was insinuated while the committee were proceeding with this investigation, that in provoking the investigation in question I had been moved by motives which I would be very sorry to see attributed to me. It was suggested in the public press and elsewhere that I had some personal rancour against the sitting member for Beauharnois ; and some went so far as to say that even further motives than that had animated me when I brought this very important matter to the notice of the House. I think it due to myself, and a duty on my part, to disclaim any such motive or intention. As a matter of fact, I state to the House now, and I trust that my statement will be accepted by the members of this House, that almost immediately after the purchase of this property by the government in January last, the circumstances of that purchase were brought to my notice, and, to a certain extent, were a matter of public notoriety in the county of Beauharnois and the surrounding counties and in the district of Montreal. Long before the session opened these circumstances were disclosed to me by parties who were familiar with them ; and, whether I displayed a want of sufficient zeal or failed to take that interest in the matter which it seems to me a matter of this gravity should command, the certificate of search of the registrar and the other documents bearing on this question were placed in the hands of my hon. friend the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). Subsequently, when the session opened, and from time to time during the session, this matter, which seems to me to be one of real importance for the members of this House, was again brought to my attention. When my hon. friend the member for Montmorency was called to England on professional business, the documents remained in the possession of members who sit on this side of the House ; and, as the close of the session approached, a distinct impression was made upon me that if we failed to bring this matter, which had been laid before us with all its surrounding cir-

cumstances, to the knowledge of this House, that failure to perform a public duty would be attributed principally to carelessness on my part or to some other unavowable motive. It was upon that impression, which was conveyed to me by unmistakable signs, that I deemed it my duty to bring the matter to the notice of this House ; and I trust, Sir, that in spite of the treatment which I received during the investigation before the committee, the members of this House will be persuaded by the explanation which I have given that, in calling the attention of the House to this grave violation of that salutary rule which guards the independence of parliament, I have been moved by no other motive than a sense of a public duty, which every member of this House, under similar circumstances, would have discharged in the manner in which I have discharged it.

It was said before the committee, time and again, that there was procrastination, and that the result was the exclusion from this House of the sitting member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy). I need hardly tell the House that I did all in my power to have the investigation concluded in the shortest possible delay. I handed in the names of my witnesses, and the House will see by the proceedings of the committee that there is no justification whatever for the strictures of the chairman of the committee regarding delay. Indeed I have no hesitation in saying that I never before had to deal with a chairman who placed upon his duties as such the interpretation which the hon. gentleman who presided over this committee did place upon his.

The circumstances of the case are not very complicated. A very faithful recital of them is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings of this House of yesterday, which contain at length the minority report of that committee. With regard to the question of exclusion, when a question of privilege has been referred to a select standing committee, I do not think that the hon. member implicated is obliged to absent himself from the deliberations of this House. If he were, the House will realize what power there would be in the hands of hon. members to obtain the exclusion, during a long time, from the House of one of its members with regard to whom a question of privilege is raised. I have not had time to fully look up the authorities, but I would submit the following authority, taken from May's 'Parliamentary Practice,' page 393 :—

> On the 17th May, 1849, petitions were presented complaining of the conduct of three members, as railway directors. The members were permitted to explain and defend their conduct, but did not afterwards withdraw. It being contrary to the standing orders of the House to make a motion, or to enter upon a debate on the presentation of a petition, unless it complains of some present personal grievance, or relates to a matter of privilege, the conduct of the members could scarcely be regarded as under the consideration of the House at that time, and as soon as the members were heard, the petitions were ordered to lie upon the Table, without further debate. One of the members withdrew, but returned almost immediately to his seat.
>
> On the 28th of April, 1846, the House had resolved that Mr. W. S. O'Brien, a member, had been guilty of a contempt : but the debate upon the consequent motion for his commitment was adjourned until a future day : Upon which Mr. O'Brien immediately entered the House, and proceeded to his place. Mr. Speaker, however, acquainted him that it would be advisable for him to withdraw, until after the debate concerning him had been concluded. The reason for this intimation was, that the member had been already declared to be in contempt, although his punishment was not yet determined upon. On the 30th, a request was made through a member, that he should be heard in his place: but this was regarded as clearly irregular, and he was not permitted to be heard. But a member not yet adjudged guilty of contempt may return to his place, when the debate is concluded.

I would infer from that authority that after the question of privilege has been debated and been referred to a committee for investigation, the hon. member concerned is at liberty to return to his place and may take part in the proceedings of the House until the committee has brought in its report and found him guilty. Any other interpretation would be contrary to justice and reason and would proceed upon an assumption contrary to all the principles of our parliamentary laws, that a man is presumed guilty until he is proved innocent.

Let me refer briefly to the facts of the case. The fact is stated in the report that the question of the purchase of a property at Valleyfield for a public building had been discussed in the county of Beauharnois up to the year 1900, and after that up to the time when the government decided to purchase the property in question. Petitions had been sent to Ottawa, deputations had come to Ottawa, and the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy), who was then chief magistrate of the town, formed part of these deputations. A vote of $10,000 had been appropriated in 1901 for the purpose of a public building in Valleyfield. No effect was given to that appropriation, and during 1902, after the by-election rendered necessary by the unseating of the sitting member and after an election contest of a very violent character, in which this question was the topic of discussion, the hon. member was re-elected, and parliament again voted $10,000 for a public building in the town of Valleyfield. On the 14th of July a letter was sent by the Department of Public Works—and I invite attention to this because it is the basis of the subsequent negotiations—to a well known real estate agent in Montreal requesting him to acquire the very property subsequently purchased. That real estate

agent deputed a man usually employed by him for the purchase of property where it is important not to disclose the name of the principal, to obtain an option on this property. This sub-agent came out to the town of Valleyfield and offered the hon. member for that county the price mentioned in the letter of instructions to Mr. Dandurand, namely, $10,000. Mr. Johnston, whose evidence was by no means favourable to those who wished to establish the truth of the charge made in this case, gave it as his opinion before the committee that it was impossible that the member for Beauharnois should have consented to a sale to the government had he known that in reality the government intended purchasing this property. But when Mr. Johnston, the sub-agent, is asked what grounds he had for that belief, he never having met the member for Beauharnois before that date, he relates the conversation which took place between himself and the hon. member on the 11th of July, and that conversation is referred to in the report. The very first question which the hon. member asked this emissary of Mr. Dandurand, and a very natural question under the circumstances, was this. Mr. Johnston says :

'Well,' he said, 'now it is not for the government, is it ?

I said : 'That, Mr. Loy, is a matter that interests me, whether I wish to deal with the outsiders or the government.'

He said : 'I would like to know.'

I said : 'I have several.'

From which I think, Sir, it is fair to infer that at that moment the member for Beauharnois had a suspicion at least that this much talked of purchase of this very property of his by the government was in the mind and in the intention of this agent. Well, during the space of a very short interview, the sitting member for Beauharnois gave an option to Mr. Johnston ; that option is to be found in the minority report printed in the proceedings of yesterday. I wish to call the attention of the House particularly to the fact that in that option, which is delivered to Mr. Johnston, who had acted on behalf of Mr. Dandurand, who was, for the purpose of this transaction, an agent of the government, conditions were imposed to that sale, and one of the conditions was that the sum of $10,000 should be paid in cash and the transaction completed within fifteen days, the deeds to be made out and the transaction completed within fifteen days, and the acceptance of the option to be made within two days, or on the 16th of July then ensuing. Mr. Johnston—this is established in the evidence—returned to Montreal, made his report to Mr. Dandurand, handed him in this option, and received the remuneration which he was entitled to, after having taken these steps towards the purchase of this property. The next day, if I mistake not, or on the 16th rather, the last day fixed for the acceptance, Mr. Johnston, or somebody on his behalf, had an acceptance prepared, that acceptance was prepared by Mr. R. A. Dunton, and I wish to call particular attention to this point, that he had been chosen both by Mr. Loy and by Mr. Dandurand, as the notary who was to act in the matter. He had been chosen by Mr. Dandurand, as results from Mr. Dandurand's own evidence, and he was the notary chosen by Mr. Loy, as results from the statement made by Mr. Loy in his deposition ; that is, the notary in the matter was Mr. Dunton, of Montreal. This acceptance was taken over to the office of Mr. Hyde, one of Mr. Loy's friends, not his business agent, but one of his friends in the city of Montreal, with a sum of $100 on account, which sum was sent out to Mr. Loy at Valleyfield. Now, Sir, I wish to submit to this House that from that moment there were fifteen days granted to the parties to complete the transaction, fifteen days within which the deed which was to constitute the real purchase was to be made out and the money, payable in cash, paid over to the vendor. This is an important point, because it may be claimed here that the property, from the moment of the acceptance, vested in Mr. Johnston, that the member for Beauharnois parted at that moment with his ownership of the property, and that everything which occurred afterwards occurred between the purchaser of the property, Mr. Johnston, and the government. The proposition which I submit to the consideration of this House is this, that upon the expiry of the fifteen days within which the transaction was to be completed and the money paid over, there was no more 'vinculum juris,' no lien de droit, as we say under our law in the province of Quebec, between the two parties in the event of failure to carry out the essential conditions mentioned in the option. That is the law of our province, and, although I am ignorant of the law of the other provinces, I venture to believe that is also the law of the other provinces, that where an option is given upon a property, and the conditions mentioned in that option as to be performed within a certain delay, are not performed, then the binding force of the option lapses, and that after the month of July there was no title in that property in Mr. Johnston, and in reality that property remained vested in the sitting member for Beauharnois. That, Mr. Speaker, is the law in our province, and the constant jurisprudence for many years. I think it is proper for me to give some proof of that proposition. Ever since 1876, and I believe long before—but I take that year as a starting point—the law in our province, such as I have laid down, has been so interpreted in our courts, both in the Superior Court and in the court of final jurisdiction in the province of Quebec. I quote from Stephen's Digest, of 1882, volume 2, at page 684, where a decision of the Queen's Bench rendered in 1876 is reported :

On the 28th July, 1874, the appellant gave to the respondent a writing, intitled 'sale from Daniel Munro to Mr. M. Dufresne.' It was in effect a promise of sale, by which Munro bound himself to sell to Dufresne certain immovable property, therein designated, for the price of $50,000, of which $8,000 was to be paid on passing the deed. The offer was to remain open until the 10th August. The parties met on that day at the office of Simard, notary, who was to have joined Dufresne in the purchase, but he declined to come in; Dufresne had not the funds ready, and they separated to give Dufresne time to make other arrangements. Later in the day Dufresne sent a letter to Munro stating that he accepted the offer made on the 28th July. The first point was whether this was a sufficient acceptance of the promise of sale to be binding on Munro. Was it sufficient that on the 10th August Dufresne should say, merely, I accept your offer? There was no difficulty that when there was a delay fixed, the expiration of the delay was fatal if there was no acceptance on the day. There was no necessity for a mise en demeure if the party does not accept on the day fixed.

The only question, then, was as to the meaning of the promise of sale. On the day named, the money was not forthcoming, and after some pourparlers Dufresne did nothing more than write to Munro, stating that he accepted the offer. It was in evidence that Munro subsequently sold the property to one B. For the same amount Dufresne then brought his action asking that Munro should have the deed to B. set aside and convey the property to him, or that the judgment be held to be a title for him to the property; and if the property could not be conveyed, that Munro be condemned to pay him $30,000 damages. The court below held Munro bound by the acceptance, and condemned him to pay $23,635 damages for the failure to convey the property. The question was this, was Dandurand bound to put the vendor en demeure on the 10th August to give him a deed on that day, and failing that, was he entirely debarred from any claim on the property?—Held that the word acceptance did not mean merely sending the vendor word that he would accept, but a complete acceptance, and that it was for Dandurand to put him en demeure. The judgment would therefore be reversed and the action dismissed.

That is the decision rendered in 1876 by the court of Queen's Bench. A similar holding was that of the Superior Court, presided over by Chief Justice Tait, on the 30th November, 1888. It was reported in the Montreal Law Reports, vol. 4, page 436. In that case it was held:

That, in order to put the vendor legally in default the plaintiff should have tendered the $6,000 within ten days from the date of the writing, and that the tender subsequently was too late. Further, that the plaintiff should have renewed the tender by his action, and brought the money into court.

A decision in the same sense was rendered by the court of Queen's Bench on the 21st May, 1890, as reported in the Montreal Law Reports, Queen's Bench, vol. 6, page 405. In that case, Foster vs. Fraser, it was held:

Where by a contract for the sale of real estate the buyer is to pay part of the price in cash within a fixed delay, in order to put the vendor legally in default to execute a deed the buyer must tender the cash payment within the delay; and in a suit to enforce the sale, and asking that the judgment be equivalent to title, he must renew the tender and pay the money into court.

A decision in the same sense was rendered still later, in 1897, in the court of Queen's Bench, Montreal. It is reported in the Quebec official reports, vol. 6, page 367. In the case of Deschamps vs. Goold, it was held:

Where the owner of real estate offered to sell the same, for a price named, to the plaintiff or to any one whom he might designate, and in the event of the plaintiff effecting a sale, he was to receive a commission of $500—the offer to hold good until a day fixed,—that the plaintiff was not entitled to claim the commission unless the vendor was put en demeure before the day fixed, to complete his part of the obligation, by the tender of a deed with the purchase price; or unless there is proof that the plaintiff, before the expiry of the term, had obtained a purchaser able and willing to fulfil his obligation, and that the inexecution of the sale was due to the unwillingness or inability of the vendor to complete it.

I think that point is of some importance, because I have contended, and I submit to this House, that when the month of August, 1902, arrived, the sitting member for Beauharnois had absolute ownership of the property, that Mr. Johnston could in no way consider himself the owner and would have no right to enforce a deed from the sitting member. Now, another point of some importance, is that, strange to say, even from the time when the sitting member for Beauharnois had given this option to the purchaser at a price which, if the evidence is scrutinized, will undoubtedly be considered a very good price for the property, if not too large a price, a price greater by $2,000 than the value estimated by the vendor himself two years before, at a time when he was not a sitting member, and when he promised to sell the property for some $8,000—I say that an extraordinary circumstance is that, from that day the personality of Mr. Johnston seems to have effaced itself completely from the mind of the hon. gentleman. He came to Montreal. He unquestionably must have had some desire to see the transaction completed. That is proved by the correspondence produced. And yet, never once until 1st of December following, months afterwards, does he seem to have taken the slightest interest in this proposed purchase of his property. But during the month of September, long after the option had expired, a correspondence took place between the sitting member for Beauharnois and the government itself. And I submit to the House, that it is impossible to read that correspondence, which is set out at length in the report that is proposed to be made in this matter, and not arrive at the conclusion that, by that correspondence, the sitting member for Beauharnois was made aware in an unmistakable manner, officially made

aware, made aware as much as if that knowledge had been brought home to him solemnly by notarial notification, that it was the government that was seeking to acquire this property. On the 8th of September, I believe it was, the sitting member for Beauharnois received from the Department of Public Works a request for a map of the town of Valleyfield, and the reason for the request given in that communication was that the map was required by the department in order to complete—not to initiate, but to complete—the purchase of a post office site in the town of Valleyfield. Members in this House will naturally say! This may have been an intimation to the member for Beauharnois that the government was completing the purchase of a site in the town of Valleyfield for this long desired post office, but where do you find in that communication any proof that it was Mr. Loy's property the purchase of which was intended by the government? Sir, a doubt may exist upon that point in regard to the communication of the 8th of September. We may assume in favour of the hon. member that he was not obliged to conclude from that communication any more than this—that at that time the purchase of a property in his own town and in his own constituency was being completed by the government. And we can understand that, under certain circumstances, as member for that constituency and as being informed on the 8th of September that this, to these people, most momentous question was being finally concluded, he should not have pushed his investigation any further. Certain it is that the plan was immediately forwarded by the sitting member to the department and his letter is on record in the proceedings of this committee. That letter refers to the question of the purchase of a site for the post office for the town of Valleyfield. Members of this House may take communication of that letter of the sitting member for Beauharnois and of his reference to the question of a post office in his constituency, and from it draw their own conclusion. But, Sir, another communication was sent to the hon. member. The receipt of this plan and of his letter and of his suggestions was acknowledged by the government in a letter dated a few days later, and also to be found in the printed report. In that letter, the secretary of the department thanked the hon. member for the plan which he had sent and states clearly that that plan was required from him by the government in order to complete the purchase of the property of Mr. R. B. Johnston, in the town of Valleyfield. This is what is stated in the communication:

> Sir, I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 9th September inst., inclosing a copy of the plan of the city of Valleyfield, said plan being required by the department in connection with the purchase of Mr. R. B. Johnston's property.

That is dated the 16th September. Now, was it possible after the receipt of this communication for the sitting member for Beauharnois to be in doubt for a single instant as to what was the part that Mr. Johnston was playing in this transaction? He knew at that time, and if he did not know as a man learned in the law, he could have found out, that this property designated to him as R. B. Johnston's was his own property, and that the Mr. Johnston mentioned in this communication had no more right to the property than I have, that the option had lapsed and that consequently what was being prepared in the department was the report of the department, no doubt the Order in Council, required for the purchase of the property which on that date, the 16th September, was the property of the sitting member for Beauharnois and his property alone. On the 17th, or about that date, the report of the department was prepared. That report was forwarded to Council on the 22nd November following only and the Order in Council was passed authorizing the acquisition of this property from Mr. R. B. Johnston. I say again, because it is a circumstance of much importance and we have the proof in the proceedings of this committee, that during this time the sitting member for Beauharnois was in want of money and that he desired very naturally to see this sale terminated. There is no doubt of that. At that time there was a desire on the part of the sitting member to close this transaction and receive a part of the purchase price. There was a mortgage on this property and if the House will refer to the statement which was produced before the committee which was contained in this report the House will find that there were very considerable arrears of interest due on this mortgage. Nevertheless, during all this time, during the month of October, during the month of November and up to the very moment that the deed of sale was signed on the 1st December, the sitting member for Beauharnois, having all this knowledge officially conveyed to him, seems to have taken no steps whatever—in fact he says he took no steps—to find out what was the truth in regard to Mr. Johnston's role—his singular role, as it must have appeared to him—in this transaction. I say it is impossible to read the evidence in this case without arriving at the conclusion that steps were taken by the sitting member for Beauharnois, or by some person on his behalf, to hurry this transaction through. There is correspondence, there is a letter from the deputy Minister of Justice; and from this correspondence and this letter, anybody must arrive at the conclusion that steps were taken to hurry this transaction through. But, on the 1st December, a couple of days after these steps had been taken, there was no money to fulfil the essential condition of the contract; there was no money to pay the

vendor. The sitting member for Beauharnois was in the office of the notary, Mr. Johnston, who had not been seen by anybody, very naturally from the moment on the 14th July preceding after he had fulfilled his part of the transaction was there, the notary was there and there was no money. What happened? Through the interposition of Mr. Dandurand, the real estate agent chosen by the department to carry this transaction through, a note was discounted in the Sovereign Bank under the signature of Mr. Johnston without any credit that we could see attached to Mr. Johnston but on the representations made by Mr. Dandurand himself the personal note of Mr. Johnston with a bank with which he had never had any transaction whatever, was discounted for $10,000. The deed was then signed and the proceeds of the note were placed in the hands of the notary who was, as I have said, the agent both of the sitting member for Beauharnois as notary and as well the notary of the government. The notary handed over immediately the sum of $1,000 to the vendor and kept the balance to extinguish the mortgage of $4,500 and also to pay the amount of the accumulated interest which figured up I think to some $731. On the 18th, after having attended on behalf of the sitting member and on behalf also of the government to the discharge of this mortgage, Mr. Dunton, the notary, paid over the balance to the sitting member for Beauharnois, some $3,360. Now, the sale made by the sitting member to Mr. Johnston was for the sum of $10,000, but on the day when the sale, long suspended, was carried out, on the 1st December, Mr. Johnston seems to have reported to the sitting member that he was entitled to some $300. The evidence given by the sitting member is that the representation made to him by Mr. Johnston was that Mr. Johnston had trouble in negotiating to find the money. I assume, Sir, that we must give the sitting member credit for ordinary intelligence and he knew and knew positively, at that time that this Mr. Johnston had not in reality deeded this property over to the government that that part of the transaction had been decided weeks before; yet, if we are to accept his statement upon the representation made by this man that he required $300, he abandoned to him this sum of $300, and the deed of sale instead of being for the sum of $10,000, the exact sum voted by parliament, the exact sum available and the only sum available for that purpose that year; the exact sum which is mentioned in the subsequent deed of sale by Johnston to the government, was for the sum of $9,700. How the sitting member could have accepted this statement that Mr. Johnston notified to him in the official letter of the secretary of the Department of Public Works weeks previously as the man who was selling this property to the government; how I say the sitting member could have accepted this plea for the payment of $300 and accepted it upon the reasons alleged by Mr. Johnston, it is for the House to decide.

Now, Sir, this note for $10,000 was renewed. It was kept in the bank until further pressure from some parties—whether acting on behalf of the sitting member or otherwise—until further pressure was brought to bear upon the government to issue an official cheque. That cheque was issued from the Auditor General, from the Department of Finance, and it was made payable to whom? It was made payable to Mr. R. B. Johnston and also to the order of the notary, Mr. Dunton, who was, I claim, the agent, the appointee, the chosen notary of the sitting member for Beauharnois as well as the notary also chosen by Mr. Dandurand, and finally designated specially by the Department of Justice to act for that department in this affair. That cheque came to Montreal and on the day it arrived in Montreal, with the proceeds of that cheque, this note lying in the Sovereign Bank for over a month was taken up and Mr. Johnston signed his deed of sale to the govfernment. Now, Sir, it is apparent, I think, to the members of this House that Johnston never acted in this matter in any other capacity but as the agent of the government. It is clear from the documents produced and the evidence of Mr. Dandurand, that Mr. Dandurand was the agent directly named by the government, and that Mr. Johnston never for a single moment occupied any other position than that of sub-agent named by Mr. Dandurand to secure an option upon this property. Therefore he had no interest in the transaction but that of a paid employee, and from the moment he returned to Montreal and handed over his option and made report to Mr. Dandurand that he had fulfilled the duty required of him, he was paid off and disappeared from this transaction and never reappeared until the day when it became necessary—not to secure his intervention for any purpose relating to the completion of this transaction, not to treat with the government whose agent in reality he was as to the price, but merely to intervene in the notary's office to sign the authentic deed containing word for word all the stipulations contained in the previously signed deed between the sitting member for Beauharnois and this sub-agent himself. Sir, I do not wish to take up unduly the time of the House but it seems to me that the circumstances of this case disclose as clear an infraction of section 10 of chapter 11 of the Act relating to the independence of parliament as it would be possible to place before this House. Few cases I submit could be clearer. In matters of this kind as in many other matters with which members of the legal profession are familiar, where it is designed to evade the law, titles never pass directly; it passes through the agency of interposed persons, and who

bears that characteristic more in the present instance than the man Johnston who acted throughout this transaction? As to the knowledge of the sitting member I say that it is impossible after the communications which passed between the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Loy) and the government itself, weeks before this sale was completed; it is impossible for members of this House to arrive at any other conclusion, than that, at the time the sale was made on the 1st of December, the sitting member for Beauharnois knew perfectly well what was the role filled and to be filled by Mr. Johnston in this matter. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the amendment which I have proposed is well founded, and I would repeat that it seems to me that in bringing this matter to the notice of the House I have fulfilled a duty of which not only the public but the members of this House themselves ought to be grateful in a certain sense and in a certain degree. There was a time Sir, speaking more particularly for my own province, when there was no law in reference to the independence of members who sat in the representative assembly. I venture to assert without fear of contradiction that since that time there has been a tendency to violate to a certain degree that cardinal principle of the absolute independence of the members of this House, without which this House would be reduced to a state of absolute inutility. Under these circumstances it seems to me that every effort made for the absolute restoration of that independence so essential to the proper working of our representative institutions, is a step taken in the right direction.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (St. Mary's, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is incumbent on me to answer the observations that have just been made by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I gladly acquit him of any improper motives on this occasion. He has stated, and I for one accept his statement in toto, that he has been animated by the desire of fulfilling his duty. He has invited his colleagues to take his word and I take his word. I would have been very pleased however if he had extended to myself and to Mr. Loy the same treatment, and had accepted our word. Mr. Loy and I have both stated on our word of honour the transaction as it took place. Mr. Loy stated on his honour that he had no knowledge of the purpose for which that property was acquired by Mr. Johnston. I stated on my word of honour that Mr. Loy never approached me and that I have never approached him when he was a member of parliament in reference to this matter. This personal question settled, permit me to call attention to the wording of my hon. friend's indictment. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) states first.

That in 1898 Mr. Loy had sold his property when he was not a member of parliament, to Mr. Archambault.

With that the House has no concern. We have nothing to do with transactions carried on by gentlemen before they are elected to this House. The indictment as far as the sitting member is concerned is as follows:—

That from the time the said George Loy handed his said property to Archambault up to the day of the sale of said property to the Crown or government of Canada, he never ceased to be the proprietor of said property, and that at the time of the sale of said property on the 20th January, 1903, said Robert Brice Johnston was merely acting for and on behalf of said Loy, who in said manner did indirectly sell his said property to the Crown or government of Canada.

This is a very serious charge. My hon. friend, on information that he had received, has made to the House a statement that when Mr. Johnston bought Mr. Loy's property, he, Johnston, was acting on behalf of Mr. Loy himself—that in point of fact Johnston had been appointed as the agent of Mr. Loy to sell his property to that department. This is the gist of the charge. I ask my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier whether he has substantiated that charge in any way whatever? Has it been established by a tittle of evidence that Mr. Johnston was the agent of Mr. Loy? Why, Mr. Loy and Mr. Johnston have stated under oath that they did not know each other. Johnston had never met Mr. Loy, and Mr. Loy did not know Johnston even by sight. The Department of Public Works did not know Johnston. As my hon. friend has just said, before taking his seat, Johnston acted as an agent for Mr. Dandurand. He was paid for his services, not by Mr. Loy, but by Dandurand himself. It is true, Mr. Loy consented to give him $300 of the price of sale; but at that time Mr. Loy did not know that Johnston had been acting for the government. Now, my hon. friend will be obliged to recognize that he has utterly failed to establish the real point of his statement, that is to say, that Johnston was acting on behalf of Mr. Loy. That is the only point with which the House is concerned. I will not discuss the law in the matter. I will not follow my hon. friend in the statement he has made that the law might involve Mr. Loy in trouble because the deed of sale was not passed immediately. The main fact is that Mr. Loy did not know Johnston. Johnston, then, did not act for Mr. Loy. It is in evidence that Johnston was employed by Mr. Dandurand. In what capacity did Dandurand act? The letters that are in evidence show. When on a tour of inspection of the different works of the department I called at Valleyfield. Parliament had placed at the disposal of the department the sum of $10,000 to erect a public building there. It was then my duty to choose a site. I proceeded to the town, I found that a government site on which perhaps I might have cast my eyes was no longer available, as it had been rented by the Department of Railways and

Canals some time previous. There was no other government property which was fit for a public edifice. I made up my mind that the Loy site was the only one that was really fit, and I immediately instructed Mr. Dandurand, whom I knew very well, who is a trusted real estate agent in Montreal, to acquire immediately the Loy site. I was aware that I could not purchase Mr. Loy's property with his knowledge that the government was purchasing from him. I instructed Mr. Dandurand accordingly. Not to awaken a suspicion, he appointed a sub-agent. That sub-agent went to Mr. Loy, represented to him that he wanted the property for commercial purposes, and took an option on the 14th of July. On the 16th of July the option was completed in Montreal, $100 being paid down as a guarantee of good faith, the deed to be passed later on. From that date Mr. Loy was no longer the owner of his former property. He had nothing more to do with it. He had pledged himself to sell, and practically had sold. Every man of business will agree that when a man has given an option on a property, he is no longer the owner of that property, but has sold it. The deed had to be executed; that was all that had to be done. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier lays a good deal of stress on the fact that in the month of September, before the final deed of sale was executed, Mr. Loy was communicated with by the secretary of the Department of Public Works. I was away then. Mr. Dandurand, the government agent, had communicated to the department officially the fact that he had secured the property that was indicated to him. Let the House not lose sight of this fact, that in the month of August, before these communications took place between the department and Mr. Loy, Mr. Dandurand had officially notified the department that he had secured the property he had been instructed to secure. There is written evidence in the record of that fact. Then the department was officially acquainted with the fact that the property was ours. There was only the ordinary procedure to be followed, and that is just what was followed. When the department is notified that a site has been secured, before passing the deed, the department sends an official to ascertain whether the site has been rightly chosen, and whether the price agreed upon is not too high. That is just what was done in this case. Mr. Routhier, an architect of the Department of Public Works, proceeded to the town of Valleyfield, and carried out the procedure which I have just indicated, and it was to give effect to the sale of which we had been notified that Mr. Gélinas, the secretary of the department, asked Mr. Loy, in the ordinary way of business, for a map of the town. Mr. Gélinas was not then aware of the different phases through which the sale had passed, I was not obliged to tell my officers what I had done. Mr. Gélinas acted in the ordinary way of business. He communicated with the sitting member for information which he might have got elsewhere. Surely if there had been any desire to conceal that transaction from the public, the Deparment of Public Works would have acted differently. The whole thing was carried out in perfect good faith. My hon. friend was surprised at the delay that took place in completing the purchase. Well, in the month of August the ministers were away, I was away, and it was only on the 17th of September that I ordered a report to be prepared. There was no sitting of the Council, and some time afterwards I resigned. Therefore, the delay on which my hon. friend has laid so much stress is very easily explained. The correspondence between Mr. Gélinas and Mr. Loy is also very easily explained. I do not desire to say much more on that question; I am a layman, and am judging things of that kind in the ordinary way in which laymen judge them. Mr. Loy gave an option on the 14th of July. On the 16th of July that option was executed and a sum of money paid in cash as a guarantee of good faith. From that day Mr Loy considered himself no longer the owner of the property. Mr. Dandurand had appointed Mr. Johnston as his agent without the knowledge of Mr. Loy or the Department of Public Works. Mr. Johnston carried out his mission in concealing from Mr. Loy the object of his errand. He went to the town of Valleyfield and explained to Mr. Loy that he wanted the property for commercial purposes. Mr. Loy inquired whether the purchase was for the government, and Mr. Johnston said no it was for other purposes. Mr. Loy did not know a word about the object of Mr. Johnston's mission, he did not know Johnston. On information that he received, my hon. friend took upon himself to assert that he was in a position to prove that Johnston was acting on behalf of the sitting member and that the sitting member was trying fraudulently to evade the law. That is the charge made. It is that Mr. Loy, knowing that he could not sell directly, appointed Mr. Johnston as his agent and that the two men were acting fraudulently. That charge my hon. friend has tried to prove. He has admitted himself that Mr. Johnston acted all through as the paid agent of Mr. Dandurand, and consequently of the government. It is evident that Johnston never acted as the agent of Mr. Loy. Then I ask: How can the sitting member be said to have been guilty of any fraudulent act? The House and the country will say no. Any man of good faith will say no. And without casting any reproach on my hon. friend, accepting his statement that he has acted in good faith, I verily believe he would have acted more creditably to himself and have shown greater regard for

the honour and dignity of the House, if he had agreed to the suggestion made to him by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, and accepted the statement which Mr. Loy and myself made on our honour that the transaction had been carried out in the way it has been. But my hon. friend, proceeding on information he had received from the outside, saw fit not to accept our statement. The question was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Mr. Loy was examined under oath. He repeated under oath what he had said in the House, that he did not know for whom Mr. Johnston was buying his property. I was examined under oath, and I swore that Mr. Loy never approached me nor did I approach him since his election to parliament. It is true that in 1898, before Mr. Loy was a member, and when he was the first magistrate of the town of Valleyfield, a petition was signed suggesting as a suitable site for a public building, Mr. Loy's property. Parliament had not then voted any money for a public building. But the citizens of the town of Valleyfield were anxious to have a public building, and they recommended the Loy property as the best site. When Mr. Loy signed that petition, he had sold his property to a Mr. Archambault, and was no longer the owner. Later on, however, Archambeault did not pay, and Mr. Loy took it back. When he signed the petition in 1898 he was not the owner, but even if he had been, he was not a member of parliament, and but only the mayor of the town; and though it might be said to be a little risky, he had right, as well as anybody else, to sign the petition. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has reminded the House that in 1898 Mr. Loy had sold to Mr. Archambault for the sum of $8,000, and that the government paid $10,000 for the same property; but my hon. friend knows that it is clearly established in the evidence that from 1898 to 1902 property in Valleyfield has increased by leaps and bounds. One of the statements which my hon. friend has made in his indictment is that the property sold to the government was sold at a price exceeding its value, and that the assessors had valued it at $5,000. In point of fact, the indictment of my hon. friend, from beginnng to end, is a charge of fraudulent conduct between Mr. Loy and myself, because if the property had been paid far too high, if Mr. Loy acted fraudulently in bonding it to Mr. Johnston, both Mr. Loy and myself are guilty. I am guilty for having closed my eyes to a transaction in which a member of parliament was involved and also to the fact that the property was purchased at too high a price. Sir, I took every possible precaution, and the evidence justifies my course from beginning to end. The evidence has established that property in Valleyfield is assessed at two-thirds and sometimes one-half of its value. One of the assessors, himself a political friend of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, swore that in his official capacity he was accustomed to value property at two-thirds and sometimes at one-half its real value.

That point is clear, and on that score, as to the others, my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has failed, I know he has acted in good faith. He had his information from parties who have told him stories that he should not have believed. The transaction was carried on in an honest way; and, indeed, I can only repeat what I said on a former occasion, that I am so sorry that my hon. friend the sitting member for Beauharnois has been subjected to such an annoyance. Let me tell the House that no more honest man has ever lived in any country than my hon. friend from Beauharnois. He is an honest man in the very best sense of the word. And that is the main reason, perhaps why the French Roman Catholic riding of Beauharnois elected him, an elder in the Presbyterian church, as their representative in this House. He was an honest man then, he is an honest man to-day. He has not violated the law willingly or knowingly, and I hope he has not violated even the letter of the law. The proverb says that the letter of the law kills. I hope it will not kill on the present occasion, for the spirit of the law has not been violated. The hon. member for Beauharnois did not know what I was doing in this matter. I concealed my actions from him; the department concealed their actions from him. He has acted in perfect good faith; he has sold at its real value a property that could be sold to-day at a profit. It is in evidence that a property smaller than his could not be bought then for less than $13,000 cash. The value of property in the town of Valleyfield has been going up by leaps and bounds within recent years.

Well, Sir, I think I have covered all the points that deserve to be covered: The property was not bought too dear; Mr. Loy had no knowledge of the object for which it was purchased; Mr. Johnston did not act as his agent. There remains nothing except the fact that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier has been wrongly informed by parties who had other purposes to serve than promoting the public interest. I quite understand that political warfare must be carried on. It is a case of political warfare on the part of the informants of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier. He has given his word to us and to the country, and I take his word. But our word must be taken also. While taking my hon. friend's word, as I am glad to do, and as I am bound to do, yet I say without hesitation that those who informed him have been acting from purely party motives. Such sentiments should not be—and I hope will not often have occasion to be—ventilated in this House. When the case is as clear as

it has been made, it seems to me we should not have held the long investigation we have held, the result of which is now known to the country at large.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). As I was a member of the committee to which this question was referred, and as I concurred in the minority report now under discussion, I desire to say, in as few words as possible, why I formed the opinion I did, that the minority report should be sent to this House, and why I think this House should receive and adopt it. The question was not one as put by the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) of the moral wrong or moral guilt upon the part of the member for Beauharnois, but whether that gentleman committed an act, which, under the statute relating to the independence of parliament voided his seat. The question arose under section 10, which is in these words :

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada, on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any officer of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House.

Now, the sole question was whether Mr. Loy, while member for Beauharnois, had brought himself within the terms of that section. Of one thing there is no question whatever, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Public Works intended to buy this property from Mr. Loy. There is no question whatever that the department resolved to make that purchase through the interposition of an agent. The minister employed a Mr. Dandurand to make the purchase, and that agent of the government simply sent an employee of his to do the work. Now, what occurred ? Mr. Johnston, who was the sub-agent or employee of Mr. Dandurand, went down to Valleyfield and there saw Mr. Loy. After an hour's discussion, or less than an hour's discussion, Mr. Johnston obtained a written option from Mr. Loy for the purchase of this property for $10,000. Now, just here it is necessary to recall the fact that for three or four years prior to the closing of this transaction, the construction of a public building in Valleyfield and the purchase of property for that purpose was a burning question there. Before Mr. Loy became a member of the House, while he was mayor of Valleyfield, he had taken part in deputations that had come to Ottawa to urge that a public building should be constructed in Valleyfield, which was within what afterwards became his constituency. It was known to him that many of the people of Valleyfield were urging that Mr. Loy's own property should be purchased by the government for the purpose of this public building. Mr. Loy first became a member of this House in 1900, and at the following session there was a sum of $10,000 placed in the estimates for the purpose of this public building in Valleyfield. Under circumstances that we need not go into here, Mr. Loy lost his seat in this House, and was subsequently re-elected at a by-election. He became a member of this House again in 1902, and again the vote of $10,000 was placed in the estimates and granted by this House for the purpose of this public building. So it stood until July, 1902, when this Mr. Johnston being sent out by the agent of the government, saw Mr. Loy and negotiated with him for the purchase of the Loy property. And, shortly, they agreed that there should be an option given for two days to sell this property to Mr. Johnston in his name for the same sum of $10,000, the amount that was in the estimates for the building at Valleyfield. Mr. Johnston, in the course of the conversation, was asked by Mr. Loy this question :

Well, Mr. Loy said, now it is not for the government is it ?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what induced Mr. Loy to ask that question ? Was it not his consciousness that what had been going on for three or four years was now culminating in the purchase of the property ? Was it not his suspicion, at least, that the person who was there offering to him, or willing to contract with him for $10,000 to buy this property, was really an undisclosed agent of the government ? He asked him a question, and what is the answer ? Mr. Johnston says :

That, Mr. Loy, is a matter that interests me, whether I wish to deal with outsiders or the government.

Now, surely that answer alone was sufficient to put Mr. Loy upon inquiry, he knowing at the time that he could not sell that property to the government without forfeiting his seat in parliament. But the matter does not rest there. There are further circumstances that bring the knowledge more clearly to Mr. Loy. The acceptance declared that Mr. Johnston was to complete the purchase, and obtain his deed, and pay the purchase money within fifteen days. He did not do so, and apparently nothing was done. The matter was allowed to lie in suspense until December, but some correspondence passed in the meantime. On the 8th of September a clerk in the Public Works Department telegraphs to Mr. Loy :

Kindly see the city clerk and ask him to forward us by next mail, if possible, a copy of the plan of the city of Valleyfield, which is needed to complete the purchase of site for public building.

Now, I would call attention to the fact that at this time the contract with Johnston was in suspense, no action was taken upon it. Mr. Loy knew that the question of the

public building related to his property; he knew he had given an option to this man and had not yet received his purchase money, yet without a word with the department without a word of inquiry he sends the plan. 'Are you buying some property; whose property are you buying?—would have been natural questions for the member for the constituency to ask, especially in the interests of the citizens of Valleyfield. He gets that plan, and he sends it to the Public Works Department with this letter:

Your telegram received last night. I send you herewith, inclosed, the only plan of the town which I could get. I am informed that Mr. Sullivan, the former engineer of the town, has a new plan, but he is away from home today. I will see him on his return, and if he will lend it I will send it or take it up to you. I would call your attention to the fact that at present there are two post offices in the town, one in the central part and another near the Canada Atlantic Railway station, in Bellerive ward.

These latter words are significant, as written by a gentleman who had no knowledge that his own property was being bought by the government. There Mr. Loy clearly shows that he knows what is the object of this purchase, it was in connection with a further post office that the town was claiming, and which the government was about to construct, and for which a vote was in the estimates of the year. The plan being sent, the clerk in the Public Works Department writes a further letter, which even more clearly brings home to Mr. Loy the knowledge that it was his own property that was being dealt with:

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 9th September instant, inclosing a copy of the plan of the city of Valleyfield, said plan being required by the department in connection with the purchase of Mr. R. B. Johnston's property.

Mr. R. B. Johnston was the man who held an option for the purchase of that property from Mr. Loy, the man who was in default, who had not carried out his undertaking to pay for the property within fifteen days. Johnston is apparently selling this property to the government, and Mr. Loy is to be assumed as supposing that he was acting as a man who had acquired and then owned the property, and was selling it again for an advance, perhaps, upon the price. Now, is it conceivable that that could be so? Is it possible to conceive for one moment that a man of the intelligence that we all know Mr. Loy possesses, would not see at once that Mr. Johnston was simply an intermediary of the government, and that he had been sent there to get round the provision of the statute; Mr. Loy knew he could not sell to the government directly, that the government ought not to buy from him directly, and so a Mr. Johnston was interposed? Mr. Johnston gets an option to purchase, he does not carry it out, but the transaction is going on in the Public Works Department, and Mr. Loy is asked to furnish a plan. He knows it is to be for a public building, and he knows it has relation to this Mr. Johnston who held an option from him, and he would have us believe that he had no suspicion that the purchase by Johnston was for the government.

Now, I do not wish to occupy any longer the time of the House. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has gone into the whole of the circumstances very fully. I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that if, under such circumstances as are here stated, it is possible for a member of this House to sell property to the government through an intermediary, the Independence of Parliament Act is absolutely waste paper. Any member can buy from or can sell to the government, and the government can buy from any member by merely sending down a person to carry out the transaction, a third person, who is merely a nominal party in the bargain. I do not wish to comment further upon the case except to say this, that although Mr. Low was kept until the 1st of December—the option having been given in July, to be carried out within fifteen days—although he was kept until the 1st of December before he got his money, he allowed Mr. Johnston to keep $300 out of the prchase money; instead of allowing him to keep $300 out of the purchase money, if there was anything that one side should be paid by the other, it was that Mr. Loy should have received interest from Mr. Johnston.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). I do not propose to detain the House very long; I think it will be sufficient for me to make but a few remarks in regard to this matter. The facts as they are now before us were disclosed at the beginning of the session, all the circumstances were communicated to the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), but he did not think them of sufficient importance to warrant him in taking any action upon them. We are told by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that he knew of these facts previously to the beginning of the session. He has told us that he is very anxious to preserve the rules and privileges of the House; and yet he sat in his seat and allowed Mr. Loy to sit here for four months and a half in violation, as he believed, of the statute, without saying one word. He did not move in the matter until he was urged to do so by some influence or other, and that influence cannot have been from the hon. gentlemen who sit upon the other side of the House, because they did not take enough interest in the matter to appear before the committee, only two or three of them. I do not know where the influence came from, but I have a very shrewd suspicion. Now, the facts that were disclosed to us are these: First, that Mr. Loy, in January, 1898, gave a promise of sale of this piece of property to Mr. Archambault, and that

that promise of sale was afterwards discharged, along in June. So far, there is no dispute. But there was the further statement in the charge that, although this promise was absolute, there was a secret agreement between Mr. Loy and Mr. Archambault which raised a suspicion that the promise was given for the purpose of enabling Mr. Archambault to make a sale of the property to the government in the interest of Mr. Loy. Mr. Archambault came upon the stand and testified himself, strongly, that such was not the case, that there was no agreement whatever between himself and Mr. Loy to that effect, and Mr. Loy said the same thing. It further transpired that Mr. Archambault took possession of the property. During the months that he had it he moved the buildings and did other things and made a loss of $800, and he only failed to carry out the arrangement because he could not get the money for that purpose. The committee very properly concluded that this transaction in 1898 had nothing whatever to do with what has been charged against Mr. Loy. Another matter that has been charged against Mr. Loy is that the purchase by the government of this property was a purchase by the government from Mr. Loy through the agency of Mr. Johnston. The words of the charge are as follows :

That from the time the said George Loy handed his said property to Archambault up to the day of the sale of said property to the Crown or government of Canada, he never ceased to be the proprietor of said property, and that at the time of the sale of said property on the 20th January, 1903, said Robert Bruce Johnston was merely acting for and on behalf of said Loy, who in said manner did indirectly sell his said property to the Crown or government of Canada, in violation of chapter II. of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 'An Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.'

I will admit that if the statement had been correct, then Mr. Loy would have violated the statute, but it is not correct even according to the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Monk) himself, because, to-day, upon the floor of this House, he does not pretend to say that Mr. Johnston was the agent of Mr. Loy, but he turns it now and says that Mr. Johnston was the agent of the government. There is the crux of the whole situation. If he had been the agent of Mr. Loy, or if he had to the knowledge of Mr. Loy been the agent of the government, then, there would have been a violation of the statute, but surely no hon. member would pretend to say that if Mr. Johnston was not the agent of Mr. Loy, and if Mr. Loy had no knowledge of the agency of Mr. Johnston on behalf of the government, Mr. Loy has committed any breach of the statute. If I am not correct in that, then, I will warn hon. gentlemen on the other side to be very careful before they sell property, because the government could send out an agent to purchase a piece of property no matter how small from one of their number and then some hon. member might get up in the House make a charge against the party selling the property and we would have to turn him out. That is a proposition that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), a lawyer stands up in the House and makes. It seems a surprising thing that he should pretend to support such a proposition as that. Let us refer to the statute and see what it says. Section 10, I believe, is the section that hon. gentlemen opposite claim has been violated :

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing, any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House.

I would like hon. gentlemen to note well the construction of this section :

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, &c.

That is if he sells the property to the government himself he commits an offence. If he sells the property by means of an agent or trustee then he violates the statute. That is the reasonable construction of the statute, and that is the evil that the statute was intended to remedy. The object of the statute was to put it beyond the power of the government to in any indirect way bribe the representatives who sit in the House, but I cannot conceive of any lawyer pretending to argue in favour of the other interpretation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If an agent of the government goes to a member of parliament and buys a property from him and the member of parliament does not know at that time that the agent is the agent of the government but he discovers it before the bargain is completed that this man is really buying for the government does the hon. gentleman think that is not covered by the statute ?

Mr. WADE. I did not say that at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to know.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman shall know. I thought I made the hon. gentleman understand me as I went along, but, if I have failed, that is my misfortune. If he finds out before the sale is completed of course he does know. My proposition is simply this, and it is so plain to my mind that it does not need any demonstration, that if the party does not know at all surely he cannot be liable under this section, but if he does know that the agent is acting for the government, then, of course, he is liable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. My hon. friends say 'hear, hear.' I am glad that I have been able to make them see this thing as I see it. The question is: Did Mr. Loy know that Mr. Johnston was acting as agent for the government? I make bold to say that there is not one word of testimony to support that position. But, there is the emphatic evidence of Mr. Loy, the emphatic evidence of Mr. Tarte, and the emphatic evidence of Mr. Johnston, all the other way showing that Mr. Loy did not know that Mr. Johnston was acting as the agent of the government. What did Mr. Loy know, and what did Mr. Johnston say? Mr. Loy, in the first instance, asked Mr. Johnston if this property was for the government. It was a very ordinary question to ask. What answer did he receive? It is a question for me whether I deal with the government or with outsiders. That was Mr. Johnston's reply. Is that not a proper answer for a man who is buying property to make? If I go to Mr. A to buy his property from him, if he states his price and I am willing to give the price, has Mr. A any right to limit the parties to whom I shall sell that property? If Mr. Johnston had bona fide purchased the property had he not a perfect right to go out and sell it to the government the next day or at any time that he saw fit? Mr. Johnston gave Mr. Loy to understand that he needed the property for a departmental store, and Mr. Loy has told us in his testimony that he believed that he was selling the property to him, but I submit here as a reasonable proposition that if Mr. Loy, at the time he sold his property, believed honestly in his mind that he was selling it to Mr. Johnston it does not make the slightest difference what was in the mind of Mr. Johnston. When did Mr. Loy have the first knowledge that the government was going to get this property? According to his evidence it was long afterwards, nearly two months afterwards on the receipt from the secretary of the Department of Public Works of the letter acknowledging the receipt of a plan he had sent and which letter stated that the plan was required for the purpose of concluding the purchase of the property from Mr. Johnston.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. I hope my hon. friends will be quiet until I am done. At that time had Mr. Loy knowledge that Mr. Johnston had negotiated a sale of the property to the government? Certainly, and he does not deny that for a moment, but he had no knowledge at the time Mr. Johnston was acting as agent of the government in the purchase of the property.

Mr. LANCASTER. I was not able to be at the committee all the time and the evidence not having been printed, I am obliged to ask questions to know what the evidence was, because I have no means of knowing. Did Mr. Loy say where he supposed the government were going to build the post office?

Mr. WADE. I do not know that there was ever anything said about it. There was an attempt on the part of Mr. Monk to prove that the government had a site there which they could have built on, but he has abandoned that as he has abandoned the statement made by him that the price paid for this property was too large. The statement made by Mr. Loy was that he had no knowledge of the government getting this property until long after he had concluded the terms of sale, and had received $100 on account.

Mr. BENNETT. And did not get the consideration.

Mr. WADE. Certainly he did not get the consideration; that has been stated half a dozen times over. He only received $100 on account, and he was under promise to convey the property to Mr. Johnston, and the evidence shows that he did not know that Johnston was the agent of the government until long after the deed had been passed and until after the whole money had been paid to him. I am not quite as suspicious as some hon. gentlemen opposite and that is the reason why I am not ready to condemn any man upon the mere statement of so flimsy a suspicion as has been put forward here. The last speaker also tried to make the point, that the option of sale was given in July for fifteen days, and that the sale was not concluded until December. Why, to my mind, that and the explanations that were given, afford the strongest argument in favour of the honesty of Mr. Loy and of his innocence and want of knowledge in this whole matter. The negotiations were going on and this Mr. Johnston was trying to get the money. It was a continuous contract, it had never been ended by Mr. Loy, he was anxious to sell his property, he needed the money to clear off the mortgage upon it, and finally at the suggestion of Johnston who said he had trouble in raising the money and that Loy would have to drop $300 from the price in order to enable him to expedite the obtaining of the money, Loy did so, and then Johnston went and negotiated his note with the Sovereign Bank in Montreal, obtained the money and paid it into the hands of the notary who, with the proceeds discharged the mortgage that was on the property and handed over the balance to Mr. Loy. Now it does seem to me that the only question we had to consider, and the only question we have to consider to-day is: Whether the statement of Mr. Loy in that connection is true or false. He has undertaken to swear, and he is supported in it by three other witnesses. that he never knew that Johnston was an agent of the government until after the deed had been passed. That is exactly the evidence and it is just as it appears.

He did know on September 16th that the government was buying property from Johnston and that is the statement contained in the letter——

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). The hon. gentleman has made a very important statement, and might I ask him when was the deed passed ?

Mr. WADE. The deed was signed in December if my memory serves me.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then surely he had the knowledge on the 8th September according to your own admission.

Mr. WADE. Not at all. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) does not seem to follow my remarks for the purpose of getting information, or otherwise he would have heard what I stated, and I stated it as emphatically as I could : that on the 16th day of September by the letter which Mr. Loy received from the secretary of the department, it was conveyed to his mind that the government was buying this property from Mr. Johnston. That is what I stated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. WADE. Now, I say that if Mr. Johnston purchased the property bona fide from Mr. Loy, had he not a perfect right to turn around and sell it to the government ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have not the evidence before us owing to the action that the government has taken, and so we do not understand this matter thoroughly, and consequently I have to ask a question. When was the sale from Loy to Johnston completed ?

Mr. WADE. The sale from Loy to Johnston was completed, if my memory serves me right on the first or second day of December.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought that was the date of the sale from Johnston to the Crown.

Mr. WADE. No. The date of the sale from Johnston to the government was away along in January.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a fact that this letter came to Mr. Loy's possession some six weeks before he completed the sale to Mr. Johnston ?

Mr. WADE. That is perfectly right. It came to his possession on or about the 16th or 17th of September.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The 8th of September.

Mr. WADE. The 8th of September, perhaps; it does not matter for a few days. That letter conveyed to his mind exactly what I have stated, that Johnston and the government were negotiating the purchase of that property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman another question. We have to get at the facts in this fragmentary way, not having the evidence printed. I do not quite understand the explanation of the rebate of $300 on the price. It has been alleged that the payment of $300 was really a commission paid by Mr. Loy to Mr. Johnston for his services as agent. My hon. friend (Mr. Wade) conveys a different view which must of course be considered because I was impressed by the statement made from this side of the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Wade) says that was an abatement and not a commission paid to Mr. Johnston; it was an abatement of the price which Mr. Johnston had agreed in the first instance to pay to Mr. Loy. Will my hon. friend give us the evidence as fully as possible with regard to that, because I think it bears pretty strongly upon the point we have to decide.

Mr. WADE. The evidence upon this point is : That the purchase price agreed upon between Loy and Johnston was $10,000, and there was to be no commission paid by Mr. Loy to Mr. Johnston and there was never any talk about commission at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Naturally there would not be—if it was a mere purchase.

Mr. WADE. It was a mere purchase. That was at the beginning of the transaction. Time went on until about the first of December or the last of November, when Mr. Johnston comes to Mr. Loy and tells him that he has great difficulty in securing the money and that Mr. Loy will have to make a reduction in the price—that is the evidence—and Mr. Loy who was in need of the money at the time finally agreed to make a reduction of $300 in the price.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask my hon. friend another question ? I have to apologize to him for interrupting him, but it is because of the evidence not being printed.

Mr. WADE. I am glad to have the hon. gentleman do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did Mr. Loy, at that time, inquire of Mr. Johnston what he was getting from the government ?

Mr. WADE. No. There is no evidence as to whether he did or not, but I would suggest this to the hon. gentleman, that if Mr. Loy had known that Mr. Johnston was getting $10,000 for the property, he would not have been very likely to have taken off the $300. There is another thing. Mr. Johnston was paid by the real estate agent, Mr. Dandurand, some $50 or $60 for his services in going out there and buying the property. That is where Mr. Johnston is supposed to have got his remuneration, but as a matter of fact Mr. Johnston manipulated the whole matter in such a way that he was able to get $300 in advance of the price he paid for the property.

Mr. LENNOX. When on the first or second of December an agreement was made to change the price, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) who is a prominent lawyer, inform the House whether he would regard that as a new contract entered into at that time, Mr. Johnston being in default on the first agreement ?

Mr. WADE. Certainly not. I would simply regard it as a modification of one of the terms of the contract that existed between them. There is no question about that. I do not know that I have anything more to say about this matter, Mr. Speaker. I should, I suppose, express my regret that my conduct as chairman of the committee was not pleasing to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, but then you know there is a certain class of lawyers who are very much given to abusing the judge who decides against them in a suit they should never have brought, and I do not see why I should not allow that privilege to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let me give my view of this transaction in just a few words. I will deal with the minority report and from that report it seems to me that there was an option got by a man named Johnston, who was agent for Mr. Dandurand in Montreal, who was employed by the Minister of Public Works for the purpose of purchasing this property. That option was obtained in July. The termination of the option was on the 31st of July. For that option he paid $100, Mr. Loy covenanting that he would have the right to purchase the property for $10,000. On the 8th of September, long after the option had expired, there is a letter or a telegram from an officer of the Department of Public Works, asking Mr. Loy to send up plans of this particular property.

Some hon. MEMEBRS. No, no.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will read the telegram :

> I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 9th September, inst., inclosing a copy of the plan of the city of Valleyfield, said plan being required by the department in connection with the purchase of Mr. R. B. Johnston's property.

For what purpose was the plan required ? For the purpose of the purchase of the property. The hon. chairman of the committee admits that Mr. Loy must have had knowledge that the government were purchasing this property when he received this letter. Then Mr. Loy had knowledge on the 8th of September that his property was being purchased by the government for the purpose of a public building. He was then under no obligation whatever to convey that property to Mr. Johnston.

Mr. COWAN. Why not ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The option had expired on the 31st of July.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not the fact.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then I am misinformed from the documents. The option was on the 16th of July, and was for fifteen days.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Read the option and its acceptance. Is it an option for ever? When does it expire ? The option expires within the fifteen days mentioned, and Mr. Loy was not obliged at any time afterwards to convey the property. At any rate, on the 8th of September following, he had notice from the government that the purchase was made on behalf of the government, and he makes a conveyance of the property on the 1st of December following, receiving the money and giving the deed. Is not that a knowledge by the party who is selling the property that he is virtually conveying it to the government which had purchased it for the purpose of erecting a post office ?

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I will not go over the ground convered by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), but I want to state how this matter strikes me. What are the facts in this case ? On the 14th of July, Mr. Johnston, who was acting as the agent of Mr. Dandurand in acquiring this property—and I am prepared to admit at once that the latter was the agent of the Department of Public Works—obtained an option from Mr. Loy which was to be exercised on the 16th of the same month. On the 16th of July the option was exercised, and $100 were paid by Mr. Johnston to Mr. Loy. There is absolutely nothing in the evidence which shows that Mr. Johnston himself knew that he was acting for the Crown. He was told by Mr. Dandurand to go and acquire this property, without being told for whom it was wanted. Mr. Dandurand himself knew that the property was required by the Crown.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Dandurand, in his evidence, makes it clear that he told Johnston that the property was required by the government.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is not my recollection. My recollection is that Johnston himself did not know at all that the property was required by the Crown.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He did not.

Mr. BELCOURT. And he assumed that it was required for the purpose of putting up a theatre or a departmental store.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Dandurand corrects that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Both Dandurand and Johnston swore that Johnston did not know for whom he was purchasing.

Mr. LENNOX. Does not the hon. gentleman remember that when Johnston was

giving his evidence, he said that he did know that the property was required for a post office, and that he knew that when he went down to Valleyfield ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. No.

Mr. LENNOX. And thought he had the right to exercise his own judgment in the selection of a site ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I have already stated my recollection of the evidence, and there is no use my repeating it. There is at any rate no dispute about the option having been exercised on the 16th of July, when $100 were paid by Mr. Johnston to Mr. Loy. That made the position the same as if on that day, instead of an agreement to sell being made, a conveyance had been actually executed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is my hon. friend aware that where property, to which a trust is attached, is sold to some one who is ignorant of the trust, but who, before the consideration money is paid, has knowledge of the trust, he is bound by the trust?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not see what this has to do with the question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will my hon. friend permit me to tell him ? If a member of parliament was approached for the purchase of a piece of property and entered into a bargain to sell it, not knowing that it was wanted for the Crown and if, before the consideration money is paid, he becomes aware of that fact, he would be within the terms of the statute.

Mr. BELCOURT. I take issue with my hon. friend on that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) was not bold enough for that.

Mr. BELCOURT. As a lawyer, with some knowledge of the law of Quebec, where the transaction took place, such would not be the case. Let me quote an authority. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition is perhaps not as familiar as we are with the Quebec Civil Code, but if he will turn up articles 1472 and 1476 he will find that I am right. 1472 says :

> Sale is a contract by which one party gives a thing to the other for a price in money which the latter obliges himself to pay for it.
>
> It is perfected by the consent alone of the parties although the thing sold is not then delivered.

Consent makes the sale perfect, and my contention is that on the 16th of July the title of the property passed from Loy to Johnston, and that anything that happened subsequently did not change the legal position of the parties. Article 1476 says :

> A simple promise of a sale is not equivalent to a sale, but the creditor may demand that the debtor shall execute a deed of sale in his favour according to the terms of the promise, and, in default of so doing, that the judgment shall be equivalent to such deed and have all its legal effects ; or he may recover damages according to the rules contained in the title of obligations.

On the 17th of July, and from that day until the 20th of January, 1903, when this conveyance was made, Mr. Johnston had the right to say to Mr. Loy : 'You must convey that property to me.' And if Mr. Loy had refused Mr. Johnston could have enforced his claim in the courts.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman say that the decisions I have quoted, and which have been uniformly followed in the province of Quebec, namely, that if a man does not conform to the conditions stated in the option, he cannot claim the property ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is jurisprudence, not law.

Mr. BELCOURT. In my opinion, a promise of sale, under the circumstances disclosed, accompanied by a payment on account, is as good a title as a conveyance. Does my hon. friend dispute that as a sound proposition ?

Mr. MONK. Of course I will deny that. I have quoted authority to show that you must conform to the conditions of the option.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is not a denial of my proposition. I am sure the hon. gentleman would be very careful about denying the proposition of law I have put. If that be so, the knowledge which Mr. Loy acquired some time in September—and I admit for the sake of argument that he received notice that the Department of Public Works wanted his property for this public building——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. He received notice that they had bought it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Assuming that Mr. Loy knew beyond doubt that that property was required for public purposes, he could not avoid the transaction which he had concluded with Mr. Johnston on the 16th July without laying himself open to an action at law to compel him to execute that conveyance. In order to determine whether this transaction was a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, we must go back to the 16th of July ; and if on that day the transaction was perfectly legitimate, then Mr. Loy did not commit any violation of the Act. There is absolutely nothing in the evidence which would warrant any one believing that Mr. Loy on the 16th of July had been notified or knew that the property was required by Johnston for other purposes than a departmental store or theatre. But hon. gentlemen opposite argue that the option had lapsed and that, as a matter of law, Mr. Loy could have

avoided the agreement he made on the 16th of July and should have avoided it because of the knowledge he had since acquired. I submit that that is also wrong in law. Under the law of the province of Quebec, he was bound to carry out his agreement. The delay in executing a deed of conveyance only gave him the right to claim interest. Article 1077 says :

The damages resulting from the delay in the payment of money, to which the debtor is liable, consist only of the interest at the rate legally agreed upon by the parties, or, in the absence of such agreement, at the rate fixed by law.

So far as the law is concerned, Mr. Loy was bound to carry it out notwithstanding the knowledge he had acquired two months later on. I want to point out a very glaring contradiction on the part of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, which shows most conclusively that—in his own mind, although perhaps he did not realize it for the moment—he was satisfied that the charge against Mr. Loy is disproved. Look at paragraph 8:

That from the time the said George Loy handed his said property to Archambault up to the day of the sale of the said property to the Crown or government of Canada, he never ceased to be the proprietor of said property—and that at the time of the sale of said property on the 20th January, 1903——

—and I call the attention of hon. members of the House to the following words :

—said Robert Bruce Johnston was merely acting for and on behalf of the said Loy.

So, my hon. friend charges that Mr. Johnston was the agent of Mr. Loy. And that was the charge, I submit that my hon. friend must prove in order to establish the fact that there had been a violation of the statutes.

Mr. WARD. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) permit me to ask him a question ? What would be the effect of the fifteen days mentioned in the acceptance of that option according to the laws of the province of Quebec ? How, long, for instance, after that fifteen days had expired would Johnston have the right to enforce that contract ? Will it go on for ever ?

Mr. BELCOURT. No, it does not go on for ever. The delay of fifteen days, as I understand it, was required by Johnston himself within which——

Mr. WARD. For looking into titles——

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes—within which Loy should convey the property to him. But there were difficulties in the way. Johnston was quite satisfied to take his deed later on, and I say that is all that we must look to, because Loy was bound to do that which Johnston required of him, notwithstanding the lapse of fifteen days.

Mr. WARD. Then, he could enforce it five years hence ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I cannot make my point if I am interrupted in this way. I was going to say that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier made the charge that Johnston was the agent of Loy ; and I say, and I think he will agree with me, that, in order to claim that Loy has committed a violation of the section, it was necessary to establish that point. For the section—section 10—says :

No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or any third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any officers of the government of Canada for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons or shall sit or vote in the said House.

What the Act contemplates is an agent on the part of the member against whom the charge is made, and not an agent on the part of the Crown. Otherwise, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) the seat of every member of this House would be in jeopardy continually. The statute provides that a member of the House shall not directly by himself or through an agent endeavour to sell his property to the Crown. And now, what has the hon. member for Jacques Cartier asked this House to declare ? Not only in his argument has he stated that it is not proven that Johnston was the agent of Loy, but by reference to the report which his motion asks this House to adopt, we find these words :

Under these circumstances, Mr. Loy could not have remained ignorant of the fact that Johnston, in the transaction with Mr. Loy, was an agent of the government.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the charge was that Johnston was the agent of Loy. Yet, my hon. friend is asking us to-day to declare that Johnston was the agent of the government. There is a flat contradiction which, to my mind, shows conclusively that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, in dealing with this evidence, himself concluded that the charge he had brought that Johnston was the agent of Loy had been disproved. Nobody disputes that Johnston was the agent of the government—he was employed by Mr. Dandurand, who, was the agent of the Crown. But Mr. Loy did not know this. And surely we are not going to declare that a member of this House has violated the independence of parliament by the sale of property if, on that day, he did not know that the purchaser was the agent of the Crown. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) would not follow the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He does not ask this House to say that there was any actual moral—I think he called it—violation of the statute, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier tells us.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member (Mr. Belcourt) must allow me to explain that I did not say that. I stated that it was not a question of moral wrong, but simply a question of whether there had been a violation of the words of the statute.

Mr. BELCOURT. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) to say that the most he would contend for was that there was a technical violation of the statute.

Mr. BARKER. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. Then, I do not press that. But it is clear that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has been compelled to say in this minority report that the other two charges that he made, namely, that the price was excessive, and that there was other property in Valleyfield suitable and available for the purpose of a public building, were disproved.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) must not misrepresent the report. It is said in the minority report, that we have confined the report to the direct question submitted to the committee. My hon. friend remembers perfectly well the nature of the evidence as to the value of the property as well as its availability as a site.

Mr. BELCOURT. I take it that if the hon. member (Mr. Monk) had been able to show to his own satisfaction that the price was excessive, he would not have been content to let that go without calling attention to it. Had it been shown by the evidence that the price paid by the ex-Minister of Public Works was excessive, it would have been the hon. member's duty to say so. Why did he include this in his charge if it was not relevant and necessary ? I think that the hon. member failed, on his own admission to show that too much was paid for the site or that there were other sites in the town available. And as to the other charge, the hon. member disposes of that himself by this motion declaring that Johnston was the agent for the government. The very essence of his charge was that Johnston was the agent of Mr. Loy. To establish that charge it must be shown that Loy must have known, at the time when the property was being acquired, that it was being acquired for the government. It seems to me that after the statement made by the hon. member for Beauharnois and the statement made by the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) might well have withdrawn his charge, because the evidence he had before him in the documents—and there is a great deal of documentary evidence—goes to show that, until two months after this option was given. Mr. Loy could never have known that this property was being acquired for government purposes. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier tells us, and we are bound to take his word for it, that he has no ulterior motives in making the charge. But, while we here are bound to accept his word, I think people outside will have a very shrewd idea that this was an attempt, perhaps on the part of a gentleman who used to sit in this House, if not on the part of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, to avenge himself upon a political opponent. I submit that the charges that were brought have been disproved by the evidence. And, in order to justify the vote I intend to give, I want nothing better than my hon. friend's own statement contained in his motion, that Johnston was the agent of the government, and not the agent of Mr. Loy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not intend to make any remarks on this matter, but the very astounding propositions laid down by my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) compel me to say a word or two. In the first place, I think it most unfortunate that the right hon. leader of the House, who, next to the Speaker, is responsible for the dignity and decorum of this House, saw fit, in his wisdom, to insist that we should discuss this matter without having the evidence printed and before us. The motion which the right hon. gentleman saw fit to have passed yesterday was that this question of the printing should be referred, if you please, to a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons. That is the position the matter stands in to-day. This question of printing the evidence touching the honour, and privileges, and prerogatives of this House is to be referred to a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons to determine whether it shall be printed. I do not regard that as a proper way of dealing with the question, and I venture to think that it was most unfortunate that the right hon. gentleman did not see fit to assent to the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier to have this evidence printed. We have had to-day disputes across the floor of this House about many questions of fact contained in this evidence, although we were assured yesterday that there was no possible question about any matter of fact involved in this case. The members of this House at the present time are in doubt, I am in doubt myself, as to the evidence with regard to many matters that have been mentioned.

But I wish to refer to some remarks of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) with regard to the effect of this statute. I wish to speak so far as the law of my own province is concerned. I do not profess to speak with any authority with regard to that of Quebec. But so far as the law of my own province is concerned, I beg to dissent most emphatically from the views which that hon. gentleman has laid down. The law of Nova Scotia, following in that regard the law of England, is very much the same as that which the hon. gentleman has propounded as the law of Quebec. If a con-

tract is made for the sale of land, although no deed passes at the time, although no money is paid at the time, the land in equity though not at law, becomes the property of the purchaser; the right to compensation is the right of the man who sells the land. That is the rule in equity, and that is very much like the law propounded by the hon. gentleman as that of the province of Quebec. But I would point out to him that according to the English law—I am speaking only with regard to the English law and the law of my own province——

Mr. RUSSELL. In regard to the point at issue, as to whether delay in the payment of the purchase money would split up the whole contract and leave both parties free, what would my hon. friend say to that ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I shall come to that very fully before I sit down.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was afraid my hon. friend would neglect that view.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say that so far as that matter is concerned, distinctions are drawn in the English law between the position of a man who has made a formal conveyance and received the compensation money, and the position of a man who has made a contract for the land, but has not yet received a legal title and has not yet received compensation. One distinction was that to which I adverted a moment ago. Another distinction I think would be made in a case of this kind, which involves a matter of public policy, because what would follow the hon. gentleman's proposition ? Has he thought of it ? His proposition is this, that if any member of this House were approached by some person and gave that person an option of purchase which was after accepted ; then if the member discovers before the contract is completed that the other party was really the agent of and was purchasing for the government, the member can complete the contract.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not dispute that, but that is not the case here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But he did dispute it a moment ago. He told us that he most solemnly affirmed upon his standing as a lawyer in this House that that man could go on and carry out that contract. My hon. friend has changed his opinion, I am glad he has changed his opinion, because I say such a doctrine as that would be a monstrous one. What would follow from it ? According to the law of Nova Scotia, according to the law of England, and I suppose according to the law of Quebec, an undisclosed principal can be sued by the man with whom he has made a contract, and that being the case, as soon as a member of parliament found out that he was dealing with the government, if the government did not see fit to carry out the contract under the new conditions, you would have the spectacle of a member of parliament bringing suit in the Exchequer Court against the government for the unpaid price of property which he had sold to the government.

Mr. BELCOURT. I was not dealing with such a case at all, I was dealing with a different case. The case the hon. gentleman supposes is not the case here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad to see that I misunderstood my hon. friend. I would not have got up except to make an observation on what I thought he distinctly stated to this House, in answer to a question I put to him, namely that such was his view of the law of the province of Quebec.

Mr. WADE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question to him ? When did Mr. Loy ascertain that he was selling the property to the government ? I submit for his consideration that Mr. Loy never found that out until after the deed had passed, he never found that this man was acting as agent for the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend's view of the case is of course entitled to all possible respect, I am not finding any fault with that. But there are circumstances in connection with this case which, in my opinion, might point to an opposite conclusion. It appears so far as I can gather from the evidence, which I have not had an opportunity of reading, that there was considerable discussion as to the probability of the property being required as a site for a post office. It appears that Mr. Johnston came to Mr. Loy and Mr. Loy was suspicious at the time that the property might be required by the government. An option was given, which I will not refer to again, as it has been read two or three times to the House. The terms of that option were not carried out. And six weeks before Mr. Loy gave any formal conveyance of the property at all, he receives a letter from the Public Works Department, a letter of the 18th of September, in which he is distinctly told that certain information which is required from him with regard to a plan of the city of Valleyfield, is required by the department in connection with the purchase of R. B. Johnston's property. Now, my hon. friend from Annapolis, or some hon. gentleman on the other side, has very ingeniously put forward this view of the situation : They say that that merely means that Mr. Loy, had agreed to sell to Mr. Johnston, and Mr. Johnston buying in his own right, had afterwards agreed to sell to the government. Well, that may be so, but it is rather unusual that Mr. Johnston should immediately sell to the government long before he got a title from Mr. Loy.

Mr. WADE. Not immediately, two months afterwards.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Let us say two months afterwards; and I think it is most

unfortunate for Mr. Loy that he was not called before the committee to give evidence as to his understanding of that letter. Was he asked with regard to his understanding of that letter ?

Mr. BELCOURT. He was before the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know he was, but I understand he was not before the committee after this letter was produced. Am I right or wrong ? Again my hon. friend will see that I am embarrassed by the fact that, owing to the action of the government yesterday, we have not this evidence before us. Am I right or wrong in supposing that Mr. Loy did not give evidence before the committee after this letter was produced ?

Mr. BARKER. He did not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then I consider it is a very unfortunate thing that he was not called before the committee to give evidence, and to make plain to the committee what his understanding was of the purport of that letter.

Mr. WADE. He was there, why did not the hon. gentleman opposite cross question him ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking of this matter on behalf of Mr. Loy himself, because here is a letter of the 8th of September written to Mr. Loy and received by him some six weeks before this transaction was completed, and in which it is made perfectly apparent to him that the man who has come to him to get an option on his property is really proposing to convey that property to the government. Now, under these circumstances, it does seem to me very unfortunate that Mr. Loy did not again come before the committee and throw what light he could as to the condition of his mind after he had received that letter.

Mr. BELCOURT. Assuming that Mr. Loy could have had no doubt on that day, the 8th of September, that the property acquired by Mr. Johnston was being made over to the crown, will the hon. gentleman contend that because of that knowledge on the part of Mr. Loy he would have been relieved in law from performing his contract made with Mr. Johnston on the 16th of July ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. BELCOURT. Could he have successfully resisted an action for the specific performance of the agreement of the 16th July ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If Mr. Loy had notice, and if Mr. Loy knew that Mr. Johnston was really acting for the government——

Mr. BELCOURT. I assume that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I asked the hon. gentleman that once and he gave me one answer, and I ask him again and he gives me another answer.

Mr. BELCOURT. Surely my hon. friend wants to be fair. Assuming that on the 8th September Mr. Loy acquired knowledge that the property was being acquired by the department, could then Mr. Loy have successfully resisted an action at law on the part of Mr. Johnston for a specific performance of the agreement of the 16th July? I say no, and I would like to have my hon. friend's opinion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If, as a matter of fact, there was, in the first instance a distinct bargain between Mr. Johnston and Mr. Loy, according to Mr. Loy's belief and that bargain had been carried out between Mr. Loy and Mr. Johnston so as to vest the title in the property to him, it would be perfectly plain that any transaction between Mr. Johnston and the government afterwards would be of no effect.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is the whole point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the whole point ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I have very great difficulty in making myself plain to my hon. friend. If, on the other hand, Mr. Johnston came to Mr. Loy as the agent of the government—and there is no doubt he did come as agent of the government in reality whether he knew it or not—to purchase this property, and before that transaction was carried out, although a contract had been entered into, Loy received notice that this was really a sale between himself and the government, then, I maintain that the contract could not be carried out between them, because you would then have the ridiculous position that I pointed out a moment ago to my hon. friend of the government declining to pay compensation money, being sued by a member of parliament who would go into court and say : I made a bargain with your agent although I did not know he was your agent, to sell this property. I have now discovered that he was only your agent, you are now declining to carry out your bargain, and I come into the Exchequer Court with my petition of right, and claim from you $10,000 which was agreed to be paid for my property. Surely the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) or any other hon. member on the other side of the House will not pretend for a moment that any such action as that would be entertained by the Exchequer Court.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? A layman may perhaps be able to make things clear. On the 16th September the

secretary of the Department of Public Works writes to Mr. Loy and he tells him that the department wants a map in connection with the purchase of Mr. Johnston's property. Mr. Loy considered then that he had sold his property to Mr. Johnston. Was he not simply informed that Mr. Johnston had sold to the department ? That is the point I would like to make clear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Here is one of the difficulties in connection with which I stated a moment ago that I regarded it as most unfortunate that Mr. Loy was not called before the committee to give evidence after this letter had been produced. Do I make myself clear to my hon. friend ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I see.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say that the letter might possibly have the construction which the hon. gentleman puts upon it, namely that Mr. Loy might merely infer from it that Mr. Johnston had bought this property in good faith from Mr. Loy, had afterwards entered into an agreement with the Crown to convey it to the Crown, and that the Crown were therefore investigating the title and wanted a plan for that purpose. That would make Mr. Loy perfectly innocent, but if, on the other hand, this letter gave to Mr. Loy the notice that I have described a moment ago, that Mr. Johnston was not really buying the property in his own right, but buying it for the Crown, and that the Crown was taking steps for the fulfilment of the contract, an entirely different condition of affairs would exist.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is in evidence that when Mr. Johnston went to Mr. Loy, Mr. Loy did not know that Mr. Johnston was acting for the department. He made that clear in his evidence.

Mr. WADE. Assuming that Mr. Johnston was the agent of the government, and the government the undisclosed principal, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will admit, will he not, that Mr. Johnston could not commence action for specific performance against Mr. Loy if Mr. Loy had refused to convey to him, and if Mr. Johnston could commence action against Mr. Loy for specific performance and if Mr. Loy was innocent at the time that he made the promise to sell to Mr. Johnston, could this statute be any defence in an action for specific performance ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be exactly the same defence that would arise in the action I have suggested. Does the hon. gentleman think that Mr. Loy could maintain an action against the government in the Exchequer Court ? I would hardly suppose that he would go as far as that, but if he did go as far as that, with every possible deference to the hon. gentleman's opinion, I would hardly feel justified in agreeing with him upon that point.

Mr. HEYD. If the most brilliant lawyers in this House do not understand this question, what could you expect from poor Loy ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that is a question which might properly be addressed to the right hon. leader of the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) particularly in view of the fact that he has not even permitted these lawyers to whom my hon. friend (Mr. Heyd) refers in such complimentary terms, to have an opportunity of perusing the evidence.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am afraid it would be worse and worse if the evidence were printed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know about that.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend can console himself with the knowledge that there was no argument before the committee at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I almost feel inclined to address the House now in the language of Samuel Weller before leaving the witness stand : Is there any other hon. gentleman who desires to ask me a question ? In conclusion, I have simply to say that my view of the statute is entirely different from that which has been presented by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. If we are to conclude from this evidence, which is not actually before us, because we have not had it printed, and from this correspondence, that Mr. Loy at all times up to the time he gave the title and received the compensation money believed that he was making a real sale of the property to Mr. Johnston, then that is one aspect of the case, and, adopting that view, we would have to acquit him ; but if, on the other hand, the evidence, the correspondence and the circumstances of the case would lead us to the conclusion that at any time up to the conveyance by him of this property and the receipt of the compensation money he became aware of the fact that Mr. Johnston was really the agent of the Crown, then it seems to me that this is not a case in which he can be justified in the way in which the majority report of the committee does seek to justify him.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, it seems almost a pity to interrupt the flow of legal eloquence, but it is also a pity that the whole of the afternoon should be taken up without a layman expressing an opinion. I can only form an opinion from the speeches I have heard ; and, taking the defence of Mr. Loy, I can only conclude that Mr. Loy is one of the most innocent men I ever have heard of. He is too innocent to sit in this House. I dare say you all remember reading of that charming old humbug Samuel Pepys, who used to humbug himself and others, and who,

on one occasion, was controller of the King's navy, and had reason to suppose that a certain gentleman was going to offer him something for an appointment. This gentleman asked him to dinner, and on leaving, Mr. Pepys, in his quaint language, says: This man did hand me an envelope which, by its feel, I felt contained money; when I got home I did open the envelope behind my back, so that if asked in future I could truly say that when I opened the envelope I saw no money there. Now, Sir, it strikes me that this simple and ordinary transaction of the purchase of a piece of property in Valleyfield for a post office, the negotiations for which had been going on for some years, has been so complicated and so surrounded with agents and with extraordinary conditions, that I would say it would be impossible that Mr. Loy should not have known that the government were purchasing this property. With regard to the abatement of $300 of the price, that abatement was paid, if I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) aright, after Mr. Loy had knowledge or suspicion that the government were purchasing. That seems to me of itself a most extraordinary transaction. As the case has been presented, from a layman's point of view it would be concluded that Mr. Loy had knowledge that that property was purchased for a post office. If he had not, he is too innocent a man to represent any constituency in this House.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). It is not yet six o'clock, and as we have just had the opinion of one layman, permit me to give the opinion of another layman. We have listened to lawyers all the afternoon, and the whole question simmers down to this: If Mr. Loy is a liar and a perjurer, then the gentlemen opposite are right; but if he is an honest man, as I believe he is, then they are wrong. I believe Loy is honest, and I am going to support the report of the majority.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved third reading of Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, before this motion passes I wish, pursuant to the notice which I have given, to move:

That the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that a branch line be built from the proposed main trunk line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, beginning at a point at or near where said trunk line crosses the Naskwaak river, and thence extending, by way of Fredericton and the valley of the St. John river, to St. John city.

It is not necessary for me at this time to go into this matter at any length, as it was discussed to a considerable extent when the Bill was in Committee of the Whole. I think this is a very important provision. As was pointed out at that time, it would be impossible for the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to enter into an arrangement by which a portion, and even the whole of the common stock of the new company might be handed over en bloc to the Grand Trunk Railway Company in exchange for certain privileges granted by that company to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. It was also pointed out that this might have a very important bearing upon the freight rates that would be charged by the Grand Trunk Pacific in the territory over which it is to run; that, if the adjustment of the freight rates of the new company were to come before the railway commission which is to be appointed, the amount of the capital stock of the company would be a very important consideration with the commission in estimating what those freight rates should properly be. Therefore, it seems to me important that due provision should be made that no such arrangement as that which I have pointed out should be allowed to take place, but that whatever capital is placed upon the market or is passed from the control of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to other holders, whether they be private persons or the Grand Trunk Railway Company, should be passed for a money consideration; so that the actual money cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific would be the only thing to be taken into consideration by the commissioners should they be called upon to adjust the freight rates over that road. It may be said that they would still have power to inquire into this matter and to ascertain whether money had been paid for the stock or not; but then, supposing that this stock or a portion of it were to get into the hands of third parties, innocent persons who had paid par for the stock, although the original owners of it had got it for ten or twenty or thirty per cent, or any other figure under par, it would not be fair to these innocent holders of the stock not to take into consideration the amount they had paid for it. I do not intend to make any extended remarks on this matter. The thing seems to me to be so plain that I cannot understand how any member of this House can oppose my amendment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, when the government's proposal in relation to the Grand Trunk Pacific was introduced into the House, the Prime Minister stated that he would insist that the

Grand Trunk should acquire $25,000,000 of this stock; and I think he ought to tell the House and the country how he intended that the Grand Trunk Company should acquire that stock—whether by purchase or by what means ?

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). While we are waiting for the answer of the right hon. First Minister, I may point out that it is provided in the contract that the Grand Trunk Company shall acquire this stock. What we want to know is in what way it is proposed that they shall acquire it ?

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course, the amendment of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), is something which is absolutely unprecedented. Not one precedent has been cited where a clause was ever inserted in a charter requiring a company to sell its stock for any given sum of money. The question which has been asked the Prime Minister, of course, I cannot answer more than to say that I do not see how such a question can reasonably be asked, namely, how a company which acquires stock shall acquire it. I suppose they will acquire it in the course of business, according to the law of the contract, which must be construed in accordance with the law of the land. In that contract the government require the Grand Trunk Railway Company to acquire $25,000,000 of this stock. Personally speaking, I think that was a wise precaution. It was, at all events, an answer to the criticism that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada was not behind or aiding or assisting in the scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company, when they do acquire this stock, are bound to hold it for fifty years and possibly longer—at all events, until the bonds which the government have guaranteed are paid off. The company cannot dispose of that stock, but must hold it as a guarantee that they are interested in and are behind this scheme. But that we should insert in a charter a clause that a certain stock shall be sold for cash at par value, is something which I never yet knew to be asked to be inserted in any other charter which has ever passed this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I made that inquiry because I regard it as a matter of importance. That provision is put in the contract for some specific purpose. I assume that it is for the purpose of establishing confidence in the public mind, that this transaction is a bona fide one, and that the provision made for security is all that could be desired. For what purpose is it made compulsory on this company to secure it, if it is not some guarantee that the Grand Trunk Railway will have an interest in this undertaking which will compel them to carry it out. The hon. member for North Simcoe says that this is an unprecedented thing. It is, but he must remember——

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not say that the question of contract is unprecedented because two parties to a contract may agree on anything ; but speaking of the charter, I say it is unprecedented to insert in a charter a provision requiring the stock of the company to be sold at a particular price.

Mr. SPROULE. While that may be unprecedented, the intention of parliament is to provide that this stock shall be taken up in order to furnish a guarantee. We have never had to deal with such a Bill before. Here are two corporations, and the same men are on the directorate of each. We are giving the directors of the one company the power to sell to themselves, as directors of the other company, a certain amount of stock and at whatever price they like. The directorate may sell it to the other at five cents in the dollar. Will any one say that such a transfer as that would be any guarantee for the carrying out of the undertaking ? This provision looks very like a blind to the public, an attempt to make the public believe that there is some kind of guarantee because we compel the Grand Trunk Railway to take $25,000,000 worth of stock in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, whereas the fact is that since the same men are on the directorate of both companies, the one board may sell the stock to the other at five cents on the dollar. That being the case, is it unreasonable that we should provide that if the Grand Trunk Railway purchase the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, they must give some substantial consideration for it. Speaking on this point, the right hon. First Minister said : 'I may say at once that one of the first sections of the contract'——

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not want to take an unreasonable objection, but a reference to a prior debate on a government measure cannot be made on a private Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. But these two Bills must be read together. They are practically the same contract. The one is the complement of the other, and a reference to the government measure is, I respectfully submit, quite in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman is in order in referring to a debate which has taken place on a Bill that is not now before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. May I remind you, Sir, that the Bill we are discussing refers to the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to quote from previous debate on any other measure.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit that I am quite in order. This Bill speaks of $25,000,000 worth of stock being purchased by the Grand Trunk Railway, and I am within my rights in referring to the

fact that the right hon. First Minister explained why the stock was taken.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is nothing of the sort in the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a perfect right to discuss the merits of the Bill now before the House, but not to quote from a previous debate on another Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. That debate has reference to the same subject. For instance I take up this Bill——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Question.

Mr. SPROULE. I am dealing with the question. The hon. gentleman need not be so uneasy.

Mr. WADE. Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. I am quite within my rights, and am speaking to the Chair. I want the hon. member for Annapolis to understand that no senseless interruptions will stop me. I am dealing with an amendment providing that this $25,000,000 of stock to be purchased by the Grand Trunk Railway shall be paid for at par, and I am quite within my rights in stating that we are given to understand by the right hon. Prime Minister that the clause in its unamended form is a substantial guarantee.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must comply with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. It is contended by supporters of the government, by the government press, that this provision furnishes a substantial guarantee to the country that the Grand Trunk Railway are behind the scheme and will carry it out. I say it does not. I say, let us have a substantial guarantee, and such a guarantee would be the payment for these bonds in cash at par. Let the Grand Trunk Railway make a bona fide purchase of the stock and let it not be shuffled from one hand to the other. Let the Grand Trunk Railway buy the stock in the open market, and then they will be putting up $25,000,000 as a guarantee for the faithful carrying out of the contract. Until that is done, the country will not be satisfied that this is a bona fide scheme. I say that the transaction, in its present shape, is one that will not bear the light of day. It is one that the people will not regard as a proper contract to be passed by this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the question is put, we should have a declaration from the government with regard to this matter. Does the government attach any special importance to the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway is required to acquire $25,000,000 of the common stock of this company? I think that that is a perfectly fair question to submit to the government at this time, and for these reasons. It is said that the Grand Trunk Railway is behind this company, and that the fact that it will control the common stock is a source of strength to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. In what way is that a source of strength? Does the government take the position that it is a source of strength to this company that the Grand Trunk Railway should acquire this stock for a nominal consideration? If that is the attitude of the government, I am not supposed to agree with it. For it would only result in an excessive capitalization of the company; and, in the end, might prove an obstacle in the way of controlling the rates as we should control them in the interest of shippers. Then, there is another matter in this connection as to which, I think, we ought to have some answer. The clause which is dealt with by the motion proposed by my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) is a clause which has been eliminated from the Railway Act of Canada as passed through this House, and as it now stands practically ready for its third reading. If this clause is not a proper one to retain in the General Railway Act, what are the special reasons which justify its insertion and retention in this Bill? It will not do for the government to tell us that this is a mere private Bill in which the country is not interested to a greater extent than in any other private Bill. This is a Bill incorporating a company with which the government proposes to make a contract and to which it proposes to give substantial assistance to the extent of many millions of dollars and a guarantee. It is a company for which the government proposes to build a road some 1,600 miles in length. For these reasons, the country is interested in this Bill to a very much greater extent than it would be in an ordinary railway Bill. This is a clause which, beyond doubt, permits the whole of the common stock of this company to be handed over to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada for a consideration which it might be difficult to estimate. Under these circumstances, I think it becomes the duty of not only my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but of the government itself to state the reasons for the insertion in this Bill of a clause which has been deemed not worthy to be placed in the general railway legislation of this country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The amendment which is now before the House has been given notice of by my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) in the following language:

That the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by striking out section eleven; or in the alternative, to amend the said section by providing that in case the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall

acquire the whole, or any part of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, such stock shall be paid for in cash to the full par value thereof by the said Grand Trunk Railway Company.

I presume that there is a clerical error in the notice and that the clause referred to is section 12, not section 11. Section 11 is in these words :

The directors may annually appoint from among themselves an executive composed of at least three directors for such purposes and——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I point out that the right hon. gentleman is reading the Bill as originally introduced, whereas the amendment relates to the Bill as it is printed.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is only one change in clause 11, and that consists in the insertion of the word 'common.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the numbering has been changed.

The PRIME MINISTER. That section in the Bill as reprinted reads :

The directors of the company elected by the shareholders may make and issue as paid-up stock, shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over in payment for plant, rolling stock, docks, elevators, wharfs, warehouses, vessels, or materials of any kind, or as consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired and also for the bona fide claims of contractors and engineers, such an amount of such stock as shall be a fair and bona fide value for the property purchased, or for the rights, powers and privileges acquired, or services rendered, as aforesaid, other than promotion services, due regard being had to the then market value of the stock, and such issue and allotment of stock shall be binding on the company, and such stock shall not be assessable for calls.

In this section there is nothing new or unusual ; it is the provision which has been inserted in all railway charters from time immemorial. My hon. friend says that such a provision has been eliminated from the General Railway Bill which is now before the House. That may be. But we have to deal with the law as it is to-day, and with the custom of parliament as it is to-day. The reasons which have induced the company to ask for these powers are the same, no doubt, as have induced all similar companies to ask for them. It may be that, in the future, it will be desirable to provide otherwise. But we are dealing with the provisions of the law as they are to-day, and as they have been for many years past. Now, I come to the main point made by my hon. friend. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada acquire this stock, why should they be treated differently from any other purchaser of the stock ? For, practically, that is what this amendment means. My hon. friend has said, and has said rightly, that the government attaches great importance to the Grand Trunk Railway Company coming into this scheme and standing behind it. The government in that, I think, interprets rightly the feeling of the Canadian people generally. They would be more confident of the ability of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to cope with the enterprise if that company have the backing of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. And I hold, that instead of being deterred from taking part in this scheme, the Grand Trunk Railway Company should be encouraged to stand behind it, because by so doing they will be of great assistance in the successful carrying out of the enterprise. But, if the Grand Trunk Railway Company are to come into the scheme, is there any reason why they should be subjected to more severe obligations than any other purchaser of the common stock of the company ? Why, Sir, the amendment, if I may say so without offence, is simply absurd. How can we bind the Grand Trunk Railway Company or anybody else to pay for stock more than the market price ? But the Grand Trunk Railway Company is to be asked to pay $25,000,000 in cash for $25,000,000 of stock. If any one believes that the Grand Trunk Railway would be willing to pay par value for this stock as it is issued, he has more faith than I, for my part, have in human nature. The stock will be sold at market value, and not otherwise. Let us read the amendment :

In case the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall acquire the whole or any part of the common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, such stock shall be paid for in cash to the full par value thereof by the said Grand Trunk Railway Company.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway put their stock on the market. Anybody can bid for it. I may buy stock at fifty cents on the dollar. But if the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada undertake to purchase stock, they will have to pay one hundred cents on the dollar. I do not think that anybody has so much faith in the enterprise—though I have great faith in it—as to believe that the stock will bring one hundred cents on the dollar as it is issued. The thing is preposterous, and that is the reason why it cannot be accepted.

Mr. BARKER. I have listened with some surprise to the remarks of the right hon. the first minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He seems to be under the impression that the company will issue its stock at the market price. I never heard of that before. He speaks as if, the market price of the stock being fifty cents on the dollar, there is no reason why the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada should not buy it at fifty cents on the dollar. And there is no reason in the world why it should not do so, provided it buys the stock from the public. But this clause is not dealing with the market price of this stock after it is issued, but it is dealing with the issue of the stock by the company itself ; and I

venture to say that the right hon. gentleman has never heard of a case where a company has been authorized to issue its stock without the subscribers of the stock being under obligation to pay one hundred cents on the dollar.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Canadian Pacific Railway stock was not so issued.

Mr. BARKER. The right hon. gentleman was speaking of the ordinary conditions on which stock is issued or stock is sold. I say that the ordinary conditions upon which stock is subscribed is that the man who subscribes for $100 worth of stock undertakes to pay $100 to the company on that stock, that is the ordinary condition; and the moment you depart from that you are making an exception. If the right hon. gentleman proposes that this should be an exception, let it be so stated that we will know what is meant. But let us not pretend here that that is the ordinary course of business in this country, because it is not. Now, the right hon. gentleman has read clause 12 in the original Bill, and I wish to point out that there has been a very material and a very significant change in this clause as it has been reprinted as amended in committee. I have pointed this out, and I beg leave to point it out again, as the right hon. gentleman does not seem to have noticed what I said before. Clause 12 is in the language read by the right hon. gentleman, and very much in the same words as were formerly used and as now exist in the general Railway Act of 1888. That clause has been struck out in the new General Railway Bill now before the House. But two or three very significant words have been incorporated in this clause since it was introduced into this House by the hon. member for Simcoe, and which read:

> The directors of the company elected by the shareholders may make and issue as paid up stock shares in the company, whether subscribed for or not, and may allot and hand over in payment for plant, rolling stock, docks, elevators, wharfs, warehouses, vesels or materials of any kind.

So far the words as they were in the Act of 1888, and as they were in clause 12 of the Bill as introduced into this House. What follows then?

> Or as consideration for rights, powers and privileges acquired.

Now, those are very important words. We must not forget that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada have practically one set of directors. They are different in name, I know, the former has some senators, for example, that are not in the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but we understand they are going to disappear. Nobody doubts that the directorial power in the two companies will be practically and in effect the same. Now, these two companies with one board of directors, one power, one government, will meet to do—what? To enter into agreements for traffic arrangements between the companies under the powers of the general Railway Act. They can agree there in consideration of the terminal facilities which the Grand Trunk Railway Company may give to this new company, to give any consideration whatever, however large; and under these little innocent looking words the whole $25,000,000 of stock may be given as a consideration for the interchange of traffic between these two companies, when, according to the right hon. gentleman, it is a part of the undertaking, without compensation, that the Grand Trunk Railway is going to help this road and be behind it. Out of the forty-five millions of capital, the Grand Trunk evidently intends—or there is no object in putting that clause in the Bill—evidently intends to get twenty-five millions of paid-up stock, and everybody knows that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada cannot pay that amount of money for it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman appreciate the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada has got to hold this stock in its entirety for fifty years?

Mr. BARKER. Yes, but the company are to rank as stockholders, and it will be paid-up stock, and when you come by and by to settle tariffs, you will hear of this to the cost of this country. That is the objection. Let the Grand Trunk pay in hard cash as holders of the twenty-five millions, and we will know where we are. But the country does not want to pay tolls in respect of this stock given to the Grand Trunk for the interchange of traffic. That is the contention here, and it is for that reason that the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Fowler) wishes to make it quite clear that the stock subscribed for by the Grand Trunk Railway Company shall be paid for in cash, so that hereafter it will be known what they did pay for it and what the company got for it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Although I have spoken once before, perhaps I may be allowed to reply to an observation of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). He knows this better than I do, because he is an authority on railways, and he does not pretend, surely, that because we print in the Bill a limit of the capital stock at forty-five million dollars, that we are bound to take that amount into consideration when we consider the rates. It seems to be in the mind of the hon. gentlemen opposite that we shall have to take into computation of the freight rates the forty-five million of dollars, whatever has been paid for it. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company do issue forty-five millions of stock and if they pay twenty-five millions, all that will be taken into consideration in fixing the rates will be the twenty millions, and not the

forty-five millions. Therefore, it does not matter what they are authorized to pay; what matters it that they shall pay the fair value of the stock, and whatever they pay shall be the basis of the rate to be levied upon shippers.

Mr. BARKER. I am very well aware of what the right hon. gentleman has said. But the right hon. gentleman knows that he is enabling these two companies to agree between themselves what the value may be of the privileges and rights accorded under this agreement; and ten years hence no commissioners, parliament, or anybody else, can go back upon that and say whether the value they put upon that agreement is or is not correct. But if you require the cash, you will know where you are. That is the distinction. Suppose, for example, that to-morrow these two companies were to sit down together—the same body of gentlemen perhaps, though really acting as two distinct corporations—and they agree that the Grand Trunk shall give terminal facilities to the Grand Trunk Pacific in Montreal or at other points, and they estimate between themselves that such facilities are worth an enormous sum of money, and in consideration of those facilities they issue paid-up stock, who hereafter is going to say that that was not the true value ? How are you going to get at it ? If you make it a cash basis, you will know what cash went into the company, and then it will be quite correct, as the hon. gentleman says, that if only twenty millions were paid in, that is all they could reckon in the settlement of the tariff or the tolls. But when you enter into such arrangements as are referred to here, compensation for rights, powers and privileges, who hereafter is going to measure the value of those rights and powers ? The right hon. gentleman leaves the whole thing at large, and it is impossible hereafter to say whether the stock issued, whether this twenty-five millions or forty-five millions, ought or ought not to stand for its full value in the settlement of tolls.

Amendment (Mr. Fowler) negatived on division.

Mr. S. HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to move :

That the Bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend section twelve by omitting the word 'Gravenhurst' therefrom.

I desire to amend section 12 by the omission of the word 'Gravenhurst' or, at all events in such a way as not to give the company a roaming commission to establish branch lines from both North Bay and Gravenhurst. If we were to say from North Bay instead of Gravenhurst I would be satisfied, or from Gravenhurst instead of North Bay I would also be satisfied, but I do not think in the interest of other companies that have undertaken the construction of roads in that locality it would be proper to give a roving commission to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I trust the promoter of the Bill will accept the amendment and confine it either to Gravenhurst or North Bay.

Amendment (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) negatived.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I desire to move an amendment of which I gave notice some time ago and which is as follows :—

That Bill (No. 64) be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending section eight by adding thereto the following words 'The majority of the directors of whom the president shall be one shall be British subjects.'

This clause was inserted in the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and it seems to me that it was a wise precaution. I hope that the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill (Mr. McCarthy) will see his way clear to accepting this amendment. About a year ago we had a good deal of talk in this country in reference to the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway becoming so absorbed by those interested in American railway systems that the Canadian Pacific Railway might practically become an American institution. However, that was guarded against by the fact that the majority of the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway are British subjects. It will be a very serious thing, it seems to me, if any of our transcontinental railways were to be placed under the control of the powerful syndicates which are operating and which are at the head of American railway systems. It would have a tendency to build up United States cities and ports at the expense of Canadian cities and ports. Under these circumstances they could operate, if they saw fit, Canadian roads in favour of the United States and against domestic enterprises and it seems to me that this would be a restriction against the adoption of such a policy. I would ask the promoter of this Bill to accept this amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) will accept a suggestion I would say that while I think his amendment is a good one and I do not see any objection to it, I think we had better introduce it into the Bill confirming the contract which will come later. I am prepared to accept this amendment, but I think it would be better to put it into the Bill confirming the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. KEMP. I understand the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to say that this provision will be made a part of the contract ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Amendment (Mr. Kemp) withdrawn.

Mr. WILMOT moved :

That the Bill be not now read the third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that a branch line be put from the proposed main trunk line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, beginning at a point at or near where said trunk line crosses the Nashwaak river, and thence extending, by way of Fredericton and the valley of the St. John river, to St. John city.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would like the ruling of the Speaker as to whether an hon. gentleman can move a motion of which another hon. gentleman has given notice.

Mr. WILMOT. I gave my reasons in opposition to the proposed line laid down in the Bill——

The PRIME MINISTER. Order, order. The hon. gentleman has not given notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot lay my hand just now on the authority, but I am sure to have seen somewhere in May that a motion making an important amendment to a private Bill must be moved by the hon. member giving notice of it. I cannot just now lay my hand upon the authority but I am pretty sure that the amendment can be moved only by the hon. gentleman who has given notice of it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, the ground I take——

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) has spoken once.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) has spoken forty times and I am satisfied that if he will only have the goodness to keep quiet the business of the House will proceed much better. I am asking a question in reference to a point of order and if I am not within my rights I will be delighted to obey the rules of the House. In case this Bill passes nine o'clock, notice can again be given and the member giving notice can move the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not a notice; it is a suggestion.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood that having already spoken on the motion of which I gave notice it was against the rules of the House for me to move the second motion of which I gave notice. I would like to ask the Speaker's ruling on the point as to whether it is in order to move this motion. If it is I am sure I will be delighted to do so and to discuss the question too.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will have to be done with the unanimous consent of the House. I understand the House agrees to that.

Mr. FOWLER. Well then, I beg to move, pursuant to notice that I have already given :

That this Bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that a branch line be built from the proposed main trunk line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, beginning at a point at or near where said trunk line crosses the Nashwaak river, and thence extending, by way of Fredericton and the valley of the St. John river, to St. John city.

There was some discussion the other evening when this Bill was before the Committee of the Whole in respect to this branch line. The charter as first introduced does not provide for any branch extending from the main line to the city of St. John. I brought the matter up and requested the promoter of the Bill to make such an amendment to the Bill as would provide for a direct connection with the city of St. John. Without such direct connection, in order to reach the largest Atlantic seaport of Canada it would be necessary to go round by way of Moncton which was the proposed terminus of this so-called—this so-called—I say it advisedly—transcontinental road. Transcontinental as applied to a road which it is proposed shall stretch from one ocean to the other but which stops at an inland town seems rather a misnomer. It was not, by the charter as originally introduced, proposed to make any connection at all with the city of St. John which is the largest city in the province of New Brunswick, and which is the nearest Atlantic port on the Canadian coast. I consider that this was a very serious blunder on the part of those who are promoting the Bill. I ask that the Bill be amended to the extent that the city of St. John will have direct connection by the shortest possible route with the main trunk line. There was a counter proposition by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who proposed that instead of going by the shortest and most direct route from the main trunk line of the proposed road, we should go by a more roundabout way, around by the small country town of Chipman and thence to Norton, a point on the line of the Intercolonial Railway between Moncton and St. John, and about 33 miles from St. John. Now, even by the contention of the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) this proposed course would be considerably longer than the proposition which I make in this motion now before the House. It was very easy matter to take the map of any country and sit down with a pencil and draw lines which shall be short routes. The hon. member for Westmoreland is either oblivious of the fact, or he has forgotten it if he ever knew it, that the route which he proposes for this main trunk line is through the most mountainous part of the province of New Brunswick. It is through a part of the province which is not only very rugged and mountainous, but which abounds in lakes of considerable size, and

in order to avoid these lakes—because even this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway road will scarcely be able to run on the water—in order to avoid these lakes and to get a feasible pass through these mountains, it will be necessary to make wide detours. And when that is taken into consideration and the necessary allowance made for these wide detours, the route which is proposed by the hon. gentleman will be more than 50 miles longer than the route followed, say from Edmundston, where it should come really, down the valley of the St. John river to the city of St. John. I do not know why this town of Moncton was made the terminus of the road. If it were intended to get the shortest possible route to the Atlantic seaboard it certainly was a very great mistake to make the town of Moncton that terminus.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nine o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills having expired, the House will resume the consideration of the motion of Mr. Wade, and the amendment thereto.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT—MR. LOY, M.P.

The House resumed the debate on the motion of Mr. Wade and the amendment of Mr. Monk thereto.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). When the debate began this afternoon I did not intend to speak upon the question, as in common with many other members of the House, owing to the fact that the evidence of the committee had not been printed, I had not been able to acquaint myself so fully with the facts as I would desire. But in the course of the discussion certain matters have transpired and certain statements have been made which I think should not go unchallenged. It has been stated this afternoon that the majority of those who have spoken on both sides of the House are lawyers, and this one would anticipate in a question of this kind. One of the laymen who spoke (Mr. Heyd) on behalf of the hon. member for Beauharnois, said that if lawyers could not agree upon a statement of the law how then would Mr. Loy be expected to know the law? Well, I do not wish to press this point, but their are certain recognized rules of law which have to be adopted in order that justice shall prevail, and one of them is that ignorance of the law is no excuse. In other words, the hon. member whose seat is attacked, whether he did or did not know the law relating to his case, is bound in common with all the subjects of the King by the law as it exists. Otherwise it would be impossible in many instances to carry out the just provisions of the law. But I am not going to address the House to-night so much upon the question of whether the seat of the hon. member should or should not be vacated, as to reply to certain very broad statements made by at least two members of the legal profession who spoke on the government side. It has been recognized since courts of justice have been known in Britain and in this country, that that which you cannot do directly as being a violation of the law, you cannot do by any underhand method; you cannot by a trick evade the law and so evade the responsibility which attaches to violation of the express provisions of the law. It is also well recognized that if certain circumstances exist which would put a man of ordinary prudence and discretion upon inquiry, and if the courts find that inquiry was avoided, much more so if it is found that the party deliberately closed his eyes so as to avoid a knowledge of that which would be prejudicial to him or inconvenient for him to know; then the same consequences must attach as if he had actually known all the circumstances. It is, therefore, exceedingly pertinent and important in dealing with this question that we should come to a conclusion not only as to whether the member for Beauharnois had actual knowledge by words or by letter of the circumstances which were transpiring in reference to his property; but it is pertinent and important to inquire whether the surrounding circumstances were such as would carry conviction and would suggest inquiry to any reasonable man situated as he was at that time. I merely refer to this. But I am induced to speak for a few minutes upon this question more particularly because of certain broad propositions, of law particularly, and some statements of fact made, this afternoon by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) and the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). The former gentleman, concluded his argument in these words: 'A certain class of lawyers'—and he did not finish them. I was rather puzzled why he did not explain what this term meant. I cannot explain it unless he had in mind a certain class of lawyers who when they have a poor case, usually abuse the opposite counsel. If he had, I do not know that that reference is borne out by the fact. If he refers to the hon. gentleman on this side of the House who brought up this matter, I do not find that the hon. gentleman abused anybody. On the contrary, I think the consensus of opinion in this House must be that he presented the matter in a calm and temperate way, with that proper measure of judicial discretion and that observance of judicial rules which we would expect in a matter of this importance, involving very grave issues to the hon. member for Beauharnois. But on the other hand, although it is true that there are certain circumstances in which a lawyer displays the fact that he has a weak case by abusing the opposite counsel, there is another way of determining whether a

counsel has the conviction that he has not a strong case, or whether or not he has a strong case. When we find the Chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) and the hon. junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), men of such a very high legal standing in this country, men of such conspicuous ability, men of such great fame in the profession—when we find these gentlemen struggling with this case for so long a time, with the result that as they proceed with their argument it becomes darker for the member for Beauharnois, what do we think then of the case? Is there not a suggestion that the case as presented by these hon. gentlemen is not strong? Can we come to any other conclusion than that if these hon. gentlemen, with their well known forensic skill, had a good strong case, they would make a very powerful argument? Now, I will not say on behalf of the hon. gentleman whose seat is attacked, 'save me from my friends,' because that might imply something not very complimentary to the hon. gentlemen who are assisting him; but I will for the moment address myself to a statement made by the hon. member for Annapolis. He said, if I understood him aright, that Mr. Johnston sold to the government, and that if he did, having made a valid contract with the sitting member for Beauharnois, then the sale was valid. I dispute the proposition that Mr. Johnston sold to the government. What are the facts? The facts as stated by the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and not questioned by any member of this House, are that he instructed a gentleman in Montreal, Mr. Dandurand, to purchase this property for the purpose of a post office site; that this gentleman went to Mr. Johnston and instructed him to act in the matter; that Mr. Johnston says that, acting upon that instruction, he went to Valleyfield and made an arrangement with the sitting member to secure an option for the purchase of this property. He was in league with the government. He had no money with which to purchase the property. He never changed his position. He began as an agent of the government—a sub-agent, it is true, but his position is not modified by that circumstance—and continued to negotiate as an agent of the government. He was supplied through the agency of a gentleman whom the ex-Minister of Public Works had instructed to act on behalf of the government. So it is impossible to argue that this gentleman was in any sense purchasing on his own behalf. From first to last he was purchasing as the professed agent of the government, under instructions directly given through the Department of Public Works, with money which was procured through the agency of the government; and he was paid as an agent by receiving afterwards the sum of $300 through the abatement made by the vendor of the property and $100, which I think was contributed by the government. The letter which was sent, stating that the government required certain land, is important as showing whether or not the hon. member for Beauharnois had a knowledge of the fact before the transaction was consummated that the property was to be the property of the government. Now, it was admitted by the hon. member for Annapolis that if, as a matter of fact, the hon. member for Beauharnois knew that the government was to be the purchaser, and that Johnston was virtually only an agent before the transaction was consummated by a deed of the property, then the law must apply and the seat must be vacated, as the hon. member had violated the law. What is the evidence on this point? It is suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition, with that fairness which characterizes that hon. gentleman that probably that letter in itself was not altogether conclusive; that it might be subject to the interpretation that Mr. Loy understood that he was carrying out the transaction with Johnston, and that Johnston was entering into an independent transaction with the government. But having regard to the facts and to the question which was put by Mr. Loy at the time the negotiation for the purchase was entered into, 'Is this for the government?' having regard to the fact that it was notorious that this property above all others was a suitable site for the post office; having regard to the fact that the hon. member for Beauharnois had been the mayor of that town, and that he was prominently connected with the municipal affairs as well as a parliamentary light: having regard to the additional fact that he was a prominent man, to whom such a question would naturally be communicated, and who would be in touch with the prevailing sentiment of the locality, which is said to have been that his property was the most suitable site for the post office, it is almost inconceivable that he should not have known from that letter that the government intended acquiring his property. At any rate, as he knew all the circumstances, he was put upon inquiry; and if he deliberately closed his eyes, he was just as much responsible as if he had allowed the full light to flow in upon him. Then is it consistent with the contention that Mr. Johnston was regarded by the hon. member from Beauharnois (Mr. Loy) as a man of means acting for himself, when just about the time the transaction was being completed by the deed, there was an arrangement made by which an abatement of $300 was taken off the original price upon the ground that he could not otherwise carry out the purchase. Mr. Johnston insisted upon a reduction in the price. Did not that reduction annul the option and make a new contract? If so, then

the hon. member for Beauharnois was no longer bound by the option he had given. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) says he does not regard that abatement as constituting a new contract. I shall not question the sincerity of my hon. friend. I take it that he gives us his opinions as an hon. member of this House belonging to the legal profession, candidly and fairly, but I do venture, with all due deference to my hon. friend, to question the soundness of his conclusion. In dealing with this matter, we are not discussing abstract, cast iron rules of law. I understand that we are to apply to it reasonable interpretation upon broad and common sense principles, and I submit that when Mr. Johnston said he could not carry out the option unless he were given an abatement of $300, a new contract was then proposed, and my hon. friend from Beauharnois, who then knew that the property was to be transferred to the government, should have declined to conclude the sale. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has laid down the proposition that if Mr. Loy knew, before the completion of the contract, that the property was going to the government, then the independence of parliament Act applied. Well, having regard to what has transpired, can there be any doubt in the minds of hon. members that the hon. member for Beauharnois must have had at least a very strong suspicion that it was the government which was acquiring the site. Seeing this the hon. the junior member for Ottawa, Mr. Belcourt, took the position that Mr. Johnston did not know that he was purchasing the property for the site of a post office. I had not the opportunity of attending all the meetings of the committee, but I was at some of the meetings, and consequently it would be easier for me to carry in my mind the evidence that transpired while I was present than if I had been present at all the meetings. I have a distinct recollection of the examination of Mr. Johnston, and I clearly recollect that he explained that he had been instructed to obtain a site for a post office. And what did seem extraordinary to many members of the committee was that he did not stop there, but went on to say that the selection of the site was left to his discretion. Hon. members who were present at that meeting were no doubt as much startled by that evidence as I was. I repeated it immediately afterwards to some members outside, and expressed my astonishment that the choice of a site should have been left to him, Mr. Johnston, the agent of the government. He went to Valleyfield for the purpose of obtaining an option on a site for the post office, and the government, through Mr. Dandurand, provided him with the money to carry out the sale. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) cited to us article 1472 of the Quebec Civil Code. I recognize no substantial difference between that article and the law in the province of Ontario. That article reads:

> Sale is a contract by which one party gives a thing to the other for a price in money which the latter obliges himself to pay for it.

Let me draw attention to these words: 'Which the latter obliges himself to pay for it. They are not at all unimportant in the consideration of this matter, because an option differs very substantially from an ordinary contract of sale, in which both parties are mutually obligated, the option of sale being more in the nature of a mere offer. Now the portion of this article of the code to which my hon. friend wished to direct attention is this:

> It is perfected by the consent alone of the parties, although the thing sold be not then delivered.

I quite agree with my hon. friend that this is a good proposition in law, not only in the province of Quebec, but probably throughout the Dominion generally. But if a sale is perfected by consent, it is only perfected within the terms of the written document or within the terms of consent. It is contended by my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) that the whole matter is to be determined by the condition of things as we find them on the 16th of July. I need not remind hon. members who are of the legal profession only, for it is well known to all the members of this House, that fraud in the initiation of a contract vitiates it, that no contract founded in fraud or misrepresentation can be enforced at the suit of the person who is a party to the fraudulent misrepresentation. Specific performance, indeed! At whose suit? Could there be specific performance at the suit of Johnston? Why, he went there with a deliberate falsehood in his mouth. He went there instructed to make statements that were untrue. The sitting member for Beauharnois was a public man, interested in the welfare of his town. It was a matter of interest to him whether that property should be used for some great public purpose, such as suplying a need of the town of Valleyfield, or should be diverted to some other purpose. The representation made that the property was being purchased for a purpose other than that which was actually stated would have met Johnston immediately if he came into court for specific performance. Could specific performance have been enforced at the suit of the Crown? What position was the Crown in? I call attention of the members of the government to that. The Minister of Public Works, who has charge of this matter, holding that the property was desirable in the interest of the government and in the interest of the country, formed a plan by which to acquire it. He goes to an agent and the agent employs a sub-agent, who is instructed to misrepresent to the vendor what the

property is to be used for. So, the Crown, which we are supposing to have instituted proceedings, is shown to have been aware that this property could not have been bought directly by fair and open dealing from the sitting member for Beauharnois, and yet it comes into court and asks for specific performance of the contract. What will the answer of the court be? The answer will be: This matter did not begin on a fair and open basis; and, in addition, the government of Canada, who, above all parties, should not initiate a suit directly contrary to public policy and to the words of the statute, cannot say that specific performance should be enforced for the sale of the property of a member of parliament to the Crown. At the suit of Mr. Loy, can specific performance be obtained? I submit to you, Sir, and I feel I am submitting a matter that you will concur in, that no such suit could be successful. I admit that if the contention of the hon. member for Ottawa were correct and the transaction were closed on the 16th July, that the option of sale concludes the whole matter, then there would be good ground. Or, if the suit arose before there was any disclosure made to the sitting member for Beauharnois, then there would be good ground for the suit. But when the facts are that he does know before the time the deed is demanded that the proposal is substantially to vest his property in the Crown, by sale, he being a member of parliament, and in the face of the Act which declares that no sale can be made and no contract entered into between a member of parliament and the Crown, it goes without argument that he too will be denied the remedy of specific performance. What is the remedy, if any? The remedy is to go after Johnston. The remedy is in damages and for damages alone ; and so, section 1077 of the Code, which my hon. friend has cited, comes in very properly. Go after Johnston, the party with whom you dealt, and who deceived you. That is the remedy. It may be said that this is rather hard ; it may be said that Johnston is a man of no substance. I have nothing to controvert that. It is probable he is a man of no substance, for it is generally a man of no substance who is put forward to carry out a scheme of this kind. The answer is : Have a care before you enter into contracts with men unknown to you; have a care when a stranger invades your town, and, with some unusual story, asks you to bind yourself to sell your property to him, trusting that you will conform to his wishes with all the innocence of youth. But, if with the unsuspicious nature that characterizes the ordinary member of parliament, you sell property of this character, which is known to be prized by the Dominion government, known to be the only site for an intended post office in your town, it is incumbent upon you to know the man you are dealing with, and you have no complaint if you are compelled to seek damages against a worthless man. But, aside from these general propositions which, I say with all fearlessness will be acknowledged by every member of this House as applied to the parties to the contract, there are certain well known rules of courts of equity which must be recognized. A court of equity does not decree specific performance as a matter of course; it decrees it or withholds it at its discretion. I cannot grant the exceptional and peculiar remedy of specific performance except where the righteousness of it is established. He who comes into equity must do equity. The party who claims specific performance must show that his hands are clean, must show that he is guilty of no connivance, no fraud, no questionable conduct. Could any of the parties show this ? But the party who seeks a decree in equity must do more than that. He must show that it is not contrary to public policy. Can this be done in this case? There could be no more flagrant violation of the requirements of public policy than for a court of this land to decree specific performance once they knew that this transaction, on the fact of it honest, was in fact an evasion of the statute, by which evasion the property of a member of parliament would become vested in the Crown represented by gentlemen in political affinity with him who was the vendor of the property.

Now, I want to appeal, not to my friends on this side of the House, but to you, Mr. Speaker, to all members of the cabinet and supporters of the government, on behalf of Mr. Loy. I do not think the hon. member for Beauharnois—I say it in all sincerity—has been treated fairly in this matter. I do not think the government have given the hon. gentleman a fair chance for his life, because, after all, a man's blameless and unblemished reputation is of more value to him than life itself. What is the position in which the government has placed the hon. member for Beauharnois ? It has forced him into this position, than at best he has to stand with a cloud of suspicion attaching to him. If that evidence had been printed, as it was the duty of the government to print it, we could have gone into the discussion of the matter fully and fairly, recognizing that whatever our political differences may be, it is our duty in all honour and in all fairness to stand by each other in that which is right. We would have been able, perhaps, not only to exonerate Mr. Loy from the charges made against him, to the extent of enabling him to hold his seat, but we would have been able, perhaps, so to vindicate his honour as that the whole House would unanimously agree that he was not to blame at all. That might have been the case if the government had allowed the evidence to be printed. But what position are we in ? We are in this

deplorable position, and I hope it is not a precedent that will be honoured in the future, that members on this side of the House and on that side of the House cannot agree because they do not know the evidence. It is impossible for hon. gentlemen upon either side of the House, except those who continuously attended the committee—and very few of them did so—to be able to judge of the merits of this case as fully as they ought to be, because they are not possessed of the evidence.

Now, in view of all these circumstances, I am not going to say that I would not like unduly to press the case against the hon. member for Beauharnois, who has been so badly treated by his own friends. They have left him—and don't you forget it—they have left him covered by suspicion, by reason of the notoriety of the fact that the government wanted this property, suspicion by reason of the fact that an appropriation had been made, the suspicious movements of Mr. Johnston in acquiring the property, suspicion by reason of the fact that Loy was a supporter of the government, and that he was specially interested and charged with a knowledge of the whole matter as representative of the city, and by reason of the fact that after the option had expired, and at a time when you would have expected him to be on the alert in regard to a man unknown to him like Mr. Johnston, he appeared indifferent to the result. I say all these circumstances are calculated to cast suspicion upon the conduct of the member for Beauharnois, even though they do not amount to actual proof. Now, under these cricumstances, feeling that the hon. member may well exclaim, 'Save me from my friends,' speaking for myself alone, having no instructions from anybody, having no knowledge of the general opinion on this side of the House, I would be glad, speaking from my feeling of good nature, if the hon. member who has had charge of this matter could see his way clear not to press his motion to a division. I feel that where honour is at stake, it is better that several hon. members who may be guilty of some infraction of the law should go unpunished, than that one member should have a stigma cast upon him which by possibility is not deserved.

Mr. E. G. PORTER (West Hastings). After the lengthy discussion that has taken place on this motion, I would not venture to address the House now but for the fact that I have the honour of being a member of that committee to whom was confided the investigation of the charge which has been the subject of discussion this afternoon. I do not wish to be understood by the House or by the country as acquiescing in the majority report which has been brought into the House in regard to this matter, nor do I wish to be understood as assenting to some of the propositions that have been laid down by hon. members opposite in regard to the construction that is to be placed on the contract between Mr. Loy and Mr. Johnston. The junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) endeavoured to convince this House that the contract of sale between the member for Beauharnois and Mr. Johnston was consummated on the 16th day of July, and that after that date, no matter what information the hon. member may have received, it was impossible for him to recede from the contract into which he had entered. Now, Sir, I take issue with the hon. member for Ottawa in that position. It is, I think, a proposition in law that will not be disputed by any lawyer, in fact, it is a proposition of individual right which will be recognized, I think, by every member of this House, that a person having property to sell, a vendor, so to speak, has a perfect and absolute right to dictate and to state upon what terms his property shall be sold. No matter how ridiculous, or how absurd, or how onerous these conditions may be, he has a perfect right to impose these conditions and a perfect right to insist upon these conditions being performed before he is obliged to part with his property. To apply that principle to the case in hand, the hon. member for Beauharnois in signing the option for the purchase of his property had a perfect right to impose upon the intending purchaser whatever terms he saw fit, and unless these terms were acquiesced in by the intending purchaser he was in no way bound. When an option is given for the sale or purchase of property, unless the identical terms under which that option is given are accepted, there is no binding contract. The option may be conditional as to the time in which the option shall be exercised, it may be conditional as to the manner in which the purchase money shall be paid, or it may be optional as to the state of the title, or it may be optional in many other ways. Whatever the conditions imposed by the vendor are, they must be accepted by the intending purchaser; otherwise, there is no contract. If the terms of the option are varied in any way by the intending purchaser, then something further is required in order to complete the contract; in other words, the vendor having received a qualified or conditional acceptance it is for himself to go a step farther and acknowledge or confirm the conditional offer that he has received. It is perfectly apparent in this case that no such third step as that was taken. Only two steps were taken in the formation of this contract, and I desire to call the attention of the House to the exact wording of the option and acceptance. I submit with every confidence to the House that upon a fair and reasonable construction of the option and of the letter of acceptance there never was a contract between these two parties before the money was actually paid over. The terms of the option are that he will sell the property,

the right to buy to be exercised by three o'clock on Wednesday afternoon on the 16th, with this further condition 'the price to be $10,000, payable in cash on day of sale.' If the argument of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is correct, the sale, according to that hon. gentleman, was completed on the 16th July, when the letter, which he termed 'the letter of acceptance.' was written. I defy any one to find in that so-called letter of acceptance an acceptance of the exact terms contained in this option. There were three things to be done—first, the exercise of the option of the 16th July ; second, the payment of $10,000 ; and, thirdly, the payment at the time of sale. Now, these are the three conditions that the vendor imposed and had a right to impose. Let us see if these conditions have been accepted by the intending purchaser. Mr. Johnston says : 'I beg to accept your offer.' That part of it is all right, and he did that on the 16th July. But then he goes on to say that he does not accept the second part as to the payment of the $10,000 on the day of sale, but he puts it in this way :

> The price will be paid in cash on title being found satisfactory and deeds executed by you.

An entirely different thing from what the vendor had stated in his option. By the terms stated in the option the intending purchaser was bound to exercise that option in its exact terms, but when we read the acceptance of the 16th July we see that the intending purchaser entirely varies the option given to him by the vendor. For that reason, I say that there was no contract, that there was no confirmation of that intended acceptance by the vendor ; and for that reason, I submit there never was a binding contract by the option and by the intended letter of acceptance between these two parties. If I am right in that contention, then it leads me one step further. The hon. member for Ottawa argued that because there was a contract, therefore, the hon. member for Beauharnois could not withdraw. If I am right in my contention, there was no contract ; and if that be so, the second part of his argument falls to the ground. If there was no contract between those two parties, as I submit there was not, then it was perfectly open to the hon. member for Beauharnois at any time after he received that letter of the 16th July to have withdrawn from what had taken place, as the negotiations might eventually end in a contract. I submit that the evidence given before the committee amply justifies me in saying that the hon. member for Beauharnois had become possessed of the knowledge that the government were really purchasing this property, and the moment he acquired that knowledge, there being no binding contract between himself and the intending purchaser, it was not only his privilege, but his duty as a member of this House, to have repudiated the whole thing and to have refused to enter into any further negotiations in regard to it. But that was not the only means of escape, to my mind, that the hon. member for Beauharnois had in regard to this matter, and I quite agree with some of the remarks that were made by the last speaker (Mr. Lennox) in regard to this question. If the hon. member for Beauharnois did not know that this property was being sold to the government, the government certainly knew that this property was being bought from the hon. member for Beauharnois, the government knew that the hon. member for Beauharnois was a member of this House at the time, and it was just as incumbent upon the government to inform the hon. member for Beauharnois of the position in which he was placing himself by going on and completing his contract as it was the duty of the hon. member for Beauharnois to have withdrawn from it when he understood what the character of the contract was. There is a principle of law which is as well recognized as any other principle of law that I know of, and it is that it is just as much a fraud to withhold information that should be imparted as to impart false information to a party with whom you are contracting, and I hold that, while the term 'fraud' may be too harsh, it was withholding on the part of the government information that it was their bounden duty to impart to the hon. member for Beauharnois to enable him to form a proper judgment upon the matter, and to escape the penalties or the obligations of this statute, which is made to protect the parliament of this country. For these two reasons, then, I differ entirely from hon. gentlemen opposite, because I have come to the conclusion from the evidence, as in fact it has been admitted by hon. members on the other side of the House during this discussion, that at a certain time before the money was actually paid over, the hon. member for Beauharnois did become aware that the government were purchasing this property, and having obtained that knowledge before he was bound to carry out the contract, or the government being under an obligation to impart that knowledge to him, I submit there was no justification for the hon. member for Beauharnois carrying out the contract, nor is it honest or just for the government to ask their supporters to whitewash him in this matter.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Monk).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Henderson,
Avery,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Barker,	Kemp,
Bell,	Kidd,
Bennett,	Lancaster,
Birkett,	Lennox,
Blain,	Léonard,
Borden (Halifax),	Maclean,
Brock	Monk,
Broder,	Morin,

Cargill,	Osler,
Clare,	Pope,
Clarke,	Porter,
Culbert,	Richardson,
Earle,	Roche (Marquette),
Fowler,	Sproule,
Ganong,	Thomson (Grey),
Gilmour,	Tolton,
Hackett,	Vrooman,
Halliday,	Wilson.—40.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Macdonald,
Archambault,	Mackie,
Bazinet,	MacKinnon,
Beith,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Belcourt,	Macpherson,
Bernier,	McCarthy,
Bickerdike,	McCreary,
Brown,	McEwen,
Bruneau,	McGugan,
Bureau,	McIsaac,
Carbonneau,	Madore,
Champagne,	Malouin,
Christie,	Marcil (Bagot),
Copp,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Costigan,	Martineau,
Cowan,	Matheson,
Davis,	Mayrand,
Demers (Lévis),	Meigs,
Demers (St. John),	Mignault,
Desjardins,	Monet,
Douglas,	Morrison,
Dugas,	Mulock (Sir William),
Emmerson,	Murray,
Erb,	Oliver,
Ethier,	Parmelee,
Fielding,	Paterson,
Fisher,	Power,
Fitzpatrick,	Préfontaine,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Fraser,	Puttee,
Galliher,	Riley,
Gauvreau,	Robinson (Elgin),
Geoffrion,	Roche (Halifax),
Gibson,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gould,	Rousseau,
Grant,	Russell,
Guthrie,	Schell,
Harwood,	Scott,
Heyd,	Sifton,
Holmes,	Stephens,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Stewart,
Hyman,	Sutherland (Essex),
Kendall	Sutherland (Oxford),
Lang,	Talbot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tarte,
Laurier (L'Assomption)	Tolmie,
Lavergne,	Tucker,
Law,	Turcot,
LeBlanc,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Wade,
Lewis,	Wright.—105.
Lovell,	

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Calvert,	Taylor,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Dyment,	McCormick,
McColl,	Ward,
Smith (Vancouver),	Hale,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Blair,	Bruce,
Carroll,	Cochrane,
German,	Haggart,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Lavell,
McLennan,	McIntosh,
Ross (Ontario),	Rosamond,
Wallace,	Smith (Wentworth),
Beland,	Boyd,
Thompson (Haldimand)	Ingram,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Tobin,	Ball,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Kaulbach,
Bourassa,	Casgrain,
Campbell,	Clancy,
Gallery,	Hughes (Victoria),
McCool,	MacLaren (Perth),
Reid (Restigouche),	Pringle,
Ross (Yukon),	LaRivière,
Delisle,	Gourley,
Bourbonnais,	Carscallen,

Amendment negatived, main motion (Mr. Wade) agreed to on division.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—PLANS PRESENTED.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg to move :

That an order of the House do issue for certain plans prepared by Mr. E. A. Hoare, engineer for a short line of railway between Quebec and the maritime provinces.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER laid the plans on the Table of the House. He said : I have also laid upon the Table of the House certain reports from the different engineers employed by the provincial governments of Ontario and Quebec, and the government of Canada. These, however, do not require any motion because they are public property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask whether this comprises the mountains of information to which the right hon. gentleman referred in his speech.

The PRIME MINISTER. No ; that does not comprise the mountains ; only some of the hills.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask when we shall expect the mountains ?

Mr. MACLEAN. The mountain is not delivered yet.

QUESTIONS.

POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, ALBERTA.

Mr. OSLER asked :

1. Has Mr. D. J. Campbell been dismissed from the position of postmaster at Macleod, Alberta ? And if so, when was he dismissed ?
2. Upon whose recommendation was he dismissed ?
3. For what offence was he dismissed ?
4. How long had he occupied the position of postmaster at Macleod ?
5. What was the appointment worth annually?
6. Has any person been appointed to the vacancy ? And if so, who has been appointed, and what was the date of the appointment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Mr. Campbell was appointed postmaster at Macleod on the 1st of January, 1885; his salary was $800 a year. He has been also acting as sheriff and his duties as sheriff interfered with the proper discharge of his duties of his office as postmaster and for that reason a change was made. On the 6th instant Mr. Samuel Heap was appointed in his place.

COMMISSION ON CAPITAL AND LABOUR; 1886.

Mr. KENDALL asked:

1. What are the names of the commissioners appointed in 1886 for the purpose of inquiring into the relation of capital to labour, and other matters?

2. What was the cost of such commission, to what was this amount paid, and how much was paid to each person?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock):

1. Hon. James Armstrong, Ottawa; John Armstrong, Toronto; G. Boivin, Montreal; U. Carson, Ottawa; J. A. Clark, St. John, N.B.; A. T. Freed, Hamilton; W. A. Gibson, Ottawa; Wm. Haggarty, Sydney, N.S.; S. B. Heakes, Toronto; Jules Helbronner, Montreal; John Kelly, St. John, N.B.; Patrick Kerwin, Quebec, Que.; H. A. McLean, Halifax, N.S.; Michael Walsh, Halifax, N.S.

2. The total cost of the commission was $81,718.98. This amount was paid as follows. To the commissioners:

Hon. James Armstrong, Ottawa	$ 7,142 17
John Armstrong, Toronto	2,400 00
G. Boivin, Montreal	1,737 90
U. Carson, Ottawa	2,040 98
J. A. Clark, St. John, N.B.	3,440 40
A. T. Freed, Hamilton	3,152 19
W. A. Gibson, Ottawa	2,831 38
Wm. Haggarty, Sydney, N.S.	1,862 17
S. B. Heakes, Toronto	3,122 84
Jules Helbronner, Montreal	6,507 80
John Kelly, St. John, N.B.	1,637 11
Patrick Kerwin, Quebec, Que.	3,072 98
H. A. McLean, Halifax	3,119 65
Michael Walsh, Halifax	3,586 91
	$45,654 48

The sum of $81,718.98 was paid out as follows:

To the secretary and stenographers of the commission	$10,019 79
To W. C. Blumchart	758 50
" J. Bouchard	425 25
" J. H. Browning	814 32
" D. Delisle	417 75
" A. deHaerne	384 00
" D. S. Hennessey	420 25
" Holland Bros.	372 12
" A. Monpetitie	1,892 55
" A. Prieur	934 00
" A. Raby	526 50
" E. Roger	615 00
" J. P. Sexton	941 25
" Wm. Smith	540 00
" M. Vidal	456 00
Total	$7,194 49
To various other persons	$ 3,543 19
To printing and stationery	10,981 01
Government stationery office	39 02
King's Printer	1,287 00
Making a total of	$81,718 98

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What are the names of the present harbour commissioners of Montreal?

2. What amounts have been paid to each of the said commissioners during the last fiscal year of said board, as salary, fees for attendance at meetings or other purposes?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine):

1. Hon. Robert Mackay, Jonathan Hodgson, Robert Bickerdike, Alphonse Racine, E. H. Lemay, Wm. E. Doran (from May 2nd), James Cochrane (Mayor), James Crathern, John Torrence, L. E. Geoffrion, Robert Reford.

2. Hon. Robert Mackay, salary as president (Act 57-58, Vic. Chap. 48), $2,000.

Fees $5 for attendance at a meeting:

Hon. Robt. Mackay	$680
Jonathan Hodgson	505
Robt. Bickerdike	570
Alphonse Racine	595
E. H. Lemay	385
Wm. E. Doran (from 2nd May)	410
James Cochrane	425
James Crathern	455
John Torrance	525
L. E. Geoffrion	490
Robt. Reford	375
	$5,415

RAILWAY BETWEEN NAPANEE AND DESERONTO.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. Was a charter ever granted to the Rathbun Company, or any other company or persons, to build a line of railway from Napanee to Deseronto, and locating the line of such railway along the bank of the Napanee river? If so, when?

2. Has any Act been passed or charter granted to the Rathbun Company, or any other person or company, to construct a line of railway from Napanee to Deseronto, changing the original location referred to in paragraph one of this question, or authorizing any other location? If so, when, and what location was so authorized?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding):

1. Charter to Napanee, Tamworth and Quebec, Can. 1879, chap. 67, covered this route by authorizing a line from Napanee to the Ottawa river, 'and to extend the said railway in a southerly direction to such points on the Bay of Quinté as may be deemed expedient.' This company subsequently, 1890, chapter 62, changed its name to the Kingston, Napanee and Western, and was amalgamated under Can. 1896, chap. 15, with the Bay of Quinté Railway Company, the latter company being incorporated in 1881,

Can. 1881 (chapter 46), with Messrs. Hugo B. Rathbun and Edward B. Rathbun as two of the provisional directors.

2. While the original location does not appear to have been changed by subsequent charter, other locations were authorized by Can. 1884, chapter 62, 1886, chapter 68, 1890, chapter 62, 1896 (1) chapter 15, section 6.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY—COST OF SISAL.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

What was the average price per pound paid each year since 1893 by the government of Canada for sisal used in the manufacture of binder twine at the Kingston penitentiary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) :

1893..	None purchased.
1894..	$3 50 per cwt.
1895..	2 91 "
1896..	3 35 "
1897..	3 06 "
1898..	None purchased.
1899..	None purchased.
1900..	$8 50 per cwt.
1901..	5 13 "
1902..	6 26 "
1903..	8 75 "

RAILWAY ACT, 1903—RAILWAY COMMISSION SALARIES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the House go to-morrow into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide as follows with respect to the salaries of the board, and other expenses incidental to the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill, now before the House, to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways :—

1. The chief comissioner to be paid a salary of $10,000 per annum.

2. The other two commissioners to be paid salaries of $8,000 each per annum.

3. The secretary to be paid a salary to be fixed by the Governor in Council, not more than $4,000.

4. Such salaries and remuneration to be paid to the other officers, staff and appointees of the board, and such other expenses to be paid incidental to the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill as are approved by the Governor in Council.

5. The salaries of the commissioners and secretary to be paid monthly out of the unappropriated funds in the hands of the Receiver General. All other salaries, remunerations and expenses, including travelling expenses, to be paid out of the moneys to be provided by parliament.

He said : I may say that the assent of His Excellency has been received to this resolution.

Motion was agreed to.

TREADGOLD COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called I bring to the attention of the government a telegram which was received from Dawson, directed to Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, M.P., and which by direction of the sender was handed to me in his absence :

Dawson, Y.T., August 4, 1903.

T. Chase Casgrain, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Board Trade asked Laurier, Ross full text scope commission twice without avail, inquire.

I presume it refers to the Treadgold commission and I would gather from it that the board of trade have asked to be furnished with a copy of the scope of the commission and have not received a reply. That inquiry would seem to have been addressed to the Prime Minister and to the member for the Yukon. However, such as it is I bring it to the attention of the government in order that such action may be taken in regard to it as may be deemed necessary.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have received such a telegram as that from, I think, Mr. McCormick, who, I believe, signs as president of the board of trade, asking for full particulars. The information if sent by mail could not reach Dawson any sooner than the commissioners themselves, who are now on their way to Dawson City. I propose sending a summary by telegram.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose there will be no difficulty for the members of the board of trade and the people who are interested in the matter, to ascertain precisely what the scope of the commission is from the commissioners themselves.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the right hon. gentleman might see that the commission are so instructed.

The PRIME MINISTER. The commission will sit as a public court.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The PRIME MINISTER. Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, if to-morrow will be convenient for him to take up the transcontinental railway Bill ? If not to-morrow, what day will be convenient ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To-morrow would have been quite convenient except for the fact that the documents which were asked for on Thursday last have not been laid on the Table of the House until to-day. In view of that, I think possibly Tuesday next will be more convenient, because it is desirable that the members of the House should make themselves acquainted with the information to which the right hon. gentleman referred in his remarks, and which up to the present time has not been accessible to members on either side of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then we will take up the subject on Tuesday.

PUBLIC AND REFORMATORY PRISONS.

Bill (No. 221) further to amend the Act respecting public and reformatory prisons, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of certified industrial schools ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amendment is made at the request of the Attorney General of Ontario. The certificate referred to is issued by the provincial secretary of Ontario, and has the effect of placing these industrial schools on the same plane as the Ontario Reformatory for Boys.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The words 'certified industrial school,' I suppose, has reference to some Act of the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

JUDGES' RETIRING ALLOWANCES.

House in committee on the following resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting judges of provincial courts, and to provide as follows :—

1. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any Superior Court of Canada, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the great seal, reciting such judge's age and period of service, grant unto him an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life ; provided such judge has (a) attained the age of seventy-five years, and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts, or as such judge and as stipendiary magistrate of the North-west Territories, for twenty years or upwards ; (b) attained the age of seventy years, and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for twenty-five years or upwards ; or (c) continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for thirty years or upwards.

2. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of a superior court of any of the provinces of Canada, resigns or has heretofore resigned his office as such judge, to accept the office of lieutenant governor of a province, and if he serves, or has served as such lieutenant governor, and is not otherwise eligible for any retiring annuity, as such judge, His Majesty may, at any time after the expiration of the term of service of such judge as lieutenant governor, grant unto such judge an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary annexed to the judicial office which he held at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately upon the issue of such letters patent, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

3. Every county court judge who has attained the age of eighty years shall be compulsorily retired: and to any judge who is so retired, or who, having attained the age of seventy-five years, resigns his office, and who in either case has continued in office for a period of twenty-five years or upwards, His Majesty may grant an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement ; or if he has continued in office as such judge for a less period than twenty-five years, equal to two-thirds of such salary ; provided that to any such judge who is so compulsorily retired, or who so resigns within years after the passing of the Act based upon these resolutions, there may be granted an annuity equal to the full salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement or resignation, irrespective of the number of years he has continued in office

4. If any judge of a county court, after having continued in office for a period of thirty-five years, and become afflicted with some permanent infirmity, disabling him from the due execution of his office, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the great seal of Canada, grant to him a pension equal to the salary of his office at the time of his retirement ; the said annuity to commence immeditaely after his retirement, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.—The Minister of Justice.

On resolution 1,

Mr. WILSON. I would like to have some better reasons from the hon. Minister of Justice for these resolutions. If my memory does not deceive me, the Liberal party was more strongly opposed to superannuation, when in opposition, than to anything else. And throughout the country, the people, irrespective of party, are opposed to that sort of thing. They consider that a man ought to pay for his own superannuation, and that the tax-payers should not be taxed in order to pay a superannuation allowance to a man who has lived in luxury while in the public service, and neglected to lay up a competency for his old age. I represent a rural constituency, and my people are not at all in favour of this policy. There are in that constituency labouring men and mechanics who earn from $300 to $400 per year. Is it fair that these men should be taxed on their small earnings to help pension a judge who has been superannuated on full pay, and who has enjoyed a salary of from $4,000 to $7,000 a year during the years he was on the bench ? I consider this most unfair. It is not even as if these judges had ever paid anything towards their own superannuation. I give this government the credit of having made some changes in our superannuation system since they came to power. Every civil servant now has to pay into the superannuation fund so much a year, and that money is returned to him with interest at 5 per cent when he is superannuated, or is paid to his family should he die before superannuation. There can be no objection to that, because they are simply getting back what they have con-

tributed. But there is no reason why the government should tax people to keep men living in luxury with their families, who have never contributed anything to the superannuation fund. I am speaking the sentiments of the people I represent.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I represent myself a farming constituency, where there is probably a greater number of farmers than in my hon. friend's riding, and I have no hesitation whatever in saying that any man who has served his country thirty years as a judge on the bench is entitled to all the consideration he can get. Many of our judges are giving their services to the country on the bench for a pittance compared to what they would earn at the bar.

Mr. BENNETT. And just the opposite too.

Mr. WILSON. In my riding there is a vacancy on the county court bench at present. And there is not a lawyer in the county town who would not take the position at the pay, and it is only a county court judgeship. There are also other gentlemen in other towns who are very anxious to get the position, and the pay is more than the most of them earn at the bar.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There may be something in what the hon. gentleman has said, but there is also a great deal in what I have said. The bench has ceased to attract the best men at the bar. My hon. friend will admit that some of the men he knows in Ontario, and whom I know in Quebec, have been on the bench twenty-five and thirty years, and are seventy-five years of age and over, and they are obliged to work on when they have really passed their years of labour, because they cannot afford to retire. In view of the very small salary paid distinguished men on the bench, the least we can do is to give them this retiring allowance.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I notice that judges eighty years of age can be compulsorily retired ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That only applies to county court judges. The high court judges may retire if they choose, but we cannot compel them.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Why is a county court judge to be compelled to retire at eighty years of age ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Because experience has shown that when a man has reached the age of eighty, it is time for him to leave the bench.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Does the hon. Minister of Justice know that some men at eighty are as full of vigour and as active in intellect as some men of sixty, I do not think it is necessary to compel a man to retire unless he is unable to do his work. In the county where I live, the judge, who has been on the bench fifty years, is full of vigour to-day, and the members of the bar there are not anxious to have him retire, nor is he himself anxious to retire. He is full of experience and probably a far better judge than any one we could select in his place.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the age of Mr. Justice Britton when he was appointed to the Superior Court in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot remember.

Mr. BENNETT. About seventy, was it not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have no idea at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would like to observe to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson), who seems to take a different view from that presented in these resolutions, and to object that judges be given pensions, because pensions of some kind are not given other classes of the community, that in all civilized countries, particularly England, the services of judges have been deemed of such a character as to make it advisable for the community at large that they should be provided a pension in their old age. The object is to put judges above temptation, to ensure their dignity and independence, and to make them what they should be, the impartial arbiters of all differences in the community. The idea of giving pensions to judges has never been called into question in this House. Ever since confederation, our judges have been granted pensions.

Mr. WILSON. Are you not increasing the amount ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, but we provide that, under special circumstances, a pension will be given. At present when a judge has served fifteen years, he can, on the mere asking, retire and receive a pension of two-thirds of his salary. This resolution provides that when a judge has served thirty years or has reached the age of seventy and served twenty-five years, or the age of seventy-five and served twenty years, he shall be allowed to retire on full pay. Now, my hon. friend objects to this, as do some other hon. members, that men should not be compulsorily retired. Judges of the county court can be compulsorily retired; judges of the superior court cannot be so retired, but they are given the option after having served thirty years, or after having served twenty years and having attained the age of seventy-five years, or after having served the twenty-five years and attained the age of seventy-five years, of withdrawing with full salary. For my part, I am sorry we have not the power to retire even judges of the superior courts compulsorily at a certain age. Such power

of compulsory retirement should not be taken as a reflection upon anybody. Unfortunately, we have to admit that as time goes on our forces diminish. And judges, being human like the rest of us, when they reach a certain age, say seventy-five or eighty years, ordinarily are not as fit as younger men to discharge the important services which the community look to them to render. Take a parallel case, say of generals in the army. In the United States a general is compulsorily retired at sixty-four years. In England also, I think, there is a limit of age for the general officers. If I am not mistaken, and speaking under correction, officers in high command are forced, after they have reached a certain limit of age, to take their pensions. The same thing should apply to judges. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) speaks of a certain judge who at eighty years of age is as well able to discharge the duties of his position as a man of sixty would be, perhaps better. But exceptions of this kind only prove the general rule, that a man at eighty is not as well fitted to do good work as a judge as a younger man would be. So, the fact that there is a judge in the county of Elgin who, at eighty years of age is able to discharge his duties proves nothing. Mr. Gladstone at eighty gave perhaps his best services to the state. Those exceptions are very rare. Though my hon. friend (Mr. Robinson) is very vigorous at his age —perhaps sixty, like myself—yet perhaps he will agree with me that his vigour was greater than it is at the present time. I am sorry to be obliged to admit that, as time goes on, our forces, instead of increasing, diminish. This rule of human life is the thing that we have to recognize and provide for in this Bill. It is a painful spectacle which some of those who have to attend in court are compelled to witness —men forced by reason of the fact that they are not in affluent circumstances, to continue the discharge of duties upon the bench when it is painfully evident that it would be better that they should take their pensions. Then, I repeat, nobody will dispute the fact that the services rendered by the judges are the most important that can be rendered to the country. I think that when a man has discharged his duties as a judge for twenty-five years and has reached the age of seventy-five, or has discharged his duties for thirty years, and, in his own judgment, knows that his forces are diminishing, and it is to the advantage of the public that he should withdraw and make way for younger men, the country should not turn him out on the street, but should maintain him in dignity and affluence and comfort to the end of his days.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I feel as though I would like to die in harness. I do not think it is right, when a servant has been faithful to you all his lifetime and has discharged his duty well, to kick him out because he hapens to have his age against him. We all grow old, but we all hate to be kicked out. We would hate to be kicked out even from this House. And if the Prime Minister is able to discharge his duties at eighty years of age, the country would not like to see him kicked out and he would not like it. Here is a judge who has served the country for fifty years and wishes to continue in his place, and members of the bar who plead before him are nearly all anxious that he should hold the position. It is cruel to turn him out. It is like turning out an old horse in the pasture to die. I hope the minister will make exceptions to this Bill, and, whereever there is a man capable of discharging his duty to the public, for pity's sake do not turn him out.

Mr. BROCK. I desire to express my own opinion, and the opinion of the class to which I belong—those engaged in mercantile and manufacturing pursuits, who have a great deal of litigation—that it is very desirable that our judges should be amongst the most vigorous of the professional men in the country. I think it is more desirable that a judge should be well paid and should be able to look forward to a pension in old age than that almost any other class that I know of should be in that position. I think that we could do with a different class of politicians, we could even do without a great many of those we have, but we cannot do without the best services that our judges can possibly render in a country like this where there is so much litigation. I think, therefore, that the motion before us is absolutely in the right direction. It is impossible for us all to pay attention to the worthy but sentimental reasons advanced by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), because if we do we shall find ourselves in very serious difficulties, such as have been spoken of by the Prime Minister. Judges who are past their best days—and sometimes people, even judges, when they grow old grow obstinate—will not retire when they should. I think it is well that the power afforded by this resolution should be in the hands of the government, so that they may use it in the case of a judge who is not able to perform his duties. It would be invidious, of course, to take a case here and there. It should be made a general rule, and it should be applied, as the Minister of Justice has provided in this resolution. Therefore, I wish to say that I favour the resolution, and I think that, so far as the class to which I belong are concerned, they will be unanimous in support of the government's proposal.

Mr. PORTER. The clause of the resolution under discussion does not make it compulsory for judges of the Supreme or Superior Courts to retire from their posi-

tions, as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) seems to think. This clause of the resolution only applies to voluntary resignation. And it seems to me that no one can be a better judge of the time when he should retire, and the advantages or disadvantages of retiring than the very men who would be entitled to take advantage of this resolution. A gentleman who has served upon the bench for thirty years and has reached the age limit provided in this resolution, ought to be the very best possible judge as to whether it would be advisable for him to continue in the occupation of his exalted position, or whether it would be to his advantage and to the advantage of litigants and the public generally for him to retire. But, while I think that would be the case, I think it would be unfair, after he had given so many years of service to the country, that a judge should be compelled to retire; or, should he believe that he had become incompetent to discharge the duties of his high office and feel it incumbent upon him to give way to some one else more capable to perform his duties, it is not fair, to my mind, that he should be allowed to retire after spending so many years in the public service without some provision being made by the country he has served faithfully and for so long. For my part, I am in entire accord with the resolution under discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the scope of the resolution been taken from any other source, or is it entirely original with ourselves ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Absolutely original. The only precedent I know of exists in the United States where, with respect to judges of the Supreme Court and judges of the district court of the United States who have served ten years, it is optional with them to retire on full pay, 70 years of age and ten years of service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) It seems to me, looking at the scope of the resolution and having regard particularly to the reason suggested by the Prime Minister, that there are possibly some cases not provided for by this resolution and which might deserve consideration. For example, take the case of a judge who is appointed at the age of forty-five years and has served twenty years, and at the age of sixty-five he finds himself subject to some infirmity which greatly interferes with or absolutely prevents the discharge of his duties as a judge. It seems to me that the reasoning of the Prime Minister would include a case of this kind. But the right hon. gentleman will observe that that is a case which is not covered by the terms of this resolution.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps to meet a case of that kind we might require some medical certificate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am assuming that everything of that kind would be safeguarded by such means as would be found desirable in the public interest. I do not know whether cases of that kind have been considered by the government, but in listening to the observations of the right hon. gentleman it struck me that there might be cases of that kind which would be just as deserving of consideration as those which are dealt with in the resolution.

Mr. OSLER. With these resolutions I entirely agree. I cannot see why they should not be extended to all the judges. If the age limit is to be applied to the lower court judges I do not see why it should not be applied to judges of the higher courts. As the hon. gentleman knows, there are cases where a man reaches his greatest vigour and is more useful at eighty years of age than at sixty. But these cases are very rare. I do not know why exception is made of the Supreme Court and Superior Court judges. It strikes me this provision should be applied to them quite as much if not more than to the lower court judges. I think in that particular the Bill does not go far enough. The Prime Minister truly said that when a man is appointed judge he should be rendered independent of all cares and anxieties as to money, and he should have full provision made for his old age after he has served the country for a long period. After all, I think these provisions do not go to the root of the matter, because the salaries we are paying our judges now were fixed at the time of confederation when living was very much cheaper than it is now. The result is, as the Minister of Justice knows, that to-day it is difficult to get the men we would like to take positions in the higher court. Another result is that we find our judges are more and more endeavouring by other means to implement their salaries. We find the judges in our higher courts, many of our best judges that we all look up to with great confidence, taking positions as directors of various companies, looking out for various outside sources of supplementing their incomes. I think that is a serious detriment to the administration of justice in Canada, and some way ought to be found of stopping this practice, as I consider it a very serious evil. These judges are sought for by companies whose object it is to get men who will inspire the public with confidence in their concerns. My experience of judges is that as a rule they are not good business men, and I think that statement may be made of judges generally. I would be afraid to say what proportion of them, at all events in Ontario, take positions in companies about the business of which they can really know nothing. They are forced to do so because their incomes are not sufficient for their position. Any lawyer of great ability in large centres like Toronto, or Hamilton, or London, or Mont-

real, or Quebec, or Ottawa, will make a larger income in the practice of his profession than the salaries received by any one of our judges. I think we cannot attain what ought to be our object, that is to have judges who are absolutely independent, until we increase their salaries very materially.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In answer to what has fallen from the hon. genleman, I may say that it is not within our power to affect the tenure of office of judges of the high court. Under the British North America Act, section 96, the Governor General has exclusive power of appointing judges of the superior, district and county courts in each province. Section 99 provides that the judges of the superior courts shall hold office during good behaviour. So we have absolutely no power to interfere. I must admit that I am one of those who would not like to have power to interfere with the judges of the high courts. I think the more they are kept beyond our control, directly or indirectly, the better it is for the bench and for the public at large. I would like to take advantage of this occasion, when I am endeavouring to do as much as I can for the judges of the high courts, to say that I agree entirely with what has just fallen from the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) when he says that it is not desirable that our judges should be mixed up in commercial corporations. I hold strong views on that subject myself, and I have no doubt about the impropriety of it. I am of the opinion that if a judge is paid a salary to give his whole time to the service of the country in that position, he has no right to divert any portion of that time to any other purpose. I think that remark applies with great force to those judges who take upon themselves to sit as directors in financial institutions, and to be connected with corporations which take a portion of their time, to the detriment of the interest of the public.

Mr. WRIGHT. Representing as I do a rural constituency, I would like to say a word with reference to these resolutions, and for this reason. We have in our constituency a very intelligent, broad-minded and liberal judge, who has passed the age of eighty years. Now we think it is only right that a judge such as this one should be allowed to retire with full allowance and full pay. We are exceedingly anxious that the very best men the country can afford should be placed upon the bench. If there is anything that we are prouder of than another, it is the status which our judges have throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion of Canada. We are exceedingly anxious that conditions may be made such that our best men can take these positions and this resolution enables them when in the natural course of events they are no longer able to perform their duties to retire on a sufficient allowance. In my own constituency and in other rural constituencies there are men in the ordinary walks of life who are not able to engage counsel in a case which comes before a judge and it is an advantage to have a fair-minded judge who will take the case up for them and see that justice is given to them. This matter has come to the notice of the people in my constituency for the reason that our judge is very advanced in years and he will be able to retire with an allowance if the resolution that is now before the committee is carried out.

Mr. GALLIHER. I heartily concur in this resolution just as it is. I am not sure that the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is not one that would probably involve us in difficulty afterwards. If I undertsand aright the provisions of this resolution they are to reward those who have spent a certain number of years in the public service. It might happen in the case suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition that a judge might be incapacitated by illness or by some accident from performing his ordinary judicial duties. Then we would have to be guided by the question of the degree of fitness or unfitness. While we might say of one judge that he was unfitted we might say of another judge that he was unfitted in a lesser degree, and that while we would give a certain benefit to one we would not give the same benefit to another because he was not unfitted to the same degree. I can see that difficulties might arise in regard to that. A judge may have served five or ten years and he may meet with an accident which renders him unfit to perform his duties as a judge. He would then be placed in the same position as a judge who had probably served twenty or twenty-five years, that is if I understand the suggestion aright which has been made by the hon. gentleman. I do not think that is really the intention of this resolution as brought down and if the government were to adopt such a suggestion I take it that they would meet with that difficulty. I wish to say a word further, not in connection with this resolution, but in connection with judges. In my opinion judges and especially judges of the Supreme Court are underpaid. We certainly want the very best men that we can possibly get at the bar to act as our judges. There is no more important position in the land to fill than that of judge. Judges have in their hands questions as to rights of property between subject, and subject sometimes involving very large sums of money. Therefore, we should have the most honest, the most upright and the most capable men that we possibly can have, men most learned in the law, men possessing judicial minds, and I would like to see some measure brought in by which the salaries of these judges will be increased or a readjustment of the salaries of judges from one end of

Canada to the other made. If they are worthy of the office of judge, then, they are worthy of being paid proper salaries, salaries that will place them beyond any question of suspicion of being tampered with in performing their duties and place them beyond any question of want when their term of office expires or they are obliged to retire by reason of age. I would also say a word in reference to county court judges and particularly the county court judges in the west. For instance, in that part of the west where I live and practice my profession our county court judge is paid $2,400 per annum. He has not the advantage, as in many places in the east, of being able to receive fees from surrogate work, so that practically all that the judge in Kootenay county, British Columbia, and I take it in other counties in British Columbia has, is the sum of $2,400. That was not a sufficient sum to induce any man who practices at the bar, who has any practice in any town or district in British Columbia to accept a seat on the bench. There should be some provision by which the salary of these judges should be increased, there should be some fees derived from surrogate work, or they should be allowed a certain amount for living expenses, because living expenses are much higher there than in the east. The salary of our county court judge unaided as it is by fees from outside sources is much less than the salary of county court judges in the east.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Everything is higher out there.

Mr. GALLIHER. Everything is higher, even most of the men.

Mr. GILMOUR. Do I understand that this resolution in regard to Supreme Court and Superior Court judges requires that they shall reach a certain age before they are entitled to their retiring allowance ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the law as we have it, a judge immediately after his appointment, if he becomes incapacitated from illness, may retire upon two-thirds of his salary. If he has served fifteen years at the expiration of the fifteenth year he can go off with his pension notwithstanding the fact that he may be in full possession of all his faculties. In the amendment which I now propose if a judge has reached seventy-five years of age and spent over twenty years on the bench he may retire, or if he has reached the age of seventy years and spent twenty-five years on the bench he may retire, or if he has served thirty years on the bench he may retire, whatever his age may be.

Mr. GILMOUR. I think if anything should happen to a judge after five or ten years service he should have some portion of his salary as a retiring allowance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was desirous of seeing what safeguard has been provided by the statute in the case which has been referred to by the hon. Minister of Justice, namely, the case of a judge who, having served less than fifteen years, becomes incapable of properly performing his duties, and therefore has to retire.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no way of compelling a judge to retire. He must act of his own motion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will send the statute over to my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In reply to what has been suggested by my hon. friend from Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher), of course, I understand that there must be some safeguard, and that you must not adopt any policy that would place any judge under the control of the executive. I would be as much afraid of that as my hon. friend is, but I would like to point out to him that under the law as we have it at present, you have the matter dealt with already in the case of a judge who not having served for 15 years, nevertheless becomes incapable of performing his duties as judge. I will read the section, omitting the immaterial portions :

> If any judge of any superior court who becomes afflicted with some permanent infirmity disabling him from the due execution of his office, resigns his office ; Her Majesty may by letters patent under the great seal, reciting such permanent disability, grant unto such judge an annuity equal to two thirds of the salary annexed to the office he held at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately after his resignation and to continue henceforth during his natural life.

I am not at present aware, whether there is any provision in the statute as to ascertaining what the permanent disability is.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A medical certificate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) This is the practice of the Department of Justice, and not a provision of the statute. Of course, that does not provide for the case where the judge becomes incapable of resignation. Then, applying the principle of the law as it is at present to the case I suggested, you would have this condition of affairs perhaps : A judge appointed at the age of 45 years, having served for 20 years, and becoming afflicted with a permanent disability such as is mentioned in this section, would if such a policy commended itself to parliament, retire under the provisions of the statute on a salary equal to that which he enjoyed at the time of his resignation.

Mr. GALLIHER. That is what I thought the hon. gentleman was referring to, and that is what struck me as to the 15-year

limit provided for by the statute, and not up to the 25 or 30-year limit; that it seemed clear that if the judge retired from disability such as you mention, you would be practically applying to him the principle of long service, whereas in reality he had not served the full term designated as long service, for instance, the 30 years or 25 years, after attaining a certain age. I can understand his being paid a proportionate part, according to the years of service, but not the full amount of the salary such as a long service judge would receive.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) was raising some objection on the ground of the difficulty of ascertaining the permanent disability. I was dealing only with that portion of his remarks, and I was pointing out there would be no more difficulty in that case than there is under the provisions of section 14 and 15 of chapter 108 of the Revised Statutes. Assuming that there is no difficulty of that kind, and there is no more difficulty in the one case than the other, then the other question comes up as to whether or not you have got as strong a case under the circumstances I have suggested for giving to the judge on retirement his full salary, as you have in the cases which are set forth in the resolutions introduced by the Minister of Justice. In the one case you have a man of 70 years of age not afflicted with permanent disability, but retiring on full salary because he has served 25 years. The case I have mentioned seems equally meritorious, namely the case of a judge having attained the age not of 70 years, but 65 years, having served not 25 years, but 20 years, but at the age of 65 becoming afflicted with some permanent disability which would prevent him from performing his judicial duties. It seemed to me, speaking off-hand, that a case of that kind possessed as much merit as the case of a judge who has attained the age of 70 years, and has served 25 years, but who is not afflicted with any permanent disability which should necessitate his retirement.

Mr. GALLIHER. It would be only a question of whether you have the two principles; one the case you have mentioned, and the other the principle of granting a man full pay who would serve the full term. You would have to have a double principle.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That observation of my hon. friend (Mr. Galliher) is perfectly fair and logical. You are, in the case I am suggesting, combining the principle which has been acted on in the statute I have referred to with the principle which is embodied in the resolution of the Minister of Justice. Whether this is a wise and logical thing to do is a question, and I am inclined to think it is wise.

Mr. GALLIHER.

Mr. WADE. It does seem to me that we should not fix the period of 20 years' service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was only using that by way of illustration.

Mr. WADE. It does seem to me that a man who goes on the bench and leaves his practice, after he has been on the bench for 10 years and is afflicted by some permanent infirmity, such as blindness or deafness, or anything of that sort, so that he is permanently unable to discharge his duties as judge; it does seem to me that in such a case as that he should be permitted to retire with his full salary. If the principle is good in one case it would seem to me that it is good in the other case. Indeed there might be far stronger reasons why in the case I speak of he should be retired with his full salary than in the other case. If a man goes on the bench at 45 and leaves his practice, and then at 50 years of age, after his practice has gone from him, he is unfit by infirmity to sit upon the bench, he has either to do one thing or the other, he has to retire on two-thirds of his income—and that is impossible in our province, where the judges have only $4,000 a year—or else he has to remain on the bench and not discharge his duties. It would be better in the public interest to allow a judge who has been in service five or ten years and becomes permanently afflicted, to retire on full salary.

Mr. GOURLEY. One strong argument to support the ground that in case of infirmity a judge should retire and retain his full salary, is that a judge should at once, when he finds himself unable to discharge his duties, be in a position to retire. I know one instance where a judge would retire now, but because of the fact that he cannot retire with his full salary he does not feel in a position to retire, and, therefore, the administration of justice is retarded by the presence of a judge who ought not to discharge judicial duties on account of his infirmity, and who would not discharge them if he had an opportunity of retiring on full pay. When there is a physical infirmity rendering a judge incapable of fulfilling his duties, I think he should be allowed to retire on full salary, in order that whenever he feels that he is not capable of exercising his duties, properly, he can step down and out without financial regret.

I want to say one word in support of the views of the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher). I think the salary of $2,400 a year for the county court judges of Nova Scotia is entirely inadequate at the present time. When the salaries were fixed twenty years ago, there might have been something to be said in favour of such a small figure; but to-day that salary is utterly inadequate to enable a judge to maintain that social position which is necessary to the proper dignity

of a judge. It is so small that it rather renders him an object of sympathy and pity than of dignity. That should not be the case. Our judges should be in a position to live well and to be independent of any thought of dependence on the public or otherwise.

Then, I have often been anxious, even before I entered this parliament, to bring another matter to the notice of the Minister of Justice and the other lawyers in this House. At confederation there was a principle established of making a distinction in the salaries of the judges in the different provinces according to the population or the area of those provinces. I think that distinction is absolutely vicious. If a judge in British Columbia, where the population may be only 300,000, exercises the highest judicial functions in that province, on what ground of justice is he paid a smaller salary than the judge who exercises the same high functions in another province, simply because the territory or the population happens to be smaller ? I regard this as a most invidious and unjust distinction. In fact, it makes a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia inferior to a judge of the High Court or to a judge who exercises similar jurisdiction in some other province. If a judge exercises supreme jurisdiction in his province, whether it is over twenty people or over one million, his salary should be equal to that of any judge in Ontario or Quebec. After all, it makes no difference in principle that the population is larger in one province than it is in another, because the judge can only do so much work in the province. As a matter of fact, the judicial territory in the larger provinces is divided up, so that a judge in a judicial district in Ontario or Quebec has no more population or territory to exercise jurisdiction over than a judge in Prince Edward Island. Although the province is larger, the particular district to which the labours of the judge are confined is not in many instances as large as the circuit in the smaller provinces. Therefore I ask the hon. Minister of Justice to wipe out this unjust and invidious distinction, introduced at the time of confederation. I think all the legal gentlemen in this House will support me in the contention that there is no reason why the salary of a superior court judge in Ontario should be one cent more than the salary of a superior court judge in British Columbia, Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia. Judges exercising similar jurisdiction in every part of Canada should be paid the same salaries. I say that in defence of the judges of Nova Scotia, and I am sure that every legal gentleman from every other province will assert the same principle.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The difference in the salaries of the judges in the different provinces has been a standing grievance for a long time, and I trust that at no very distant day something may be done in the direction of levelling up judicial salaries. However, one must not try to do too much at one time, and if I accomplish now what I have undertaken, I think I shall accomplish something, and I would prefer to leave another part of the work to some future time.

Mr. KENDALL. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question or two in regard to the demeanour of judges towards gentlemen at the bar and court-houses full of ratepayers. I have not much to say of a derogatory nature of the judges of the province of Nova Scotia. I have always understood that most of these gentlemen have been men of great learning, of high character and generally of gentlemanly demeanour. But I wish to bring before the notice of the Minister of Justice the fact that on two or three occasions during the last year or two the bar has been subjected to indignities by members of the bench and court-houses crowded with respectable ratepayers have been attacked in the most malignant way by one or more judges of the province of Nova Scotia. I ask, is a judge within his rights when he reflects on the character of a committee appointed by a county council to contruct a court-house ? Is he within his right when he makes a malignant attack on the tastes of a court-house filled with well-behaved ratepayers ? I will not say more than this, but I hope this reference will secure in the future more respectful treatment of lawyers and of people whose business of inclination takes them to a court-house. I would intimate to these judges, if my remarks should reach their ears, that if they wish to command the dignity due them, they must treat barristers and the people who frequent their courts with that consideration to which they are entitled.

Mr. KAULBACH. Being a layman, I had no intention of taking part in this discussion, but I certainly consider that I would be derelict in my duty to my county were I to remain silent. The resolutions with regard to the pensions of judges are, to my mind, contrary to what I consider a just principle. Our judges in our different courts are supposed to live within their salaries, but if they are improvident and lay nothing by for a rainy day, that is their own faults and they should suffer the consequences. I would very much rather increase the salaries of our judges than give them pensions. We have more judges now than we have work for, if I can judge by the work of my own county. There the judges sit twice a year and despatch the business in two or three days. I therefore do not see why the number should not be reduced by one-half, and then give double pay to the others and abolish this system of pensions. The public who have to pay the judges' salaries and pensions are deserving of some consideration. In my opin-

ion, the principle of pensions to any one, I care not who he may be, is wrong, and I take this opportunity of expressing my disapproval of so uncalled for, extravagant and unprecedented a drain as calls, on the exchequer of this country.

On resolution 2,

Mr. SPROULE. That seems to be very exceptional treatment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We will let that stand and consider it another time.

On resolution 3,

Mr. STEPHENS. I was somewhat surprised to find that the hon. Minister of Justice had made some changes in the ages at which county court judges may be compulsorily retired. When this resolution was first put on the Order paper, it read, 'seventy-five years,' but now it is 'eighty.' I am of the opinion that not one man in eighty is as capable as younger men. I have made some inquiries, and have failed to find a mercantile or financial institution in this country with a man as manager at the age of eighty. Let a man seventy years old seek employment in any institution where brainwork is required, and he will not in many cases succeed, but even should his application be entertained, the undertaking would not prosper under his management as it would under the management of a younger man. I consider the position of county court judge a very responsible one—one that requires a man to be in possession of all his faculties. This is certainly required of a man who has to look into and decide intricate cases, and that generally without delay. Besides that the position is a responsible one, for the reason that from the decisions of a county court judge, in many cases, there is no appeal. Look at the case from a merchant's standpoint. A merchant may sue a man for $100 or $200; and if the judge is incapable of giving a proper decision, he not only injures that merchant from a monetary point of view, but his character as well. I propose therefore to move in amendment to clause 3 that the word 'eighty' be struck out in the first line, and 'seventy-five' be substituted, and that 'seventy-five' be struck out in the third line and 'seventy' be substituted.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The reason for the change from seventy-five to eighty is this. When the resolutions were first introduced they attracted some attention, and I discovered that in Ontario there were three county court judges who would be compulsorily retired at seventy-five, notwithstanding the fact that they had not served twenty-five years. Consequently, they would have been obliged to retire on two-thirds their salary. Under the circumstances, I thought it better to extend the period of time into eighty. The law now provides for action by the executive where you have a county court judge not competent to perform his duties. An application may be made to the Minister of Justice, and he can appoint a commissioner who will hold an investigation, and the judge may be retired by Order in Council. So that we have that provision at the present time, and I think it is only fair to go as far as we can towards giving such relief to the county court judges as we can give; and I do not think we are giving too much by adopting the resolution in its present form.

Mr. CLANCY. The rule of forcing retirement on the county court judges is, no doubt a very harsh rule. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice has gone so far as to say that he would have that made compulsory with the Superior Court judges, if he had the authority to do so. I think that when an hon. gentleman brings a resolution in this House, he ought to have the courage to make a charge rather than shelter himself behind the privileges of parliament. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Stephens) insinuates, without having the courage to state and take the responsibility of his statement, that one of the county court judges, presumably in the county he represents, is unfit for his position. Will the hon. gentleman declare from his place in this House that there is a county court judge in the county of Kent who is unfit to discharge his duties? If he is prepared to do that he will assume some responsibility and will show some courage. This is not the first time the hon. gentleman has played a second part in these matters. The hon. gentleman some time ago proposed a resolution in this House which he had never framed, a word of which he had never written, but which had been placed in his hands, with regard to one of the Superior Court judges. He is now playing an equally false part with regard to his own county. He has had a resolution placed in his hands to move here, prompted by somebody from his riding who wants to secure an appointment there. If he wishes to make a charge against the county of Kent judges let him be man enough to make that charge rather than insinuate what he dare not state.

Mr. STEPHENS. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that he is mistaken in saying that this resolution was written out and given to me. It is wholly my own suggestion. And I was not making any insinuation as to the judge of the county court in Kent county. I simply say that there are several judges that I know of in Canada who are not capable of discharging their duties.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Stephens) know that?

Mr. STEPHENS. I know it from statements made to me by solicitors in the different counties.

Mr. LENNOX. What counties ?

Mr. STEPHENS. There is no need to say what counties. The hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) is wrong when he insinuates that this amendment was placed in my hands to be read to the House. He evidently thinks that there is no one capable of doing anything in this House except himself. In that he makes a sad mistake. Beyond the age limit I have proposed, very few men are able to discharge the duties of any bench, to say nothing of the county court bench. A judge of the county court has great responsibility. He is only one man, and in many cases, there is no appeal from his decision. His position is more important than that of a judge of a higher court.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman state what hardships have come under his notice to induce him to take the course he does ?

Mr. STEPHENS. It is not necessary that I should state them. I say that a man of eighty years of age is not capable of discharging properly the duties of a judge. I think that is a good stand, and that is the stand I am going to take.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman, I think, stated that I thought nobody to be capable of doing certain things except myself. I wish to say that I do not think there is any gentleman in this House capable of doing what he has done except himself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) who gives vent to that utterance that he is not playing a part consistent with the high position he holds as a member of the legal profession.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not a judge.

Mr. CLANCY. Surely the hon. gentleman ought to stand by the eminent members of his own profession who are guilty of no greater crime than that of growing old, I hope he will be spared to be as guilty as the oldest of them, and that nobody will say 'oh !' when that time comes should his case be discussed. I do not expect to see that time myself. As to the hon. member for Kent, he is not a legal gentleman. Depending upon hearsay and that, no doubt, from some person who wishes to get an appointment at his hands, he comes to this House and partly insinuates that certain judges are unfit to occupy their position at eighty years of age, yet refuses to state that he knows of a single case where hardship has arisen from cases of that kind. I think I can leave him in the position he occupies, a position which does not display great courage.

Mr. STEPHENS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) know of any judge who is not capable of discharging his duties ?

Mr. CLANCY. I have never said that there was one.

Mr. STEPHENS. But does the hon. gentleman know of any such case ?

Mr. CLANCY. I know of none.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Minister of Justice how many judges in Ontario will be retired under this Bill if it passes as he proposes ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The committee will be surprised to learn how few judges will be given relief under these resolutions, should they pass in their entirety. In the High Court there are only two men in the whole province of Quebec, one man in Nova Scotia, and one in the North-west Territories.

Mr. GOURLEY. Who is in Nova Scotia ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The chief justice, who is seventy-five years of age and has been twenty-two years on the bench. There is one man, Judge Richardson in the North-west Territories. In New Brunswick there is one, the chief justice. With respect to the county court judges in the county courts of Ontario, there are :—Judge Elliot, who is eighty years of age and has been thirty-four years on the bench; Judge Hughes eighty-one years of age and forty-eight years on the bench; Judge Deacon, seventy-nine years of age and thirty-five years and six months on the bench; Judge Lazier, seventy six years of age and twenty-one and one-half years on the bench; Judge O'Brien, eighty-three years of age and thirteen and one-half years on the bench; Judge Ketchum, seventy-five years and six months of age, and fourteen and one-half years on the bench; Judge Woods, eighty-four years of age, and seventeen and one-half years on the bench. In the county court of New Brunswick there is Judge Stevens, who is eighty-one years of age and who has been thirty-six years on the bench—and who, I may say, has been for a long time asking for such legislation as is now brought in.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the hon. minister any account or memorandum as to the number who would be retired in the course of two or three years.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. It took considerable time and labour to get together the information for this memorandum. Unfortunately we have not in the department the ages of the judges at the term of their appointment and have some difficulty in ascertaining them. I do not apprehend that there are very many who would be affected by this legislation within the next two or three years.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister will not be able to find out their ages now.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I may say that I have not had any complaint with respect to the legislation now proposed. I

do not think its operation will produce hardship. After all, judges who have got beyond seventy-five years of age retire with full pension. So, there is no hardship so far as they are concerned.

Mr. POPE. They ought to have full pension.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Some of them ought.

Mr. MACKIE. In regard to Judge Deacon's age, he is in his 81st year, instead of 79.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have taken Judge Deacon's word for it.

Mr. MACKIE. I have taken Judge Deacon's word for it myself, within the last three months.

Mr. BENNETT. In view of the prospect of three more appointments of county court judges in the province of Ontario, I think the Minister of Justice might give a thought as to how these appointments shall be made. A principle was inaugurated in the province of Ontario that worked out well, namely that it was thought better not to bring active politicians from the scenes of their fights and place them on the bench. That principle was observed by Sir John Thompson, and was supposed to be an admirable one, but owing to party exigencies the Minister of Justice, since he has been in office, has been forced to break in upon it, and the result is that we see in the province of Ontario, installed in judicial places, men who have been the keenest politicians and are now brought face to face with the people with whom they have been fighting for many years. While that has been going on, I must congratulate the Minister of Justice that in the county of York, and in the county of Grey, he did not promote the junior judges. I think that was an admirable conclusion arrived at by the minister. I think that both those gentlemen who are junior judges deserve richly to be reprimanded as they were by not being promoted. I hope the active part taken by them in politics will be a lesson to all junior judges in future, and that they will prefer to take chances of preferment by reason of their merits rather than by reason of their political affiliations. Coming down to the question before us, I say that in my opinion the salaries of Superior Court judges, particularly in Ontario, are not high enough. I wish to say also that I think there are too many judges in our province. What have we seen lately? At the last session of the Ontario legislature, in deference to political leverage, for it cannot be anything else, the provincial government has arranged for the appointment practically of three more judges. As I understand the law, once the province has determined upon the appointments, then it is the duty of the federal power to supply the salaries. It is a notorious fact that in Ontario the superior court judges are not pressed with work. I think perhaps there has been some congestion so far as appeal judges go.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it not a fact that there are only two judges to be appointed, and one is to be taken from the chancery division?

Mr. BENNETT. That will be two too many, in the opinion of the general public, I think. It comes to this, that in the province of Ontario we all believe that we should have better men on the bench than some of the gentlemen who have been getting on. In order to get the best men, you have got to pay higher salaries. I have understood that there are Superior Court judges to-day in the province of Ontario who are quite willing to do more work, but they expect more pay for it, and I think they are right. It is a notorious fact that in past years Superior Court judges in Ontario have crippled the courts, owing to the fact that they were absent from their duties. In regard to county court judges, it has got to be a screaming farce, appointments are made in counties where there is no more need for a junior judge than there is for five wheels to a wagon. I am not going to say that the government who are now in power are entirely to blame for that, because I think the former government erred in that respect also. But now that there is to be an appointment in the county of Prescott, let me draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that in that county last year there was not a single case tried in the so-called county court. There might have been a division court case, but the return shows that in the county of Prescott not a single case was tried before the county court. In view of that fact, and seeing there is a junior judge in that county, it would be well to promote him, and in that way do away with one. Take the county of Ontario, which has two judges, in that county last year there were three cases tried. Political exigencies have played such a part in the appointment of judges that we find in the county of Ontario that Judge McCrimmon, the senior judge, is a man in the prime of life, and yet he is assisted by a junior judge, and owing to political exigencies it was found necessary to appoint a third gentleman as surrogate court judge. So there are three gentlemen practically standing around to do work that might be done by one. The time has arrived when there should be a thorough revolution in relation to county court judges. Let there be fewer of them. So far as salaries go, I think, with the addition of the surrogate fees that are paid to them, their salaries are fairly good; but in regard to the superior court judges, I think it is the opinion of the lawyers and of the general public that they should be paid higher salaries and that there should be fewer of them.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend is somewhat mistaken when he says that Sir John Thompson laid down the principle that county court judges should be taken from the bar outside the district to which they were appointed. That principle was laid down by him, it is true, but when the question came up for discussion some time ago in the House, I had an analysis made of the appointments that were made by Sir John Thompson, and when this resolution comes up again for consideration I intend to bring that down, and the hon. gentlemen will learn that we have all sinned very much with respect to these appointments. While the rule has been laid down by Sir John Thompson, I am not disposed to say that I think that rule ought to be abrogated.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether this clause is intended to affect junior court judges as well as county court judges.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. All county court judges.

Mr. PORTER. It says every county court judge. In some legislation that took place a few years ago with regard to the salaries of county court judges, that expression was used, and it was afterwards construed to have application only to senior judges, but not to junior judges. I would suggest to the hon. minister that that be made perfectly clear by adding junior judges. While I am on my feet, I desire to say a word with reference to the salaries that are paid to county court judges. I quite agree with the remarks that have been made by some hon. members that the county court judges are not sufficiently paid. As I understand the matter, the salaries now paid to county court judges were fixed at the time of confederation and there has been no increase since then. But there has been a decrease of some $200 to $400. At the time the salaries were fixed, it is an actual fact that the cost of living to a county court judge was very much less than it is at the present time. The salary was then fixed, not only having regard to the cheapness of living, but having regard to the duties that were then expected to be performed by a county court judge. Now while there has been no increase in the salary there has been a very significant increase in the cost living of the county court judges and there has been a very significant increase in the amount of work they are expected to perform. Instead of only performing the duties belonging to county courts and division courts, as they were intended to perform at the time of confederation, there has been passed since that time not less than 52 Ontario and Dominion statutes, imposing additional duties upon county court judges. Now, is it reasonable to expect that they should perform the duties imposed upon them by these 52 additional Acts of parliament without additional salary, while at the same time they are obliged to pay a higher cost for living than at the time their salaries were fixed. In fact they are paid a smaller sum.

It does appear to me that it is entirely unfair to the county court judges. This matter was recognized by parliament in regard to the superior court judges, when in 1873 an Act was passed increasing the salaries of the high court judges it was put in the preamble, that owing to the increased cost of living, the government of the day felt it incumbent upon themselves to increase the salaries of the superior court judges. If there was an increase in the cost of living for the superior court judges, there was a similar increase in the cost of living for the county court judges and while parliament increased the salaries of the supperior court judges it decreased the salaries of the county court judges. There is another very cogent reason why the salaries of the county court judges should be increased. A part of the means of adding to their salaries has been taken away from them. In former times it was quite the usual practice for a county court judge to fill the dual position of county court judge and local master of the high court. Now, in any county of this province where that position becomes vacant it is no longer given to the county court judge, but an appointment from the bar is made to fill that position and that source of revenue is cut off from the county court judge. In former days fees that were derivable from the business transacted in the surrogate court were given to the county court judges, but now the practice is that if that position becomes vacant a special appointment is made from the bar to fill the position and these fees go into the pocket of the appointee and are not received by the county court judge. One other strong reason why county court judges should be paid more is this: County court judges, in addition to being county court judges, are to all intents and purposes superior court judges with the one single exception that they do not try high court cases, but all chamber motions and applications of all sorts in connection with cases in their respective counties are heard by the county court judges as local judges of the high court and instead of this business being performed by the judges of the high court in Toronto as formerly, it is now performed by the judges of the county court and in that way their duties have been very materially increased, while there has been no proper adjustment of their salaries. If I understood correctly we have received an intimation from the Minister of Justice that something would be done in the future for these county court judges and I hope he will see his way clear to do something for them in the very near future.

Mr. FOWLER. I entirely agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Hastings

(Mr. Porter) as to the necessity of increasing the salaries paid to county court judges on account of the additional cost of living at the present time as compared with that at the time their salaries were fixed and the additional duties that they have to perform. In my own province we are not so fortunate as to have one or two judges for a single county. We have only one judge to attend to the judicial duties in several counties and that statute respecting speedy trials has caused a very large increase in the expenses of the judges. The judge of the county that I represent is also the judge of the county of Albert. If a man is charged with a criminal offence the judge is obliged to go to the county of Albert when this person applies for trial, and he is put to considerable expense for railway fare and also his living expenses during the time he is absent. For this he receives no remuneration whatever. I think the salaries of the county court judges should be increased for the reasons which have been so ably enumerated by the hon. member for Hastings.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have a great deal of sympathy with what has been said by the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) in regard to an increase in the salaries of the county court judges and I would like to repeat what I said before, that I concur in the statement that our county court judges should be better paid, but I am afraid I am placed in the same position that much more eminent men than myself have found themselves in when they attempted to increase the salaries of the county court judges. They withdrew the resolutions after they had got them into committee. This question has been under consideration since 1883. I have a letter written by Sir John Thompson to one of the judges, in which he says that he hopes during that session to bring down a resolution for the purpose of increasing the salaries of the judges of the high court and the county courts. Unfortunately, he never got beyond the resolution. I think the judges are not paid sufficiently well. I think they ought to receive further consideration, but, however, that is only my own personal view and I cannot do more than express it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say a word in reference to the controversy that took place between the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) in reference to the policy laid down by the late Sir John Thompson. I remember quite well, when Sir John Thompson was Minister of Justice, pressing him to make an appointment in my own county and he informed me that he had determined upon the line of policy intimated by the hon. member for East Simcoe and that he could not make the appointment of the gentleman we then thought it desirable to appoint, and he did not make it. Might I suggest that the hon. member for East Simcoe is quite correct and at the same time the hon. Minister of Justice may be correct? Posibly at the commencement of his term of office Sir John Thompson had not adopted that policy, but after having been Minister of Justice for one or two years he came to the conclusion that it was a proper policy to adopt and that from that time forward he did adhere to that policy. The hon. Minister of Justice may be quite correct in saying that he made appointments in a way different from that intimated by the hon. member for East Simcoe, but these appointments may have been made in the earlier part of the regime of Sir John Thompson.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will produce here a list of the names of the gentlemen appointed, the districts to which they were appointed and the dates at which they were appointed. I have a memo. all prepared and I will have it here when these resolutions are taken up again.

Mr. HENDERSON. It occurred to me that both the hon. gentlemen were right.

Mr. FOWLER. Could the hon. Minister of Justice give us some data as to the judges who will be affected by this eighty year provision. I understand that the amendment proposes that the word 'eighty' shall be struck out and that 'seventy-five' shall be substituted.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think it is a pity that the hon. Minister of Justice did not have sufficient courage, as his predecessor had, to bring down a resolution to increase the salaries of the county court judges and let us see who are the members of this committee who will stand up and say that they are sufficiently paid. I can only speak of the province of Ontario, and I am bound to say that I do not think there is any man in the public service that is as poorly paid as the ordinary county court judge in that province. It is no criterion of the work of a county court judge, when you speak of the number of cases that are returned as having been tried in the county court. In that return there are only included certain cases over which the judge has civil jurisdiction. To begin with, the county court judge saves the country an enormous amount of expense in the trying of criminals. More and more every day men charged with criminal offences are advised by their counsel that they are just as safe in trusting their liberties to the county court judges as to a jury. I am safe in saying that two-thirds of those charged with criminal offences in nearly every county of Ontario now elect to be tried by the county court judges, and the county court judges have power to try all offences except murder or treason. It must be recognized by parliament that judges who have such full jurisdiction in regard to the liberties of the

subject, must be competent men or else the parliament of Canada would not allow them to do that work. Considering the cost of living to-day, and considering that a public servant who is underpaid is not fairly treated, we have, I think, to admit that our county court judges are not treated by the country as they should be. I wonder sometimes that we can get competent men to take the position, and I often think that it must be public spirit rather than the salary that induces them to do so. Probably they desire to serve their country rather than to look to the compensation that attaches to the office. I know that many county court judges could not live on the salaries they get had they not private means. That ought not be so. If a man has not got a shilling and yet is fit to be a county court judge, the salary ought to be sufficient to enable him to take the office. Without unduly delaying the House at this late hour, I wish to emphasize particularly on the Minister of Justice that had he brought down a resolution to increase the salaries of the county court judges—I speak of those in the province of Ontario about whom I am most competent to speak—such a resolution would have received the support of a large majority of the members of this House. I regret that the Minister of Justice did not bring down such a resolution, because I believe that the county court judges in Ontario at least are at present very much underpaid.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The amendment proposes to reduce the age of compulsory retirement from 80 years to 75 years, it being 75 years in the original resolution. I believe for the reasons given by the Minister of Justice, that the age should be maintained at 80. It would work a great hardship on several of the county court judges if the age is not so maintained. In my county the judge who on his appointment had every reason to believe that he would be continued during life and good behaviour in his office, will be about 23 years on the bench when he is 75 years old. That would only entitle him to two-thirds of his allowance, and I believe that would be unfair. Several such cases occur in Ontario, and I believe that 80 years should be maintained as the age of compulsory retirement.

Mr. LANCASTER. What period of years does the Minister of Justice intend to insert in the blank?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not intend putting the resolution through to-night, and I thought I would like to hear what the committee had to say on the subject. I shall take it into further consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the reason for confining it to a certain number of years ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was inserted when we had the limit fixed at 75, but now in view of the change I do not think there is any need for it now.

Amendment allowed to stand.

On section 4,

Mr. STEPHENS. I wish to amend section 4 by striking out the figures 'thirty-five' in the second line and substituting the word 'thirty' therefor.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why have you fixed any number of years here? I do not see why, if a county court judge becomes afflicted with some permanent disability 25 years or 20 years or even 10 years after he has been appointed to office, he should not be taken care of by the state just as well as after 35 years. I cannot see any merit in a man having the good luck to be in office a few years longer before he was afflicted with some permanent infirmity. If it is a sudden affliction that comes to a man it is a matter he cannot control. If a man having given up his profession and not intending to retire, but being rendered by the act of God afflicted so that he cannot perform his duties, it seems to me he ought to have the right to be looked after no matter at what period of his service it happens.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will remember that up to last year or the year before if a county court judge became permanently disabled at any time before he had been on the bench for ten years, he simply went off and got nothing at all. Last year the law was amended so that if he had served five years he became entitled to half his pay, and if he had served ten years to two-thirds of his pay. If we did make this change with respect to the county court judges, we would put them in a more favourable position than the high court judges ?

Mr. LANCASTER. That might not be undesirable, considering the small salaries they get.

Mr. LENNOX. Suppose a judge is not willing to resign his office, what does the hon. Minister of Justice propose to do ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is a serious question. We had two cases of that kind in Canada, and in neither case was anything done except to let the judge continue on. That has been the course followed in England. I would ask my hon. friend to let the amendment stand as well as the resolution, and I would ask that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the order of business to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Railway Commission Bill will be taken up, and we will endeavour to clear off other matters on the Order Paper as much as possible, probably the lead resolutions, and later in the day other Bills may possibly be dealt with.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, August 6, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 236) for the relief of Harford Ashley.—Mr. Porter.

EXCHEQUER COURT AND RAILWAY DEBTS.

The PRIME MINISTER moved that item 47 on the Order Paper, to wit, second reading of Bill (No. 155) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts (Mr. Demers) be placed among government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT SALARIES.

Mr. CLANCY asked :

What increase of salaries have been granted to officers and employees of the Customs Department in Montreal during the last three months ? What are the names of these employees ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). The following is a list of the increases in question :

	Increase.
M. Charland	$100
E. H. Mercier	100
E. T. Wilkes	50
T. S. Slattery	50
J. Davis	50
J. S. Sorley	50
T. Butler	50
A. Bourret	50
J. S. Loyer	50
B. Heroux	150
J. Hough	50
F. L. Chevrier	100
A. E. Giroux	100
J. M. Bessette	150
J. A. Chicoine	50
R. Fontaine	50
P. Martin	50
P. J. O'Neil	50
J. C. O. Brière	50
T. J. Dawson	100
E. O'Shea	100
J. Z. Corbeil	$ 100
J. McCluskey	50
J. Murray	50
B. T. Holdbrook	100
N. Provost	50
J. A. Robert	50
E. Bernard	50
H. McCamley	50
J. Cannon	50
J. A. A. Larin	50
D. Manson	50
M. Neher	50
J. Drysdale	50
S. B. Lytle	50
S. St. Jean	50
P. McGovern	50
M. McGurn	50
H. Gauthier	140
P. Keane	50
W. Murphy	150
T. Logan	100
C. Killoran	90
F. Brabant	100
J. B. Desbois	100
P. J. Martin	80
H. Hearne	80
P. Sansfaçon	50
E. Beauvais	50
J. Dwane	30
E. Elliott	30
P. Locke	30

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

MR. A. W. WRIGHT.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

What different sums of money have been paid, and at what dates, and on what account, to A. W. Wright, Conservative organizer, of Toronto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). On the 29th October, 1895, Mr. Wright was appointed a commissioner to inquire into the sweating system in Canada. He made his report on the 6th of March, 1896.

The total expenditure on account of this commission was $904.90, the details being as follows :

Services, eighty-eight days at $5 per day	$440 00
Board and lodging	269 50
Travelling expenses	174 20
Miscellaneous	21 20
	$904 90

BRITISH COLUMBIA LABOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. EARLE asked :

Has the commission appointed by the government to investigate the labour troubles in British Columbia reported ? If so, will the report be laid on the Table of the House, and when ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The commission has reported, and its report is now in the hands of the printer. As soon as the report is printed, a copy will be laid on the Table.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY—MEETING IN CANADA, 1906.

Mr. CARSCALLEN—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to invite the International Congress of Geology to hold its next meeting in Canada in 1906 ?

2. If so, what steps have been taken to that end ?

3. Have delegates been appointed by the government to attend this year's congress in Vienna ?

4. If so, who are they ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1. and 2. The government has informed the Royal Society of Canada that if the society's invitation to the International Congress of Geology is to hold its meetings in Canada in 1906 is accepted, the government will furnish certain funds for receiving and entertaining the congress.

3. and 4. Dr. Bell, the acting director of the Geological Survey, has been given authority to proceed to Vienna as a representative of Canadian geologists and as delegate of the Royal Society, for the purpose of delivering the invitation.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—PARISHES CROSSED—LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA.

Mr. MORIN asked :

What parishes will the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific cross between the Quebec bridge, at Lévis, and the county of Temiscouata ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is not possible to name the parishes through which the road will pass until the location of the road is made, but it may pass through the counties of Lévis, Dorchester, Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet, Kamouraska and Temiscouata.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—CROSSING OF MOUNTAINS.

Mr. MORIN asked :

In what county and at what point will the line of the Grank Trunk Pacific cross the chain of mountains that separate it from the line of the Intercolonial ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I can only say that the line has not yet been located, and we cannot answer the question definitely.

TRENT CANAL—EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICER.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Who is medical officer to the government contracts and contractors on the Balsalm lake to Lake Simcoe section of the Trent canal ?

2. How far from the works does he reside ?

3. Has the government received any complaints anent his neglect of the workingmen on the works ?

4. What is his remuneration ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. The Department of Railways and Canals have no doctor employed on the Balsam Lake to Lake Simcoe section of the Trent canal, and are not aware as to whether or not the contractors employ one.

2. The above answer, answers this question.

3. The Department of Railways and Canals have received no complaints.

4. Answer to No. 1 answers this question.

TRENT CANAL—PAYMENT OF WAGES—CASE OF MR. THOMAS DODDS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the case of Mr. Thomas Dodds, of Woodville, now a patient in Lindsay hospital, been brought before the Department of Railways and Canals, he having been working on the Balsam lake to Lake Simcoe section of the Trent canal ?

2. Is the government aware that he has not received his pay for some time, the excuse being given that the government has not paid the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. No record can be found in the department of any such complaint.

2. The department is not aware that he has not received his pay for some time.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—PRINTING OF THE BILL IN FRENCH.

Mr. J. EMILE LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Order of the Day is called, I wish to draw the attention of the government to the fact that Bill (No. 235) concerning the National Transcontinental Railway has not yet been distributed to the House in French. I wish the government would hasten the printing of the French copy of the Bill.

BRITISH CABLE NEWS SERVICE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions :

That it is expedient to enact as follows :—

1. The Governor in Council may authorize the payment of the following sums, in the respective fiscal years mentioned, for the purpose of assisting in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain, for publication in the Canadian press :—

(a.) For the fiscal year 1903-4, a sum not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars, or at the rate of fifteen thousand dollars per annum for any period less than a year.

(b.) For the fiscal year 1904-5, a sum not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars.

(c.) For the fiscal year 1905-6, a sum not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars.

(d.) For the fiscal year 1906-7, a sum not exceeding ten thousand dollars.

(e.) For the fiscal year 1907-8, a sum not exceeding five thousand dollars.

2. The said sums may be paid at such times and in such manner as the Minister of Finance

may determine, to any association or committee representing the proprietors of such newspapers as may associate themselves for the purpose of establishing and maintaining such service.

Provided, however, that no payment shall be made under authority of this Act until the Minister of Finance shall have satisfied himself that the benefits of the service are open, on fair and reasonable terms, to all newspapers published in Canada; and that not less than one-half the cost of establishing and maintaining such service is paid by the proprietors of the newspapers participating in the benefits thereof.

3. The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

Motion agreed to.

RAILAY ACT, 1903.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions:

That it is expedient to provide as follows with respect to the salaries of the board, and other expenses incidental to the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill, now before the House, to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways :—

1. The chief commisisoner to be paid a salary of $10,000 per annum.

2. The two other commissioners to be paid salaries of $8,000 each per annum.

3. The secretary to be paid a salary to be fixed by the Governor in Council, not more than $4,000.

4. Such salaries and remunerations to be paid to the other officers, staff and appointees of the board, and such other expenses to be paid incidental to the carrying out of the provisions of the Bill as are approved by the Governor in Council.

5. The salaries of the commissioners and secretary to be paid monthly out of the unappropriated funds in the hands of the Receiver General. All other salaries, remunerations and expenses, including travelling expenses, to be paid out of the moneys to be provided by parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) is not in his seat at the moment. He will be here soon. In the meantime, I may expose to the House the reasons which have induced the government to suggest the salaries mentioned in these resolutions. These salaries are the highest that will be paid by the government for any officers that we have at the present time; they are even higher than the salaries of the justices of the Supreme Court and superior courts of the land, higher also than the salaries of the ministers. It has been observed, and, I think, with a great deal of truth, that the salaries that are now paid to the highest judicial officers are becoming—indeed, have actually become—insufficient. No revision of such salaries has taken place for thirty-five years, since the opening of confederation; and the opinion has been expressed more than once on the floor of this House in past sessions, and during the present session also, that the time has practically arrived when it would be advisable to have a revision of salaries paid to the judges. The commission which we are organizing will have to discharge duties of no less importance than the duties now discharged by the judges. Some of the officers, especially the chief commissioner will have to be versed in the law generally and in the law of railways, and versed also in all matters which appertain the practical working of railways. That being so, it seems to us that the salaries proposed are not at all too high. In comparison with the salaries to be paid other officers, it may perhaps sound high, but, looking at it from the point of view of the importance of the duties which are to be discharged by these officers, and judging it also by what is done for the judges and other officers of the government, I think the House will be disposed to agree with us that what we ask them to vote is not at all unreasonable. If we compare the salaries we propose for these commissioners with the salaries that are paid to railway managers, for instance, whose duties are no higher or no more important than those assigned to the chairman of the Railway Commission, it will perhaps be agreed, that these salaries are reasonable. It must be borne in mind also that the gentlemen who serve on this commission will be denied many of the advantages which to-day appertain to the judicial office. For instance, the judges of the land are not removable, holding office during good behaviour. The members of the commission are appointed for ten years, and even during those ten years they are removable.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Ten years? I thought it was reduced.

The PRIME MINISTER. I feel assured that I am right in saying the term is ten years. But during those ten years the tenure of the office is not so secure as the tenure of the office of judges, because they may be removed in the same manner as lieutenant-governors are removed. The judges are not removable except after very exhaustive proceedings, they can only be removed upon an address voted by both Houses of parliament. From this consideration it seems to us that the sum of $10,000 which we propose to be paid to the chairman of the commission, is an adequate salary. If this sum is agreed upon as a reasonable compensation to the person who is to act as chairman of the commission, then we submit also that the sum of $8,000 pari passu ought to be the salary to be paid to the other two commissioners.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What constitutes the qualifications of the other two gentlemen?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no special qualification provided in the Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is no qualification for any of them, none for the chief commissioner ?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no special qualification provided in the Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The only thing I would add is, has the government come to any conclusion as to who will be appointed on the commission ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the question has not been considered. I would suggest a brief amendment to the resolution, that instead of saying the 'chief commissioner' we should use the words in the Bill, and say 'chairman of the commission.'

Mr. MACLEAN. It is chief commissioner in clause nine of the Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. If it is, then do not change it.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. In my opinion, my hon. friends on the treasury benches make a mistake in not paying suitable salaries. A minister of the Crown is not paid enough, though it is true he has the honour of leading a great party, and he has the privilege of being a Privy Councillor. But if you want, in this age, to get good men, honest men, you must pay them well. In my humble opinion the president of such a commission as this should be as well paid as the manager of a great railway corporation. I take the liberty of throwing out the suggestion, which perhaps may come more fittingly from me as I am an independent member of the House. The government might perhaps on this occasion, at any rate, pay some consideration to the advice which I am tendering, and which I believe will be echoed by those who have given this subject some attention. The salary of $10,000 is altogether inadequate. The government will not be able to get a strong man as president of this commission for any such salary.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to see the chief commissioner mentioned in this resolution paid at least $15,000 a year, and the two other commissioners paid $10,000. I would also like to see the manager of the government railways in this country paid at least a salary of $15,000. You cannot get men of the calibre required to take these offices, I believe, for a less sum than $15,000. Men who discharge similar duties in other positions are in receipt of $25,000 a year, and some of larger sums. Some bank managers are getting $15,000 to $20,000 a year, men who are not required to perform duties so important as those which men in this position will have to perform. I am not afraid to say in this House that I think the time has come when parliament ought to revise the salary list, and pay men of high executive capacity, and they are very rare, substantial salaries, something like what they would get in the open market when other great corporations required to choose executive officers.

The PRIME MINISTER. My own inclination would run in the direction indicated by the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte) and my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). There was a time when my ideas of economy were perhaps different from what they are today. At one time I thought it possible to diminish our public expenditure by millions of dollars. But I notice lately that every time we have attempted to do that our friends on the other side have prevented us from doing it. Therefore, I do not know exactly what to do in this matter, so I have taken the safe course of suggesting that we should adopt a salary of $10,000 a year. But if I live I shall not forget this expression of opinion, in which I largely share myself. The time may come perhaps when we shall have to attempt a revision of all the salaries paid under the government, especially the judicial salaries, and when we do so certainly the salaries allowed to these commissioners ought to be revised also.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of what the right hon. gentleman has just stated, that he does not know what to do in this case, I am bound to say that that is the position every hon. member of this House is in at the present moment. He has not stated whether he intends to appoint as chairman of this board an expert railway man. If he does intend to have a first-class expert railway man, he certainly cannot secure such a man for $10,000 a year. If the hon. gentleman says that it is such a man that he wants to secure, then I, as a member of the opposition, say that the proposed salary is insufficient to secure a man of that character. I think it is very important that the government should secure an expert railway man, because such a man is needed to fill the position that has been created. But in deciding on the salaries to be paid to these officials, I think we are putting somewhat the cart before the horse. The government should have appointed these men in the first place, and then we would be in a better position to say what salaries ought to be paid to them.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say for the comfort of the Prime Minister, who seems to have no one to come to his support, that in my judgment the great majority of the people of this country will think that the salaries he proposes to pay the railway commissioners are large enough, and unless he gets an extra superior man for chairman, the people will think the salary is perhaps a little high. So the right hon. gentleman need not worry very much about the danger of people grumbling, because he has not put the salary high enough. I am rather inclined to think he will re-

ceive the support of the great majority of people in his desire to keep it down.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am glad to find that the ideas of the first minister are getting expanded, that he has larger ideas now than he had in former times. I hope, if he lives to be as old as I am, his ideas will keep getting larger and larger. We must remember the condition of things existing now in comparison to what they were in former times. While my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has not the honour of being a minister, he has the honour of being what I was once myself, an ex-minister of the Crown. So we must wear these honours with our usual modesty. The late Lieutenant Governor Tilley told me that when he went home to London on a delegation with my great friend, Joe Howe, as they used to call him, Howe used to say to him, 'Tilley, you must enlarge your ideas, you must have a wider breadth of beam, and if you live to my age, you will get clear of these narrow ideas.' I would say another thing to the right hon. leader of the government, and it is that if you are to have first-class men, you must give them first-class salaries; otherwise you cannot get first-class men.

Mr. MACLEAN. Perhaps the right hon. leader of the government would tell us whether there is any prospect of the farming portion of the community being represented on this commission.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think such is the intention.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if any estimate has been made of the total cost of this commission? There is an amount of $10,000, two amounts of $8,000 each and then $4,000 for the secretary. Of course, this is only a part of the cost of the commission. Can the government give us any idea what the annual cost will be?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Perhaps I may be able to throw a little light upon the question that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has asked while of course I cannot undertake to say that in what I may observe, I am expressing the present views of the government. The subject has received more or less consideration from myself, and I endeavoured to form a judgment as to what sum it would be desirable to ask parliament to grant the first year at all events for the purpose of the maintenance of this board. Looking at the amount of work which would naturally devolve upon it in the earlier part of its existence, considering that it would be called upon to enter upon inquiries and investigations in different portions of the country, and considering that in connection with these inquiries and investigations there will be more or less expense in summoning witnesses, procuring expert aid and assistance of various kinds in different localities, I thought that it would be unwise and unsafe to ask parliament to vote anything less than $100,000 for the first year. It may prove that the estimate is somewhat excessive. If it proved to be excessive no harm would be done if there was proper provision to enable the commission to work out the purposes for which it was created. If, on the other hand the sum that was voted proved inadequate, it would practically disable the commission from performing its work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall ask in the supplementary estimates for an appropriation for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the commission, but, as to the precise amount of it, I could not say anything at the present moment.

Mr. MACLEAN. Section 21 of the Bill says:

> The Governor in Council may from time to time, or as the occasion requires, appoint one or more experts, or persons having technical or special knowledge of the matters in question, to assist in an advisory capacity in respect of any matter before the board.
>
> 2. There shall be attached to the board such officers, clerks, stenographers and messengers, as the board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, from time to time appoints, at such salaries or remunerations as are recommended by the board and approved by Governor in Council. The board may, at will, dismiss any such employee.

I take that to mean that the Governor in Council can appoint all these officers.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. He will do so.

Mr. MACLEAN. On the recommendation of the board.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. MONK. The estimate made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) seems to be a very fair and just one, considering the work that is going to be confided to this commission. At the same time, I, for my part, agree very much with what has been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and it seems to me, that, as regards the assistance, which no doubt the commissioners will require, we ought to be able to find a man and two assistants to do the work required at the salaries which have been proposed by the government. These salaries are reasonably high. But, it occurs to me that it would have been wiser for us in view of the very large expenditure for which we are exposed in the creation of another commission, as I understand it, for the purpose of building the eastern section of the proposed transcontinental railway to defer for the present the creation of this commission.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, agreed to and referred to the Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 21.)

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

On section 255,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I propose an amendment, the object of which is that there shall be no change in the classification until notice of the application to have the change made has been published in the 'Canada Gazette' so that all parties interested may have proper notice and be represented if they desire. The change will be by way of an addition to the clause:

No goods shall be removed from any lower to any higher class until two weeks notice shall have been given in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. KEMP. Two weeks would not be sufficient notice for British Columbia, for instance. I think it should be at least six weeks.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Very well, we will make it read:

Until six weeks notice shall have been given in the 'Canada Gazette' or such further notice as the board may determine.

Mr. KEMP. I think that will be satisfactory.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I wish to add as section 309 (a) the following:

In every case in which the parliament of Canada votes financial aid by way of subsidy or guarantee towards the cost of railway construction, all mechanics, labourers or other persons who perform labour on such construction shall be paid such wages as are generally accepted as current for competent workmen in the district in which the work is being performed; and if there be no current rate in such district then a fair and reasonable rate. In the event of dispute arising as to what a current or fair and reasonable rate is, the same shall be determined by the Minister of Railways whose decision shall be final.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you copied that from the imperial contracts?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Practically.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not think you should impose on the Minister of Railways the duty of fixing the wages.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He will have to submit the question to some expert, and though it will be his decision, it will not be his task.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think it is sufficient to copy the clause in the imperial contracts without making reference to the Minister of Railways.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You would need some tribunal to appeal to.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the meaning of that clause?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The meaning of it is that the contractor should be obliged to pay in the particular district in which the work is done the rate of wages which is current for similar work performed by other people in the neighbourhood. That is to say, the contractor shall not have the right to bring in a lot of men and pay them wages far below that rate.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does that apply to companies which have already received government assistance?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. A somewhat similar provision is already in the Subsidy Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. minister made any provision for a case in which the contractor contracts himself out of this obligation? The hon. gentleman will remember the case which arose a few days ago in which a firm of contractors who had a contract for a public building at Nelson in the province of British Columbia, made an agreement with some men in the province of Quebec to go out at less wages than the current rate in the locality. They went out and did the work, not knowing what the rate of wages in the locality was until they arrived there, and on their return they sued the contractor. The Public Works Department ignored the fair wage contract, and declined to asisst the men in any way. Has the hon. minister made provision against a recurrence of a case of that kind?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think it would be exceedingly difficult for us to provide against a contract being made between a contractor and his employees as to the payment of any particular rate of wages. But the government have a right to make provision that a contractor who receives aid from the government shall pay a particular rate.

Mr. CLARKE. As I understand, there was a clause in the agreement between the contractor and the Crown that the contractor should pay the current rate of wages, and he ignored that provision. Can there be a repetition of such a case? I think the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) knows the circumstances of that case better than I do.

Mr. GALLIHER. In that case I think it was pointed out that in the contract made between the contractor and the men who were brought from the province of Quebec to British Columbia there was a consideration that their employment should be for a fixed term, that is, during the continuance of the erection of the building. That in itself, as I pointed out at the time, was to my mind a good consideration. They also received their transportation to the place of work and back home again if they chose

to come, and their keep in the meantime. I think that was the distinction that was pointed out. Further, in the contract which those men signed there was a statement in express words that they knew perfectly well that they were not receiving the wage that was being paid in the locality. Consequently they knew what they were contracting about. I am not justifying the transaction at all; I am simply stating the circumstances.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice if there is anything to prevent men who know what the prevailing rate of wages is in the district where the work is going on, doing what these men did in the case of the Nelson post office—contracting to work for less than the current rate of wages, provided the contractor pays their fare? Does that do away with the obligation of the contractor?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have not given the matter very much consideration; but it appears to me at first sight that no legislation that we could pass here could affect a contract of that sort. That is a contract relating to civil rights which has to be regulated by the laws of the province in which the contract is made. But, on the other hand, when we enter into a contract with a contractor or a company, and we undertake to give a subsidy towards the work that is to be done, we have a right to stipulate that the contractor or the company shall do certain things, and we can enforce that stipulation by means of the subsidy which we have in our hands when we come to make a settlement with them. But that is an entirely different thing from the point suggested by my hon. friend from West Toronto, which refers to contracting out by the labourer.

Mr. CLARKE. I think it was brought out pretty clearly that there was money for the work in the hands of the government when these men made their claim; but the ex-Minister of Public Works seemed to ride rough-shod over the Department of Labour, for he decided off-hand that the balance under the contract was due to the contractor, and paid it over. The men found, after they deducted their fare to Nelson and return, that they were $100 or $200 each short of the amount they would have received if the wage contract between the government and the contractor had been observed. There does not appear to be any machinery to enforce this wage clause, and it ought to be provided for here.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am now getting some information on the subject which my hon. friend has brought up, and I do not think all the facts in that case have been before the House. I was not here when the matter was discussed, but I have some recollection that a case of that kind came to the Department of Justice from the Department of Public Works. It was the case of a foreman who entered into a contract at Hull to work in British Columbia for a firm of contractors, one of whom was named Lemoine. He went out there, and asked to be paid the rate of wages that was paid in that particular locality to men occupying a different position. The papers came over to me and I think we reported to the Public Works Department that they were not entitled to retain any part of the subsidy. I speak from memory, however. If the matter is to be discussed thoroughly, I would like to have a proper memorandum prepared, so as to state to the House what the real facts of the case were.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think the case spoken of by the hon. member for West Toronto is not the same case. That case, I think, was never referred, the point being that there was no schedule rate of wages for a foreman in the labour regulations. The other case is, I think, a case of a blacksmith from Montreal.

Mr. FRASER. I remember, when the case was up, that reference was made to the fact that he knew what the terms of the contract with the government were. Knowing that they were entitled by law to receive a certain wage, if they choose to contract for another wage, they have a right to do so.

Mr. CLARKE. Can they do that under this clause?

Mr. FRASER. I would think that any special contract for a valid consideration would be effective. Any man may enter into any valid contract he pleases with his eyes open.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the point. It is quite clear that if a workman can contract himself out his rights, then the law becomes inoperative. If he signs away his rights he has no recourse.

Mr. LANCASTER. If this clause is intended to have any effect, it is to compel contractors to pay the wages usually paid in the locality where the work is done. To allow the labourers to contract themselves out of that right would be to nullify this provision. If we have the right to stipulate that the contractor shall pay certain wages, that carries with it the right to stipulate that any agreement made between a contractor and a labourer contrary to this provision would be null and void.

Mr. MACLEAN. The same question has come up in the matter of the Grand Trunk Railway benefit fund. The Grand Trunk Railway employees have been signing their rights away, and it is proposed to insert a clause that will protect them even if they do so.

Mr. CLARKE. If a contractor can make an agreement that will relieve him from the

obligation imposed by this law, the law is a dead letter.

Mr. FRASER. No, because in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the men would not enter into such a contract. They hardly ever do except they are going away a long distance and have some special reason. If a man thought it would be better for him to go to a new country and that was part of the consideration, he should be bound by the contract he made with his eyes open. If the Act of parliament said that by no contract could he put himself outside the statute, that would be different, but that would be going rather far.

Mr. LANCASTER. Can there be any objection to doing that once we undertake to interfere with the freedom of contract? The object, I presume, is to prevent a contractor beating down wages by bringing men from a distance. If he should bring men from a distance, he ought to pay them the wages current in the locality where the work is being done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As the hon. Minister of Justice has pointed out a provision in the statute against contracting would be ultra vires. But if we make it part of the law whenever railways are receiving financial aid from the government, the workingmen employed in construction are entitled to a fair wage, then the government, in a contract with the railway company, may insert the condition that the company shall satisfy the government that it has complied with all the provisions of the statute. In this way you will have secured an effective remedy for the workingman.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would there be any objection to putting in a clause providing that the workingmen shall not be allowed to contract themselves out of their rights?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. Minister of Justice fully treated that point. He has given the opinion that any declaration in this Act that a workingman could not contract himself out would be null and void. It could not affect the legal rights one way or the other.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that a contractor may present a document binding the workman to receive less than a fair wage, and if the workman signs it, he is not bound by it? I did not understand the Minister of Justice to make that statement. I would like to know if that is his opinion of the law—that it is impossible for a man to contract himself out ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course it is not. I did not say it was impossible. I said that this amendment, being part of the general Act, if a company becomes entitled to financial aid, the practice is for an agreement to be made between the Crown and the company setting forth the terms under which the company is to be entitled to payment. The mere voting of a subsidy by this House does not complete the contract between the Crown and a railway company. The contract has to be entered into, and that contract contains necessary provisions. It seems to me that it would be proper, in framing a contract between the Crown and the railway company, under which the company was to be entitled to financial aid voted by parliament, to insert in that contract provisions requiring the company to comply with the law whatever it is. If the law is that the company shall pay to the men certain wages, it would be proper to provide for a compliance with that condition in the contract. And it does not appear to me that the contractor would be entitled to say that he has complied with the provision of the fair wage by showing that he had not paid a fair wage because the workmen had chosen to surrender the right to be paid a fair wage.

Mr. CLARKE. But the hon. gentleman (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is making everything depend on the contract and not on the statute.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) in any way object to this parliament declaring that such an agreement is null and void ?

Mr. CLARKE. What is the use of the clause ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will move to strike it out ?

Mr. CLARKE. Oh, no.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman objects to it, but will not have it struck out.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not object. But I simply want to point out to the minister that he is giving these workmen a gold brick instead of something that will be of real benefit to them. If the contractors can contract themselves out of the obligation to pay the current wages, what is the use of the clause? The contractor is fully aware of every condition of the contract he enters into with the government, and the men he is employing may not be. And it may be, as in the case of the men sent to Nelson, that it will be alleged that the privilege of seeing the romantic and beautiful scenery between the place where they made the agreement and the place where they went to work is compensation for the loss of the fair wage—that that is one of the conditions. Or it may be said that their fares were paid there and back. If these conditions may be interposed between the contractors and the government, what use is this law ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Not being a lawyer, I have often wondered, when there was a certain principle agreed to by the commit-

tee, why it could not be worded in such a fashion as to convey to everybody what is intended to be conveyed. We see that difficulty again right here. And I would suggest to the Postmaster General and Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir William Mulock) that when the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) is introducing a Bill he should allow that hon. gentleman himself to tell us what he means by it. The Minister of Justice is supposed to deal with legal questions, and I think he is prepared to explain anything he proposes to the House. As I understand, there is a consensus of opinion that any contractor who receives aid from the government should be required to pay his men the current rate of wages in the place where the work is being carried out. If that is the principle we are going to affirm, why cannot the Minister of Justice word a clause in the statute so that it will carry out the idea of the committee? I understand that as the clause is now worded it is possible—as in the case of the men employed in this part of the country to work in British Columbia—for a contractor to make such an arrangement with his men that they may be cheated out of the wages that they would be entitled to under what was supposed to be the law. It seems to me that the Minister of Justice could prepare a clause that would prevent the contractor from doing this. Suppose, for instance, that a contractor in British Columbia having a contract to which this section applied arranged with Chinese labourers to do the work at such wages as those labourers were willing to accept, but which would make it impossible for white labourers to obtain employment on the work at the rate of wages current in the district. This would clearly be contrary to what the committee intended, and I do not see why the Minister of Justice could not prepare a clause which would legally carry out what we wish, and one that would not provoke a controversy among legal men as to what it means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The proposition of my hon. friend the Postmaster General with regard to this matter seems peculiar. If there were no contract as to wages, or, to express it more accurately, if the rate of wages were not expressed in the contract between master and servant, you would have exactly the rate of wages provided for in the clause, namely, the current rate of wages in the district. But, according to the Postmaster General, you cannot interfere with a contract. Therefore, this clause has no operation at all. It has no operation in the case which has been suggested, because you get that rate of wages anyway in the absence of any other rate being fixed in the contract; and, in the other case, according to the Postmaster General, the clause which we are proposing to pass is ultra vires of this House, and so, of course, has no operation. I have not given careful consideration as, no doubt, the Minister of Justice has done, to the question as to how far you can go in the direction of interfering with contracts. It all depends upon that, of course. But I should not think you were going any further by saying that this should prevail notwithstanding any provision in the contract between master and servant. If you intend to touch the case where the rate of wages has been agreed upon between master and servant, I should think, with all deference to the Minister of Justice, that you are not going further if you say 'notwithstanding anything in the contract between master and servant.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If this section is good, that would go as a matter of course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) Perhaps so. Well, are you only going one step further—I do not think you are—when you say in addition to that that the servant shall not be allowed by any contract to put himself outside the provisions of this Act? Does my hon. friend the Minister of Justice think you are going further there?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid so. That is a matter I have considered rather carefully.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have an absolutely open mind on the subject, and the Minister of Justice may be able to convince me. In one case you say that this statute shall take effect notwithstanding any provisions to the contrary in the contract between master and servant. You are certainly dealing with the question of contract there, and you are getting the power to do so because that is supposed to be incident to the subject you are dealing with. If you go a step further, and say that any agreement not to observe the provisions of this section shall, as between master and servant, be void, are you really overstepping the line?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let me state the position, as I understand it. Of course, as to the question of contract, that must be regulated according to the law of the province within the limits of which the contract is made. I do not say that it is impossible for us to interfere with the contract, such as is here made, any more than with any other contract. But I do think that if we grant aid, for instance, toward the construction of a railway, we have a right to make it a condition of the grant that the company that receives the aid shall apply that money, in connection with the contract with its labourers, according to a fixed rate of wages. Now, we can only enforce that contract, so far as we are concerned, against the contractor or the railway company, or the individual, and in this case I speak of the railway company. We can only enforce it against the railway company; but we could not step in for the purpose of en-

forcing a contract against or in the interest of the employee of the railway company, because that is a contract absolutely independent of us.

Mr. CLARKE. Where does the employee come in ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In so far as we may be able by this indirect method to force the company, or the contractor, to pay the labourer a particular rate of wage, the company or contractor would feel that there was a penalty attaching to the non-fulfilment of the conditions. I have considered this matter as far as I could, and I do not see what more we can do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend may be right, because he has considered the question and I have not. But, I want to ask him this : If you can deal in that indirect way to the extent the hon. gentleman has stated, why can you not deal in that indirect way to the extent of preventing the employee from contracting himself out ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We might perhaps go so far as to prevent the employer from making a contract of that sort, but I do not think we could control the employee. There is no contract between us and the employee, but there is a contract beween us and the contractor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But would not that observation have the same application to what I said a moment ago ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice says it is only a sort of penalty which attaches to the party who contracts with the government. Supposing the government were to say : You have not been paying fair wages to your men, and we will retain the difference between what you have paid and what you ought to have paid. Can you do that ? To whose benefit is the money to accrue ? Does it go into the exchequer of the country, or has the Minister of Railways and Canals power to return it to the labourer ? I think the first position the Minister of Justice took was the correct one. Is this an incident to something which we have power to do, that is, the building of a railway ? We can exercise our jurisdiction to the fullest extent possible in building a railway. We can pass an Act of parliament which prevents an employee from contracting himself out, because that is an incident to the power we have of building a railway, we have full jurisdiction over that subject. I should say it is an incident to this power for us to see that fair wages should be paid to the employees upon the construction of any road which is being built under government supervision. If it is an incident to it, you have a right to say that the contractor shall pay to the employee a fair wage ; if not, you must said that it interferes with the jurisdiction of the local government over a contract between the employer and employee. You must take one of the horns of the dilemma.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the Minister of Justice if there is not a form of affidavit current in some of the departments, I think in the Post Office Department, which has to be made by persons who supply goods to the Post Office Department ? I think the contractor has to say in that affidavit that he has paid the current wage, and that he has complied with certain sanitary conditions.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am not aware of that.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it not be possible to provide a form of affidavit to which the contractor must subscribe, certifying that he has made no contract in violation of this section ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What does the minister do with the penalties that he is going to enforce under this Act ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Ask the Minister of Railways and Canals that.

Mr. MONK. The case of the public building at Nelson occupied the time of this House some days ago, but I do not think the Minister of Justice was present when that case was discussed. It was a case of three brothers who had engaged with the contractors of a building in British Columbia, and had contracted themselves out of the rate of wages mentioned in the schedule to the contract. It was evident by their agreement that there was an intention to escape the rate of fair wages mentioned in the schedule. I remember that these terms were used, that the amount paid to them was so much, but that in view of the advantages the contractor offered them by paying their passage money out, and giving them board, which would be deducted later from their wages, these advantages should be considered an equivalent to the $5 a day which was the rate mentioned in the schedule attached to the contract. It was urged here very strongly that we had no power, as the Minister of Justice observed a moment ago, to interfere with a contract made between the employee and the employer, and the fact, when representations were made to the Department of Labour and to the Department of Public Works, which was the department interested in that construction, they seemed to have come to the conclusion that as that agreement had been made between the parties, it was impossible to give these three men the relief they claimed, because they claimed that relief ; and in consequence of that contract having been made, they lost the sum they were claiming, which amounted in the aggregate to nearly $1,200.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have not lost it.

Mr. MONK. They have lost it unless they take the recourse suggested by the Minister of Labour of going into the courts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But the hon. gentleman said they were sure to win, and the defendants are responsible.

Mr. MONK. If the schedule had been observed they would have had the money at once.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did they lose it ?

Mr. MONK. It is a matter of determining the rate of wages. But when we voted a sum of $40,000 for the Department of Labour we imagined the labourers would be saved the misfortune of falling into the clutches of lawyers. Now, this amendment of the Minister of Justice appears to me to be on the face of it a very wise one, but I would suggest to him the advisability of adding a proviso that any contract made by the employer in avoidance of this clause, would be null and void. The labourers would find it out quickly enough, as my hon. friend knows, and the employer would be warned by the law that he must make no stipulation which would deprive any man of his fair and equitable wage. I think that would be an admissible law, it is not contrary to public order, and it is perfectly fair. It would simply state that the workman, who is very often the victim of the necessities and blandishments of the employer, would have that protection that the law declares in the contract he should have, and that if he makes any contract with the contractor in avoidance of the terms of this clause it will be null and void. My hon. friend from Grey suggested that it might be an interference with the right of contract. There are cases in which parliament can interfere with the right of contract. We had one under discussion yesterday, and this very clause now I think is an interference with the right to contract, and a justifiable one and the only suggestion I make to the hon. Minister of Justice is to add that proviso.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have considered the wisdom of making the provision that my hon. friend refers to, that the labourer shall not have power to contract out, and I am of opinion that this cannot be done, that it is not in our power here to regulate contracts between employer and employee. I do not think we can interfere with that ; at the same time, the matter is one that is worthy of consideration and I am quite willing to consider the matter further if it is so desired, but I must confess that up to the present time I have not seen how it is at all possible to interfere with a contract between employer and employee.

Mr. CLARKE. Could you not make the employer sign a statement to the effect that he had not evaded the payment of the current rate of wages ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, we could make him do anything that we choose in respect to his employees, but that is a matter of contract between himself and the department.

Mr. CLARKE. Could you not provide that he shall make an affidavit that he has not contracted himself out of his obligation to pay the current rate of wages? The hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir. Wm. Mulock) has some such affidavit that he requires all persons doing business with his department to subscribe to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be a matter of contract between the employer or the contractor and the department, but I do not think that it ought to be made a matter of statute.

Mr. CLARKE. Of course, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier pointed out how these men could be imposed upon, and if the desire of parliament is to protect them and to see that they are paid the current rate of wages, we ought to be able to provide machinery to carry out our intention.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think a contract such as was referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier by which the labourer would contract out of the provisions of the law would be perfectly valid in our province. Under our law a labourer has the right to contract out. It would not be enforceable in Ontario as I understand because I am informed that the contractor cannot contract out under the Employers' Liability Act. An amendment might be made to the Civil Code in our province to prevent a labourer from contracting out, but I do not see how we could make that amendment here.

Mr. PUTTEE. I should like to point out to the hon. Minister of Justice that if it is acknowledged that power to contract out lies in the clause it is practically acknowledging that it is of very little use to the worker who needs this protection most, because, if there is power to contract out, the worker is going to be practically forced to contract out.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) seems not to have read the provisions. While a man has a perfect right to contract out it relieves the contractor as to the labourer, but not as to the department. The department can still enforce this agreement against the contractor.

Mr. PUTTEE. While the department can go on and enforce its contract with the contractor I am surprised to hear the opinion that contracting out would still be allowed. It must be remembered that the proposal to contract out would always be made on the part of the employer himself. There

is another matter that I would like to mention. This amendment is carrying out in almost the exact terms the resolution of 1900, that went through this House and, of course, it is only right and proper that we should apply it to all railway grants, bonuses and subventions, as I believe it has been applied to some in the past. We have had three years' experience of trying to enforce the current wage resolution and a good deal of information has been acquired upon the subject. The British House of Commons after having this resolution in force for six years, appointed a commission to inquire into its working and found out a great many of the drawbacks which are similar to those which we have experienced in this country in the last few years. The very fact that the resolution was of some use has been proved by the number of expedients that have been resorted to on behalf of contractors to overcome it. In the amendment which has been proposed the hon. Minister of Justice will see it is proposed that in case a dispute arises as to the current rate or fair rates the matter shall rest for decision with the Minister of Railways and Canals. Is the hon. minister aware that we have fair-wage officers whose whole duty lies in ascertaining what fair or current rates of wages are in different parts of the country? I should imagine that with the experience they have had these officers are becoming supplied with very valuable information as to what fair and current rates are throughout the country and it seems to me that the Minister of Railways and Canals would have no officer in his department to whom he could delegate this work in case of a question arising as to what was a fair rate of wages.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. These fair-wage officers who are in existence may be used for the purpose of giving advice to the Minister of Railways and Canals when he is called upon to decide as to whether or not a contractor is complying with the terms of his contract, but I think it would be going rather too far to say that we should substitute a fair-wage officer for the minister in connection with an important matter of this sort.

Mr. MONK. I think with some other hon. gentlemen that it is very important if it is possible that we should protect the workingmen, because there is no doubt—I say this with no desire to appear as the protector of the workingman especially—that they will be the sufferers unless some relief can be afforded to them by the amendment suggested by my hon. friend. When this session opened, the hon. Minister of Justice will remember that I had a Bill before the House by which I endeavoured to place the responsibility for fires caused by railway companies upon the railway companies, but I admitted that the matter of torts or damages was a provincial matter and that we could not directly legislate in this House that railways under the control of this Dominion should be responsible for fires caused by their locomotives. I thought that was impossible because it was an invasion of the provincial field by the Dominion legislature. Therefore, my Bill consisted of an endeavour to make clearer some provisions of the Interpretation Act so as to arrive indirectly at the result which it was desired to obtain. But that did not meet with the views of the hon. Minister of Justice; whereas, a direct law decreeing in very words that the railway companies shall be responsible for fires caused by the locomotives, is now incorporated, as I understand, in this Bill. In other words if my view is correct we have legislated on a matter of damage and tort which is in the provincial field exclusively in a manner designed to meet the point. According to the view entertained by my hon. friend, I suppose that we were legislating in regard to Dominion railways and that therefore we could impose any conditions that we chose upon the railways under our control even if those conditions constituted an invasion of the provincial field of legislation. I believe that has been held by the Privy Council in the case of the taxation of the banks which came up before the provincial court and went to the Privy Council. If we can do that why cannot we legislate in the sense that no contract by which a labourer will have contracted out of the conditions mentioned in the law will be available before the department, or some such legislative disposition without decreeing especially that any contract made by the labourer with the employer shall be null and void, which might, as the hon. Minister of Justice says, be beyond the powers of this legislature, or say, as least, that any such contract cannot be invoked between the contractor and the labourer in so far as the subsidy granted by this parliament is concerned? I would not undertake to word the clause; I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Justice can do it much better than I can. But if we have legislated that the damages occasioned by fires caused by locomotives under the control of railways that are under our control, shall be paid by the railway company, surely we have the right to legislate in regard to the contracts existing between contractors and labourers on railways which are under our immediate control. That is the point I wish to make.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think the two things can be compared. In the case of damage by fires the position is that where an individual who suffers damage applies to the railway company for redress, he can only apply on the principle that there has been fault on the part of the railway company, which fault has resulted in damage to the individual who seeks redress. What the Privy Council decided in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway was, that if a company does that

which the legislature authorized it to do, there can be no fault, and it seems to me that notwithstanding all that has been said about that judgment, it is a most elementary principle that there can be no fault where there is legislative sanction for doing the thing complained of. With respect to the amendment to which my hon. friend referred, what we decided here was purely and simply that while we authorized the company to operate its road in a particular way—if we limited ourselves to that we would relieve them from responsibility for anything that might happen so long as they remained within the law—we specifically extended that feature in the doing of the thing we authorized, by saying that for damage occasioned by way of fire caused by them, they would be responsible. That is to say, we limit the extent to which they would have the right to go in connection with the operation of their road. That is completely within our control. But what I cannot up to the present time see is, where we can get authority to interfere with a contract entered into between two individuals within the limits of any particular province with respect to the lease and hire of service. A contract is made between two individuals, and if the law of a particular province allows absolute freedom of contract with respect to that, then how could we do anything here which could in any way influence that particular contract or modify it? How can we restrict the right of the parties to that contract? How can we determine any limit to the area within which they can contract? Where do we get authority to do it? I contend that we have a perfect right to say to a man who asks us for assistance, that in consideration of the assistance we are giving him he shall do so and so, and if he doesn't do it we have recourse against him for failure on his part to comply with the terms of his contract. But that we can govern the relations between himself and some one else for the benefit of that other person, I cannot see where we can get authority to do it.

Mr. MONK. If the Minister of Justice is right the only question is this: Can we push our right to legislate in regard to these railways that are under our control to the point that we will regulate the relations existing on those railways between employer and employee. My hon. friend, I suppose, admits that principle?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Railways do not come under the control of this government simply because they receive subsidies from it.

Mr. MONK. As far as the subsidy is concerned, they do come under the control of this government.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Then, going beyond that point which was mentioned by my hon. friend, since we have the right to legislate as to federal railways, it seems to me that we have the absolute right to legislate as to the relations that will exist between the employers and employees on these railways. That is going very far, but it seems to me it is not going too far. As my hon. friend admits, the moment we grant a subsidy to a railway we can attach such conditions as we like to the granting of that subsidy. The Minister of Justice, by his amendment, goes this far: He decrees what shall be the relations between the railway company to whom the subsidy is granted and its employees, but he says that we cannot go so far as to declare void any contract in relation to that employment between those employers and those employees. I submit that we can interfere with such a contract, since we have the right on the granting of the subsidy to legislate as to the relations between employers and employees. We can go so far as it may be necessary for us to attain the object which the hon. gentleman has in view in this amendment, and we can declare that a contract made between a subsidized railway and its employees in avoidance of this amendment shall not be a contract which can be invoked between the parties. We can go that far.

Mr. LANCASTER. When I spoke on this matter about an hour ago, I am afraid I did not impress upon the Minister of Justice what my meaning was. I intended to convey to the Minister of Justice that instead of being afraid of interfering with other people's rights in that contract, we might be permitting them to interfere with our right of contract if we stopped short of what I suggested. That is to say, that any contract sought to be made—I would not say any contract made, because I do not admit they would have the right to break a contract entered into with us—but that any contract sought to be made in violation of this stipulation should be null and void for the purpose of this section. What I mean by saying that they might be interfering with our own right of contract is this: We certainly have the right to contract in regard to these subsidies; we have the right to say what conditions shall exist in the granting of these subsidies. When we make a contract with a contractor we say that one of the conditions shall be for the benefit of some other individuals who are citizens of Canada, and not for the benefit of the Dominion of Canada itself as a government. The government of Canada seeks to say to the contractor that these individuals who are workmen shall have certain rights which the contractor shall not take away from them. The minute we say that the power of a provincial legislature can make our contract ultra vires, then we are saying: Although we made this contract with this contractor intending him to carry it out for the benefit

of the workmen, we at the same time recognize that he shall have the right to violate it if he sees fit.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no; you can enforce it against him.

Mr. LANCASTER. The fact is that we have been arguing in a circle. We must be intending by that contract that this contractor shall pay a certain scale of wages and if we recognize that some one else can evade the effect of that contract then we are saying that our contract is no good.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why some one else ?

Mr. LANCASTER. We are making a contract for the benefit of these workmen, and if we let it be understood that without the consent of the government, that the contractor can make another contract with these very people we have undertaken to protect, then we are doing away with the whole benefit of our contract.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And if he does that he pays the penalty.

Mr. LANCASTER. But what good does the penalty do the men we are trying to protect ? What is the object of the contract ? It is to benefit these workmen, and how are they going to get their fair wages by that penalty being paid ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Because the man who is subject to the penalty is more likely to do what is required of him.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is there any better way by which we can prevent a contractor making these unfair contracts than by expressly enacting that if he does make such a contract it will not be of any use to him after he has made it ?

Mr. CLARKE. If the contractor and the workmen have a right to agree together to that effect, why should we penalize the contractor or the company for making an agreement which they have a perfect right to make ? What is the use of this clause ? If we cannot by legislation in this House prevent that being done, I think we should oblige the contractor to make an affidavit before the subsidy is paid that he has not done so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We could do that as a matter of regulation.

Mr. MONK. I do not know that the remedy suggested by my hon. friend would be as complete as the one mentioned a moment ago ; but perhaps the two might go together. The affidavit would be a very good thing, although my feeling to-day is that I have a great distrust in human nature ; but I would add to it the other proviso. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says that what we are contending for is already provided for in the amendment of the hon. Minister of Justice ; and so it is to a certain extent, because by this amendment we do legislate as to the contract of lease and hire of work. My hon. friend says by his amendment that the labourers shall be paid at such a rate, irrespective of any contract. It seems to me that we should take very great precautions in this case. An affidavit to be furnished by the railway company before the subsidy is paid will certainly produce an excellent result ; but railway contractors and companies are not always very scrupulous, and the man who makes the affidavit may consider that he has conformed to this clause, though he may not have done so. The three brothers who were despoiled of their just wage through the absence of the Minister of Labour, were paid, so the contractor represented, the equivalent of $5 per day. If we legislate between the lessors and lessees of work, I think we can go a little further, and provide that every agreement made in violation of this provision shall be null and void. If that had no other effect, it would have the effect, whether constitutional or not, of scaring the railway company, and I am not, like my hon. friend the Minister of Labour, against the workingman, but in his favour.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The suggestion which my hon. friend from West Toronto has made respecting the evidence which the contractor must give that he has complied with the conditions of his contract, is a regulation which would be effective, and if I were the Minister of Railways, I would be disposed to provide that such a regulation should be made part of the contract.

Mr. CLARKE. If it is a matter of regulation, it will rest with the government to provide such a regulation. I think it the sense of the House that it should be provided.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CLARKE. I would take the liberty of asking the hon. Minister of Justice a question with respect to section 193. That section, as originally in the Bill, was amended at the request of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was good enough to insert an amendment providing connections with railway stations by local telephones. The matter is one in which the municipalities of Port Arthur and Fort William are very much interested, and the mayor of Fort William has written that he is in doubt as to the meaning of this clause, and he has taken some advice upon it. The opinion given him is that it does not affect municipal telephones already in existence. I took the liberty of consulting the hon. member for St. John (Hon. Mr. Blair) and he gave me the opinion that the rights of municipalities

now owning a telephone service were fully protected.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would be prepared to accept any opinion expressed by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals on a subject to which he has given so much consideration. I know of no one more competent to give an opinion in relation to the Bill. My own view is that the words 'whenever any municipality is carrying on operating and maintaining a telephone system' would apply to any municipal system now in operation.

Mr. KENDALL. By clause 211, provision is made to compel all trains to be equipped with certain safety appliances, but by section 212 power is given to the board to exempt railway companies from this obligation. The board is therefore given a power which, in my opinion, should be vested in parliament alone, namely, the power of deciding whether in any particular case any railway company shall be exempted from providing safety appliances. The board, however, might be allowed the power of extending from time to time the period within which these appliances must be applied, on good reason being shown for the delay.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 212 has been adopted, and if the hon. member proposes to move an amendment to it, he must first move that it be reconsidered by the committee.

Mr. KENDALL. I move that the committee reconsider section 212.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Before this motion is adopted, I should like to thoroughly understand what my hon. friend has in view. I do not feel disposed to allow any amendment at present to this Bill which has had so much consideration.

Mr. KENDALL. The object of my amendment is to retain in the exclusive power of parliament the right to decide whether or not certain railways shall be exempted from using certain safety appliances.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What does parliament know about the apparatus to be employed ? How can parliament tell anything about it ?

Mr. KENDALL. If parliament does not know, in all probability the board will not know anything about it. I would not be content to delegate to any board the power to decide in such a matter. We can all understand what influence might be brought to bear on the board.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman means that the board might be influenced into making an order permitting a company to postpone making these improvements ?

Mr. KENDALL. I ask by my amendment that after the word 'section' in clause 212, all the words be struck out, and the following substituted. 'But may from time to time extend the period within which such appliances shall be used, on being furnished reasonable evidence by the railway company of its inability to comply with the law.' Instead therefore of giving this discretion to the board to exempt a company from providing safety apparatus, I would only give it discretion to extend the time within which the company must equip its road with such appliances.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Parliament has declared that certain improvements shall be placed upon railways. Some of the railways have not got these improvements but are getting them made and having them put on as fast as possible. Parliament then gives the commissioners the power of deciding whether these railways are proceeding with the requisite despatch in equipping themselves with these improvements, and the hon. gentleman wants to take that power from the commissioners and vest it in parliament.

Mr. KENDALL. If the hon. gentleman will read clause 212, he will see that the railway board is given the power to decide whether these safety improvements shall be applied at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am personally in favour of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), because it strikes me—as this discussion goes on I may be further enlightened—that section 212 is in exact conflict with section 211, and almost renders nugatory its provisions. We have spent a great deal of time in providing that certain things shall be done for the protection of the men working on the cars and for the protection of travellers also. Section 211 declares what shall be done and what appliances shall be provided. As I understand the amendment of the hon. member for Cape Breton, it is not what the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) supposed, but it is of a character that that hon. gentleman would favour. The amendment simply proposes that the board may have the power to extend the time for providing these appliances, if it thinks right to do so. But the section as it stands will give the board power practically to repeal section 211. I am opposed to that. Parliament, in section 211, declares that certain things are necessary for the safety of the public, of the railway employees and of passengers. That is for parliament to say. But, under section 212, the board may say that their opinion is better than ours, and so they may 'exempt the company from using upon its railway or any portion thereof, any of the appliances in the last preceding section mentioned, and may from time to time extend the period with which such appliances shall be used.' I do not think

that it should be for this board, with the manifold duties that they have to perform, to undertake the duties of parliament also, as they would be authorized to do under this section 212. I think the amendment should carry, because if it does not, we endow the board with power to enact the very opposite of what parliament has enacted.

Mr. MACLEAN. I might point out that the brotherhoods among the railway employees who are interested in this legislation desire this amendment. We fought all this out before, and got these protective clauses inserted in the law in their interest. But now, after we have the principle admitted, there is this section to make nugatory all that has passed in the law. Certainly, railway men are dissatisfied with the Bill and wish amendments to be made on the line proposed by the hon. member for Cape Breton.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely the hon. member (Mr. Kendall) leaves power in the board to make modifications of the provisions of section 211 ?

Mr. KENDALL. To extend the time only.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kendall) think that this amendment will make the clause more as desired by the railway employees than it is at present ?

Mr. KENDALL. I certainly would think so.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Under the present clause the railway company may be wholly exempt by the commission from the obligation to use these appliances.

Mr. MACLEAN. Under the amendment, the railway company must give a good reason why it cannot provide the appliances. That is what the men want. They say : We want these protective appliances, but we are willing, if the company show that they cannot provide them in a reasonable time, that the time should be extended; but we want them to comply with the law. I think it is only fair that this protection should be afforded to the railway men. Similar protection is afforded under the railway law of the United States. It was fought out there, the companies were given a certain number of years to put in these safety appliances, and they have put them in. Congress gave an extension from year to year for a sufficient number of years to enable them to make the changes. I can tell the committee that the men who are mainly interested and for the safety of whose lives these provisions have been put in this Act think that the Act is worthless as it is, and ask for this reasonable amendment.

Mr. CLARKE. It does seem to me that what the hon. member for Lincoln has stated is quite true, that this clause 212 gives too broad a power to the commission. It authorizes them to 'exempt the company from using upon its railway, or any portion thereof, any appliances of the last preceding section mentioned.' The only condition being that 'the same can be allowed without danger to the public or to passengers or to employees of the company.'

Mr. GALLIHER. I support the amendment of the hon. member for Cape Breton. I think it must strike anybody who will read section 211 and 212 that the amendment is necessary. In the first place, section 211 explicitly provides that there shall be these appliances. That is a parliamentary Act. But section 211 provides that, notwithstanding that we have legislated that these appliances shall be used, this board may allow exceptions and modifications, if they are satisfied that life is not endangered. In other words, it puts the power of legislation in their hands. I have been asked by the railway men interested, to look into this matter ; and I have looked into it, and am satisfied that what they are asking is reasonable and right. For my part I am prepared to support the amendment. All they ask is that the words after 'section' be struck out and the following substituted : 'but may from time to time extend the period within which such appliances shall be used'—that is, they do not want to be unreasonable in the matter. If it is a difficult task for the railway company to put in these appliances at once, or within a month, or within six months, let the time be extended, so long as the railway company can satisfy the commission that the delay is necessary. This is no hardship upon the railway companies, while it provides that section 211 shall be carried out, and the best possible appliances provided on our railways.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am afraid that if we adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Kendall) the result will be that improved appliances may be made by 1906 that cannot be used on these cars unless parliament is again applied to, and special provision is made. You have to leave some latitude with the board, but if the desire is to take away the right to exempt the company from the legal obligation to use these appliances, I would suggest an amendment that would meet that case.

The board may, upon application order that any apparatus or appliance specified in such order shall, when used upon the train in the manner and under circumstances in such order specified, be deemed a sufficient compliance with the provisions of the last preceding section——

The board must determine the extent to which the law has been complied with.

—but the board shall not, by such order, allow any exception to, or modification of, the requirements of such section unless fully satis-

fied that the same can be allowed without danger to the public, or to passengers, or to the employees of the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That throws a very heavy responsibility upon the board.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It does, it throws upon the board the responsibility of determining what ought to be done to protect the public against accidents in the way of providing cars and engines with proper equipments. Then we might amend the other part of the section. The section now reads :

And the board may, by general regulation, or in any particular case, on good cause shown, exempt the company from using upon its railway, or any portion thereof, any of the appliances in the last preceding section mentioned, and may from time to time extend the period within which such appliances shall be used.

The hon. gentleman is afraid that the board may have it in its power to exempt a company from using any appliances at all. I would suggest that we modify that section so as to leave out all the words between 'exempt' and 'mentioned.' So the section will read in this way :

The board may, by general regulation, or in any particular case, on good cause shown, from time to time extend the period within which such appliances shall be used.

Taking from the board the right to exempt the company from using the appliances, and giving them merely time to extend the period within which the appliances should be used.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is intended to apply to construction trains.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And small railways.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the clause as framed at present gives power where it is not necessary to use them on these particular trains.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the object of the clause.

Mr. INGRAM. These are the very trains they should be used on. Only the other day, on the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway, a gravel train ran into another one and killed some persons because they had not the proper attachments. I noticed in the evidence taken in the inquiry that it was stated that it was necessary to have these attachments on that class of trains. They are the very class of trains they should be on. I regret to say that on most railways they are not on.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the amendment I suggest, there would be no power to exempt any company from the use of these appliances, but the board would have the right to extend the delay within which the appliances may be used.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid the words he is leaving in and which the hon. member for Cape Breton wants left out, would accomplish what we wish to avoid.

The section now says :

The board shall not by such order allow any exception to or modification of the requirements of such section——

The member for Cape Breton wants it to stop there, but the minister says go on and add :

—unless fully satisfied that the same may be allowed without danger to the public.

Does it not mean that the board may allow any exception or modification if fully satisfied that the same may be allowed without danger to the public ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Supposing there are improvements which will enable us to do away with some of the appliances mentioned in the preceding section, and that the board of commissioners come to the conclusion that the use of these new appliances may exempt the company from the necessity of using all other appliances that are provided for, surely they must not be compelled to come to parliament every time they want to use new appliances on a railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. They must use better appliances than are mentioned here, for instance, outside ladders on the sides of each car. Would you say that the board ought not to have power to say that any other ladder will do instead of the one specified here ? This section would allow them to say that any other ladder could be used.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I suggest that the clause be made to read this way :

The board may, upon application from time to time, order that any apparatus or appliance specified in such order shall, when used upon the train in the manner and under circumstances in such order specified, be deemed sufficient compliance with the provisions of the last preceding section, but the board shall not, by such order, allow any exception to or modification of the requirements of such section.

Strike out all these words :

Uuless fully satisfied that the same can be allowed without danger to the public, or to passengers or employees of the company.

And then substitute :

But the board may by general regulation, or in any particular case on good cause shown from time to time extend the period within which such appliance shall be used.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 211,

Mr. INGRAM moved :

That subsection two of section 211 be reconsidered.

He said : I understand that it has been proposed that the words 'in Canada' in

the first line of subsection 2 of section 211 be struck out.

Mr. CLARKE. There is surely no objection to that.

Mr. INGRAM. Subsection 2 reads as follows :

All box freight cars built in Canada, for use on Canadian railways, after the passing of this Act, shall be provided with the following attachments, &c.

Mr. INGRAM. They might bring in cars from the United States and evade the Act.

Mr. CLARKE. We oblige our people to manufacture cars in Canada which will comply with the conditions of this section, but we do not oblige people who manufacture cars on the other side to comply with them. Cars may come from the other side without these attachments and be used in Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. The object of this amendment is to make sure that the section shall apply to cars built in the United States for use on Canadian railways. We know that the railway companies have not been able at times to get a sufficient number of cars in Canadian shops and that they are obliged to give orders to American manufacturers. If they are to be compelled to place these attachments on cars built in American shops and intended for use on Canadian railways then it will be necessary to strike out the words 'in Canada' in the first line of this subsection.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As far as I am concerned I think this Bill has been so thoroughly discussed when it was formerly before the House that I cannot see my way to agreeing to any amendment such as that which has been proposed.

Mr. INGRAM. All I have to say to the hon. Minister of Justice is that he will have to fight the people who do want it.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the objection, may I ask ? There has been a great dearth of cars of all kinds and the railway companies in Canada have been obliged to procure cars from the other side. As I understand, the object of the amendment is that these cars must be equipped as is contemplated under section 211. Is there anything unreasonable in that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is nothing unreasonable in it except that the company would be required to procure a lot of cars that could not be used in Canada. If they could not get sufficient cars in Canada they would buy these cars elsewhere and they could not use them because they might not be equipped according to this section.

Mr. INGRAM. Why should they not comply with the laws of Canada ? Why should not the company be compelled to specify in the contract which they make for cars to be built on the other side that they shall have these attachments ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a great diversity of opinion about the value of these attachments. I understand that the Master Car Builders' Association have passed a resolution absolutely opposed to their adoption.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no Master Car Builders' Association that has passed any such resolution, and any person who says that there is does not know what he is talking about. They simply have not approved of them, that is all, but they have not passed any resolution against them. Why should not the companies procuring these cars comply with the conditions laid down in this Act ? Many of the companies are building cars to comply with the conditions laid down in the Act. Who will pretend to say that the master mechanics are violating the rules of the Master Car Builders' Association ? It is simply idle rot to make such a statement and any man who has any knowledge of this question knows perfectly well that this is the proper course to adopt.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will point out to the hon. Minister of Justice that we have put this provision into the Bill in order to protect the men working on the cars. By allowing these two words to remain in the subsection an evasion is permitted in the case of a large number of cars and all we want to do is to carry out the law to its fullest extent and make it apply to cars built in the United States as well as to cars built in Canada. We have adopted the principle which is now in the Bill and we say that this principle should apply to all cars, and I think that when the object is pointed out to the hon. minister he will consent to striking these words out.

Mr. CLARKE. Subsection 2 provides that :

All box freight cars built in Canada, for use on Canadian railways, after the passing of this Act, shall be provided with the following attachments.

These attachments are specified in the subsection which follows. Then, the paragraph at the bottom of the page provides that :

All cars built prior to the passing of this Act shall be fitted with such attachments on or before the 31st day of December, 1905.

There is an obligation imposed upon the companies to fit all cars which are built and in existence at the present time with these attachments. There is an obligation on the Canadian manufacturer as well as upon the

railway company to attach the appliances to cars that are now being built in Canada. If the words 'in Canada' are not struck out the company may bring in as many cars as they please that may be built six months or a year from now in the United States, and these cars need not be equipped as the Canadian cars are. If the minister will give the objection raised by the men careful consideration he will see that it is reasonable.

Mr. BARKER. As the section stands now, it simply means that a Canadian railway company ordering cars from the United States can order cars differently equipped from those which they could order in Canada. I do not see what objection there can be in striking out these two words.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Read the section with these words left out.

Mr. BARKER. The words 'built for use' would not be carried so far as to mean cars belonging to United States companies.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In legislating it is not a question of how far you would carry it, but of what the words mean.

Mr. BARKER. You must give a reasonable interpretation to them.

Mr. CLARKE. They are not built for use on Canadian railways, but on American railways.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. They are built for use everywhere.

Mr. LANCASTER. If you strike out the words 'use on' and 'in Canada,' you will get it right.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton would not be of any value, because these cars are often in an emergency purchased as already manufactured, and not built expressly for any Canadian company at all. The difficulty is that you are undertaking to legislate to cover every imaginary case. You have required that the box-cars used on Canadian railways shall have these appliances, but, not satisfied with that, you want to have a provision that all cars that are built hereafter must necessarily have these appliances. I do not see any necessity for that. You are only creating embarrassment and leaving loop-holes which would not otherwise exist.

Mr. CLARKE. Does not the hon. gentleman think it would be advisable to have these cars that are operated in Canada equipped, as far as possible, with the same sort of equipment ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. How can you do it ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Half the cars used on Canadian railways come from the United States and are used there in conformity with their laws, which do not require some of these appliances you are insisting upon.

Why should you want to add to the difficulty of exchange of traffic and the carrying on of business, because there are a certain number of people who insist upon certain protection, while an equally large body of railway people say it is not at all necessary ? These things seem to be carried rather too far, and you are liable to embarrass the business of the country to an extent which you do not now appreciate.

Mr. CLARKE. How would it do to say 'all box freight cars built for Canadian railways ?' Will not that meet the objection ?

Mr. MACLEAN. If a railway company wants 100 box-cars and orders them in Canada, they must have these attachments, but if it orders them in the United States, they need not have these attachments, and so would cost less. If you do not change this section, you are going to put the Canadian car builders at a disadvantage.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It seems to me that there is a real difficulty in connection with this section which it is worth considering. The section now is applicable to cars built in Canada, and the railway company might acquire cars in the United States which may not be so equipped. Why not say 'all box freight cars purchased by the company after the passing of this Act shall be provided,' &c.?

Mr. CLARKE. I think that would do.

Mr. INGRAM. You must not forget that railway companies lease a lot of box-cars.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. A railway company in a sort of way leases all the box-cars on its road belonging to other railways, because they pay so much a day for them while they are in their possession, and consequently there might be trouble if you use the expression 'lease.'

Mr. INGRAM. The ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) used the argument that we are endeavouring to pass a law here which conflicts with the laws of the United States. Let me point out that the Michigan Central Railway operating in Canada interchange more American cars than any other railway in Canada in proportion to its mileage, and they are building their cars as required by this Act. Why do they go to that extra expense if the Master Car Builders' Association is correct ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. There are probably various reasons.

Mr. INGRAM. That company is not eager to spend money unnecessarily, but they find that it is to their interest to have these attachments, and they are interchanging with American railroads all the time handling from forty to seventy cars on a train largely of American freight passing through this country, and yet they find no hardship in providing these appliances. Let me ask any hon. gentleman of this House

to apply his own reasoning to the matter. When he is passing along on a passenger train and sees long freight trains on the sidings, let me ask him whether he would pass between the cars in order to get up on top or whether he would not get up on a ladder if there was a ladder there for him to use? Would not common sense tell any man that that is the safest way? The men, knowing this, are asking for this protection. The reason I feel so strongly on this question is that I speak from experience. I have climbed on the cars myself hundreds of times, in all hours of the day and night, and in all kinds of weather; and knowing what I say to be the case, I cannot see why the provision should be refused when we apply a little common sense to the matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have drafted an amendment which I think will meet the real difficulty; but it is now six o'clock, and I will endeavour to have that amendment ready by eight o'clock.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved to amend subsection 2 of section 211 by inserting the words 'all box freight cars of the company built after the passing of this Act shall be equipped with.'

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I move that the committee reconsider section 242. My object is to move an amendment to section 242. The amendment I intend moving is to add the following as subsection four:—

Notwithstanding anything in any public or special Act heretofore passed, or in the rules or by-laws of any railway company, or in the rules or by-laws of any insurance or provident society or association of railway employees formed under the authority of any Act heretofore passed, no contract or agreement made or entered into by a workman, employee or servant of any railway company, and no rule or by-law of any society or association as aforesaid, shall be a bar or constitute any defence to an action against such railway company by such workman, employee or servant, for the recovery of compensation or damages for personal injury to him, or, in case the injury results in death, to an action by the personal representatives of such workman, employee or servant—

(a.) unless for such workman, employee or servant entering into such contract or agreement, or becoming a member of such insurance or provident society, there was other consideration than that of his being taken into, or continued in the employment of the railway company;

(b.) unless such other consideration is, in the opinion of the court or judge before whom such action is tried, ample and adequate; nor

(c.) unless, in the opinion of the court or judge, such contract or agreement, in view of such other consideration, was not on the part of the workman, employee or servant, improvident, but was just and reasonable;

and the burden of proof with respect to such other consideration, and of its being ample and adequate, and that the contract was just and reasonable, and was not improvident, shall in all cases rest upon the railway company.

That clause is taken from the Ontario Act known as the Workmen's Compensation Act. A similar Act is in force in several of the other provinces. The difficulty I seek to remedy is this: Some railway companies, by means of special legislation or special clauses incorporated in their charter, have been able to form insurance or provident society, and by means of a summary contribution to the funds of these societies, they are able to have a great deal to say in their management and the formation of rules to govern them. In the case of one of these companies, the Grand Trunk Railway, which employs about 25,000 men, it has formed such a society, under the authority of an Act passed by this parliament in 1874, and amended in 1878, giving it power to form a provident society and conduct the business of accident and life insurance. No one objects to their doing so, but the difficulty is that provision is made in the rules of the society for the immunity of the railway company, on the payment of a small fee per head according to the number of members, from every liability in the case of accident. In the Grand Trunk Railway provident society, there is a rule to this effect, rule number 15, which reads as follows:

In consideration of the subscription of the Grand Trunk Railway to the society, no member thereof or his representative shall have any claim upon the company for compensation on account of injury or deaths from accident.

The men are charged fairly high rates for the small insurance they get. They are charged 50, 60, 75 and 80 cents per month for an insurance, which in many cases is only $250. The premium is much higher than is charged for a much larger amount of insurance in other benevolent and friendly institutions. It has been proved in a court of law that benefit associations doing business in Ontario to-day, give, for a lower rate, insurance of a thousand dollars, instead of $250, and the same weekly benefits in the case of sickness or injury. For many years this rule lay dormant. The Grand Trunk Railway never set it up in an action for damages, but in later years it has been set up in such actions almost invariably. In Ontario the only decision we have by a judge of the Superior Court is the decision of the trial judge in the case of Holden against the Grand Trunk Railway, which was tried at Hamilton. In that case the Grand Trunk Railway set up rule fifteen as a defence for the action, and the trial judge upheld the defence. That case went to the court of appeals, but unfortunately it was not there decided on the point I have men-

tioned, but the decision of the court was based on the question of contributory negligence. It has been decided, however, in the Superior Court in the case of Grenier against the Queen—a case arising out of an accident on the Intercolonial Railway where a similar rule is in force—that that rule is binding on the workman and his representatives.

Now, this is in direct antagonism to all modern legislation on the subject of master and servant. Other corporations, large employers of labour, are bound by the Workmen's Compensation Act in Ontario and similar Acts in other provinces. They cannot escape their common law liability, unless they do so on the giving of some consideration other than the fact of the employment. If they wish to secure themselves, it is open to them to take out accident policies in the various insurance companies doing that line of business. So, I submit, it should be with the Grand Trunk Railway Company or other companies having such a rule as this. Now, it has been stated that this amendment in a manner deals with the question of civil rights, which is ultra vires of this parliament. But, I think that proposition may well be doubted. The only decision we have upon the subject has upheld it. The Ontario law was pleaded in the case of Holden vs. The Grand Trunk, but the trial judge said: No, the rule is binding; it is passed under the authority of Dominion legislation in 1874 and 1878; the Grand Trunk Railway Company is a Dominion corporation. And so the rule was upheld, notwithstanding the Workmen's Compensation Act in the province of Ontario. Now, I submit that no harm can be done to any one by engrafting that legislation upon the Dominion statutes. It will be a long time before a railroad workman who has lost an arm or a leg, or before the widow of a railroad workman who has been killed in an accident on the road, can go to the court of Appeal or the Privy Council to find out whether that statute in Ontario is binding upon the railroad companies or not. You can remove all doubts by placing that legislation in the Dominion Railway Act. I bring it up here because the Bill that I introduced early in the session, though it was read a first and a second time and passed the Railway Committee almost unanimously, is very little likely to be reached this session. But, as it was a Bill to amend the Railway Act, I think this is the proper place, if it becomes law, to introduce it in the Railway Act as an amendment to section 242. These are briefly the facts, and I would ask leave to reconsider that section with a view to introducing that amendment to subsection 4.

Mr. LANCASTER. Speaking for myself, I quite agree with the amendment of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). In the Railway Committee I supported him in the Bill he introduced, because I think, we shall be allowing an inconsistent and wrong state of law to exist if we do not, for the reasons the hon. gentleman has so well explained, pass this legislation as a part of the Dominion law respecting railways. If the law is not amended as contended for by the hon. gentleman, we may have a case like this arising in Ontario, or in any other province where a law similar to the Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario is in force: A man may have two sons, one working for a railway company chartered by the Dominion, and another for a manufacturer, and both injured by the same sort of negligence on the part of their fellow employees; one son will be able to get damage from his employer and the other not able to do so because his employer is the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It does not seem that there can be anything harsh against the Grand Trunk Railway Company or any other railway company—for this applies to all—to provide fair and reasonable protection to the employee. They can still escape liability if they make a compact with the workman based upon a consideration other than the fact of their employing him; and, in passing, I may say, that I think that is no consideration at all, for no railway company will pay a man more than the services he renders are worth, so that all he gets is paid for wages and there is nothing left to be regarded as a consideration for anything else. But, if they employ him and give any other consideration than the employment and if in the opinion of the court or judge before whom such action is tried, ample and adequate; or if, in the opinion of the court or judge, such contract or agreement, in view of such other consideration, was not on the part of the workman, employee or servant, improvident, but was just and reasonable, the railway company can still escape liability for the injuries even under the amendment my hon. friend proposes. So, there is no hardship to the railway company in enacting this amendment. And, as the railway committee, by a very large majority, declared that it approved this legislation and practically there is a report to the House to that effect. I suppose we need not take much time in arguing that it ought to pass the House in this form.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The question fairly arises whether or not, supposing the committee to agree entirely that it would be desirable that some legislation of this kind should pass—if we have the authority to pass it in this parliament—it is necessary to pass this amendment, or whether all that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) is contending for is not already provided for in the Bill as it stands to-day. I refer to section 242, subsection 3. If hon. gentlemen will read this carefully, they will see that it recognizes that legislation touching relief

from liability for misfeasance or for a tort of any kind which may be sought to be enforced by an employee of the company is governed entirely by the provision of the legislation of the province in which the cause of action is alleged to have arisen. This subsection reads :

No inspection had under this Act, and nothing in this Act contained——

Let me call attention to this—' nothing in this Act contained :'

—and nothing done or ordered or omitted to be done or ordered, under or by virtue of the provisions of this Act, shall relieve, or be construed to relieve, any company of or from any liability or responsibility resting upon it by law, either towards His Majesty or towards any person, or the wife or husband, parent or child, executor or administrator, tutor or curator, heir or personal representative of any person for anything done or omitted to be done by such company, or for any wrongful act, neglect or default, misfeasance, malfeasance or nonfeasance, of such company, or in any manner or way to lessen such liability or responsibility, or in any way to weaken or diminish the liability or responsibility of any such company, under the laws in force in the province in which such liability or responsibility arises.

Now, if I correctly interpret this clause—and it appears to be very clear—it provides that if the law of the province in which the cause of accident is alleged to have arisen, provides that the employee is not bound by any contract under which he contracts the company out of liability, that condition of things is recognized and the parties are placed in exactly the same position as respects their rights as if we were, five or six times over, to re-enact what the hon. gentleman (Mr.Guthrie) is asking us to sanction. If he will take the trouble to read this clause he will agree with me that it is not only susceptible of, but it must necessarily bear, that meaning.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I cannot read that section as the ex-Minister of Railways reads it. It says :

No inspection had under this Act, and nothing in this Act contained——

Well, there is nothing in this Act at all bearing on the subject. The difficulty does not arise under this Act, but under a special Act obtained by the Grand Trunk Railway Company from this parliament in 1874, and the subsequent Act of a private company obtained in 1878. There is nothing in this Act touching upon the subject at all.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The hon. gentleman has not read the whole :

—and nothing done, or ordered, or omitted to be done or ordered.

Now it must be under this Act that the railways are operated, it is under the authority of this Act that the company does its business, they cannot do business otherwise. It is not a corporate organization except by virtue of the provisions which are contained in this Act. And when the language is as particular as this :

And nothing in this Act contained, and nothing done or ordered or omitted to be done or ordered, under or by virtue of the provisions of this Act.

You cannot have broader language than that.

Mr. LANCASTER. This same legislation existed at the time Holden's case was tried, the case the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) referred to, and where the decision of the trial judge went to the court of appeal, but was not there decided because the court passed off on to another question. This Railway Act as it existed then had exactly the same words which he ex-Minister of Railways and Canals relies on, but that did not save Holden, that did not cause the trial judge to decide in his favour.

Mr. GUTHRIE. As I read it, the whole section is confined to anything done under the provisions of that Act, or ordered to be done under that Act, or omitted which should be under this Act. Now the defence submitted by the Grand Trunk Railway made this plea :

These defendants further submit that the said Grand Trunk Railway Insurance and Provident Society being a society authorized by the statutes of the Dominion of Canada and such rules and by-laws being passed pursuant to such statutes, there was no power in the legislature of the province of Ontario to authorize any court or judge to take away the defence which said statutes, by-laws and rules give to these defendants, and any legislation to the contrary would be beyond the powers of the province as affecting these defendants.

Now that has been upheld.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. We are not overriding that or attempting to do so.

Mr. GUTHRIE. If we put that amendment in this Bill that defence will not be permissible, because the effect of the amendment is that they shall not be permitted to defend on that ground.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the difference between the General Railway Act and this section 242 ? There is none. If there be no difference between the old Act and the present one, and if these cases occurred under the same section, what power would they have now beyond what they had at the time the trial took place ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I am not familiar with the case already referred to, but my hon. friend is apparently relying upon a special Act of the company whose employee had brought the action and who is raising this defence, and it was by virtue of the provisions of that special Act. Am I right?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Not exactly. The special Act authorizes the railway company to form

a provident society, and to formulate rules for the government of the society. Now my own opinion is, if I may venture an opinion in face of the decision of the trial judge, that that rule on appeal would not be upheld. But the difficulty is that you cannot get any one to fight a railway company and go to appeal. Therefore, to settle all these doubts and to make the matter perfectly plain, I do not know a shorter cut than by passing this amendment. It will clear the atmosphere, and people will know where they are. I do not believe an appellate court would uphold that decision. It was upheld under somewhat different circumstances in the Intercolonial Railway case.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The circumstances were not the same.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The object of the amendment is to set these doubts at rest, and to have a clear statement of what the law is.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. As the hon. gentleman is now stating the matter—I do not profess to be familiar with the Act or the circumstances arising out of the case, or with the decision of the judge. But he is asking us now to incorporate a provision in this Bill which will change to some extent the provisions of the special Act with which this Bill has nothing whatever to do. Parliament has chosen to grant a special Act to a company, as it did to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We have not taken away from any of these companies any special privileges or powers that were granted in those Acts. If we did that an appeal would be a proper thing. My hon. friend proposes by a general provision in respect to a particular Act what we have not done in respect of any Act in any clause of this Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. member for Wellington to say that the last Act affecting this case was passed in 1878. I know something of the history of this Grand Trunk Provident Insurance Society. I know that under the law of the province of Ontario, an Act was passed excluding the Grand Trunk Railway Company from the operation of the Workmen's Compensation for Injuries Act, by reason of the Grand Trunk Railway Company having an insurance and provident society for their railway employees. A strong fight occurred in the legislature in 1887. The Grand Trunk Railway took the ground that its employees preferred the benefits of the insurance society rather than the benefits of the Compensation for Injuries Act. As a result of the fight between the employees and the company, the Ontario government issued a lot of questions which they circulated privately to the railway employees of the Grand Trunk Railway asking them whether they would prefer being excluded from the benefits of the Compensation for Injuries Act and to retain their position in the society; and I believe over 70 per cent of them answered that while they had no objections to the Provident Insurance Society, at the same time they wanted the benefit of the Compensation for Injuries Act. They said they paid for their insurance, and they felt that they had no right to be deprived of the benefits of the Compensation for Injuries Act. As a result of these answers, the government wiped out the section which excluded the Grand Trunk Railway from the provisions of the Compensation for Injuries Act, and that company came under the provisions of that Act in the province of Ontario. Now I am surprised to find that the courts are holding that because employees are members of the Provident and Insurance Society they cut themselves out of any benefits that might come to them by reason of the Ontario Compensation for Injuries Act, in case of accident. I think something ought to be done to make it perfectly clear that, though they belong to the insurance society and pay for that privilege, they are not thereby deprived of the right to damages in case of accident.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the committee will adopt this provision moved by the member for South Wellington. The ex-Minister of Railways says that this is a proposal to alter a special Act. Well, in some respects, probably it is, but I do not understand that the hon. gentleman who proposes the amendment exactly shares in that view, and I do not think it is the fairest way to look at the matter. The case presented by the hon. gentleman who proposes the amendment is, that it may be quite possible that the special Act granted to a railway company does not justify the position that the railway company takes, but, on the other hand, the railway company does see fit to place upon the Act a certain interpretation, and that interpretation having been placed on it by the railway company and the decision of the court, standing as it is in the province of Ontario, it is impossible for any person to get at what may be the true interpretation of the statute until he carries it to the ultimate court of appeal. The hon. gentleman points out that it is important that the class of people who invoke the provision of the law for their benefit in a matter of this kind shall not be handicapped by the difficulty of having to carry their case to the court of appeal; in other words, that the widow and children of deceased employees of the railway companies are not in a position to fight the railway companies. The hon. member asks not for the repeal of the special Act under which the railway company is operating, but for such an amendment as will, in effect, be a declaration of the rights of the parties. That is what it amounts to. He brings in an amendment declaring that the railway companies shall

not have power to contract themselves out of liability unless the contract is founded upon some new construction, independently of the mere fact of admitting a person to the service of the railway company, because it has been well remarked from my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) that no just consideration arises out of the mere circumstance of employment; because it is supposed that the employee gives value for every dollar that he gets from the company. We declare the presumed intention of parliament, when it gave the right to the company to grant insurance and to make insurance regulations, namely: that it should not have the power to contract itself out of liability unless it could show that there is some consideration for the contract beyond the mere matter of admitting the employee into the service of the company. In addition to that the hon. gentleman who introduces the amendment, very properly provides that the contract shall be in force only in so far as it is declared by a judge who tries the case to be just and reasonable. This is no new system of legislation. It is one that is well recognized in various statutes in the province of Ontario, and I apprehend in the statutes of other provinces as well. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) referred to subsection 3 of section 242, and argues, with his usual force and clearness, that there is probably a sufficient safeguard in this section. I venture, with all deference, to submit that the subsection in no way affects the question. It is not an enabling provision at all. It is a mere negative provision. It provides no remedy. It merely provides that:

> No inspection had under this Act, and nothing in this Act contained, and nothing done or ordered or omitted to be done or ordered, under or by virtue of the provisions of this Act, shall relieve, or be construed to relieve, any company of or from any liability or responsibility resting upon it by law.

In other words, it leaves the law as it was before. But, if any additional argument is required, I wish to refer the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill, at the present time, (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to this fact, to be borne in mind, that although we are dealing with a new statute, we are dealing with an old provision. The same provision appeared word for word in the statute of 1888, the General Railway Act; therefore, this provision was in force at the time these difficulties arose, and at the time these matters were brought before the court. I may say, though this is not a matter of great importance, only as illustrating the position that I take, that I have also had personal experience of the matter. I have not been so unwise, I admit, as to bring an action, under such circumstances, because I realized that unless one has a pot of money it is impossible to follow these railway companies from court to court, but I held a brief in a case which came up for trial at Brampton after the decision in the case of Holden vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the learned judge who was sitting there declined to hear the case. He, of course, gave us a suggestion that it was not wise to press the matter, and in effect told me that he would not try the case until he had heard the ultimate result in the case of Holden vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The hon. member who proposes this amendment has explained that that case was not decided in appeal upon this question, but on another point—showing that the judges regarded it as a question of difficulty, and, therefore, they will not decide this question finally by way of appeal until they are driven to it. The fact that it is a matter of difficulty and that it is a questionable point, ought to be sufficient, I submit, to induce this committee, having regard to the necessity, the vital importance it is to the widows and children of a deserving class of our people who are not able to protect themselves in all cases, to accept this amendment. I do not often have the pleasure of supporting an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, but I have great pleasure in doing so upon this occasion.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I happened to know something about the case of Grenier vs. the Queen, as I was engaged on that case myself, and I may say that that case did not turn in any way upon the point that is now before the committee. The case was one that arose in the province of Quebec as the result of an accident on the Intercolonial Railway at Fraserville, and the point to be determined there was as to whether or not the action that the widow brought for damages as the result of the death of her husband was what is called a representative action or an independent action; that is as to whether this action came to her in her character of a widow independent of her husband or whether the action was one which came to her because she was the widow of the deceased. The judge held that the action of the widow was an independent action, and on appeal to the Supreme Court it was unanimously held that it was a representative action, that the widow was bound by the act of her husband, but in no way was the question involved here dealt with in that case.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I read that case only last week and it is distinctly held that the rule is binding.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was held that Lord Campbell's Act applied and that the husband could legally contract out of his liability, but the question at issue in that case was a question as to the nature or character of the action. My hon. friend says that that point was involved in the

case of Holden vs. the Grand Trunk Railway. I have had occasion to look into the law in the province of Ontario, and into the cases, and I find that half a dozen cases have been tried. In the case of Farmer vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the common pleas division before Galt, McMahon and Rose the point was formally decided there.

Mr. GUTHRIE. That was before the Workmens' Compensation for Injuries Act was passed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend has got me at a disadvantage in this respect when he talks about these things; I have only to rely on the law and I find it referred to in this judgment.

Mr. GUTHRIE. What year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In 1891 the case of Lydia Farmer vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Here is the holding of the court :

Held, that the action was not maintainable. The plaintiff was paid $250 by a benefit insurance society in connection with the railway—though a distinct organization, of which deceased was a member. The plaintiff gave a receipt stating that the railway company was relieved of all liability. The deceased's certificate did not profess to be an insurance against acidents, and the railway company were no party to the receipt :

Held, that the receipt formed no bar to the action against the defendants ; nor was there any right to deduct the amount received from the benefit society from the sum the plaintiff was entitled to as damages.

Mr. GUTHRIE. It was a question of release.

Mr. LENNOX. In 1891 the Ontario Act against contracting out of liabilities had not been passed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Workmen's Compensation Act was referred to. However, my point is made out by hon. gentlemen who are arguing the other way. The Workmen's Compensation Act regulates the matter, and it is only in so far as that Act prevents contracting out that it is not possible to do it. This is a mere matter affecting the right to claim damages arising out of an accident within the limits of a province; it is a mere matter of civil rights in the province.

Mr. INGRAM. Would not the special Act of the Grand Trunk Railway have something to do with it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. I think it is absolutely unnecessary. In so far as legislation of that sort is of any use, this Act provides that nothing contained therein shall operate against any claim that may arise under the civil law of a province.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps in the case quoted, the employee was guilty of contributory negligence.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And that very point of contributory negligence shows the absurdity of the position we are led into. In our province contributory negligence is no defence at all to an action for damages.

Mr. INGRAM. It is in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is in Ontario, and that very thing shows that these cases must be guided according to the laws of each province. In the province of Quebec you cannot set up the doctrine of contributory negligence. In the case of Grenier vs. the Queen it was a clear case of contributory negligence, but we happened to get the law of our province applied to it under civil rights, and as a result the Crown escaped.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite understand what the Minister of Justice says in reference to this matter being to a certain extent controlled by Ontario legislation, but the difficulty is that this parliament has granted a certain statute to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company are setting that up as a reason why they should not be liable. What is asked by this amendment is that you shall so control and declare the meaning of that statute, that it shall not hereafter prevail as a defence. I feel that if the amendment were incorporated in this Bill it would be very beneficial and it would work no injury, even if it is not necessary in every aspect of the case as the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) alleges.

Mr. GUTHRIE. The case referred to by the Minister of Justice does not decide the point at all. I recollect that case very well, and it turned on the question as to whether or not there was a release given by the receipt for the insurance. The rule in that case was not pleaded by the Grand Trunk Railway. It is only within the last few years that the rule has been pleaded at all. The decision is simply this : That as this privilege is extended to the Grand Trunk Railway Company under an Act of this parliament to a corporation incorporated under the law of this parliament; the Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario does not apply to it. That has been held in Holden vs. the Grand Trunk Railway, and that is the only decision we have.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Where is the decision in Holden reported ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. It is not reported, but it is a well known case among the members of the Ontario bar; so well known that it has been followed on several occasions by trial judges. That being the case, if the contention of the Minister of Justice is cor-

rect that the Ontario law does govern, his contention is in direct antagonism to that decision and no harm can come to any railway company by putting that clause in this Bill and making sure of it. If we have it wrong in the province, we will have it right in the Dominion, and vice versa. I submit that no injury can be done to any railway company exercising these rights. I believe the only other company having such a privilege is the Algoma Central; the Intercolonial Railway makes use of it, but that comes in under another Act and will not be affected by this clause.

Mr. KENDALL. What we have heard to-night simply corroborates the experience of a great number of us. That ample legal provision is not made for a splendid body of men in this country engaged in a very hazardous occupation, many of whom are killed and the families of whom have to bear the brunt of the loss. I have had some little experience in connection with these cases. I have seen under the common law of Nova Scotia probably some twenty actions brought for damages for loss of life, and I think in only one or two of these cases has compensation been recovered by the plaintiffs. If they won in the lower courts the case was taken to a higher court, and then appealed again, with the result that the families of the persons killed had, if I may be allowed to use the classic expression of Dante, about as much chance in the courts of the land as a cat in hell without claws. Now, Sir, this condition prevailed in Great Britain for a great many years. Society was at last aroused to the fact that hazardous occupations in the country were killing off hundreds and hundreds of people and that their families had to bear the entire loss. Public opinion was so aroused that the British Workmen's Compensation Act was put on the statutes in 1897 and came into force in the year 1898. Though I am not a lawyer, I will venture if legal gentlemen have patience with me, to mention the provisions of the British Workmen's Compensation Act. This Act is based on the assumption that hazardous occupations ought to carry their own risks. Of course that ground has been assailed by croakers and pessimistic prophets, but the practical working out of this Act has been so satisfactory that during the last five years its provisions have extended, and this year amendments of the most drastic nature are before the British parliament. Under this Act the compensation varies between £150 and a maximum of £300. Under this Act the employees in any specified hazardous occupation cannot contract out of this agreement unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the registrar of friendly societies in England that he is already enjoying the benefits of an Act not less friendly to him than the Workmen's Compensation Act. Another feature of the law is that the burden of proof as to the liability for injury does not rest upon the descendants of the man killed. But the burden of proof lies upon the employer to show that the workman caused his death or was injured by his own act of negligence. The practical working out of that has been that where, under the old law, only a very small proportion of the actions resulted favourably to the workingman, under the Act to which I refer the great majority of the decisions have been in favour of the employee; and in the amendment which is before the British House of Commons to-day contributory negligence is proposed to be done away with entirely. It is assumed that no man will of his own will and accord put himself in a position to cause his death. Whether that will pass or not, we have to wait and see. Furthermore, what I understand is known among lawyers as the doctrine of fellow-servant is done away with by this Act. If a man is killed or injured, and his death or injury is due to the act of an overman or foreman, the overman or foreman is not liable to him or his representatives, but the employer is the responsible party. The employer has a right of action against his contractor if he sees fit to take that action. I simply say that, in my humble opinion at least, an Act which was considered not too good for the British parliament to pass away back in 1897 is not too good for us in Canada to enact at this time. I would ask the Minister of Justice if he holds that parliament has power to place on its statute-book the provisions of the British Compensation to Workmen Act for all railway employees of Canada?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I entertain no doubt that we have no power to do anything of the sort. If we have the power to regulate this question of contract, and we decide that an employee cannot contract out with his employer, we have also power to enact that the doctrine of common employment or contributory negligence shall be applicable to the whole Dominion of Canada, notwithstanding the law of the province of Quebec. We have as much right to do the one thing as the other. If you want to take responsibility, that is for the committee to decide; but it must be done against my formally expressed opinion on the subject. What is the result? Where is this going to lead to? In whose interest is this being done? I speak from my knowledge of insurance companies, when I say that both the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk systems contribute large amounts each year to what they call their insurance funds. We are called on to vote each year $6,000 to a fund for the insurance of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. CLARKE. How many men are affected by it?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot tell how many, but all the employees. Pro-

bably 1,200 or 1,500 men belong to the association. In addition, each member contributes a small sum. The result is that when an accident happens the injured man gets the benefit, not only of the contributions of his fellow workmen but of the contribution by parliament. The same thing is done by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. They also contribute each year a large sum to the insurance fund of their employees, and each employee also contributes. The reason why the company and the government contribute to this fund is that it enables them to relieve themselves of liability for accidents if accidents occur. That is the determining cause. But if we are going to interfere and say by legislation that they shall not derive any benefit from that contribution or obtain any relief from liability as a result of it, we might as well ask what is the use of that contribution ?

Mr. INGRAM. Does any part of this $6,000 go to pay doctors' fees ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Then it is evident that instead of contributing $5,000 or $6,000 for the benefit of the employees, the management of the Intercolonial are contributing for the payment of doctors in case of accidents, because they want to relieve themselves of liability and want to have medical witnesses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Is not the medical assistance for the benefit of the employees ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. My hon. friend is quite in error in saying that medical men are employed in order that there may be medical witnesses in the interest of the railway. The doctors are chosen, named and employed by the employees themselves. The Intercolonial Railway authorities do not, under any circumstances, select any of the physicians who are employed.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not disupute that, but I think the hon. member will bear me out in saying that a portion of this fund goes to the payment of these doctors.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Certainly, because they employ the doctors.

Mr. INGRAM. And part of their duties is, in case of accidents along the line of railway, to be present on the spot to assist in relieving the injured, and in case of actions for damages, to be present to give evidence.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Not at all.

Mr. INGRAM. I fancy that is the object of the Grand Trunk Company. They manipulate the officials who manage the provident insurance societies, and doctors are employed on the different divisions ; and, in case of accident, these are the doctors who are sent to look after the people who are injured, and also to be in a position to give evidence as to whether the company was responsible for the accident or not. When accidents occur on the railways, I am sorry to say, that you can get expert medical evidence, either for the plaintiff or the defendant, for which the doctors are sometimes paid large sums. You can almost prove anything you want to prove nowadays by medical testimony. You can prove that the accident was a serious one and that the company should pay large damages ; or you can prove the contrary. So I say it is to the interest of the company to have this fund, and if they can induce the employees to contribute towards it, so much the better for the company ; but I repudiate the idea that these large sums are contributed by the company for the benefit of the employees. I myself was compelled to sign a contract on the Grand Trunk Railway against my wishes, because I thought I was sufficiently insured and to the limit of what I could afford to pay, as hundreds of other employees are. Because they are employed by the Grand Trunk Railway they are compelled to insure whether they are amply insured or not. My young friend who has charge of the railway Bill may have a very good idea of the theoretical working of this legislation, but when it comes down to its practical working out, he knows no more about it than hon. members. There are two sides to the question.

Mr. HEYD. I can quite understand why the Minister of Justice attaches so much importance to the symmetry of the Bill, and his desire to have it uniform and regular. That sort of thing appeals to the legal mind, but to the ordinary layman, who wants to get on the spot in the shortest possible time and who is not held back by any niceties of construction or interpretation, it has no force. In the employ of the Grand Trunk Railway there are some 25,000 men who, in Ontario at any rate, are deprived of certain rights that are enjoyed by other workmen. In return for a subscription by the company of fifty cents per year for each employee to the provident fund, these men have to sign an agreement that, if killed or injured while in the employ of the company, the company will be not liable to them or their representatives for any compensation, no matter whether it be in fault or not. If a man in the employ of a painter goes up a ladder with a defective round and falls and injures himself, he has an action against the master painter for having been the cause of the accident. But if a man is employed by a railway company, which has become part owner of a transcontinental system, he can be set to work around defective machinery, and if injured he has no recourse, because he has signed away his rights under a rule of a provident institution to which the company contributes fifty cents per year per head for every individual that belongs to it. If we have the power to put a clause in this

Bill providing that an employee of the Grand Trunk Railway shall have in Ontario the same rights as any other employee in that province, we certainly ought to do it. If the Workmen's Compensation Act was passed for the benefit of the workmen, the employees on the Grand Trunk Railway should not be precluded from its benefits. I do not care whether the law is symmetrical or not, whether there are exclusions this way or the other way, if we have the power to settle this matter in this Bill, we ought to do it. The Minister of Railways and Canals has accepted many suggestions made with the idea of improving the Bill, and I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will accept similarly the suggestion we are now making. It is in the interest of the wage-earners of Ontario, and the Grand Trunk Railway can afford to pay.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. According to my hon. friend, it is absolutely immaterial whether the thing be right or wrong. Provided it be a short-cut to what he has in view, it must be adopted. But my experience is that in legislation short-cuts lead to the cemetery.

Mr. INGRAM. It is unfair that an employee should be compelled to sign a contract which takes away his rights and privileges and which at the same time may compel him to drop a large amount of insurance that he has kept up in some other society. A company which is getting rights and privileges from parliament should not be allowed to force its employees into such a position.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The question is whether or not it is within the legislative competency of this parliament to make such a provision as is here proposed. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister of Justice is entirely right. You might as well say that because this parliament incorporates a company to carry on a wholesale dry goods business in the city of Toronto, all the relations between the employees and employers come within the legislative control of this parliament, and we have the right to say what the conditions of employment shall be. My hon. friend says that some judges have passed an opinion to that effect. I would like to see the case, because I can hardly realize that any judge of eminence in Ontario could come to such judicial determination. I agree with the Minister of Justice that is too clear for argument that we have no such power as the hon. member asks us to attempt to exercise. If that be the case, what is it the committee are proposing to do ? Does it propose to destroy this Bill ? Does it propose to compel the Minister of Justice to advise the Governor General that we have passed a Bill, a portion of which is entirely beyond our competency ? Or does it propose that this Bill shall stop right here ? I do not pretend to indicate what course the Minister of Justice will take in the premises, but if I were he and had advised the committee as strongly as he has, there is only one course which I would adopt.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the House not to pay deference to the views expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice. But what we do ask is what damage would be done the company, if it were made responsible?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I say that it is responsible, under the law of Ontario. Holden and the Grand Trunk Railway to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. CLARKE. The opinion of the hon. minister is entitled to a great deal of respect, and I would not presume to contradict him. If he says that notwithstanding the existence of this Grand Trunk Railway Provident Company, the widow or representatives may enter an action against the company for damage sustained by the injury or death of an employee, the agreement in question will not be a bar to that action, I have nothing more to say, and am prepared to accept his opinion.

Mr. MACLEAN. Is there not some way of attaining the end other than the one proposed, something in the way of disciplining the company—providing that it shall not do certain things ?

Mr. FRASER. You would have to repeal the Act that gave them the power to establish this provident insurance company.

Mr. MONK. I take it that the law is as the hon. member who suggested the amendment has explained it to us. The objection that occurs to me is that it is difficult to legislate in a general Act and not interfere with the rights which the Grand Trunk Insurance Association has exercised under the authority of this parliament, or without considering the position to which that insurance association has advanced under the express authority of our own legislation. For, if the suggestions made in this amendment are well founded, by what legislature can we have that amendment enacted? Not by the provincial legislatures. Who has passed these by-laws ? It is a company incorporated under the authority of the Dominion parliament. It is a company which owes its existence to our legislation, It seems to me that if we have absolute control over the Grand Trunk Railway Company and this insurance association exists by virtue of our own enactment, we surely have the power to limit or expand the regulation-making power of the insurance association we have the power to declare they shall not pass by-laws such as this referred to by my hon. friend ; and it seems to me very desirable that some such provision as this amendment should be made in the interests of the workmen.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not propose to controvert the opinion of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), or the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). They both give us illustrations of what the position and the relative rights of the two parliaments are. But I think there is a distinction which should be called to their attention at this stage. The ex-Minister of Railways says, if we incorporate an insurance company in the city of Toronto, we cannot regulate all its transactions from first to last, for these are largely matters—I understand both these gentlemen to agree as to this—relating to property and civil rights. To this extent, I think, the position is quite clear. But it leads up to the point we wish to discuss in this matter; and I think that if we can make these hon. gentlemen thoroughly apprehend the point we are endeavouring to present, probably they will concur with us that what the mover of the amendment seeks can possibly be accomplished. We have incorporated the Grand Trunk Insurance Association, and have given them certain powers. But whether they have the powers, under that Act, to make certain regulations particularly rule 15—Mr. Chairman, if you and the assistant clerk will drop your conversation for the present, and if the hon. members of the House will suspend conversation for a time, it will be easier for me to make myself heard. What I was endeavouring to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to, is, that this parliament, having passed an Act incorporating the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or a branch of it, as an insurance association, had power, at that time, to limit the powers of the company as to what they should do in reference to their employees. So, it comes down to this, that the only difficulty arises from the fact that we are not dealing directly with the original Act, but are indirectly dealing with it in a general Act. There may, therefore, be some possible question as to the advisability of amending their powers at the present time, none as to our power. It is a mere matter of procedure. But when we keep in mind that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) who moves this amendemnt, introduced it as a Bill, of which all the companies concerned had full notice, that this Bill was discussed at length in the Railway Committee, and as recommended, practically unanimously, by that committee—at all events, there was an unanimous report—and that thus there is practically a Bill before the House for an amendment of the charter granted to the insurance branch of the railway company—when we consider this, we see that it is a mere matter of expediency or procedure. I do urge upon the minister to consider whether, having the power, and I quite concur in what he says as to the law in reference to the province of Ontario—Mr. Chairman, will you call hon. members to order. I do not propose at any time to have hon. members of this House think they can make as much noise as they like. If hon. gentlemen will continue conversation, and so prevent a member who is speaking from being heard without shouting at the top of his voice, I shall move that the committee rise. There is business to be transacted here. Every member of the House has equal rights, and I propose to exercise my rights. I am speaking in the interest of a large and deserving class of people; I am speaking in the interest of thousands of the labouring class of this country. Perhaps I may be unable to accomplish my purpose, but I do not propose to consent to hon. members, while I am speaking, carrying on conversation, in some instances, I am forced to believe, not with the best possible design.—— Now, addressing myself again through the Chair to the Minister of Justice, and endeavouring—with some difficulty, under the circumstances—to make myself clear without repetition, I wish to say that I recognize the position the hon. minister takes and am quite prepared to concur in his view with regard to the rights of the provinces is their full control over their legislation, and over certain classes of subjects. But I submit to the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the Bill that, having regard to the fact that we have incorporated this insurance company, we can limit their power in such a way as we think fit, and may say: You shall not pass regulations which contract you out of liability; we find that they are unfair and we hereby define your powers. I defer to the minister's opinion in the matter, but it seems to me it is all a question of what is judicious, it is a question of procedure. And, if we have this power, I submit that it will be no hardship upon the company if we exercise it—seeing that this Bill was introduced, has obtained publicity, and has been sanctioned by the Railway Committee, a fact which is always referred to, by hon. gentlemen who support the government, as almost conclusive as to the rights of the parties.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) say that you can amend a special Act by a general Act, unless you mention the special Act?

Mr. LENNOX. No, I do not think so.

Mr. FRASER. Then there is no use talking.

Mr. LENNOX. I think there is use in talking. I shall address myself through the Chair to the Minister of Justice, not to my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser). I have the greatest respect for my hon. friend when he rises, as he often does, at the close of a debate to enlighten both sides, wending his careful way through the mazes of what has been said, and judicially awarding praise and blame, but, I prefer to address myself to the Minister of Justice. What I wish to submit

to the Minister of Justice is this, that although we cannot affect a special Act without a special mention of the Act, I do not think that this should bar our way. I am entirely in accord with the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) who says: Let us get there by a short cut. We cannot adopt that view in one sense, though in another sense we can; I mean that so long as we do no wrong let us not be too technical about the method by which we accomplish our object.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion before the Chair is to reconsider section 242.

Amendment (Mr. Guthrie) negatived. Yeas 25, nays 41.

Mr. DAVIS. I move to reconsider section 24.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentleman had better explain what he wants to accomplish.

Mr. DAVIS. In this section, subsection (e) deals with fire-guards, and in this Bill power is given to the commission to deal with that question. But out in the North-west Territories that power would be of no use whatever to the people for the reason that the commission would only have control over the right of way which belongs to the railway. Now, a fire is often started by sparks on windy days blowing from a locomotive outside the right of way, and we would like some provision whereby the railway company should be compelled to plough fire-guards and burn a tract of land in order to stop fires from running. This question has been up several times before this House, and I would like to read an extract from a report of the Commissioner of Public Works of the North-west Territories of 1901, which will give the minister an idea of how the territorial government feel on this question:

> The department is doing everything possible to provide a thorough system of fire-guards throughout the territories, and in pursuance of that policy we ploughed or backset 950 miles of fire-guard last year, and in addition the small local improvement districts provided some 900 miles of guard. Our efforts, however, have been practically nullified in some districts by the failure of the railway companies to provide a proper system of fire-guards along their lines to prevent the spread of the many fires which are started by their locomotives. The question has been dealt with in both the last two annual reports, but it has now become so important and pressing as to require immediate action of some kind. . . . The companies naturally deny the claim that a large number of fires are started by their locomotives, but that such is the case is well known to residents in the vicinity of the railway lines, and to everybody who has given the matter any consideration. That fires are started in this way is only reasonable when it is noted that the guards, if any, which are put on by the company, are only a short distance from the track, and that in an open country subjected, like the greater portion of the teritories, to high winds, sparks from locomotives are sure to be carried outside such guards and start fires which spread until they get entirely beyond control. Unfortunately there is at present no legal provision compelling the companies to provide and maintain a proper system of guards, and unless such a law is passed or public opinion becomes strong enough, the companies are not likely to move in this important matter. In last year's report attention was directed to the correspondence which has passed between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the department regarding a proper system of guards, and to the failure in the effort to make any satisfactory arrangement.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a very important matter to stock raisers in the North-west Territories, because if fires are allowed to run in the fall of the year as well as in the spring of the year, they sweep over whole tracts of country and practically leave the ranches without any food for their cattle, because the grass has not time to grow up, and there is nothing to feed the stock the following spring. It is very important that they should have some provision whereby the railway company would be compelled to afford relief. I understand that in discussing this matter before, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals thought it would be trenching on provincial rights to put such a clause in this Bill, that it would be forcing the company to go outside their regular right of way to plough fire-guards. The clause I would like to have inserted in the Bill is this:

> Provided that in respect of fire-guards the board may, if empowered so to do by the legislature of the North-west Territories or of the province of Manitoba respectively, order the company to enter upon land not owned by it to construct and maintain such fire-guards and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the order of the board; and provided further that neglect or failure of the company to comply with any such order of the board be an offence under this Act punishable, on summary conviction, by a fine not exceeding $1,000.

I understood the other day when this question was brought up by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) that one of the members for Toronto, Mr. Osler, who is connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, stated that some arrangement had been entered into by the railway companies and the government of the North-west Territories in reference to this matter. I want to say that such is not the case. An arrangement was entered into which the government of the North-west Territories found very unsatisfactory. I will read you a telegram that was sent to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) when he had a Bill up in connection with this matter:

> Regina, N.W.T., April 20.
>
> Walter Scott, M.P.,
> House of Commons,
> Ottawa.
>
> Territorial government have cancelled fire-guard contract with Canadian Pacific Railway

to take effect at end of this year. Use your best efforts to get fire-guard Bill through compelling railway companies to do this work.

G. H. V. BULYEA.

At the last meeting of the North-west Assembly that passed an ordinance with reference to this matter, to amend chapter 87 of the Consolidated Ordinances of 1898, entitled an Ordinance for the Prevention of Prairie and Forset Fires. It says :

Section 21 of the Prairie Fires Ordinance is hereby amended by adding thereto the following subsection :—

(2) If a fire shall be caused by the escape of sparks or any other matter from any engine or other thing it shall be deemed to have been kindled by the person in charge or who should be in charge of such engine or other thing, but such person or his employer shall not be liable to the penalties imposed by this section if in the case of stationary engines the precautions required by section 12 have been complied with and there has been no negligence in any other respect or in the case of railway or other locomotive engines such engine is equipped with a suitable smoke stack netting and ash pan netting in good repair and kept closed and in proper place and in the case of railway engines where the line of railway passes through prairie country there is maintained for a distance of at least three miles continuously in each direction from the point at which the fire starts on each side of such line of railway and not less than two hundred nor more than four hundred feet therefrom a good and sufficient fire-guard of ploughed land not less than sixteen feet in width kept free from weeds and other inflammable matter and the space between such fire-guard and such line of railway is kept burned or otherwise freed from the danger of spreading fire and there has been no negligence in any other respect.

That is the ordinance, but I think the hon. Minister of Justice will perhaps agree that this will be considered ultra vires, and that it would be disallowed by the government on account of it interfering with matters over which the territorial government had no control. An arrangement was eventually obtained, as mentioned by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), but not until he companies became afraid that legislation would be passed here compelling them to do something themselves. The government of the North-west Territories has been offering to assist them in doing this work for years, but up to the present time they have not shown any disposition to do their part. My statement is borne out by an extract from a letter which the acting Commissioner of Public Works of the North-west Territories sent to the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) :

I note your remarks regarding the possibility that the second reading of your Bill to amend the Railway Act regarding fire-guards may not be reached this session. We had, as you know, opened negotiations with the railway company with the object of getting them to be put in proper system of fire-guards before the Bill was introduced, but had failed to get any satisfaction. Almost immediately after the introduction of your Bill they telegraphed here for further information, and it now looks, from correspondence which the deputy commissioner has had with Superintendent Leonard, as if the company were going to come to time and agree to put in a proper system of fire-guards. I am quite satisfied that the introduction of the Bill caused this matter to move, and even if it has not reached its second reading, the fact that such legislation has been introduced and will probably be pressed next session will, without doubt, have the effect of making the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway deal with this very important question.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that the fact that the Bill was introduced by the hon. member for West Assiniboia had the effect of waking them up, and a correspondence was started on this subject between the superintendent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Leonard, in Winnipeg, and the territorial government, but up to the present time nothing satisfactory has come of it. I have already read a telegram from the territorial government saying that the arrangement that they had with the railway companies was being cancelled, and in connection with that I have read from the acting Commissioner of Public Works of the North-west Territories, giving the reasons why the territorial government have terminated this contract between the railway companies and themselves. He says :

As you are aware, in the spring of 1902 this government took up the question of fire-guard construction with the Canadian Pacific Railway, owing to the very unsatisfactory manner in which the work had been done—or, in other words, had not been done—in years past, thus rendering a larger area of the Territories liable to destruction by fire, for want of a proper fire-guard along the line. This work is done in the interests of the settlers and not for the benefit of the railway company. A contract was signed in which the company agreed to contribute one-half the cost of construction of fire-guards along their line, up to a maximum of $10 per mile, that is, the railway company would not pay more than $10 per track mile for a guard on the two sides of the track, or, in other words, a maximum of $5 per mile of guard. For re-ploughing this guard, the company would only pay one-half the cost of the work, but in no case would they pay a sum exceeding $2.50 per mile of guard or $5 per mile of track. All the cost of inspection and everything incidental thereto was to be borne by the government, and in addition, in event of the guard having to make a detour around sloughs and other obstructions, the government pays the additional mileage caused thereby. Considerable difficulty was experienced last year in getting persons to tender for the work, and in fact a great many contracts entered into were never completed, or were only done in a most unsatisfactory manner, leaving no guard in some places on either side of the track, in several places only a few furrows, some here and some there, so you can easily imagine how inefficient a guard has been made. In many instances we were called upon to pay a higher price than $10 per mile of guard, but the Canadian Pacific Railway, of course only paid $5, the department paying the balance, and as I have already stated, bearing the cost and trouble of advertising for tenders, staking out and inspecting the guards.

This year a very small number of unfinished portions of these guards have been completed in the vicinity of Dunmore and Cowley. From your intimate knowledge of the question, you will know full well that guards constructed last year will require backsetting or other work done on them this year to render them efficient, and safe should we have an abundance of rain, followed by a dry season in August or September.

At the present time, we are using our best endeavours to complete the work begun last year, and re-ploughing or disk-harrowing the portions of the guard finished, so as to render efficient protection to the country along the railway lines from Morley to Broadview, and along the Crow's Nest and other branches, but owing to the demand for contract work of all classes, we are having difficulty in securing competent men to proceed with the work. We are endeavouring to deal with the guard along the line from Gull lake to Broadview and the Soo branch from the office. Mr. Stocks, assistant chief engineer, is travelling over the western portion of the line and the Crow's Nest line to see what he can do there, and we will probably know in the course of two weeks' time just how the matter stands. I may add here, that the work is of that class that should be done by the railway company themselves, they having, or being able to obtain, everything required in connection therewith and having the means of transporting contracting outfits along the line and getting them any supplies, so that it is hoped that your best efforts will be used toward getting a Bill through parliament to compel the railway company to do this work and not leave the matter as it is now, for the government or the people to do to protect themselves against the company. I may add in conclusion that a contract was submitted to the department last year by Messrs. Osler, Hammond & Nanton, on behalf of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and the C. and E. Railway, upon somewhat the same basis as that entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and was returned to them some time in July, if I remember rightly, for amendment, as they had included the whole line from Prince Albert to Regina, along the Q. L. L. and S. Railway, and from Macleod to Strathcona, on the C. and E., whereas it was only intended to make a guard along the Prince Albert branch from Regina to Saskatoon and along the C. and E., from Macleod to Olds. Thinking that the contract would be returned with this amendment, the department proceeded with the work of constructing the guard along the two lines and practically completed a fire-guard along both sides of the C. and E. Railway, from Macleod to Olds, and had a small amount of the work done on the Q. L. L. and S. Railway. The contract was never returned, and as a result the government paid for all the work done.

You were informed by the commissioner by telegraph some months ago, that notice had been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that the contract had been cancelled. This will take effect on December 31st next. Since that time the Q. L. L. and S. Railway and the C. and E. Railway people have been notified that it is not the intention of the department to undertake any further work of constructiong fire-guards along these two lines.

I have also a further letter, dated July 17th, containing additional information, with special reference to the C. and E. and Q. L. L. and Sask. Companies, as follows :

Since the question of the construction and re-ploughing of these guards has been taken in hand this year some correspondence has taken place between the department and Messrs. Osler, Hammond & Nanton, who represent these two railway companies, they being now able to produce the contract which was returned to them for execution in July, 1902. They have returned copies of the contract covering the Q. L. L. and S. Railway from Regina to Saskatoon, and the C. and E. Railway from Macleod to Olds, duly executed. Unfortunately the late commissioner had executed these contracts on behalf of the department before forwarding them to Messrs. Osler, Hammond & Nanton ; doubtless had it been left for the railway companies to perform their part and sign the contract first, these copies would have been returned long since, so you will understand that as far as the records of this office are concerned, the only inference we could draw was, that the C. and E. and the Q. L. L. and S. people had not and did not desire to execute the contracts at the time they were returned to them, last year, owing to the proposed amendments. I may add that these contracts were received by the department only yesterday, July 16th. It perhaps would be saying too much to state that Messrs. Osler, Hammond & Nanton showed bad faith in not returning these contracts at the time they were returned to them for execution, but they are cerainly guilty of neglecting performing their part of the contract.

In other words these contracts were signed and sent back after the discussion about fire-guards took place in this House. They kept them until they found there was to be legislation here, and then they signed these contracts and sent them back. I do not see why the government of the North-west Territories should be compelled to expend a large sum of money to do work that the railway companies themselves should properly do. It is their engines that set fire to the prairie and do the damage, and they should be compelled to protect the people. I hope that now that this matter is before the House, the Minister of Justice, who has charge of the Bill, will take steps to insert a clause in this Bill that will cover the ground and give power to the commission to see that proper guards are made. I quite understand that difficulty may arise from the fact of railways having to plough outside of their right of way on land that does not belong to them, but any one who is acquainted with the North-west Territories knows that there are miles and miles of government land where they could not be interfering with the rights of any person, and any way no one would object if they ploughed up fire-guards and carried out the idea suggested in the amendment. In the amendment which I have submitted, the commission before enforcing this, would have to get authority from the government of Manitoba or the government of the territories.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think I have never had an opportunity of agreeing with the mem-

ber for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) since I have been in the House, until this evening, and I feel a pleasure in getting in touch with him at last. I know that the Minister of Justice cannot understand the fire-guard question in the slightest degree. No man who has lived in the east, no matter how intelligent he is—and the Minister of Justice I presume has the ordinary intelligence of the men of the east—no man in the east understands the question of fire-guards. A man has to live in the west, and to have experience in the west, before he understands the extraordinary difficulties connected with the fire-guard question. Before I had lived in the North-west long enough to become familiar with this matter, the question of fire-guards would have been utterly meaningless to me, but now, I know that it is a paramount question there. A rancher with 20,000 acres of grazing land, and a large stock of either cattle or sheep, is absolutely dependent upon the preservation of his pasture land for the preservation of his stock. A prairie fire may ruin him in a night. I have seen prairie fires do immense destruction within 24 hours, and within 48 hours in a grazing country that was smiling with green grass, I have seen the verdure disappear, and thousands and thousands of acres burned and browned, and the rancher compelled to take up his location and go hundreds of miles away, at a cost which was enough to ruin him. I recollect one evening, the ranch people having been at work all day gathering hay, suddenly some one saw a few miles away the appearance of a prairie fire. The whole country was alarmed and well it might. I could not realize what the alarm was about, but in a few hours I saw this tremendous sheet of flame apparently as far as the human eye would carry, racing upon the people's stock, and the whole country side and the Mounted Police turning out and fighting that fire as if it were an invading army. It is a matter of the most vital importance to the rancher, whether he is going to be exposed day after day, and night after night, during the dry season in that country, to this alarming danger. The railway runs through the ranching country for hundreds of miles. A man's property may abut against the railway for ten or fifteen miles, and that whole country is exposed to a single spark setting the prairie fire going, and the man's ranch may be burned down, and thousands of square miles swept clean of a bit of verdure within 24 hours. No man can afford to have a band of sheep, or a bunch of cattle, in that country, without putting up a large quantity of hay for the winter. The winter may be soft and he may not need the hay, but on the other hand he may be compelled to feed his cattle for a considerable time, and then the salvation of the stock depends upon having a quantity of hay safely housed. The danger of a prairie fire is therefore double. It not only clears away the growing grass, but it destroys the hay which the rancher has preserved for the protection of his stock in the winter time. Consequently, the Minister of Justice should reflect upon this problem, as one of vital interest to the people of the North-west. I want it to be understood, that I have no quarrel with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am friendly to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe it to be one of the greatest institutions in Canada, and I have never been able to sympathize with the people of the North-west, who have indulged as I think, in the most unjust and ungenerous criticism of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has done so much to develop their country. When I was in the west, I could not help but notice that the whole development of that west depended largely upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of course, when it was a young enterprise, it had to charge rates that were considered in the east high, but that was unavoidable. That was never a sufficient basis for any man to object to, or to abuse the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was a very proper basis, on which to negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to appeal, for a reduction of their charges, but there was an attempt in certain quarters of the North-west, to arouse popular prejudices against the Canadian Pacific Railway, simply in order to play to the gallery. I always felt that unjust. There were, it is true, rightful criticisms to be levelled against the Canadian Pacific Railway, but these were magnified and distorted beyond reasonable bounds. I am not speaking to-night as an opponent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe, that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been one of the greatest national institutions ever created in Canada, and that, it has done more to give us a national status, than even the distinguished nation maker opposite. At the same time while I do not wish to press anything against the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be called upon, to do justice in the matter of fire-guards. I have some small interest in the North-west now, and I am compelled every year to undergo serious pecuniary loss for protecting property against fire. Gentlemen in the east do not know what the ploughing of fire-guards is. You may have a grazing territory there of considerable extent, and twenty or thirty miles away you have what is called a home ranch, where your home and your buildings are. you may drive your flocks or herds thirty miles away to pasture, but there is a home ranch consisting of probably 640 acres, and to protect that home ranch by fire guards, you have to send your men once, or perhaps twice a year to plough around that home ranch, a breadth of 30 or 40 feet, in order to protect your buildings from prairie fires.

If a man's ranching territory happens to lie near the railway, he has to plough for miles along it in order to protect his ranch

from the danger of fire. That burden in my time was thrown entirely on the ranchers, and it is an enormous burden. I have known men to be ploughing day by day and week by week. The furrow is so long that a man who starts in the morning hardly gets it completed by night. I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice, from the narrow limits of his experience in the province of Quebec—I mean the mere knowledge of space and distance which no man in the east can have—is unable to realize the idea of magnificent distance which one gets on those magnificent prairies. Unless a man has that idea, he cannot comprehend what enormous burdens are thrown on the man who has great flocks and herds in the west and the immense pastures on which they subsist. A man may to-night be as rich in flocks and herds as Job, and to-morrow he may be as poor as Lazarus. In this case the hon. member for Saskatchewan is absolutely right. He has presented a real grievance, unlike many of the North-west grievances, which are entirely a play to the gallery. It is a grievance thoroughly well based, and we must not go headlong and place the blame at the wrong door or the expense of rectifying the grievance where it does not belong. With regard to the constitutional difficulty, many men in this House are oppressed with constitutional difficulties. It is time we were done with this provincial rights business. A great deal of that difficulty arose from political questions. Whenever a man, who had not much mind to think or anything to say, wanted to say something, he would get up and talk about provincial rights. No matter how shallow he was, he could talk learnedly about provincial rights. There is no question of provincial rights involved in this case. When this parliament is properly seized of a subject matter which the constitution has vested in it, we can pursue that subject to the end, and no question of civil rights can intervene until parliament has exhausted its power of legislation on the subject matter in question. On this matter, which is a pure matter of railway legislation, we can legislate until we exhaust the subject, even if in doing that we enter the domain of what may be regarded as merely provincial rights; and if after we are done, nothing is left, no person can raise that question. It is of no use for the railway company to have guards inside their fences. The difficulty from fires is always twenty or thirty or forty yards outside the railway fences. The ranchman who ploughs his fire-guards ploughs them thirty or forty yards, or it may be one hundred yards, outside of the railway fence; and if you give him protection you must give it to him there. The land outside the railway fence, as a rule, belongs either to the government or to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If it belongs to the company, there is no harm in forcing the company to plough fire-guards on their own land outside of the fence. If it belongs to the government, and we give the Canadian Pacific Railway Company power to plough these fire-guards, there can be no harm in that. If it belongs to a ranchman, he will be happy to give the railway company power to go on the land and plough the fire-guards, because if the railway company does not do it, the ranchman will have to do it at his own cost. Whether the railway company should be charged with the whole cost or not is a matter of equity for the Railway Commission to decide. But in any case there should be some provision in this Bill. Whether the provision proposed by the hon. member for Saskatchewan is the right one or not, I do not know, but the mere wording of the Act would be a very simple matter once the principle to govern this thing were settled. It is a matter of vital importance that this matter should be settled, or some day the whole North-west, along that railway, will be burned up, and a serious injury will be done to the whole stock interest of that country. They have been avoided on many an occasion with the greatest difficulty, and only by the whole country side turning out, and especially because of the good work done by that splendid body, the North-west Mounted Police. I have seen these policemen save the North-west many times from enormous disaster. They have a perfect system for fighting prairie fires. It is wonderful to see that magnificent body attack a prairie fire with military precision and overcome it just as they would an enemy that would venture to assail Canada. I cannot say too much in praise of that fine organization. It is one of the greatest organizations that could exist in any civilized country for the beneficent purposes of civilization. What it accomplishes in favour of good government and the protection of the North-west from lawlessness and destruction of property is beyond the comprehension of the ordinary man in the east. Therefore on all grounds, I would urge the Minister of Justice to take up this question and deal with it. It is the most important I have heard raised in the whole debate, on the Railway Bill. The only trouble is that our friends from the North-west raise many questions and throw such an amount of dust around every question they raise, that it is difficult to say which is the important and strong question to which parliament should turn its attention. This is one of the serious questions which ought to be dealt with in the interests of the ranches of the North-west, and I speak as an eastern man with some knowledge of the subject.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The committee does not need to be convinced that conditions exist in the North-west which call for immediate legislation of some kind. The question now under discussion is not a new one at all. Some two or three months ago the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) called my attention to a Bill he was

about to introduce or had introduced dealing with this subject. I gave it my very best attention, and the conclusion I was compelled to arrive at was that we would have to depend on provincial or territorial legislation in order that proper and due effect should be given to the power we were conferring on the board.

Mr. GOURLEY. What induced the hon. gentleman to come to that conclusion ? Was it the constitutional question ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Undoubtedly the constitutional question. We were asked to enact that the board should have power to authorize or compel a railway company to go upon private lands and take them without compensation for the use and purposes of a fire-guard.

Mr. GOURLEY. Could the hon. gentleman not have given the railway commissioners power to direct the company to do this, and throw upon the company the necessity of making such agreements with the property owners that might be made or else give the company the power of expropriation ad hoc.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. No, the better way appeared to be to authorize the board to require the company to make proper fireguards, but that would not become operative until the local authority had passed the necessary and proper legislation. I understand that there is no doubt at all but that they will pass that legislation, and when they do pass it, then the power conferred on the board, under the 24th section of this Bill, subsection e, will enable it to require the company to provide fireguards. The subsection is as follows :

With respect to the use of any engine, of nettings, screens, grates and other devices, and the use of any engine or car of any appliances and precautions, and, generally in connection with the railway respecting the construction, use and maintenance of any fire-guard or works which may be deemed by the board necessary and most suitable to prevent as far as possible fires from being started, or occurring, upon, along, or near the right of way of the railway.

You have there ample power conferred on the board to order the construction of fire-guards. My hon. friend shakes his head. You have all the power parliament can give the railway board to require that these precautions should be taken. It is proposed by the present amendment that this clause shall be inserted :

Provided that in respect of fire-guards the board may, if empowered to do so, by the legislature of the North-west Territories or the legislature of Manitoba, order the company to enter upon lands not owned by it, to construct and maintain such fire-guards, and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the order of the board.

The trouble is this : The first portion of that clause is wholly unnecessary. The board has power now, to the full extent of the legislative authority of this parliament, to order a fire-guard to be erected. Therefore, we do not want to repeat that. Why is it necessary to assert that when Manitoba or the territories shall give the board power, they may do it ? You do not require such a provision, because the board have under this Bill that power the moment this legislation is passed. It is the latter part of the amendment to which I take more particular objection, 'no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the order of the board.'

Mr. GOURLEY. I am not concerned with the mere wording of the amendment, but only wish to arrive at the idea.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. We have nothing to do with arriving at ideas. Let the provincial legislature pass the necessary legislation and the board can act.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why the provincial legislature ? We are fully competent. If the hon. gentleman would suggest a legal argument which precludes that competency, I am not so prejudiced as not at once to give in. But I can see nothing in the constitution of Canada to prevent our fully exhausting the subject in every way. We are seized with the power to make an Act on this subject matter. Once seized with the subject matter, we cannot be ousted from that jurisdiction by any claim of the provincial legislature. I think there may have been, at one time, in the early days of the study of the constitution, a narrower idea prevailing; but I am persuaded that this is the correct construction of the constitution, and the one approved by our constitutional lawyers, by the Privy Council, and by every authority. For instance, it was once the idea, among provincial judges, that this parliament, though it was clothed with power to legislate, fully, upon bankruptcy, it could not invade, or overcome, a provincial Act, that gave a preference. That is exploded to-day. It is now held, that if we undertake to legislate upon bankruptcy, we can exhaust every civil right known to the law, and oust every provincial statute, if necessary, and if we deem it wise policy. We can deal with the subject of promissory notes ; we can deal with the subject of execution. Provincial laws may give priority in execution. We can come in, and destroy in a moment; no control by the provincial legislatures, over matters of property and civil rights can stand in our way. In these matters the provincial control over questions of property and civil rights means control of what is left after we have done legislating on the subject. That is to say, if we undertake to legislate, with regard to property and civil rights, on a subject over which we have jurisdiction, there is nothing

for the provincial legislatures except what is left outside of our legislation. This parliament has vested in it the right to legislate on the subject of railways. We can regulate them, control them, confer powers upon them, and require them to exercise those powers in a certain way. When we enter upon that subject, we can exhaust every civil right, and we have no right to make our legislation depend upon anything done or left undone by a provincial legislature. That is why, in the Railway Committee, I urged that every mile of railway should be declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, in order that we might have one law, one set of rules governing all the railways in the country. Therefore, I would like to hear the Minister of Railways and Canals state specifically, if there is any reason why we should not provide that every railway shall, within two hundred or five hundred yards of its own fences, and of its own right of way, make a fire-guard, and then, having made that general order, provide wise regulations for carrying it out. Take the case of Dominion property. We could provide that the company shall have the right to go upon that land without compensation. Our Act would be a license to any railway company. This would provide for fire-guards on the property that belongs to the Dominion. Then, with reference to the property that belongs to the Canadian Pacific Railway—and every other lot along the railway, that has not been sold belongs to them—no question would arise, because they would have the right to make fire-guards across their own property. There might be another class of lands, those belonging to private individuals. The owners would be only too happy to agree to the employees of the company going upon their land to plough a fire-guard. In my own case I would be only too happy to welcome them. In the case of these lands we can make some provisions that, if the Canadian Pacific Railway offered to make the fire-guard over private lands and the right to do so was refused, that should be a perfect defence in any suit for damages that might arise. I think that would be perfectly fair. So, for these three classes of land—government land, Canadian Pacific Railway land and land of private individuals—we could make regulations here that would be perfectly constitutional, and against which there could be no objections. I do not think it is right for us to be constantly deferring to the supposed rights of provincial legislatures, making our legislation depend upon those supposed rights when really there are no such rights in existence.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. In the course of a conversation I had with the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) I stated the conclusion I felt justified in arriving at on this matter. I did not come to that conclusion without having given the matter the very best consideration in my power; and I assured him—and I am still of that opinion—that the Bill as it stands now will give all the power that he desires, except that it does not, by enactment, declare that these people shall have the lands taken away from them without compensation. My hon. friend who is now in charge of the Bill may conclude otherwise. I do not think he will, but it is for him to say whether he will adhere to the position I took when I had charge of the Bill. I pointed out that I could not consent to make any change or adopt any different principle in the case, taking the land of private owners for the purpose of fire-guards from that which applies in the case of lands of private owners taken for other purposes. We have provisions in the Bill which control and regulate that matter in its entirety. And, if you do not wish to go to the provincial legislature for this power, or, if, going to the provincial legislature, you fail to get the power, it is still open to the board to provide that fire-guards shall be made upon the property of individuals, and if that is provided, the company will have to take advantage of the powers of expropriation, paying to the owners the compensation provided in the Act. We cannot go outside of that. The hon. gentleman must see that it would be impossible for us to incorporate in the Bill any different principle in dealing with private property under these circumstances from those which we recognize in dealing with private property under other provisions of the Bill. That question, I take it, is settled, unless my hon. friend feels that he would be compelled to vary or depart from it. This Bill as it stands covers all the ground. I assure my hon. friend that, in my opinion—and he can take also the opinion of the Minister of Justice—it covers the ground as fully and completely as we can cover it, and as fully as is asked for, except that we do not say, and we ought not to say, that we are going to take the property of people away from them without compensation. For we have no power to do so. Of course, we can confiscate by an Act of this parliament, for parliament is supreme. But when I say we have no power to do this, I use the word in the general sense. We should not take away the property of any man, except we give him compensation. It is said that very little private property would be taken for this purpose. I am not sure that that is a correct statement. The information given me by the hon. member for West Assiniboia is that a great deal of private property would have to be taken for the purpose of this protection; and when I asked the question, the hon. member said that the people who owned the land along the railway were not interested in the fire-guards, did not care about having them, and would not go out of their way to afford facilities for laying them down but would be likely to exact the last dollar for property taken from them for this purpose. So, the question stands to-day

as it stood then. I trust the committee will not feel that there is any good reason why there should be a departure from the rule that governs all legislatures, at all events, under British institutions, and that has always governed them.

Mr. GOURLEY. Would the ex-minister say whether he thinks this language would justify the board in ordering the erection of a fire-guard outside the actual limits of the railway ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The board has power, or if any supplementary authority was needed it could be obtained, to authorize the taking of the property under the Expropriation Act. You do not want any legislation for that purpose, because you have it now.

Mr. DAVIS. Do I understand the ex-Minister of Railways to mean that the Railway Commission would have power to order the railway company to provide a proper system of fire-guards ? If so, it would be the duty of the company, under the expropriation clause of this Act, to go outside and buy that land if they found it necessary. Will the board, under this subsection (e), have power to force the company to erect these fire-guards outside of their right of way ? I would like to know also what right the local legislature has to pass legislation dealing with lands ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. They are the only legislature that can do so, dealing with the question of compensation.

Mr. DAVIS. Do I understand that under this Act the commission will have power to force the company to put up these guards ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. That is my opinion.

Mr. GOURLEY. Do I understand the ex-minister to say that we could not here amend this clause by inserting a few words giving to this commission power to expropriate land, or authorize the company to go upon it and exercise rights ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. No ; not without paying something for it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am willing to take the word of the ex-minister as to the power of this commission.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. That is my opinion, and the opinion of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. OLIVER. That this clause as it stands fully empowers the Railway Commission to order the erection of fire-guards outside of the railway right of way ?

Mr. GOURLEY. The minister did not say so.

Mr. OLIVER. Do I understand that it is within the power of the local legislature to provide that this authority may be exercised without compensation to the owners of property ? I understood the minister to say that this parliament would not have the right to give that authority to the Railway Commission.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, now, would the local legislature have the right, leaving outside the question of whether it would be equitably right or not, to authorize the making of fire-guards, under the authority of the commission, on property outside the right of way ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. That is our opinion.

Mr. OLIVER. They would have the right to legislate to do what the ex-minister intimated would be practically an act of spoliation ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. That satisfies me on the subject. I am perfectly satisfied to take the ruling of the ex-minister. Let me point out, however, that taking the right to construct a fire-guard on private property is not an act of spoliation, and should not be considered, in my opinion, as requiring expropriation. The necessity of fire-guards exists because of the land not being cultivated, or owing to the fact that the owner of the land does not reside in the immediate vicinity and is not able, except at great loss, to make the fire-guard. Just as soon as the land comes into cultivation, or just as soon as settlement becomes close along the line of railroad, then the necessity of entering upon outside land and making these guards ceases. It is merely a temporary necessity caused by the peculiar existing conditions, which, in process of time, will change, at least in a great part of the country, so that where fire-guards are necessary now they will not be necessary later on. There would have been a danger in passing legislation here covering the whole case that the law would be made applicable to parts of the country where it is not necessary.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. We have restricted that.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I consider that the provision as it stands, and as interpreted by the minister, is much better than a hard and fast piece of legislation which would put unlimited compulsion on the railway company. It must be largely within the judgment of somebody as to whether a fire-guard is actually necessary. Where it is not actually necessary expense should not be incurred, nor should trespass be committed upon private property ; but where it is necessary it is not a trespass upon, but a protection of private property.

Motion (Mr. Davis) to reconsider section 24 negatived.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I rose this afternoon to ask the minister to allow the committee to return to section 242, which deals with actions for damages. I think the present clause does not cover the point

which should be covered for the protection of farmers who have to take their cattle to market. I may perhaps in a few words relate a circumstance that happened two or three weeks ago on the Canadian Pacific Railway, near the town of Galt. Three farmers, two of them neighbours of mine, and the other a resident of the constituency of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), were killed, and three others were seriously injured owing to a rear end collision that occurred between a freight train and another train. The freight train was loaded with cattle, and the men were asleep in the caboose. At midnight another freight train came along, ran into the cattle train, and these three men were killed. Of course, an inquiry was made into the cause of the accident. An inquest was held on one of the men who was killed, but the coroner did not take much pains to probe the facts. It seems that he was very anxious to get through with the inquest, and a full inquiry was not made. He refused to allow the solicitors for the friends of the men who were killed to examine witnesses. A verdict was given and all parties seem to have been exonerated from blame. My reason for bringing this matter up is that I think something should be placed in this Bill to protect men who entrust their lives and their property to the hands of the railway companies. Of course, accidents may occur, but whenever the railway employees or the company are to blame for the accident, these men should have redress, and I hope that the hon. Minister of Justice will see his way clear, now that this has been explained, to place a clause in this Bill covering the case. The cattle men are obliged to sign an agreement with the railway company whereby they renounce any claim to redress in case of accident. If the cattle were killed, they could get redress, but if they lost their lives their relatives have no recourse. Human lives amount to very little apparently to railway companies. These men left widows and children and there should be a court to which these widows and children could appeal for redress. If there is no court established for such a purpose there ought to be, and I do think that the government should see that our farmers are protected in taking their cattle to market. Therefore, I beg to move :

That section 242 be reconsidered and that the following subsection, to be known as subsection 4, be added to section 242 : 'Whenever any cattle or other live stock are shipped on any railway and the person in charge of such cattle or other live stock is killed or injured through the carelessness or neglect of the railway company or its employees, the case may be tried in any court of competent jurisdiction and the company shall be liable for all damages.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would suppose that this amendment would not be very necessary, because the law provides now not only for the protection of gentlemen in charge of stock, but also for the protection of the general travelling public. Any person who travels by railway has redress if an accident happens through the carelessness of the employees of the railway company or of the company. There are courts of competent jurisdiction to deal with such matters.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I presume what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) has in his mind is this : The ordinary rules of railway companies will not permit the owner of cattle to send along people free of charge with the cattle. The railway companies engage to take care of the cattle themselves, and they are bound to deliver the cattle at their destination and to look after them while in transit. But, if the owner of the cattle thinks he would like to send one or two or more men along and if the owner is willing and if the people who go are willing to ride with the cattle, not in an ordinary conveyance, not in a first, second or third class passenger coach, but to travel with the cattle, receiving their transportation free, then it is a perfectly reasonable and proper thing for a railway company to say : Well, if you wish to take the risk we will permit you to accompany the cattle, but you must take the risk. Unless you are prepared to travel in proper cars which we provide for passengers you will have no claim for damages. It is under those circumstances that the hon. gentleman says these people are not able to recover. I do not think we ought to change the law at all. I agree with the hon. Minister of Justice that it would be very unwise legislation to adopt a provision of that kind; therefore, I think the committee ought not to reconsider the section.

Mr. INGRAM. As I undersand it, the railway company insists upon a caretaker to accompany the stock, provided the stock is to be transported a distance exceeding 100 miles. Then, I understand they have a certain provision that if the caretaker accepts a pass the company shall not be responsible for damages in case of accident. I think it can be shown that in certain cases which have been tried in court, our judges have differed on that question. I do not profess to be a lawyer, but it occurs to me that if one judge is correct in what he holds then the companies are responsible according to the law as he interprets it. Take the case of Bicknell vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company :

A contract was made by a railway company for the carriage of cattle to a point on the line of a connecting railway company at a fixed rate for the whole journey. The contract provided that the shipper (or his drover) should accompany the cattle ; and that the person in charge should be entitled to a 'free pass,' but only 'on the express condition that the railway company are not responsible for any negligence,

default, or misconduct of any kind on the part of the company or their servants :

Held, that the condition was valid and could be taken advantage of by the connecting railway company, who therefore were not liable to the shipper for injuries suffered by him in a collision caused by their servants' negligence.

The judge says :

By the contract between the plaintiff and the Bay of Quinté Company, it was provided, by the terms of the 17th clause of the agreement endorsed upon the receipt note, that 'When free passes are given to persons in charge of animals, it is only on the express condition that the railway company are not responsible for any negligence, default, or misconduct of any kind, on the part of the company or their servants, or of any other person or persons whomsoever, causing or tending to cause the death, injury or detention of any person or persons travelling upon any such free passes, and whether such free passes are used in travelling on any regular passenger train, or on any other train whatsoever ; the person using any such pass takes all risks of every kind, no matter how caused.

It will be observed that this clause merely exempts the contracting company from liability and does not refer at all to the defendant company.

The judge comments on that clause in this way :

The fact that he was being carried free, if it was a fact, would make no difference, as appears from the Jennings case. But I do not think there is any evidence that he was being carried free. I should find, as a fact, that the consideration that he paid for the carriage of the cattle included his own carriage or the carriage of some person in charge of the cattle. For, by clause seventeen, above referred to, it was necessary for the plaintiff himself, or some one under his direction, to travel with the cattle to take charge of them, as will appear from the directions therein contained (the learned judge read clause 17 and continued) :

It is perfectly manifest, I think, and I should find as a fact that the cattle would not have been delivered for the purpose of carriage had not the company agreed to some one going along with them for the purpose of looking after them. It was as much a part of the contract that the plaintiff, or some one in his behalf, should go with the cattle, as it was that the cattle should be carried by the company.

I do not see anything to exonerate the defendant from liability.

That was the decision in the case. The jury found $5,000 damages against the company for causing the injury to this man, but on appeal, judges Osler, MacLennan, Lister and Moss, all disagreed with Judge Rose, the trial judge in the case. The judgment in appeal was unanimous, but it shows that the law is not by any means very clear.

Mr. COWAN. The court of appeal reversed the trial judge, and that is the established law of the province now. It was settled in the court of appeal in the Bicknell case that wherever a man is travelling on a free pass there is no contract, and, therefore, he takes his chances.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. INGRAM. This parliament now enacts that when stock gets injured on a railway by reason of the negligence of the railway company, the company shall be responsible, and it strikes me as the most remarkable thing that a man can contract himself out of any compensation because of accident, when in nine cases out of ten he never reads the contract, and only accepts the pass and signs the contract under the impression that he cannot ship his cattle unless he accompanies them or has a caretaker to do so. Why should the caretaker of cattle on a train be able to contract himself, and his family in case of his death, out of the possibility of securing damages because of the negligence of the railway company ? It does not seem fair to me as a layman. They compel the caretaker to go with the cattle, and if he accepts a pass then he contracts himself out of any liability on the part of the railway company. There are suits arising from this accident that occurred at Galt, and there is no question at all but that it was due to the gross carelessness on the part of a railway employee. The company have a semaphore there, and they have provided everything necessary, if the employees carry out the instructions of the company to prevent accidents, but this accident occurred because of negligence on the part of an employee, and these three men lost their lives and others were injured. It is a hardship to the families of these three men that they have to suffer on account of the loss of their bread winners, and I hope something will be done by the Minister of Justice to remedy this defect in the law.

Mr. COWAN. I draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact, that while under the law a railway company is supposed not to be able to contract itself out of negligence, at the same time the railway company compels a shipper in certain cases to sign a contract in consideration of a reduced rate to limit the liability of the company. I have a case in mind which no doubt the legal gentlemen in the House are quite familiar with. It is the case of Robinson vs. the Grand Trunk Railway. The race horse 'Henry R.' was injured in a collision, being shipped from the city of St. Catharines. At the time of shipment Robinson was compelled by the railway company to sign a contract, that in consideration of the reduced rate charged by the railway company their liability was limited to $100 in the event of damage through the negligence of the railway. The horse was killed in a collision. An action was brought and the value of the horse was fixed by a St. Catharines jury at $5,000. It turned out upon the trial that although it was stipulated in the contract signed by the shipper, that it was in consideration of a reduced rate, as a matter of fact it was the usual rate charged by that railway, as well as others, and was not a reduced rate.

In appeal, the Supreme Court held, following the Vogel case, that while the railway could not contract itself out of negligence, at the same time a man could enter into a contract with a railway company, and in that contract the railway could limit its liability to a specific amount notwithstanding its negligence, and that the contract was good although it was not a reduced rate that was charged as the contract stated. It does seem to me that there ought to be some provision in this Bill to meet an emergency of that kind. I do not think that a railway company should be able to contract against its own negligence in any case wherever a fare is charged.

Mr. GOURLEY. The Minister of Justice, not being familiar with the shipping of cattle, did not grasp the full significance of the objection that was raised by Mr. Robinson, and included in his amendment. It may not have been expressed scientifically, but he was really endeavouring to cure a wrong. In the west, every shipper has to send a caretaker with the cattle, and while the caretaker may technically get a pass, as a matter of fact, he travels in consideration of the charge that is made for the cattle, and Judge Rose was perfectly right in holding that was the true construction of the contract. A part of the money that is paid by the shipper, is paid as much for the transportation of the caretaker, as the transportation of the cattle, but, of course, there can be no opinion among legal men, but, that the court of appeal were perfectly right in holding as they did.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will observe that both courts could not be right.

Mr. GOURLEY. I hold that Judge Rose was right and the court of appeal was right, because their decisions were on different points. Now, the question arises, will this parliament sanction any railway company contracting with people to carry their freight, and at the same time contracting that in case the company kill an individual who accompanies the freight, they shall not be responsible to any one for damages ? That is the question before us. The court of appeal has decided that that contract is valid ; but I think that Judge Rose stated the equity of the thing, which should control our action. We are here not to construe hard and fast statutes, but we are here to settle a principle ; and I agree with the hon. member opposite that we should affirm the principle that no railway company should compel anybody to contract that if the company negligently kill an individual there should be no remedy. Up to this time it may have been legal ; but the question is, shall we in future allow the Grand Trunk or any other company to compel a man to sign a contract like that, so that there will be no damages to be paid by the company in case he is killed ? I say that it is not right, and that some remedy should be provided. In the case cited with regard to the horse, the simple point on which that case was decided was that both parties had agreed what the damage should be in the case of loss ; and the principle is clear that when a man agrees what his damage shall be, no court can interfere. In that case the shipper need not have shipped the goods until he had made a satisfactory contract ; but having done it, there was no remedy, and I do not see very well how that can be changed. But in the case brought up by the hon. member for Elgin, all we have to do is to provide that no company shall compel any man to forego his right to damage if the damage is caused by negligence of the company, notwithstanding his having used a free pass. I would go that far, because the court would be met by this free pass, and the courts might not all be like Judge Rose, who held that the free pass was not a free pass, but was the holder's right and was part of the contract to carry the cattle. Therefore, I would provide that no such contract would be valid, and that the conditions on that pass were unreasonable and void. That would cure the whole difficulty. The company would not be allowed to plead those conditions, and the relatives of the party killed would be thrown back upon their remedy at common law without this technical defence of the company. I think the House should say that the man who goes with the cattle should have the protection of the common law. Is it not an awful thing for this parliament to say that the relatives of a man who has been killed have no remedy? I think we should not be put in that position. I think the time has come when we should make a law which would suit another state of affairs, and when those decisions should not longer continue to be made, and they must be made unless we alter the law.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask the minister one question. Shippers who must sign a shipping bill, sign that is practically a contract. There are many conditions in that shipping bill in which the shipper contracts away his rights ; but he is obliged to do it or he cannot ship. Is it not a fact that the courts hold generally that if the conditions in that shipping bill are unreasonable, the shipper is not compelled to forego the rights which he has signed away by signing that shipping bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend has overlooked the provisions of section 275, which provides that the conditions shall not be binding unless they have first been approved by the board.

Mr. SPROULE. Hitherto, so far as I know, they have not been approved by anybody. I thought the court would decide

what was reasonable or unreasonable, and, if the conditions were unreasonable, the shipper would not be bound by them.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot understand how it comes according to the Minister of Justice, that a Grand Trunk Railway employee cannot contract himself out of any benefit in case of accident, by reason of the company contributing a certain sum to the provident insurance society, while the cattle drover who goes to take care of stock does do so by reason of accepting a pass.

Bill reported with amendments.

LEAD BOUNTIES.

House went into committee to consider the following resolutions :—

That it is expedient to repeal chapter eight of the statutes of 1901, intituled : 'An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on lead refined in Canada,' and to enact as follows :—

1. The Governor in Council may authorize the payment of a bounty of seventy-five cents per one hundred pounds on lead contained in lead-bearing ores mined in Canada ; such bounty to be paid to the producer or vendor of such ores, upon evidence that such ores have been smelted in Canada. Provided, that the sum to be paid as such bounty shall not exceed five hundred thousand dollars in any fiscal year. Provided, also, that when it appears to the satisfaction of the minister charged with the administration of this Act that the standard price of pig-lead in London, England, exceeds twelve pounds ten shillings sterling per ton of two thousand two hundred and forty pounds, such bounty shall be reduced proportionately by the amount of such excess.

2. Payment of the said bounty may be made from time to time to the extent of sixty per centum of the full bounty authorized, subject to adjustment at the close of each fiscal year. If at the close of any year it shall appear that during the year the quantity of lead produced, on which the bounty is authorized, exceeds thirty-three thousand three hundred and thirty-three tons of two thousand pounds, the rate of bounty shall be reduced to such sum as will bring the payments for the year within the limit mentioned in section one.

3. If at any time it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that the charges for transportation and treatment of lead ores in Canada are excessive, or that there is any discrimination which prevents the smelting of such ores in Canada on fair and reasonable terms, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment of bounty at such reduced rate as may be deemed just, on the lead contained in such ores mined in Canada and exported for treatment abroad.

4. The said bounties shall cease and determine on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and eight

5. The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the intention of this Act.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This resolution provides for the repeal of the existing Act passed in 1901 respecting bounties on lead and provides another system of bounties in lieu thereof. The bounties provided by the existing Act are for the refining of lead. A refinery has been established under that Act but it has done very little. At all events we have had occasion to pay but a very small amount so far. I am advised however that the proprietors of the refinery are consenting parties to this legislation, so that although in the form of resolution we are now proposing, no reference is made to refining, the refining process is by no means given up but will still be continued. We propose to provide a bounty equivalent to $15 a ton on the lead contents of lead bearing ores, when sent to smelters in Canada. I propose to make a slight change in the wording of the resolution but not in its essence. The resolution says this bounty shall be paid on evidence that the lead has been smelted in Canada. It has been pointed out, however, that the lead ores are delivered to the smelter and may not be smeltered for a considerable time. We propose that samples shall be taken and assayed and payments made to the miners on these assays. We propose to adapt ourselves to the practice of the mines, and by a slight amendment it is intended that sixty per cent of the bounty may be paid to the producer who has delivered his lead to a smelter for the purpose of being smelted in Canada. Forty per cent of the bounty will be retained until it is proved that the actual smelting has taken place. That forty per cent shall not in any case be paid before the end of the fiscal year for this reason. We provide that the total sum shall not exceed $500,000 in any one year. If the output proved larger than the $500,000 would pay for, then the rate per ton shall be reduced accordingly, so that the amount paid shall not exceed $500,000 in any one year. It has been suggested by those interested in the lead industry that it is possible—and this is not necessarily a reflection on the owners of smelters—that circumstances might arise in which the owners of smelters and transportation lines might take such action as would prevent the smelting in Canada at fair and reasonable rates. While that is not likely, it is a possibility which might as well be guarded against, and provision is made that if any such circumstance should arise and the Governor General in Council be satisfied that there is unfair interference with smelting conditions in Canada, then the lead ore may be exported and the government may make a reduced rate of bounty adapted to that condition. Another condition of some importance is that with regard to the value of lead. Lead has ranged in price from as high as £17 in the last few years to as low as £12 and sometimes lower still. There is a standard price of lead in the London market. Whenever it goes above £12 10s. it would be proper for us to. reduce the bounty. If it does not rise above that price, this bounty shall stand. If it should advance, as

in former years, the lead miners would be receiving such a good price for their lead that this bounty would not be required. We have taken £12 10s. as the standard price of a ton of lead, according to the English method of weight 2,240 pounds. I think the latest quotations are about £12 5s. If the lead advances in price, as it has done in former years, above £12 10s. there shall be a corresponding reduction in the amount of bounty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman speaks of the bounty entirely ceasing when lead has attained a certain price. What price would that be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At about £16—the bounty would cease entirely. I am advised that lead has been quite as high as that in the past four years and indeed higher. The bounty shall be given for a period ending in 1908. Another clause I propose to insert, which is not in the resolution, is intended to meet a new process which has been brought to our notice. We propose to pay this bounty on lead which is smelted in Canada—a part of it on delivery of the lead ore at the mill and the balance on evidence that the smelting process is completed. It has been represented, however, that there are new processes for the manufacturing of lead which do away with the smelting processes and that certain products of lead may be made direct from the ore without passing through what is commonly known as the smelting process. It is not likely that that system will be extensively developed, but it is scientifically established that it is feasible, and I propose to insert a clause providing that if at any time it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor General in Council that products of lead are manufactured in Canada direct from ores mined in Canada, without the intervention of the smelting process, the Governor General in Council may make such provisions as may be deemed necessary to extend the benefits of this Act to the producers of such ores.

I think, Sir, that covers all the points mentioned in the resolution. The lead industry, a few years ago, was a very extensive one in British Columbia, the output having been as high, in 1900, as 30,000 tons. I believe the present output is about 5,000 tons. However, since these resolutions were placed upon the Notice paper, there has been quite a revival of the lead industry, and we have every reason to believe that, under the influence of the aid to be given, there will be a large development of this industry in British Columbia.

Mr. CLARKE. When will the payment of this bonus be commenced?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will take some time, I suppose, for the mines to get into operation, but if they were in operation at once after the passing of this Act, payments would be begun.

Mr. CLARKE. The bounty will not be paid on any ore that has already been mined?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My attention has been drawn to that point. From the best information I could gather, the quantity of ore already mined is very small. It would be difficult to distinguish between the ore on the dump and that which is to come out. Still, if it were likely to be a matter involving a considerable sum, we should take steps to make the distinction. But we are advised and believe that it will hardly be worth while to do so.

Mr. CLARKE. The bounty will be paid on the lead ore already mined?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that now on the dump.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). What guarantee will the minister have in paying the bonus ? How will he know what quantity has been mined ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In all bounty legislation we must give, as we do in this case, power to the Governor in Council to make regulations. The Department of Trade and Commerce, under whose direction this matter will come, will have to provide regulations so as to take the greatest precautions against fraud.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to strike out the words 'upon the evidence that such ores have been smelted in Canada,' because we are dealing with this point by an amendment later on.

Mr. POPE. What interpretation do we place upon the word 'vendor' ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been represented that, in the case of a small miner, he may produce lead, but not be able to hold it long enough to take it to the smelter. And if he raises money on it or sells it, the buyer should not be deprived of the right to the bounty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is assumed that the producer will get the benefit of it in the price he obtains?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. What provision is the hon. minister making with regard to making a reduction upon a favourable condition of the market? It seems to me that this is surrounded with great difficulties, except in the case of a long-continued rise in the price. There might be a sharp increase in the London market, yet none of our lead might get the benefit of that increase.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that what is called the 'smelter return' fixes on every transaction the standard price of lead by the latest cable quotation. This smelter return is a document

which the proprietor of the smelter gives to the producer of the lead when the lead reaches the smelter. That would bear on the face the London price of the day, and that transaction throughout would be governed by that price.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is undoubtedly a very important industry in the province of British Columbia, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is not giving the House very much information as to the causes in relation to that industry which have induced the government to adopt this measure of encouragement. I understand that the amount of capital invested in silver lead mines in British Columbia is supposed to be about $20,000,000. No doubt, the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) would be able to inform the House as to that. The amount invested in railway and steamship lines which depend largely upon this industry, I understand, is in the vicinity of $12,000,000 or $15,000,000. The amount invested in smelters is $800,000. The lead production in 1900 was 31,670 tons, worth $4,487,000 ; in 1901, the prduction was 25,700 tons, worth $3,336,000; in 1902, the production was 12,000 tons, valued at $1,154,000, but the production has fallen at the present time, as the hon. Finance Minister has stated, to about 5,000 tons. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance what effect he expects this bounty will have on the maintenance and development of the lead-ore production. Is it expected that this will give the Canadian market to the Canadian producer of lead to any greater extent than at the present time ? I understand that our consumption of lead in Canada is somewhere in the vicinity of 14,000 tons annually. I do not know whether that is correct, or whether the Minister of Finance has different information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is about correct, as I am advised.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And all that we consume is imported, I understand, with the exception of about 3,000 or 4,000 tons. Is that in accordance with the information of my hon. friend?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, is the bounty expected to have the result of giving the Canadian market to the Canadian producers to any greater extent than at present? In the next place, will the bounty have the effect, that we all desire, of establishing in this country any of the industries allied to the production of lead—for example, works for the corrosion—I think that is the expression—of lead, and other industries, which, I believe, might be expected to result from the encouragement of this industry by a protective duty ? I do not know whether the Minister of Finance has any information for the House on these subjects; but it seems to me that it would be extremely desirable that some policy of encouragement to the lead-mining industry should be adopted which would bring about results of this kind. If this bounty will not give to the lead producers of British Columbia the control of the home market to any greater extent than they have control at the present time, it will amount, in a great measure, to a bounty on export. If the lead producers have to send to a foreign market for sale all the lead they produce in excess of the 3,000 or 4,000 tons sold in Canada, practically we are paying a bounty to encourage production first, but, in the second place, to encourage the export of what we produce.

Now, I am desirous of supporting the government in any measure which will have the effect of developing this industry in British Columbia and of increasing the production of our own lead mines in Canada, but I would rather see that accomplished in a way which would give the lead producers of this country control of their own market. I dare say, that if it were attempted by means of a revision of the customs duties, it would be necessary to make changes in the customs duties for the purpose of increasing the protection to other industries, but would it not be desirable to do that if by doing so you could not only give the Canadian producers of lead control of the Canadian market, but at the same time give encouragement to the establishment in this country of the other industries to which I have referred ? I have no doubt that all these matters have been under the consideration of the hon. Minister of Finance, but I think it would be well that he should give some information to the committee on this point, because I think he will agree with the rest of us, that if it is possible to accomplish the results which I have indicated, it is desirable to do so. I have a good deal of doubt, myself, as to whether the system of bounties which is proposed by these resolutions would accomplish the result in anything like the way it could be accomplished by increased protection in the shape of customs duties. At the same time, I realize to so very great an extent the importance of this industry, not only to British Columbia, but to the country as a whole, that I am willing to support the government even in this measure which the hon. Minister of Finance has introduced, although I am of the opinion, which I think is very well founded, that a better result might have been accomplished in the way I have indicated. I would like if the hon. Minister of Finance would give us an idea as to the causes of the depression in the lead industry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is very largely due to the attitude of the American trusts and combinations, which have practically shut our lead out of the market. As to the general question as to the effect of this bounty upon the home market, I think

my hon. friend will agree with me that the home market is entirely a question of price. If the producer of lead in British Columbia can sell his lead low enough, he will have control of the home market. This bounty will enable him to sell his lead at a lower rate than he otherwise could sell it for, and in that way he can get access to the market. I do not think the lead producers contemplate dealing in this way with the export trade. They will have to export some, because the total consumption is only 14,000 or 15,000 tons, and they contemplate an output of at least double that, and some portion will have to be exported ; but I anticipate they will supply a much larger amount to the home market than has been done in former years. However, I imagine that with the bounty and with lead being produced under more favourable conditions, it will enable other manufacturers to take this lead and to develop their industries, although it is only a conjecture as to that. I understand, however, that there are parties who propose proceeding in the production of white lead, which is a product of the corroding process, and it is very likely that that product will be made in Canada under the assistance given in this way.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) would have done better, if he had followed the advice given by the legislative assembly of British Columbia. They say :

That it is desirable in the interest of silver-lead mining and smelting industries of British Columbia, that the duties on pig-lead and the products thereof imposed by the Dominion of Canada should be so increased as to protect the capital invested in these industries.

That is to say, that these duties should be so increased as to shut out American lead which is being used in Canada, and provide at least a home market for the Canadian producer. Their judgment was that customs duties would have accomplished that better than bounties would, and I think they would have done so. The hon. minister says that if we pay them a bounty and that bounty enables them to sell their lead cheaper so as to compete with the Americans, they will have control of the home market, but would it not be better to put on a customs duty so as to shut out the American lead, and if necessary, in addition to that to grant a small bounty and encourage the manufacture of lead at home. If the government have ignored the recommendation of the legislative assembly, I would have thought that they would have had some regard for the recommendation of the Rossland Liberal Association, which passed a very strong resolution on January 10, 1903, on the same lines. The following resolution was adopted :—

That we, the members of the Liberal Association of Rossland, do heartily endorse the action of the silver-lead miners and do especially urge upon the Dominion government the establishment of such duties as will secure for Canadian mines the benefits of the entire home market and will enable resumption of work in the many mining districts of British Columbia which are now suffering from great depression.

The government had the recommendation of the legislative assembly, and to make it stronger, the Liberal Association of Rossland backed it up with their recommendation. I would have expected that the government would have paid a good deal more attention to that, coming, as it does, from their own friends, and their own friends only, than if it had come from another source. But I regret that they have seen fit to ignore the recommendation, and that, instead of increasing the duty, as has been advised by both of these bodies, they propose to give a bounty that will allow the Americans to control our market still which ought to be supplied by our own people at home. In my judgment, the government are not adopting the best way to do for the lead miners what they desire. They are not securing the home market to the lead miners of Canada, and while I think they will improve it a little, they would have helped the lead miners much more if they had adopted the advice of their own friends of the Liberal association and had increased the duty so as to secure the home market for our own people.

Mr. POPE. While I do not like to disagree with the government in this matter, I am inclined to think as the hon. Minister of Finance might perhaps anticipate, that in the matter of these bounties he is not going to do the good that possibly he desires. Being a protectionist, perhaps I am prejudiced in the matter somewhat and do not see clearly how the bounty upon this product is going to give a permanent stimulus to the situation. When we consider that ore going from Canada to the United States has to pay a duty of $30 a ton, when we find that the duties of the United States, as they apply to the lead in its various forms of pig, pipe, bars, sheets, white and red, and all the rest of it, range from $50 to $65 a ton, because these are the duties that are applied to lead in the United States, as against our duties of $16, $17, $12 and down as low as $3.87 per ton, which constitute the protection which we have in this country, and if we add this $15 a ton to any of these figures that I have mentioned, it will be seen that our encouragement falls far short of the encouragement which the United States are giving to the lead industry in that country. I do not expect that we shall realize in British Columbia that benefit that we would all like to see, under any policy of bounties or under any other policy than carries with it the absolute control of this market, and without such encouragement as to make possible the export of these products to foreign countries. I believe that on top of that $15 a ton we should have a duty equivalent to that of the United States. With a less duty

than that we are not going to develop this industry. Of course, the Minister of Finance understands that we, on this side of the House, are going to accept any encouragement, whether it be by bounty or otherwise; but we would be failing in our duty, if we did not emphasize the fact that, with $15 a ton on our side, when $30 a ton are charged for exporting lead into the United States, the producer of lead in Canada has to pay $15 a ton more to get his lead into the United States, even after this encouragement.

Mr. GALLIHER. They will not take our lead in the United States at all, even if you give $60 a ton.

Mr. POPE. Then if that be true, it is impossible for us to export our lead into the United States. I think that only emphasizes the statement I made a few moments ago that the government should not hesitate a moment in placing the duty dollar for dollar with that of the United States.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Most of the lead that comes into Canada does not come from the United States, it comes as a rule from Spain.

Mr. POPE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that we buy scrap and pipe lead from Mexico?

Mr. GALLIHER. That is principally made from Canadian ore, the pig-lead. It is our own lead, our own bullion, that is sent into the United States in bond and refined there, then brought back and put on the market here.

Mr. POPE. I am obliged to the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Galliher) for the information he has given. I am more convinced than ever that it is our imperative duty to run this industry ourselves rather than let the United States run it for us. Let our people get the whole advantage of the development of that industry instead of the United States.

Mr. GALLIHER. I may point out that this government did give a bonus some two or three years ago to a refinery to refine this very lead I am now speaking of that is being refined in the United States in bond. That refinery is turning out a certain quantity. It was an experimental plant in the first instance, operating under a new process that had never been tried before. Therefore their plant is small at present, but it will be increased. The government granted them aid to help develop the lead refining industry and they experimented with the electrolytic system. They claim that it is a complete success, and the company are preparing, as I understand, to enlarge their plant to meet the growing requirements. But that takes time. So far they have not refined a great quantity of lead, one reason being the fact that they were experimenting for a considerable time. But gradually the have been improving the process until they are now in a position to enlarge their plant.

Mr. POPE. The government, I think, would do better to give encouragement to a system that did not need to be conducted as an experiment. There are systems in operation in treating lead ore that do not require experiment. The hon. gentleman has just told us that they have been spending their time in experimenting.

Mr. GALLIHER. Not altogether.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman said they had been spending their time in experimenting with these ores. If they had had proper protection they would have developed under a system that is in use every where else.

Mr. GALLIHER. Let me correct the hon. gentleman. The new system they have been conducting is not only greatly in the interest of science, but it will be advantageous to the refining of ore throughout the world, because it is the best and cheapest system, and the cheapest plant that can be invented.

Mr. POPE. Then the hon. gentleman argues that there is no development for that system inside of Canada, and if there is no development inside of Canada, why grant a bounty?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is under the impression that we have granted a bounty for a particular method of refining lead, which is a mistake. We have not granted a bounty to any particular method, but we have granted a bounty on the refining of lead, and we have paid it to one refinery. There is nothing to prevent any other refinery coming in and getting the bounty, but this happens to be the only one that was established.

Mr. POPE. Evidently the system of bounties has failed, it has failed in developing that single industry. You have not accomplished anything. One man says it is an experiment, the minister says they have given it to the only refinery that exists.

Mr. GALLIHER. I may point out something that the hon. gentleman knows, as he is interested in this industry. The lead smelters of the country have not been running even to supply the refinery that was running last year. The fact that they were shut out of the American market for selling their ore is responsible for the present condition. It is not a question of the bounty failing to encourage the industry.

Mr. POPE. Does the hon. member think that the company would prefer a strong system of protection to a system of bounties?

Mr. GALLIHER. I might answer the hon. gentleman by repeating expressions

of opinion made by people interested in this matter, and who are better able to give him information than I am. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the question of protection in the readjustment of duties was not the only question considered at these meetings. There was also the question of a bonus. Some favoured one and some favoured another, but I am bound to admit that the majority came to the conclusion that a readjustment of the duty would be better. Any one who will take the trouble to read my speech on the budget will know that I am stating exactly what took place.

Mr. CLARKE. Why did they come to that conclusion ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Like all mass meetings of that kind, it was not all composed of men of the same political thought ; some came to that conclusion possibly because of their political belief and others came to a different conclusion, but at all events the majority came to that conclusion.

Mr. CLARKE. Purely political motives.

Mr. GALLIHER. No ; I do not wish to convey that idea at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) himself think that a protective customs tariff is really the best for this industry ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Let me answer the questions one at a time. When the Minister of Finance announced in the budget speech that the government did not see its way to grant the request of the lead miners for an increased duty on pig-lead and corroded lead, it was intimated that later on something might be done to aid the industry in the way of a bounty. I set to work, and the matter was brought before the different associations in my county, and I received numerous telegrams urging me to place before the government as strongly as I knew how the desirability of assisting this industry by means of a bonus. After the announcement of the bounty, on the 8th of July, I received telegrams from the boards of trade, the owners, the associations, men of different political views ; but all interested in the welfare of the lead industry, and these telegrams show that the people most affected are well satisfied with the action that has been taken by the government. Some of these telegrams are complimentary to myself, and for that reason I will dispense with them. But I would like to read one which, after thanking myself and those from the province who supported me in obtaining this bounty, winds up by saying :

> We appreciate the result on the lead question and can say that the country is rejoicing at action of government. Please convey thanks to other members of British Columbia.
>
> Signed, Geo. Alexander, S. S. Fowler, G. L. Parker, executive committee. L. Pratt, secretary of Silver Lead Association.

I have other telegrams conveying the appreciation of the people on the action of the government in granting this bounty. I think this expression of opinion from the people interested is probably the best answer I can give to my hon. friend.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that indicate that they prefer a bounty to a protective tariff ?

Mr. GALLIHER. When the men who own the mines, and who have their capital invested, and who are most deeply interested ; when these men say that the country is rejoicing at the action of the government, it ought to convince members on both sides of the House that they are satisfied.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if protective duties had been put on instead of bounties, he would not have received those telegrams of rejoicing ?

Mr. GALLIHER. I can only speak of what I have received.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no desire to enter into the general question of the relative advantage of duties and bounties at this late hour, but there is one view I might suggest as bearing on the question. Suppose we had put some moderate and reasonable customs duty on these articles greater than we now have, these duties would only operate as a protection to the extent of the quantity consumed in the home market, which is about 14,000 tons. The bounty will apply to the output of 33,000 tons, and therefore the benefit of the bounty covers a larger output. I can imagine that even a man who is a protectionist may perhaps see that the bounty system, for the present at all events, might help him better than customs duties. I do not want to argue the merits of the two systems, but merely to call attention to the fact that while, by the protective system, the benefit would only be on the quantity consumed in the home market, by the bounty system the benefit is received on the total output.

Mr. WILSON. How long has the lead industry been in operation ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The Hall and Slocan mines turned out lead, copper and silver as far back as 1885.

Mr. WILSON. How long have they had bounties ?

Mr. GALLIHER. This is the first bounty that has ever been granted. Prior to this time the ore was bought by the American smelters to the extent that we could supply it, but then this Lead Smelter Trust of the United States was formed, and it was formed, as we firmly believed in that country, for no other purpose than to close up the industry in Canada, and now they won't purchase our ores.

Mr. WILSON. When you made your speech in the House, did you not ask for protection instead of bounties ?

Mr. GALLIHER. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the 'Hansard' of the 29th of April, he will find my speech there, and he need not ask me to depend on my memory.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand the hon. member (Mr. Galliher) to say that we do not get any of our lead from the United States?

Mr. GALLIHER. We get no United States produced lead.

Mr. SPROULE. We got from the United States 5,895,174 pounds of dry and white lead.

Mr. GALLIHER. Not one pound of that is produced from ore mined in the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. That information is not given in the returns, but at any rate it comes in from a country that has a high duty against us. I would think that the instructions which the hon. member (Mr. Galliher) would have regard to would be the instructions given by his own Liberal Association, and I have before me a copy of the resolution which they passed on the 10th of January, 1903, and which says :

ROSSLAND LIBERAL ASSOCIATION.

Robert T. Grigor,
President.
Roland A. Laird,
Secretary.

Rossland, B.C., January 10, 1903.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that at a largely attended meeting of this association held last night the following resolution was adopted :—

Whereas since the present Canadian tariff was framed, changed conditions have placed Canada in a position to more than supply the lead necessary for home consumption and her mines are now, through the smelters marketing the bulk of their lead product in China, Japan and Europe, while German lead and Mexican lead manufactured in the United States is being marketed in Canada, supplying the most of the demand, to the detriment of the mines, smelters and refineries in Canada ;

Whereas practically all the silver-lead mines are closed, due to the decline in the world's price for silver and lead, in consequence of which the vast amount of money invested in the development of these districts is now lying idle, and workmen, whose wages were as high as any in the United States and higher than the average paid in Missouri, Mexico and Australia are unemployed, and

Whereas the Dominion government has, through some of its members, stated that tariff revision would be made when changed conditions justified it, therefore,

Be it resolved that we, the members of the Liberal Association of Rossland, do heartily endorse the action of the silver-lead miners and do especially urge upon the Dominion government the establishment of such duties as will secure for Canadian mines the benefits of the entire home market and will enable resumption of work in the many mining districts of British Columbia which are now suffering from great depression.

Be it further resolved that copies of these resolutions be immediately forwarded to the members of the Cabinet, Senate and House of Commons.

RONALD A. LAIRD.
Secretary.

I presume that at least one of these was sent to their own member, and I take it that these were the instructions given by the Liberals of that constituency to him as their representative. Now he pretends to say that he is satisfied with the bounty, and he does not say one word in the way of asking the government to put a duty on lead, which his own association asked for, but he says they are quite satisfied with the bounty. After the budget speech was made, and the statement of the Finance Minister that he did not consider it wise to change this session the duties upon this or any other article, I presume that they were compelled to be satisfied with the half measure which they got, though they did not believe, and do not believe to-day, in my judgment, that this is the best way to help the lead-mining industry in that country. The people of British Columbia, as represented by the resolution passed in the legislative assembly on the 11th June, 1902, and by the resolution of the Rossland Liberal Association—and this is only one of several resolutions in the same line passed by Liberal associations—were in favour of a customs duty and not a bounty on lead. You give them, not what they believed was the best, but only a half measure of relief.

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think that those who sent me here, whether they were Liberals, Conservatives, labour men, or anybody else, have any cause to complain of my action in forwarding their interests on this lead question. I am quite satisfied to leave myself in their hands in that respect. I hope the hon. member does not think that I sat idle until the budget speech was delivered, and did not urge what I was sent here to urge.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman think that the people who sent these representations knew what they wanted?

Mr. GALLIHER. I represented to this government exactly what I was sent to represent. The hon. member knows very well that a member from any district, on approaching the government to obtain a concession of any kind from them, comes armed with all the strength he can possibly command, if he understands his business. That will account, probably, in some measure for the resolutions which I came armed with.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the resolutions merely a bluff to strengthen the hands of the hon. gentleman ?

Mr. GALLIHER. You can form your own opinion of them. We do these things

pretty much as I think they are done in all parts of Canada, and in all parts of the world, for that matter.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Might I ask the hon. member if he has changed his opinions ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Will the hon. member be kind enough to allow me to answer the hon. member for East Grey, and then I will be only too happy to answer any question he may put. The hon. gentleman quoted the resolution of the Rossland Liberal Association, and said that they had received not what they asked for, but something they were compelled to take, and that they did it simply because they could not get anything else. I will read a telegram which I received on the 8th of July, the day these resolutions were placed on the Order paper. This telegram is addressed to myself :

Rossland, B.C., July 8.

W. A. Galliher, M.P.,
Ottawa.

We congratulate you, Senator Templeman, provincial members and the government on the splendid stand taken on lead question.

This is signed by the president of the Liberal Association. I could quote considerably more literature to my hon. friends if they wished it, to prove that the people are satisfied. In fact, they never expected to get $15 a ton for their lead, and they are very pleased indeed that it has been granted.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Just to set this matter possibly a little more clearly before the House, I may say that I had the privilege of attending, in the city of Vancouver, one of the first meetings held of the silver lead men of British Columbia. They were not themselves a unit as to the best method by which the difficulties they were labouring under could be got over. The question of a bonus was largely discussed. The general consensus of opinion of the lead men was that a bonus would not be granted. In view of that, they thought they had better later on ask for a higher protective duty. In the home market last year we consumed 12,000 tons, or 24,000,000 pounds. The first lead shipment in British Columbia was in 1887. The shipments from that date down to last year were as follows :—

	Pounds.
1887..	204,800
1888..	674,500
1889..	165,100
1890..	nil.
1891..	nil.
1892..	808,420
1893..	2,135,023
1894..	5,662,523
1895..	16,475,464
1896..	24,199,977
1897..	38,841,135
1898..	31,693,559
1899..	21,862,436
1900..	63,358,621
1901..	51,582,906
1902..	22,536,381

You can easily see from this immense lead production and our small consumption, what a small market we have for lead in Canada. In 1901 the lead combine was formed in the United States, and in 1902 our total production of lead was exactly our consumption, possibly a little less. Our total production was 22,536,381, and we consumed that year 24,000,000 pounds. We have had practically our market to ourselves.

Mr. SPROULE. How can the hon. gentleman say that when we brought in 15,000,000 pounds of foreign lead——

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes, but the majority of that is Spanish lead. But we sold at the same time 22,536,381 and consumed 24,000,000.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. gentleman says we had our own market. Evidently we had not.

Mr. MACPHERSON. We sold enough to supply our own market and had to buy some besides, but the reason was we were not getting a proper price for our lead, not having an open market for it. The hon. member for East Grey has quoted the Liberal Association of Rossland. Let me quote to him the New Denver 'Ledge,' which is a strong Conservative organ and one of the most representative mining papers in British Columbia. On July the 16th the 'Ledge' published the following article :—

Outlook Much Brighter.

Prospects of good times in the silver-lead camps of the Kootenays have greatly brightened since the assurance has come from Ottawa that the Dominion government will give aid to the producers in the sum of $500,000 a year. From all sections where lead mines are being developed, words of cheer are heard, and there is no doubt that mines which have in recent years been operated only in the development stage, will in a short time be thrown open and ore turned out at their full capacity.

Senator Turner, principal owner of the Sullivan group, in East Kootenay, is credited with saying to the Cranbrook 'Herald': 'The proposed bonus will enable Sullivan Company to start mine immediately and to complete the smelter this season.'

Reports of a like nature come from other camps. J. L. Parker, of the North Star mine, says :

'As long as the bonus lasts, we may consider that we will have good times for the following reasons :

1st. The mines that are in a shipping condition, but which are not shipping, will naturally ship their ores.

2nd. Those in a developing condition, but not developing, will naturally develop.

3rd. Those properties which have a favourable surface mineral condition, will naturally either have some work done on them, or the owners will find a more favourable market for them than has been the case the past two years.

4th. Encouragement will be given to the prospector to hunt for new finds, probably resulting in the later opening up of a new district or two.

5th. The wage expenditure will return to the old standard of about $2,500,000 per annum instead of less than $500,000.

6th. The merchants, who have been reducing their stock, will replenish it, resulting in the merchants east getting fresh orders, and giving the railroads more work.

7th. The smelters will have live furnaces, instead of dead ones, and this will give employment to more men, and through this certain ores available for fluxes can be used and purchased by them which would otherwise have to remain in the ground. The latter feature is an important one, giving employment to more men.

The amount of bonus to be distributed in five years time on the basis of $15 per ton, will be about $2,500,000, and as the mine-owners will spend $10,000,000 more during the same period, than they would have done under the past conditions, it will be seen that the government aid, although tardy, will mean a direct aid to the district of two million five hundred thousand dollars, besides an indirect aid of ten million.

John A. Finch is reported as saying: 'We expect to start up the St. Eugene this summer by reason of the benefit from the lead bounty. We formerly worked about 200 men on the property and were shipping 3,000 tons of lead concentrates per month. The concentrates were running 65 per cent lead.'

Bryon N. White of the 'Slocan Star' said: 'The mine-owners are getting all they asked for from the Dominion government. The effect of the bonus will certainly be beneficial. The Slocan Star, which was shipping to the American Smelting and Refining Co., and suspended shipments some time ago has entered into a contract to ship to the Trail smelter and will start shipments soon. It is reported the bonus will be paid only on lead ore mined, smelted and refined in Canada. By shipping to the Trail smelter we will receive all the bonus coming to us.

I have no doubt the increased output stimulated by the bonus will take up all of the grant of $500,000 per annum made by the government. Indirectly the bonus will be of still greater benefit to the province as it will bring several millions of British and American money into the Slocan and Kootenay lead mines for investment.

I could go on quoting page after page from British Columbia papers all to the same effect. As a matter of fact the lead mine-owners more than once asked this government for aid, and they appreciate the aid now given which will bring the price of lead to a certain figure. They do not care whether that is the result of a bonus or a duty. Lead miners in British Columbia to-day without exception will tell you that $15 per ton of a bonus is much better to them than the duty first suggested.

Mr. LAFURGEY. It is not the best thing for the country.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I think it is. We were suffering under great difficulties, and the people believe that their difficulties are now removed and that is all they hoped for.

Mr. POPE. I am glad to see that I am sustained in the position I am taking by an authority which the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo must recognize as a good one. I have looked up the hon. gentleman's speeches, and I find that on the 29th of April last he sustained me in every position I have taken. In the first place he pointed out that the great difficulty experienced was the competition of Mexican ore, mined by men who are paid fifty cents per day, and who thus enter into competition in British Columbia with men who receive from $3 to $3.50 per day. If the hon. gentleman represents the labouring men of that section, he will be disposed to think very seriously of their situation with regard to that competition. The bounty will not lessen that competition. If it is simply a question whether the miners can get enough out of this bounty to operate a certain number of mines. I find that the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo said in that speech:

> It was unanimously decided at the Sandon meeting that the delegation should be sent to Ottawa to present the facts to the government and to ask them to give us a duty on our lead that would be sufficient to place our miners—not exactly in that position of the American miners because we felt that we could not get that—but at all events to place them in a position so that they will be able to work their mines to advantage.

The hon. gentleman was asked what he thought would be a sufficient duty on lead and he replied:

> What was asked was practically the Dingley tariff which is two and one-eight cents a pound on pig-lead, and two and seven-eights cents a pound on corroded lead. That would be adequate but I had no hesitation in using the word 'adequate.'

So you see, Mr. Chairman, that when he came fresh from his constituency and from this meeting at Sandon, which unanimously decided to ask for duties, the hon. gentleman urged this government to protect the lead industry by the imposition of duties and not by a bounty.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) that to refer to the past debate, and certainly to read from that debate is against the rules of the House.

Mr. POPE. I am referring to an utterance of an hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) on the same subject, and here is a clause that will interest you, Mr. Chairman:

> An adequate bounty would tide us over our difficulty——

I said that probably that might be the result of our bounty system, and the hon. gentleman from Yale and Cariboo agrees with me. That was the speech on the budget debate, made when he came fresh from his constituents:

> —for a time until the government could see its way clear to give us at least a fair, proportionate and reasonable adjustment of duties, so that our lead products, at all events, would

be on the same basis as other products of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should be frank enough to admit that while he and I are, to a limited extent, satisfied with the half loaf we are receiving, it is quite clear that we are not receiving what the people of that country asked for and what he himself said he was instructed to ask for here. So, there will be nothing satisfactory to this industry until it receives the adequate protection the hon. gentleman referred to—equal to the Dingley tariff, or something better. It is not necessary for me to pursue this subject further. The hon. gentleman and I quite agree, and I am delighted, as a man living in the east, with some interest in that western country, but not understanding that industry as one living there would—for I have not a scientific understanding of the question—to find that when, as I say, the government is not doing the measure of justice that the people demanded unanimously at their meeting, according to the remarks of the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo, to be corroborated by the hon. gentleman who has the honour to represent those people in this House.

Mr. BELL. I understand that a very important feature in connection with this industry is the supply of fuel. I see that boards of trade and other associations in British Columbia have laid great stress on the development of the coal properties owned by the government of Canada in the Crow's Nest Pass. Of course, the intention of the bounty is to place the mining industry of British Columbia on a paying and satisfactory basis as far as possible. Might I ask the government what has been done by them to meet the views of the British Columbia Board of Trade, in which they ask that the government should select their coal lands on Morrissey Creek, and should either develop them as a government work or lease them under such conditions that it would be possible for other mining companies operating in that part of Canada to get control of the output. I made the discovery on a visit to British Columbia last fall that the fuel question there is so important that it is considered that unless it is settled, anything the government can do to foster the lead industry by a bounty might be unavailing. The industry is liable to be interrupted by difficulties in connection with mining by strikes, and would be entirely jeopardized by a serious rise in the price of coal or coke; so much so that it has been suggested that the government should take steps which would guarantee a sufficient supply of coke or coking coal at a fixed minimum price. I know that this is not related directly to the question of bounties, but, as it is essential that the fuel question be put upon a safe basis before the benefit can be expected from the bounties, may I ask what attention has been paid to the representations on this point of parties who speak on behalf of the mining industry and especially of the lead mining industry?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In connection with representations made to me and my colleagues as to the lead industry, I think I am correct in saying that nothing was said as to the fuel question. It may be that something was said to my colleagues on that point. The question of developing coal lands might come more directly before the Department of the Interior. But the gentlemen who composed the lead deputation did not represent that they were under any disadvantage in connection with the fuel question. As to the general question of doing something in the way of developing the government coal lands, that is worthy of attention, and will, on doubt, engage the attention of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. BLAIN. If I understand the case correctly, when the proposal was first presented to the government by the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher), he stated in the House that three separate meetings were held in the west in connection with the lead mining indutsry. The first was held in Sandon, and a resolution was passd asking the government to increase the tariff. After that meeting had passed this resolution unanimously, another meeting was called at the city of Nelson, and the resolution which had been passed at the meeting at Sandon was repassed by the meeting of miners assembled at Nelson. And the third and final meeting was held in Sandon, and resolved unanimously that the government should be called upon to put a tariff on lead, and not a bounty. After the Minister of Finance made his statement in the House, the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo received telegrams from the mining interests in the west calling upon him to urge the government to reopen the question, not to decide in favour of a bounty, but to call upon them to raise the duty. Surely there cannot be any doubt that the men engaged in mining in the west are not in favour of a bounty.

Mr. GALLIHER. Did I state that?

Mr. BLAIN. Did the hon. member state it? I will read that part of his speech.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will have to take objection to this reading. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) does not deny that he said what was attributed to him, and, if he does not deny it, that is just as effective as if the report of his statement were read. The speech referred to was made on the budget. It is part of a past debate, and I do not think it should be opened.

Mr. CLARKE. If you would declare, by your ruling, whether the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Galilher) said it or not, we should be satisfied.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have ruled. The hon. gentleman can't refer to a former debate.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood that in a discussion of this kind we could make reference to statements made in a debate on the same question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Let me say how that is. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) can go on and use an argument used during the debate on the budget, but it should be used independently, without reference to that debate, and without reading from the report of the debate. To read from past debates is distinctly out of order.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to violate any rules, Mr. Chairman, and will not attempt it, but what I do say is that, as the House understood, the request from British Columbia made by miners and those interested in the lead industry was unanimous, and it was that the government should place a tariff on this article; and in no case did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) or any representative from the west call upon the government—and in no case, I think I may say, did the representatives of the west call upon the Finance Minister—to place a bounty on lead, until they had received the statement of the government that it would be impossible to put a tariff on lead, but that they might reach the case with a bounty. After the statement made in the House by the Finance Minister, telegrams were sent from the lead mining industries in the west to their representatives here asking them to use their influence not to have a bounty, but a duty.

Mr. GALLIHER. I deny that in the form in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) states it.

Mr. BLAIN. With that denial I think I shall be permitted to read what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) said :—

> I have received numerous telegrams, and resolutions from boards of trade both in the territories and throughout the entire province of British Columbia, urging upon me that I should ask the government to reconsider the question of the adjustment of duties, so far as lead is concerned.

Mr. GALLIHER. But the hon. gentleman added that I had said not to put a bounty on it. That is what I denied, and that is not in my speech.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understood the Finance Minister's statement, and I am sure the hon. member understood it in the same way, it was that there would be some resolution in the House this session that would meet, or make an effort to meet, the demand from the west in respect to the mining industry. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) will not deny that.

Mr. GALLIHER. I will not deny anything that I said.

Mr. BLAIN. When the statement was made——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Allow me another word. When an hon. member is charged with having made a statement, and that hon. gentleman says he did not make it, the question must there and then cease; the statement of the hon. gentleman must be accepted. And here is what the rule says with regard to a previous debate :—

> No member in speaking can refer to anything said or done in a previous debate during the same session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That rule is qualified in many ways, Mr. Chairman, and the rule that you have laid down on the other point, perhaps, is not expressed as accurately as it ought to be. If two hon. gentlemen have the same personal knowledge of the same question, one is not required to accept the statement of the other, for the rule would apply to both, and each would have to accept the other's statement. Thus, the rule applies only to cases within the personal knowledge of one and not of the other, according to my understanding. As to the rule respecting a previous debate, as it is laid down in May—I am not familiar with it in Sir John Bourinot—it is not quite so broad, it seems to me, with all deference to your opinion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I quoted the very language.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking of the rule in May, which I had occasion to examine recently. For example, if the Minister of Finance, on motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means should make his budget speech, and the committee should rise; and if, later in the session, he goes into Committee of Ways and Means for the purpose of amending the tariff, it is competent, on any resolution then discussed, to refer to the budget speech, because you are dealing with the same subject and by the same procedure. That is very much the case here. The Minister of Finance dealt with this question of the lead duty, which was dealt with by hon. members in that debate. Now, the hon. minister, though not going into Committee of Ways and Means, is practically doing the same thing in bringing down resolutions with regard to bounties. I should think it would involve us in some difficulties in conducting the debates of the House if, on resolutions of this kind, we were not allowed to refer to the budget debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax). If there is a proposition placed before the House, and that proposition is discussed and finished either by defeating it or by adopting it, that discussion becomes a past

debate to all intents and purposes. A single resolution in Committee of Supply becomes a past debate when that resolution is decided by the House; otherwise we would have all the resolutions and questions so mixed up that we could not tell what was a past debate and what was a present one. I do not think that May puts the construction upon it that my hon. friend has said.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a different opinion.

Mr. SPROULE. Supposing we are dealing with a Bill and a motion is made for the second reading, which practically affirms the principle, and that motion is carried. According to your interpretation that would be a past debate. If that Bill comes back to this House and we go into committee, and you rise several times and report progress, every time we go into committee again we are at perfect liberty to refer to any discussion that took place on that Bill, because we are dealing with the same subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will examine the rules he will find that that rule does not apply to Bills. A Bill is considered a subject from the preamble to the last section of it, and consequently can be referred to from time to time. But a proposition in the form of a resolution or anything of that kind comes under the rule that I have expressed. The rule in reference to a previous debate is found on page 426 of May, in a foot note :

> The rule, however, does not apply to the different stages of a Bill, but it does apply to all other cases.

Mr. BLAIN. I submit at once to the ruling of the Chair. But I would like to have an understanding with the hon. member for Yale and Cariboo (Mr. Galliher) on this question. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if, when he came to the House with a request from the lead-mining interests of the west, their request was not a unanimous one asking that the government place duties upon the lead-mining interests ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Chairman,——

Mr. BLAIN. I beg the minister's pardon, I did not ask him a question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not want to interpose, but my hon. friend did not seem to think it was necessary to answer it.

Mr. BLAIN. Whether the minister thinks it is necessary or not, I think it is necessary. This is a question that the committee should thoroughly understand. It is not enough for some members of the committee to say that the lead-mining interests of the west are satisfied with this bounty, when the fact is that the lead-mining interests of the west did not ask for any such bounty. The lead-mining interests of the west called upon the government, through their representatives, for a duty to be placed upon lead. What I ask now from the hon. gentleman is whether I misunderstood the representations made by himself in this House. Am I correct in understanding from him that the lead-mining interests of the west, meeting at three separate places and at three separate times, passed unanimous resolutions calling upon the government to place a duty upon lead?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think the hon. gentleman will accuse me of making any statements in my speech that were not true. My statements are there, and the hon. gentleman can read them for himself.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman from Burrard (Mr. Macpherson) says they are satisfied. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to answer my question, whether the mining interests in the west called upon him as a representative to ask this government for a bounty, or whether they called for a duty upon lead?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I said that at a meeting held in Vancouver, after the meeting held in Nelson, they adopted a resolution unanimously asking for a duty. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that they were not by any means unanimous in their branches, whether it should be a duty or a bounty. I say further, that had the lead men any suspicion that they would receive a bounty of $15 a ton there would never have been a question of duty at all.

Mr. WILSON. So great a bounty.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Yes, because it is a bounty that is quite sufficient. Now, I can tell the hon. gentleman that he could not go into the Kootenay country and make them feel bad by telling them they ought to have a duty and not a bounty, because they are all very well satisfied.

Mr. POPE. We will try you later on that.

Mr. MACPHERSON. You will always find us doing business at the old stand.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman says that if the lead-mining interests of the west had understood that a bounty of $15 a ton could be secured from the government they would not have asked for a duty. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman this : After the Finance Minister had made his statement in the House that a bounty would be placed upon the lead-mining interest, how does it happen that telegrams were sent from the lead interests in the west to the members here calling upon them to ask the government to put a duty on lead? How did that happen if they were so well satisfied? The hon. member for Yale made that statement in the House.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I received a telegram at the same time from the Mining Association at Victoria asking me to urge for a bounty of $8 a ton. Now, what does the hon. gentleman make of that ?

Mr. BLAIN. I venture the statement now that the hon. gentleman cannot produce a telegram from the lead-mining interests in all the western country calling upon this government for a bounty in preference to a duty upon the lead-mining interest.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that what I say is not true ?

Mr. BLAIN. I am not responsible for the construction that the hon. gentleman puts upon it. I did not say that. I make the statement, and I make it without fear of contradiction, because I had the privilege of interviewing some of the lead-mining men, when in British Columbia, and, while I do not assume to be as familiar with the question as hon. gentlemen representing that district, the demand there was for a duty, and that the mining men called upon the governemnt for a duty, so that they would have possession of the home market. Nothing that is in the correspondence, nothing that is in the public press of the west, nor in any resolution can warrant the hon. gentleman in the statement that the lead mining interest wanted the government to put a bounty on lead. The one request from the west is, and always has been, that the government should place a duty upon lead.

Mr. OLIVER. I represent a section of the west, and I may say that I received a number of letters in regard to the position of the lead industry, and in no case was a question of duty mentioned. They asked for assistance to the lead industry, but they did not mention the kind of assistance that they wanted.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman if in the correspondence there was any demand for a bounty ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. gentleman make the statement now, that the lead mining interests would be as well satisfied with a bounty as with a duty ?

Mr. OLIVER. Unless the lead mining interest is perfectly crazy, I would say, certainly. Considering that we import some 20,000,000 pounds of lead, and that we produce two or three times that much, I do not see, myself, how the lead mining industry is going to be substantially or permanently benefited by the imposition of a duty. If the output has to be exported in order to be marketed, certainly a duty cannot affect the price of that part which has to be exported. If the larger part has to be exported, the price of the larger part is not going to be affected by the duty. I may say, further, if it is a matter of information, that I discussed this lead question with a gentleman who represented himself as the representative of the mining industry in British Columbia, and his proposal, as given to me, was, that they wanted an increase of duty, and that they wanted a bounty also.

Mr. POPE. That is right. That is business.

Mr. OLIVER. But neither he nor any other person else that I ever spoke to in regard to this question, or whoever spoke to me in regard to it, pinned his faith on any particular method. Anything that would produce the result was what they wanted, and as I understand it, the amount of the bounty that is being given is considered sufficient to produce the result. These gentlemen, now knowing the amount of the bounty that is being given, have, through their representatives here, declared themselves satisfied. It does not make any difference whether at not, at some time in the past, the lead mining interest of British Columbia expressed a preference for one form of assistance or another. Now that they know the amount of the assistance that they are getting, and now that they have expressed themselves as satisfied through their representatives, surely the House ought to be satisfied.

Mr. BLAIN. That cannot be a correct statement of the case. The lead mining interest had three meetings in the west prior to this session of parliament, first at Sandon, then at Nelson, and then again at Sandon. At no one of these three meetings was a resolution passed calling on the government to place a bounty upon lead, but at each and all of these meetings a unanimous resolution was passed calling upon the government to place a duty upon lead. If that be the case, I assume that the lead mining interests meeting in convention knew what they wanted. I do not think it is fair for the hon. member for Alberta to get up now and say that they are satisfied with a bounty. When the representation was made to the governmen, during this session, calling upon them to place a duty upon lead, and when a statement was made by the hon. Minister of Finance that a bounty would be placed upon lead, how did it come that the representatives of the mining interests of the west, having read the hon. minister's statement, sent telegrams down to their representatives, calling upon them to ask the government to put a duty on lead ?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason is, that they did not know the amount of the bounty that was going to be given.

Mr. BLAIN. That is the answer, is it ? However, I will not pursue it further.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was just going to call attention to the fact that

this proposition is one to aid the lead industry. The whole House is well acquainted with the circumstances connected with it and with the conditions of the market. I think all parties are agreed that this is an industry to which some relief in some way should be given by parliament. Well, now, as to whether the men engaged in the production of lead themselves wished this relief to be given by way of a duty or by way of a bounty, it seems to me, need not concern us very much. I understand that what has been said is correct. I understand that they would like to have a bounty, and that they would also like to have a duty, that they would like to have both, as I understood in some interviews I had with some of them. I have not the slightest doubt that the earliest representations made were for duties, but the government are not bound to accede to all the demands that are made upon it. The government are bound to give them a candid hearing, and most courteous treatment, and to weigh the suggestions that are put before them, and having done that in this case, the government have decided to assume the responsibility of the course which they now propose. Therefore, this is aside from the question as to what suggestions were made to the government. The government recognized that the whole country was interested in this industry, and might fairly be called upon to do something to bear part of the burden of encouraging that industry. They have decided that the best way to do that, in their opinion, is in the form of the proposition now before the House. If I were to express an opinion myself in reference to the bonus, I would view it, that probably, when they urged us strongly for duties, they had not anticipated that the government might see its way clear to propose to the House such a large bonus. From the information I can get, strengthened by the telegrams read by the hon. member (Mr. Galliher), it would seem that all parties interested are satisfied. I would hesitate to give my opinion as to which form is the better, because the men interested ought to be the best judges, but, looking at it from my standpoint, I would say that they must be better satisfied with a bounty than they would be with a duty, for the reason that if a duty were put on, it would have to go by a roundabout process before it could reach these men and benefit them.

Mr. POPE. It would be permanent.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know about its permanency either, but the hon. gentleman will agree with me that the benefit would be by a roundabout process, because it means the raising of duties on many articles of commerce that are a second or third remove from where we are applying the relief directly. You would need to have adjusted the duties in these two or three different points, before these men would get the benefit, but the result of the bounty is, that now these mines are opening up, development has commenced, and you have an immediate relief which you could not have had the other way. Whether they would prefer to have a duty or not I cannot say. But it strikes me that if the committee see fit to approve of this resolution, it would be a direct relief to the industry. No one in the House seems to object to the resolution itself ; the only discussion is as to which is the better way and this being the proposition of the government, it seems to me that it would be well for us to adopt it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think so, Mr. Chairman, and as the Minister of Customs says, there is no one here objecting to it. It is fortunate indeed in that respect, that we have not present these earnest and consistent free traders the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because there would be strong objection, I have no doubt, if they knew that the Finance Minister was introducing this resolution, particularly as the Minister of Customs has pointed out, that this is a direct way and not an indirect way of putting money into the hands of these heartless corporation against whom we used to indulge in such tirades in days gone by.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I never did that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Customs has pointed out that this bounty puts the money into the pockets of the lead miners in a direct way, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce used rage throughout the country because as he alleged money was put into their pockets in an indirect way. The merit of this proposition, according to the Minister of Customs is, that it puts money into their pockets in a direct way, and therefore, every one ought to be satisfied, even the earnest free traders on the other side of the House who apparently do not recognize that bounties are the most extreme forms of protection.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did I say anything about putting money in any one's pocket.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Oh, yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Immediate relief —direct relief—surely the minister has not forgotten what he said a few minutes ago.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I certainly did not say that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The whole question has been summed up by one British Columbia authority in these words :

> No bonus without duty will relieve the competition in our domestic markets from the product of cheap foreign labour, and the anomaly would be presented of a highly bonussed Canadian miner selling his products in the markets of the world while the greater part of his home market is reserved for the products of foreign countries.

That is the way in which it is viewed in some quarters. However, as the Minister of Customs has said, in the absence of the distinguished cabinet ministers I have named, there is no one in the House who seems to be specially opposed to this resolution, and probably under the circumstances it might be passed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend must remember that in matter of parliamentary procedure, and in the enactment of statutes, it is the latest statute that always governs and by it all the others are wiped out; in like manner the latest resolutions and telegrams from the miners of British Columbia wiped out all the others.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Customs express himself as he did. He treated this whole question as a matter of expediency; and as if we should satisfy the people of British Columbia for political reasons only. It would seem from his argument, that the whole object of the policy of the government is to pursue a trimming course in this matter. There is no decided policy on their part as regards free trade or protection, but each one of them seems to be trimming his sails to meet the political exigencies that may arise at the next election. There is a deplorable want of sincerity in the manner in which these gentlemen opposite treat the fiscal policy of this country. The hon. member from Vancouver read a long article from a western paper setting forth how the trade of the country was going to boom on account of the establishment of this bonus, but notwithstanding that, in my opinion the bonus system is entirely wrong. The government is working from the wrong end in this matter, and they are simply trying to postpone the inevitable. We shall have in the end to protect our industries by a legitimate form of protection that will give stability to the industries of the country. You cannot accomplish that, by this hand to mouth proposition of bonusing certain industries. In this country we need a staple fiscal policy that will encourage foreign capital or home capital to invest in legitimate lines. When the government found that we had in the western country a mining industry which needed some protection, the proper thing for the government to do was to give that industry protection in a legitimate form. Instead of that, they give a bonus of $15 a ton which apparently pleases some people, and because it pleases some people the Minister of Customs is perfectly satisfied, and he does not care whether it is taking the money out of the pockets of the people and giving us permanent benefit to the country so long as he thinks it is going to help his political party.

Mr. GALLIHER. You are not objecting to the bounty.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I am not objecting to any assistance being given to any industry which will help it to advance. I object to this form of assisting an industry, because I believe it will not give permanency and stability to that industry. It is the same with every other industry. We want to establish permanency. We want to put up our tariff wall so that all these industries will be perfected and carried out to their utmost in this country. Why, take the nickel industry. Nickel ore is turned out in Ontario for something like $400 per ton; it is sent to the United States and treated and brought back here worth $2,500 per ton. Would it not be much better if we had so fostered that industry that that treatment would take place in Canada, and we would be building up our own country and inducing capital to come in, and using our wheat products of the west in feeding our own people? That is what we want to do, not only with the lead industry and the nickel industry, but with the steel and iron industry, and almost every other industry that needs protection. And the form of protection should be such as to give permanency and induce capital to come into the country. Now, I want to read an article which I have taken from a paper.

Mr. COWAN. Is it a long article?

Mr. LEFURGEY. It is pretty long, but it is good and will do the hon. gentleman good. This article is by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. He says, speaking against the lowering of the tariff, which was contemplated about that time:

> I am only attempting to show the folly of a free trade remedy for an alleged evil.
>
> We are frequently threatened with overproduction, and against this we must always protect by increasing our markets as far as possible. But other countries also have overproduction, and from this source our industries are sure to be crushed unless protected. Does any one suppose any iron industry in the United States could have survived an inundation from Europe occasioned by recent business stagnation in some localities on the continent but for the tariff.
>
> The Republican party watches primarily that the American labourer shall have employment. It is probable that during the last year or two free trade in iron would have cheapened the product to the American consumer, but a million and a half people, fed and clothed directly by wages paid by the various iron and steel manufactories, would have been again begging bread.
>
> Unreasonable prices are always objectionable, but prices unreasonably low are more objectionable and fraught with greater hardships, primarily to the wage-earner, and, secondly, to all those who supply the wage-earner's necessities, than prices unreasonably high. Do you remember that President Harrison said again and again (for the issue in 1892 was high prices). 'There is such a thing, gentlemen, as having prices too low.' But the public did not heed the warning and we had four years of low prices.
>
> Do you want to try this experiment again so soon? We will have prices low enough as soon as the supply equals the demand, and the naked threat of a change of economic

policy always has had the effect to check demand more rapidly than anything else. To-day consumers actually bid against each other.

It has often been pointed out that a protective policy will be a burden on the consumer; and possibly to some extent during the building-up stages this may necessarily to some degree happen. But we have to pass through that stage, and the sooner we get past it and have the competition and the industries built up in our country, the better. Further on, using the United States Steel Corporation as an example, he says:

The corporation owns its own ore, and it therefore pays out for labour directly or indirectly, every dollar except what it pays in interest and dividends. It follows then that this one concern paid during the year ending June 30, 1902, directly or indirectly, over $400,000,000 for labour. And what became of this money? Most of it was spent primarily for food and raiment and material to build homes. This food came from the wheat fields of Minnesota and the Dakotas, and from the grazing fields of the south and from the sheep ranches of the far west, but it all came thence by way of the factories of New England and the Atlantic states. Nor is this all.

The farmers who received this money for food products, for cotton and for wool, spent it in turn for labour or for building material, for carpets, for clothing, or barbed wire, or nails, or other articles of consumption. The mills which ground the wheat, the packers who killed the beeves and the hogs, and the factory men who produced the cloth, paid at least 95 per cent of their gross receipts for labour.

And so these millions went on and on and on and are going still. They have cheered many homes. They have brought food to those who were starving six years ago, and they have helped, in a measure, to make us all rich. But what has the corporation done with its net profits?

The stock of the corporation is held by more than 48,000 people. So this profit is thus divided and subdivided. And what do these stockholders do with it? They, too, have been fed and clothed.

I speak of these things only to show that the entire profit has not been lost. There are compensations, even with high prices. We have at least kept the money with us. It has not gone hence, and labour has received, perhaps not its due proportion, but more than if the money had gone abroad.

But I believe competition is in sight. Last year the entire rolled iron and steel product of the United States was 12,000,000 tons, of which the United States Steel Corporation produced less than 51 per cent. The Lackawanna Iron and Steel Company is building a plant near Buffalo, costing $26,000,000, and they propose to be able to produce a million and a quarter tons per annum. The independent concern, with which Mr. Frick in connected, is being increased to a $20,000,000 plant. I have a letter from Mr. James Swank, secretary of the American Iron and Steel Association, in which he says that when the plants now in process of construction are completed the capacity of this country will be fully 24,000,000 tons per annum; you can draw your own conclusions.

In my judgment we are to have competition, and it will be the kind the American people have learned to appreciate. It will be American competition, and our own artisans will not be forced upon the street again to beg while foreign workmen supply the limited needs of a paralyzed country.

I read this article with the object of showing you that the high protective system in the United States has proved a boon to that country. While there are necessarily some hardships in the working, it has fed and clothed their millions of workmen; and while their prices are higher, they are able to pay their workmen higher wages. The people of the United States find that the protective system, when properly carried out, produces competition at home, which results in lower prices. That is what we want in this country. We want to establish a permanent and stable fiscal policy, which the people can have some dependence upon, instead of dribbling in bounties on one product or another, and having no definite line of action. The country would be in a very much better condition if we established some such policy and applied it to the steel industry, the lead industry and numerous other industries, which would come forward to reap the results which the hon. Minister of Customs expects them to reap from this measure, and they would have the added benefit of permanency.

Mr. POPE. Might I ask the hon. Minister of Finance upon what basis he arrived at this bounty of $15 a ton?

Mr. WILSON. They only asked for $8.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They asked for $20. The lead is worth about $60 to $62, and $15 is not an extravagant allowance. If they were getting it in the form of a duty, it would not be considered as a high one.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The government are granting a bounty to the manufacturers of binder twine and also to the manufacturers of steel, and they are now giving a bounty of $15 per ton for the production of lead. What are they going to do for the farmers? The hon. Minister of Customs told us distinctly that the bounty was paid directly by the people. I assume that the farmers will have to pay the whole of it. If instead a protective duty had been imposed, that would be paid by the outsider. I purpose saying a word on behalf of the farmer, and I would like to ask the government what assistance they propose to give to help the beet sugar industry. A large deputation this year asked for some assistance for this industry. Does the hon. Minister of Finance intend giving it any?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is not aware apparently that that industry is already largely encouraged, or, if he prefers to put it that way, protected.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). There are two lines in which the farmers are particularly interested. One is the beet sugar industry, the manufacturers of which are not satisfied with the amount of protection they are receiving, and the other industry is market gardening. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition they expressed great solicitude for the farmer, but now they seem to think that every other industry requires assistance except those which would benefit the farmer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you against the bonus ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We think that we have done a great deal for the farmer when we protect him against the adoption of a policy which would add enormously to his taxation.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). The hon. Minister of Customs said that, in the case of a bounty, the consumer had to pay the whole of it, but that, in the case of a duty, it was the foreigner who paid it. I am in favour of protecting the farmer and making the foreigner pay their duty.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I certainly never said that. Is the hon. gentleman in favour of this resolution to pay this bounty to the producers of lead and to which the farmer will have to contribute ?

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would much prefer a duty.

Mr. CARSCALLEN. I may mention another industry which has pleaded for protection, but without avail. A large deputation interested in the arsenic industry waited on the government last session. They had been led to believe before the election that they would be given a bounty, but they have not received it yet. That industry used to employ some 300 or 400 hands, who are now out of work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must take exception to the statement that these people were ever led to believe that they would get a bounty. There was no foundation for it.

Mr. CARSCALLEN. I have read a letter of the hon. minister in which he stated, if his words had any meaning at all, that not only this government, but the local government would give a bounty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will not find any letter of mine dealing with the local government or promising any bounty. I would invite him to produce the letter, but there is none such in existence, and he has been misinformed.

Mr. CARSCALLEN. I saw the letter myself. The hon. minister will remember that he referred directly to assistance being granted by the local government.

Mr. COWAN. Produce the letter.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. CARSCALLEN. It can be produced quite easily if you will allow this discussion to stand over.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman has any such letter, he will find no lack of opportunity to present it. But I gave no such letter and gave no assurance whatever of any bounty.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). I would infer from the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance that there is to be no assistance granted to the beet sugar industry or to market gardening. My constituency is deeply interested in these industries, and that is why I want the government policy to be made known.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am precluded by the rule respecting previous debates from reviving a discussion which we have already had concerning market gardeners.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I move that the first clause of this section be struck out and the following be substituted :—

Payment of the said bounties may be made from time to time to the extent of sixty per centum on evidence of the smelter return showing that the ores have been delivered for smelting at a smelter in Canada. The remaining forty per centum may be paid at the close of the fiscal year upon evidence that all such ores have been smelted in Canada.

It goes on then, ' if at the close,' &c.

Mr. WILSON. How did you pay the bounties before ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Upon the refined lead, which was a more advanced product.

Mr. WILSON. Why is it paid in portions ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is represented that the process by which the smelters carry on the business will not permit them to guarantee the smelting at the moment the ore is delivered. They take a sample which they assay, and pay the miner on that basis, but they do not smelt it for some time. We assume that they are going to smelt it, and so pay this sixty per cent, but we do not pay the full bounty until the ore is smelted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of fact, it practically amounts to this—the smelter buys the ores after having made an assay to ascertain the value.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, and in order to have some leverage, we do not pay the bounty until the smelting takes place.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In order to carry out what I stated with respect to

the manufacture of lead by another process, I desire to insert the following :—

If at any time it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that products of lead are manufactured in Canada direct from lead ores mined in Canada without the intervention of the smelting process the Governor in Council may make such provisions as may be deemed equitable to extend the benefits of this Act to the producers of such ores.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the government expect that such a process will be soon adopted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I had an application since this resolution was placed upon the paper from some gentlemen in Toronto, who stated they were engaged in an industry by which they proposed to produce the products of lead without the smelting process. I asked for information, and they gave me the opinion of experts that it was reliable and would probably be put in operation. I thought it right to make the resolution wide enough to cover that operation as well as the smelting, if it should turn out satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would move for a reconsideration of the first clause from which the word proportionately has been struck out. I would point out to the leader of the opposition that £12 10s. is the price at which they will get this bonus. Say that the lead goes up to £14, then the bonus is reduced proportionately. Now, that word 'proportionately' has been struck out, the effect will be to reduce the bonus by £1 10s.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would be all right if you were to follow it up by the words which conclude the sentence 'by the amount of such excess.' When you say that 'such bounty should be reduced proportionately by the amount of such excess," I do not understand that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It may run up ; if it runs up to £16 10s. it ceases altogether. It shall be reduced proportionately to that ; that is, if the price has advanced we will say £3, then whatever proportion that £3 would bear to £12 10s. whatever percentage that was, would effect a reduction.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is another question. We have a ton of 2,000 pounds and the English ton is 2,200 pounds. I think for the present the word 'proportionately had better be allowed to remain in, and before the third reading we will give it further consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would remind the hon. gentleman that these resolutions impose a further charge upon public revenues of the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, because it is limited to $500,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But it is possible to impose a charge because it might not amount to $500,000 without that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think my hon. friend is right there. This is an important question as to the various methods, but the limitation is the same. We are empowered to go up to the sum of $500,000, but not to increase that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But it might not amount to $500,000 without this additional charge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not an additional charge, if it goes to ores in both cases.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 239) respecting bounties on lead.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 1.25 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, August 7, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask a question with regard to the correspondence which took place on the subject of the inter-imperial conference. I am informed that the question was put to the right hon. the Premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a few days ago whether he would endeavour to have this correspondence laid on the Table at an early day, and he replied that he hoped to be able to lay it on the Table in a few days. Might I ask, in the absence of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), if the Prime Minister has any further information to give us on the subject ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I told my hon. friend the leader of the opposition that I would have to communicate with His Excellency the Governor General before making any statement. This I have done. The information I have to convey to the House is that the despatch which came from the Colonial Office was a secret despatch, which we have not the right to lay upon the Table. His Excellency has communicated with the Colonial Office asking for permission, and no answer has been received.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—OLD SURVEYS.

Hon. J. G. HAGGART (South Lanark). I would like to call the attention of the act-

ing Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Fielding) to the necessity of furnishing the House either to-day or on Monday with all possible information that is in the department in reference to surveys that were made for a contemplated railway at the time when the Canadian Pacific was building, from Lake Témiscamingue north of the height of land, north of Lake Nepigon towards Lake Winnipeg. One of the surveys west of Lake Nepigon and to twenty-five or thirty miles north was made by a Mr. Bailey. The one on this side was by Mr. Secretan, and Mr. Gansby made another survey. I do not want the actual surveys, but the reports of the engineers as to the nature of the country would be very interesting and helpful in the debate on Tuesday next.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I have been informed that there are no reports of the character referred to in the department other than those which have been published and that may be found in the library. I made inquiry with reference to what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) said on a previous occasion, and this is the information that was given me in the department. Perhaps, with the details that the hon. gentleman has given, we may be able to find them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I can give the names of the engineers who have charge of the different surveys. There can be no doubt about it. The reports must be there.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All these reports, I think, were published at the time, and are to be found in the library. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that there was something later.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No; they are not published. They are reports made for the purpose of an alternative route for the Canadian Pacific Railway. The surveys were made under the direction of Sir Sandford Fleming (then Mr. Sanford Fleming), who was then the deputy head of the department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that what my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) refers to will be found in the different reports of the department that are on file in the library. I understand he has reference to some that were not published. I will make further inquiry about the matter.

BRITISH CABLE NEWS SERVICE.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to enact as follows:—

1. The Governor in Council may authorize the payment of the following sums, in the respective fiscal years mentioned, for the purpose of assisting in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain, for publication in the Canadian press:—

(a.) For the fiscal year 1903-4, a sum not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars, or at the rate of fifteen thousand dollars per annum for any period less than a year.

(b.) For the fiscal year 1904-5, a sum not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars.

(c.) For the fiscal year 1905-6, a sum not exceeding fifteen thousand dollars.

(d.) For the fiscal year 1906-7, a sum not exceeding ten thousand dollars.

(e.) For the fiscal year 1907-8, a sum not exceeding five thousand dollars.

2. The said sums may be paid at such times and in such manner as the Minister of Finance may determine, to any association or committee representing the proprietors of such newspapers as may associate themselves for the purpose of establishing and maintaining such service.

Provided, however, that no payment shall be made under authority of this Act until the Minister of Finance shall have satisfied himself that the benefits of the service are open, on fair and reasonable terms to all newspapers published in Canada; and that not less than one-half the cost of establishing and maintaining such service is paid by the proprietors of the newspapers participating in the benefits thereof.

3. The Governor in Council may make regulations for carrying out the purposes of this Act.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The resolution which is before the committee, as will be seen, has reference to the granting of a sum of public money to assist in making a better cable service for the benefit of the Canadian press and, through the Canadian press, for the benefit of the Canadian people. I am sure that members of the committee will agree with me when I say that the manner in which our Canadian press is served with cable news from Europe, except as respects a few special despatches which they are receiving, and which are unobjectionable, is eminently unsatisfactory. I am sure that every hon. member when reading in the public press the report of something of imperial concern which has been before the British House of Commons, or in some way has engaged the attention of the people, has had reason to feel aggrieved at the tone and temper of the whole report. This arises from the fact that our Canadian newspapers —though I am glad to say they are making gratifying progress, and are making an excellent place in the journalistic world—are not, many of them, endowed sufficiently with wealth to be able to establish an independent cable service. Some two or three of the more enterprising have recently obtained special cable reports of their own, but the majority are still obliged to use the reports received by way of the United States and prepared chiefly for the United States people. The consequence is that many things that are of interest to us in Canada are not reported at all, and many that are reported are coloured in a way that is far from agreeable to us. Several years ago I was so impressed with this fact that I asked the consent of my colleagues to make

a proposition to parliament for a public grant to assist a movement of this kind toward the establishing of a better service for the Canadian press. I thought then, as I think now, that the service should not be entirely supported by government, but that the newspapers themselves should bear a proper share of the expense. I had negotiations with a number of gentlemen connected with the Canadian press, in the hope that I might then be able to prepare a scheme of this character. But, as it involved a considerable outlay by the Canadian newspapers, they were not prepared at the time to respond to the suggestions we made. The proposition received their sympathy, but the financial part imposed too serious a burden upon the newspaper proprietors, and, for the time being, the movement was not successful.

Quite recently however some gentleman connected with the press who have been aware that the government entertained such an idea in time past, have approached us again and asked if we would still be disposed to carry out what was then in our minds, and I have been glad to be able to assure them on behalf of the government that if they were prepared to form an organization for giving an efficient service to the Canadian press and bear a reasonable proportion of the expense, we would be glad to make a contribution to the system. A committee composed of representatives of the press, irrespective of political parties, came here some time ago and stated that if we would agree to give a moderate degree of assistance they would themselves undertake to raise a considerable sum of money. We have come to the conclusion to ask the House to approve of the grant of the sums which we have mentioned in these resolutions $15,000 for the first, second and third years, $10,000 for the fourth year, and $5,000 for the fifth year. We are assuming that the press will develop considerably, and that while at the beginning they cannot aid as much as we would like them to do, and they would like to do for themselves, we expect that after several years they will be able to gather in the subscriptions of a larger number of newspapers and be able to carry on the service effectively after the expiration of the five years. We leave the scheme largely to the newspapers. The government do not assume to exercise any control over it. We propose to deal, as the resolution says, with an association or committee representing the press generally.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they not outlined any scheme yet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not further than this, that we have intimated to them that for a time at least they should undertake to provide a service, to employ correspondents, to pay for cable bills and do all that is necessary to create an efficient service, and they have agreed to secure the co-operation of as many newspapers in Canada as are able to contract for the service. The newspapers in the large cities will have to pay a much larger amount than the newspapers in the smaller centres, although all will receive the service alike ; those in the large communities will have to pay more, those in the smaller communities will pay less, though they all get the same news. We leave the gentlemen of the press to work out all the details for themselves. The conditions which we impose are, first, that they raise and spend for the service at least as much money as the government does. The second condition is that they must hold the service open to every newspaper in Canada on fair and reasonable terms ; and unless they can show us that everybody in Canada who wants to contract has all the privileges which this scheme offers them they are not entitled to receive the money. We leave the working out of the details entirely to the newspaper people, and we accept the assurance which the representatives that the leading papers have given us that they will work it out on an entirely non-partisan basis, and with the co-operation of the press generally throughout the Dominion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) I heartily and cordially support the proposal of the Minister of Finance in this regard. I am satisfied that the people of this country have not had fair play in the way of getting news from England during the past, and on the other hand the people of England perhaps have not been any better supplied with Canadian news. We have had to get a great deal of our news through sources which are coloured, not certainly from a Canadian or an English standpoint. While I am not disposed to make any reflection in that direction, nevertheless I feel satisfied from what information I have obtained, and that I have had placed before me in connection with this very matter, that certain events of great public consequence in the mother country have sometimes come to us with a certain colour which is not desirable either in the interest of the empire or in the interest of Canada. If it is possible by aid of this kind to ensure that the press of Canada shall have fair and accurate reports of events of public importance in the mother country, and that the people of the mother country shall have accurate and adequate means of knowing what is being done and published in Canada, I think a great service will be rendered to the country. I do not know how it is in Great Britain at the present time, I have not had the pleasure of visiting that country for six or seven years ; but I know that during my previous visits I have often been intensely disappointed, I might even use a stronger word, at the very great dearth of news of my country that appeared in the English papers. In many of them there was not a word regarding Canada for a considerable time, and in the more import-

ant journals only a line or two and perhaps not that. If this grant will contribute to any better result, and I have every reason to believe that it will, I think there is no person in this country who would not heartily join in supporting the proposition of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Some time, either in the month of June or July, I attended a meeting of gentlemen connected with this project in the city of Montreal. At that time they did not appear to have any clearly defined scheme in their minds, I hope it has been made clearer since. At the meeting to which I allude there were, besides newspaper men, some business men. Similar meetings I understand had been held in Toronto and elsewhere. If I understood what was in their minds, their idea was to form a kind of a joint stock company together and send news. It was in my capacity of a newspaper man that I was invited to attend the meeting; there were only a few newspaper men present for the city of Montreal. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance on what conditions he proposes to pay that pretty large sum of money. So far as I understood the idea of the newspaper men, it was to act in opposition to the existing cable, or at any rate to the existing state of affairs. The object was not very clear, and that is the reason why I inquire. Let me say before taking my seat that, being no more Minister of Public Works, I am more free to fight for the rights of my former department. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is invading the realm of the minister of telegraph. If it were in my days I would kick. I make that remark in a very friendly spirit, but all the same I claim that when a department has direct charge of business-like telegraphs the hon. Minister of Finance should at least agree that the minister of telegraphs should make a report jointly with him. That is only fair. I have no personal ends to serve and I make these observations in all friendship.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In regard to the statement of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that it is an invasion of the Public Works Department, I may say that it is not an invasion of any department for the Minister of Finance to provide the money. I have never found that any department had the least objection to the Minister of Finance providing money. I am not clear that any particular department has charge of this business, but I may say that when the Minister of Public Works required money for the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, a matter coming within the purview of his department, as far as expenditure is concerned, it was always the Minister of Finance who brought up the appropriation and gave him the money, so that we are simply following the same rule in this case as in other cases. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), whose commendation and co-operation I am glad to welcome, I am afraid connected this resolution with a matter which is a little beyond its scope when he suggested that we might make provision not only for news coming from Great Britain, but also for a supply of news from Canada to Great Britain. That is very desirable indeed.

Mr. CLARKE. This scheme may work out in that way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, this scheme may lead to it. You have to make arrangements with the English papers to publish your news and this is not a matter that can be directed from this side of the Atlantic. If we could do anything to induce English papers to give more prominence to Canadian affairs it would be well worth our pains to attempt to do something in that direction. I am glad to know that of late years there has been a vastly increased interest taken in colonial affairs, and particularly in Canadian affairs, and we find that the English newspapers are to-day disposed to publish much more matter from Canada than formerly. They have a number of special correspondents in Ottawa. I have had the pleasure of meeting three of four gentlemen representing the British press within a few days who have come out to visit Canada, not only those with the British press party, but others who have come out individually. I think if anything could be done to arouse an increased interest in London, and to bring about the publication of Canadian events in the British papers it would be very desirable.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that this cable service will be quite independent of the American lines?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the cost per word for these despatches, and what number of words will be received per day during the year for that amount?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information. When we say it will be independent of the American lines, what we mean is that there will be a Canadian correspondent in London and he will do work entirely for the Canadian service, and that will give us a purely Canadian service. We do not make any condition as to what particular cable the news must come over. As to rates, I have no reason to suppose that the rates will be any lower than they now are. Just what number of words this will give each day is a point that I could hardly undertake to speak upon.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the rates now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The press rate is 12½ cents per word, or half the ordinary commercial rate. The commercial rate is 25 cents a word, and the press rate is 12½ cents a word.

Mr. CLARKE. What about utilizing the Marconi system ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no doubt they will, and if they do they will get the benefit of the rates for which we have stipulated. On that point we have not very much information as to the recent movements of the Marconi system. A representative of the company was here recently, he came to see me and he said that while they had suffered some difficulties and delays, he felt satisfied that within a very little time they would be able to carry out all they had undertaken.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of fact is there not another company that has made some better progress than the Marconi company ? I have noticed some tests between the two companies in the United States, the Deforest Company and the Marconi Company, and I observed that on two recent occasions messages transmitted by the instruments of the Marconi Company have been tapped by another company. One of these occasions was only a day or two ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is another company which has been making very great progress. As to the relative merits of the two systems, I would not be in a position to offer any opinion. The Marconi system is admittedly successful for short distances as the Deforest system is. As to long distances, I would not say anything as to their relative merits, but they are both successful as to short distances. At present the Deforest company has not attempted ocean telegraphy, but they have it in contemplation, and they believe that they can carry it out more successfully than the Marconi Company. They have made some proposals to the departments looking to the adoption of the Deforest system in the Canadian government service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think it would be extremely desirable for the government to make sure as to the success of either system before spending any more money in connection with it. It seemed to me extremely inconsistent that last year we should be making a grant of money in favour of the Marconi Company, and at the same time building cable lines in localities which should be served by this company if this invention is going to amount to anything. I do not know anything of the relative merits of the two systems, but I think that possibly the hon. Minister of Finance may be able to tell us whether or not the Marconi system across the Atlantic is an assured success.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it is not a commercial success yet. I understand, however, that they are sending messages from this side to England. The representative of the company who called on me, in answer to my question as to that, said that they were prepared to transmit any message which I might give him to any of my friends or acquaintances in London, but that they could not undertake to bring the return message, because the power of their station in England is not as great as the power of their station in Cape Breton. That was the reason given.

Mr. CLARKE. It is a lop-sided system.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, it takes two parties to make a contract like that. I do not regret the step that we have taken in assisting the Marconi system. It is a great invention, and I think Canada obtained a little kudos for holding out her hands and assisting these people to come to Canada, and if the Marconi system should prove to be a great success in the future the government of Canada will always in the history of that invention be credited with having been the first government in the world to give it a friendly hand.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me, from the calculation that I have made, that they would not get a very big service for the amount of money that is proposed to be given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They have to give an equal amount of money.

Mr. SPROULE. That would make it $30,000. If you take $30,000 and divide that by eight, which would practically give the rate per word, then divide the result by 365, the number of days in the year, you would find that the number of words that you would get would not be very many. Then you would have to deduct also from that the cost of delivery and other incidental expenses in connection with it; so that you would not get a very good service for the amount of money, unless there is some special arrangement whereby there will be a reduction in the rate that we are paying to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I will have to give away some of the family secrets. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is too confiding when he assumes that every word he reads in these cable despatches in the newspapers has been cabled from the other side. I have no doubt that there is an impression amongst many excellent people, when they read these long columns of cable despatches that every word came from England exactly as it appears, at the rate of sixpence per word. The fact is, that many of these words are never cabled from England at all. These cablegrams are skeletonized, and a clever journalist can,

with the exercise of his intelligence and his experience, fill out that paragraph, save a good deal of money, and give the people an intelligent service.

Mr. CLARKE. That is the practice on the other side.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a world-wide practice in the field of journalism, and it is a legitimate practice in the hands of capable and responsible men. If you are giving the exact words of a man or a quotation from a document, of course that must be given exactly; but for the general purpose of giving news you can fill in your skeleton cable and you can do it quite legitimately.

Mr. SPROULE. Without destroying the sense or warping the meaning?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) is so seldom on his feet that I have no objection to being called to order by you, Mr. Chairman, in order that I should give the floor to him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLMES. As one of those who happened to be present when the delegation of newspaper men waited on the Finance Minister, I wish to say a word or two on this matter. The representations then made to the Finance Minister and made to myself in private conversation afterwards, were that the representatives of the press intended by this method to get an entirely uncoloured news-service so far as English cable news is concerned. My hon. friend the leader of the oposition, as stated by the Finance Minister, is evidently under a wrong impression as to the nature of this service. I would myself be glad if it were possible to have in the English newspapers a good summary of Canadian news, which apparently we have not at the present time. However the object of the newspaper men who waited on the Finance Minister as representing the various leading papers of the country of both sides of politics, was that they might be able to obtain a much better and more complete cable service than they have at the present time. I do not know what information the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has over and beyond what he has stated to the House, but so far as the representations made to the Finance Minister are concerned, there was no idea or intention that there should be the establishment of an independent cable service at all. The simple idea was to procure through uncoloured channels information that would be of advantage and benefit to the people of Canada. There is also this fact to be borne in mind—as criticism is offered by the member for East Grey—that the amount that was promised by the Finance Minister is the amount that was practically asked for by the gentlemen representing the newspapers. They evidently had made some estimate as to the annual expense that would be involved, and they were perfectly satisfied with the conditional assurance of the Finance Minister that assistance of the nature now proposed should be granted. They realized that this would give to them a satisfactory news-service. Anybody who had had any experience with newspapers knows perfectly well that telegraph tolls as a rule are pretty heavy, and the newspapers do not get any more cable news than is absolutely necessary because of the great expense. Under the anticipated condition of affairs, they will have an everyday cable service that will be more satisfactory to newspaper readers and to the people of Canada generally. I understood from the remarks of the deputation that they intended taking in a number of the journals throughout the country as co-partners in this scheme. Of course, newspapers are subjected to what no other business is subject to, in that there is more or less stealing carried on by the papers that come out later than the others, and consequently no help can be obtained from some newspapers for this scheme. However, it was understood that a number of the papers joining in this organization were willing to bear their share of this expense in connection wth the proposal as announced by the Minister of Finance. It seems to me that the proposal will meet with the cordial approval of the entire House. It is one of the few questions upon which we can all agree, and I am satisfied that it will prove a decided advantage to Canadian newspapers. If the result should be to lead to the publication of fuller and better Canadian news in the British newspapers, we will have accomplished a great deal of good for Canada by voting this money.

Mr. SPROULE. I feel deeply grateful to the member for Huron (Mr. Holmes) for the gratuitous information he has given to the member for East Grey, and also for the additional information he has given us as to the proclivity of the newspaper men for stealing their news.

Mr. BENNETT. That is only some of them.

Mr. SPROULE. The small press, he says. I assume that those who acquire the habit of stealing ballots could as well steal their press despatches, and therefore it would not be much out of place for them to do so. I still believe that this scheme is not universally regarded by the press of the country as a satisfactory arrangement. I am told that the Montreal Gazette is not of the opinion that it is going to be an unqualified success, and for reasons which I need not wait to explain at the present time. I am not opposed to the proposition because I think the principle is good. I have al-

ways regarded it as an unfortunate thing that our news from England comes through a source that so warps it, that it is of little value to us, and does not do justice to the country or to those with whom the information originates. It is very desirable, if it be possible to attain it, that whatever news we do get shall not be coloured by the fruitful imagination of journalists, but that we should get in substance the same information that was given at the other end of the wire. That is a matter of great importance to the country, and as for news going to England, I assume that it is not so liable to misrepresentation as the news coming from England to Canada. If this succeeds in getting us correct information in cable despatches, the money, in my judgment, will be well spent.

Mr. HOLMES. Every one in this House knows perfectly well that when the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) addresses the House, he only speaks on subjects that he is familiar with, and hence his reference to ballot stealing must be based on personal experience.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not on record as having any experience in that line like my hon. friend.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). As a member of the newspaper fraternity, I believe I can express the opinion prevailing in the province of Quebec, when I congratulate the government on this new departure. It is certainly a sign of the times, and I hope the benefits of the proposal will be lasting for the Canadian press and for the Canadian people. The scheme is so good a one that I am sorry it has been limited in its operation to Great Britain. We have in Canada more than a million and a half of Canadian citizens who take a very deep interest in what goes on in France. Successive governments have made praiseworthy efforts to renew our commercial relations with France; the Conservative government brought about a treaty with France and the present government is following up the efforts which were made in that direction in the past. I trust, therefore, that the government will not overlook the importance of having a branch of this cable service extended to Paris. London, of course, is the centre of the English world, as Paris is the centre for continental news, and it is in the interest of Canada that certain things which happen in France should be reported to the Canadian press from Paris itself, and not receive a colouring in London, as unfortunately has happened when some little friction has sprung up. While I commend the effort that is now being made, I hope that the government will see that this Canadian Press Association will have an agency established in Paris, not only for French news, but for continental news generally. No Canadian now goes to Europe without going to Paris, and no trip to Europe is complete without a visit to Paris. If we wish to extend our commercial and social relations with Europe, I believe that we should have a representative of the Canadian press in Paris, and that Canadian news should be sent to Paris, which is the centre of distribution for the whole continent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad to be able to assure my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) that the matter which he has spoken of has not escaped our attention. When I was discussing the subject with the gentlemen of the press who called on me, I suggested to them that it might be desirable that we should take into consideration the needs of the French press, and I asked them to communicate with some of the French newspapers and ascertain to what extent they desire communication with Paris. I anticipated that it might be necessary to stipulate that there should be an agency in Paris, but I am informed, and though my information is at second-hand, I think it is correct, that the leading French papers take the view that while they were desirous of having occasional telegrams from Paris, when something of importance occurred, they did not think there was enough news of interest to Canada to require a regular correspondent to be established there in the same sense as in London. I anticipate, however, that the committee will see that a connection is made with Paris for getting French news, and supplying as much of that to the French newspapers as they are desirous of having. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the matter has been considered, the committee has been in communication with the proprietors of some of the French newspapers, and I am assured that they are in sympathy with the movement in its present shape.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have the committee or the gentlemen who are to compose the proposed association had under consideration at all the subject of supplying Canadian news to the English press? I regard it as very important that the news which is distributed throughout the United Kingdom with regard to Canada should go as much as possible direct from Canada, and I believe that is not the case at the present time to a very great extent, except with the great journals.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Though it is not the case to as large an extent as we could wish, it is the case to a much larger extent than ever before. There are two well known press agencies in England, the Reuter and the Exchange Telegram Company, both of which have correspondents at Ottawa; and when a despatch goes to either of these agencies, it is distributed to a large number of newspapers. In addition to that, several papers have

their special correspondents, who, though they do not send daily telegrams, do send telegrams when anything of importance occurs. While I realize that this service is much better than it was in former years, it is not yet all that we desire, and I shall be glad if this association can be the means of improving it. The newspaper men of Canada represent to me that while they can enter into an agreement for news to be printed in the Canadian press, they have no guarantee that any news they might send to England would be printed in the English newspapers if it were sent. So that I do not think that at the present time we are able to do in that respect what my hon. friend and myself both desire. I hope the effect of this arrangement will be to help the other end of the service, and that, ere long, we shall have a better service on both sides than we have at present.

Resolutions reported, read the first and the second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 240) to assist in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain for publication in the Canadian press.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY DEBTS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved second reading of Bill (No. 155) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts. He said: This is a Bill which has been placed on the government orders, but which has been introduced into the House by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers).

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). In 1890 an Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts was enacted as chapter 44. By this Act leave was given to the mortgagees, creditors or holders of debentures against a railway to obtain from the Exchequer Court a decree of sale of the railway. Since that time it has been discovered that there were other parties to whom no leave was given. These are the ordinary creditors and the public at large. It is proposed by this Bill to give relief to these parties. It is a well-known fact that many of our railroads are not operated during certain parts of the year, and though the public at large suffer, this government has not been able to afford a proper remedy. It is proposed by this Act to permit the Minister of Railways and Canals when a railway is insolvent to apply to the Exchequer Court for an order of sale and for the appointment of a receiver.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it intended by this Bill to take away any of the jurisdiction which a provincial court might exercise so far as a railway wholly situated in a province is concerned?

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). The purpose of the Act is not to take away the jurisdiction of provincial courts. It is in accordance with what was in the Act of 1899.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It seems to me that the first paragraph of section 1 is an answer to the question of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. It is intended to give the Exchequer Court jurisdiction merely in connection with railways under federal jurisdiction, i.e., railways that reach beyond the limits of any one province, or that connect with the great French lines running into, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The intention is to give jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court over such railways as are within the legislative jurisdiction of the federal parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We have railways in Nova Scotia, which are subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, but which are wholly in the province of Nova Scotia. Is it intended by this Bill to vest exclusive jurisdiction over such railways in the Exchequer Court? I do not know that there are any words in the Bill which necessarily would lead to that interpretation, but, some question might be raised; and if it is not intended to deprive provincial courts of any jurisdiction they have at present, it would be better to state so specifically. I might bring to the attention of my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville the use of the word 'insolvent' in subsection (a). Has he defined that word anywhere in the Bill?

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Yes, in section 5. As I have already stated, clause 1 of the Bill, defining the railways over which the Exchequer Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction, is taken verbatim from the statutes of 1899, chapter 44.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section simply re-enacts that?

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). No, it goes further. While the same railways fall under the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court, as are defined in chapter 44 of the statutes of 1899, the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court is extended beyond that Act to ordinary creditors and to roads not operated.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This legislation is rendered absolutely imperative by

the judgment of the Privy Council in Grey vs. the Manitoba and North-western. The Privy Council held that no provincial court has jurisdiction to deal with a railway as an entity, which exceeds beyond the limits of the particular province in question, so that in order to have such a railway sold, it is necessary to vest some federal court with jurisdiction over it. As regards a railway entirely within the limits of a province but which is under federal jurisdiction, owing to its having been declared a work for the general utility of Canada, I cannot see any good reason why a provincial court should not have jurisdiction to deal with it. It is an immovable and entirely within the limits of the province.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree absolutely with my hon. friend that, as regards a railway which extends beyond the limits of a province, we must confer jurisdiction on the Exchequer Court. But there is a question as to those wholly within, although as the hon. member for St. John and Iberville points out, he has used exactly the same language in that regard as is to be found in the Act of 1899. We have had no difficulty in Nova Scotia about working out these matters in respect of a railway wholly within that province. My hon. friend from Annapolis knows that our courts have dealt with these matters without any difficulty whatever, and it seems to me that it would be more convenient to deal with them in the province where our courts are readily accessible and not have to go to Ottawa for the issue of process and the many interlocutory applications necessary in litigation of that kind. Of course, in so far as this Bill proposes to confer upon the Exchequer Court powers which are not exercisable by any provincial court, and which are in the public interest, you migh leave it as it is with respect to interprovincial railways; but in the case of a railway situated wholly within the province, it would be better to have those powers exercised by the highest court of the province. Has my hon. friend from St. John considered that point in his Bill?

Mr. WADE. I would be very sorry indeed to see any of the powers of our provincial courts taken away. I do not think that the wording of this section deprives them of any jurisdiction. It only confers jurisdiction on the Exchequer Court in cases where it is not vested in a provincial court. If there be any doubt, it would be well to add a clause providing that this Bill shall not detract from any jurisdiction now vested in our provincial courts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a little more in it upon which I would be very glad to know the opinions of members of the bar throughout the House. This Bill does confer powers upon the Exchequer Court which are not at present exercisable by provincial courts. But in respect of a railway situated wholly within a province, is it better to confer those powers upon the Exchequer Court or the provincial court of the highest jurisdiction? At this moment there is no good reason why those powers should not be exercised by the highest court in the province in respect of a railway wholly situated within that province.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). The Bill only concerns railways over which the Privy Council has decided that the provincial courts have no jurisdiction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree that the Exchequer Court is a proper tribunal to have jurisdiction in respect of any railway extending through more than one province. But why should not the provincial court of the highest jurisdiction exercise those powers in respect of a railway situated within a province? I take, for example, the Dominion Atlantic Railway, or the Nova Scotia Central Railway, which are entirely within the province of Nova Scotia. Suppose you want to exercise the powers here conferred upon the Minister of Railways and Canals or upon any creditor, to sue for a decree against such a railway because it has become insolvent, or has for more than ten days failed to efficiently continue the working or operating of such railway, why should you not have the decree made by the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia instead of by the Exchequer Court?

Mr. BELCOURT. It seems to me that the suggestion of the leader of the opposition is a good one.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If it were decided to carry out the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition, all that would be required would be to strike out the words 'or as regards any railway otherwise subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.' This would restrict the jurisdiction to those railways not wholly within one province. But the question arises as to whether it is or is not wise to give the federal court which is under our control absolute jurisdiction in all matters connected with railways that are under federal authority. It seems to me that this would be desirable rather than to follow the suggestion of the leader of the opposition. There is no reason why a railway that is under federal jurisdiction, even if it is wholly within the limits of one province, should not be made subject to the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court, the same as with a railway extending beyond the limits of one province. It seems to me it would be better to make uniform legislation. That would not exclude the concurrent jurisdiction of the courts of the province in dealing with those railways that are situated wholly within the province. My hon. friend will remember the decision in the case of Redfield vs. Corporation of Wickham, where the Privy Council held that

a provincial court had a right to sell a railway. I will read from that decision :—

> They do not suggest that, according to the policy of Canadian law a statutory railway undertaking can be disintegrated by piecemeal sales at the instance of judgment creditors or incumbrances; but they clearly show——

And this is the important part——

> —that the Dominion parliament has recognized the rule that a railway or a section of railway may, as an integer, be taken in execution, and sold, like other immeubles, in ordinary course of law. They justify the statement of Chief Justice Dorion, in the present case, that 'it is now well settled by the jurisprudence prevailing in this country, and recognized by the Act 46 Vic. c. 49, that a railway can be seized and sold for the debts of the company who owns such a railway.

That was a railway which came within the operation of our Dominion Act, but, being entirely situated within the limits of the province of Quebec, it was held that the provincial courts had jurisdiction, and the railway could be taken in execution and disposed of by the sheriff absolutely in the same way as any other property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with everything that the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) has said with regard to the operation of the law. The old rule, of course, was that, in respect to a railway you 'could not cut down the trees, but only take the fruit'—you could put a receiver in charge and use the revenue to pay a judgment creditor.

Mr. WADE. That, however, never prevailed on this side of the water.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That prevailed in England. And they put it on the ground of public policy—that a railway was intended to be a public service, and you could not interfere with the service at the instance of the creditors, but you could give him relief by giving him the rents and tolls through a receiver. I do not know whether I clearly apprehended the reason on account of which the Minister of Justice said that these powers should be conferred on the federal court. Would he be good enough to repeat briefly the reason that he gave in that regard ? I suggested that, in the case of a railway wholly within one province, it would be more convenient to confer the jurisdiction upon a provincial court. The hon. gentleman made some answer to that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think I answered that. No doubt, it would be convenient in one way to have the court of the province continue exercising its jurisdiction. But I said that we conferred jurisdiction upon the Exchequer Court in these cases to deal with railways under federal jurisdiction, whether they were under our jurisdiction because they have been declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada, or because they connected with certain railways mentioned in the Railway Act, or because they extended beyond the limits of one province; and it seemed to me better, for the uniformity of legislation, that we should give federal jurisdiction over all. This could be done without interfering with the existing jurisdiction in the provincial courts with respect to those railways which though federal in their character, are situated entirely within the limits of one province, and the suggestion as to that point I am ready to agree to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the hon. minister will see that you do not secure uniformity even if you do adopt his suggestion, for the provincial courts will still have power to sell a railway at the instance of the creditor under the powers which are vested in it apart from any statute. Is there any reason why you should not give to that court the additional powers that are created by this statute ? In one sense it would be more uniform to give the powers to the Exchequer Court, but we do not attempt uniformity of that kind in other things. With respect to insolvency we confer jurisdiction upon the provincial courts ; even in the case of the elections to this parliament, we confer jurisdiction on provincial courts. This is a matter of some importance to provinces situated at a long distance from this capital, the place where the Exchequer Court has its headquarters.

For example, take the province of British Columbia, or of Prince Edward Island, or of Nova Scotia, it is a very difficult thing for them to transact business in the Exchequer Court on account of the long distance. In cases of this kind you would naturally have a great deal of interlocutory business, there is no local judge, and you may have to have the business transacted in Ottawa. It might be a very desirable thing that the local solicitor or counsel should be present at motions and proceedings of that kind. Unless you can give some strong reason for restricting jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court, it would seem to me to be the wiser course to let the provincial courts within the province deal with these matters so far as railways wholly situated within the province are concerned. That would be my own view, though I realize that there may be some reason for the opposite view. It is not a matter I am pressing very vigorously.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like the hon. gentleman to say whether he can see any objection to giving concurrent jurisdiction to the provincial court and the Exchequer Court. The provincial court is now undoubtedly vested with jurisdiction to deal with these particular railways, and is there any difficulty or any objection to granting to the Exchequer Court jurisdiction also over these railways, so that it might

be optional with a creditor to select his own court ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Speaking offhand, I do not see any objection to that. My hon. friend suggests that all statutory powers which are created by this proposed Bill are to be conferred upon provincial courts concurrently with the Exchequer Court, so far as railways only situated within the province are concerned.

Mr. WADE. Is it not a fact that at the present time provincial courts have complete jurisdiction over railways, no matter whether they are railways declared to be for the general advantage of Canada or not, and no matter whether they are entirely situated within the province ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is right.

Mr. WADE. It has no power to order the sale of a railway that extends beyond the province. Our provincial courts have not that power.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am only saying that there are certain powers which are statutory powers and are not vested at the present time in the provincial courts because they are creatures of this statute.

Mr. WADE. What power ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The power, for example, to sell a railway because the company has failed to work it for ten days. I wish to make myself clear to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade). I mean that so far as you are creating powers here which are not at present vested in any provincial court you should vest these powers in a provincial court at least concurrently with the Exchequer Court so far as railways wholly situated within a province are concerned.

Mr. WADE. I asked whether that is not the case now. Have they not absolute power ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am talking about powers created by this statute, which do not exist outside this statute.

Mr. WADE. That is the very thing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand the leader of the opposition to say that in this Bill, we are conferring certain specific powers upon the judge of the Exchequer Court, we are granting that court certain powers that are not now vested in it, and the leader of the opposition suggests that we should give to the judges in the provincial courts these same powers with respect to this particular class of railway that we are vesting in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Exactly.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is suggested to me by a layman that there might be a difficulty in giving the courts concurrent jurisdiction. You may have one creditor going to the local court for the purpose of having the railway brought to sale, and another creditor going to the Exchequer Court. There might be a conflict of jurisdiction between the two courts. There does appear to be something in that. We will have to guard against that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You can easily guard against that. A court in which a second action is taken always stays proceedings until the first action is determined. There are cases where an action is taken in two different courts each having jurisdiction. For example, an action might be brought in the province of New Brunswick and another in Nova Scotia, both going on at the same time, one brought before the other. The usual course is that the court in which the second action is brought stays proceedings until the first action has been determined. That is also the rule which has been acted upon in England within a very few years past, and acted upon in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. Not long ago a similar case was decided in England, I forget the name of it, perhaps the Minister of Justice is familiar with it—a case where an action had been brought in either a French or an Italian court, and the action was also brought in England during the pendency of that foreign action. The English court, if my memory serves me correctly, simply stayed proceedings until the foreign action had been determined, then they gave the judgment in accordance with the decision which had been arrived at in the foreign court. There would be no difficulty on that score.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the promoter of this Bill this question. Suppose there is an action brought in the province of Quebec by a creditor of a railway company before the Exchequer Court, and there is a sale ordered of the property. Is that sale adjudicated by a provincial court in the province of Quebec, that is, does the provincial court transfer the property absolutely, and are the proceeds received from the sale of the property distributed by the court among the different creditors according to their rank ? Would the judgment of the Exchequer Court have two different effects in different provinces ? In the province of Ontario it would be only a sale of the franchise, in the province of Quebec it would be an absolute disposition of the property. Now suppose a party holds bonds under a Dominion statute, or securities, or perhaps a mortgage, on a judgment obtained before the Exchequer Court against a Dominion railway which has a Dominion charter in the province of Quebec ; now if this property is disposed of as the court in the province of Quebec has a right to dispose of it, that is making an absolute

sale, that would not be the case if he held securities.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand that the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition would meet that difficulty, because the suggestion of the hon. gentleman was that we should confer upon the provincial court the same powers that we confer upon the Exchequer Court so that the powers which could be exercised by the courts in each of the provinces would be the same as those which are exercised by the Exchequer Court. The difficulty of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) would be met by the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The security from a company which has a Dominion charter which the holder of a mortgage has is the franchise of the company which can be sold if the debts of the company are not paid, but if you get judgment in the Exchequer Court here against a company in the province of Quebec you can sell the property absolutely although the property might only bring one-fifth of the value of these prior securities should the court order. There is no sale in Quebec that is not an absolute transfer of the property. Then, the courts act as the receiver and distributes the money received for the property according to the rank of the security.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If a company were authorized, in Ontario for instance, to give a mortgage on its franchise, and covering not only its franchise, but its rolling stock, permanent way and buildings, you surely could sell these on foreclosure proceedings ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but you could not by an ordinary execution. You could only sell the franchise or the right to run the road.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Subject to the claim of the mortgagee.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). That was the law, but in 1899 this parliament decreed that the Exchequer Court could sell the railway. The Act was passed in 1899 permitting the Exchequer Court to sell the property, but I do not see anything in the Railway Act authorizing the sale of the franchise.

Mr. WADE. I think I am compelled to agree with the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) in regard to this question. We have to be a little cautious as to how we apply certain provisions that are in this proposed Bill. As far as the general jurisdiction of a railway situated exclusively in a province, although the railway may be subject to the legislative jurisdiction of Canada, is concerned, our courts have already full and complete jurisdiction over them in the matter of the foreclosure of the mortgage, the sale of the road, and appointment of a receiver in connection with the property.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Not in Quebec.

Mr. WADE. Of course I cannot speak for Quebec, because I am not familiar with the law there, but it seems to me that in the province of Quebec to that extent they must have jurisdiction. I can speak with authority in regard to our own province as the matter has been thoroughly threshed out in the case which has been referred to by the hon leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), the English principle to which he referred was also settled in that case, and the distinction which prevails between the situation of English railways and our own was clearly defined. By the English statute law they do not permit the company to mortgage anything more than their tolls. They do not permit them to mortgage their property or their franchise, hence, the only thing you can do under the trust which they give to secure their bonds and debentures is to apply for the appointment of a receiver, operate the road under the receiver and in that way collect the tolls for the purpose of paying their debts. But, under the charters that are granted here the company not only mortgage their property, but their franchise, and you can take foreclosure proceedings in regard to all the property and the franchise of the company, and the party purchasing them will have all the powers that the company possessed in the way of operating the road. All these powers our court possesses at the present time in regard to roads which are wholly within the province and the only restriction upon its power of sale is where the road is partly in one province and partly in another. The hon. leader of the opposition has asked that they should be clothed with that jurisdiction, which this Bill proposes to give to the Exchequer Court only, an extraordinary jurisdiction to cover two classes of cases, one is where the company have not paid their debts or met their liabilities, and the other is where they have failed to operate the road. In other words, any creditor of the company may go before the Exchequer Court and proceed against the company, and ask for an order for the sale of the road, or if the road has not been in operation for ten days, any person may do the same thing. This a very large and a very extraordinary jurisdiction which we are conferring upon the Exchequer Court, and it seems to me that it might be dangerous to give that jurisdiction to the provincial courts, because, as has been said by some one, we must look at the effect that legislation of this kind would have upon the securities which have been issued by the company and which are held abroad. Anything that has a tendency to weaken these

securities is not wise legislation, and I think that where this extraordinary jurisdiction is sought by any person it should be before a court that has general jurisdiction, and there cannot be any hardship in taking these proceedings before the Exchequer Court. It should not be given to the provincial courts to act in the matter, especially in cases where the railway is under the legislative authority of the Dominion parliament. I do not apprehend that the provincial courts would not act just as wisely or just as carefully in the matter or not give quite as good a judgment in each case as the Exchequer Court would, but what I am looking at is the effect of this legislation upon the securities of the railway company. When it is proposed that on the motion of any party the provincial court could proceed to have the road sold, I think it would be better to have the matter remain in the hands of the Exchequer Court, because it does not weaken the jurisdiction of the provincial courts in regard to any other matters.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is any weakening of the securities it is effected not by the court to which the jurisdiction is assigned, but by the legislation itself. If it is possible that the securities may be weakened by conferring this jurisdiction upon the provincial courts, why the same result would not be effected by conferring it upon the Exchequer Court is rather too fine a point for my intellect to grasp.

Mr. WADE. I will explain why I think so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You could only explain it in this way: You think one court would exercise it wisely and that the other court would not exercise it wisely. I think the provincial courts are just as capable of exercising their judgment wisely and discreetly as the Exchequer Court. I think this power should be conferred upon the provincial courts concurrently with the Exchequer Court.

Mr. WADE. I took care to say that the provincial courts would give as wise a judgment as the Exchequer Court. I do not think there is any trouble about their judgment; and there is no doubt that they would do right; but I do say, it would have a much more serious effect on the security if it were known that any court in a province could take this extraordinary proceeding. It would have much more serious effect on the securities than it would, if this jurisdiction could only be exercised by a central court, and that court the court of the Exchequer. I think the general public would have more confidence, that it would not be exercised hastily. I think further, that there should be some striking urgency for any proceedings to carry out the provisions of this section, and such an urgency as would make it worth the parties while to make application to the Exchequer Court rather than to some local court. If we make it too general it will be dangerous legislation.

Mr. FRASER. What the hon. member (Mr. Wade) says goes to prove the contention of the leader of the opposition that there must be some difference between the two forums. If there is a confidence on account of going into one forum that would not obtain in going into another, it must be because one forum is deficient.

Mr. WADE. There would be this difference. In one case there is one court and one judge before whom these proceedings could be instituted; in the other case there might be sixty judges.

Mr. FRASER. That would make no difference unless you say that the sixty were inferior to the one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. I can very well understand that the Exchequer Court on account of its mode of procedure, on account of having rules that are better fitted than the rules of the Supreme Court—for example under our Judicature Act in Nova Scotia—may be a better court to wind up a railway company in that its machinery might be more operative, but, I cannot understand the other proposition. I think perhaps that this section is too broad. There are three cases in which the Minister of Railways and Canals or any creditor or a company may ask for an order to decree the sale of the railway: (1.) When the company has become insolvent; (2.) If for ten days it has failed to efficiently continue the working or operating of the railway, and (3.) If it has become unable so to do. There might be a bridge down for example so that for ten days they would be absolutely unable to operate the railway. These words are too broad. Has the minister looked into that?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would suggest that this section be allowed to go through, with the understanding that before the third reading, we will consider it in the light of this discussion, the extent to which we may be able to improve the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will be quite satisfactory.

On subsection (b).

Mr. WADE. I think there is one very strong objection to the operation of that section. It says:

> Or, at the instance of a mortgagee of such railway or section, to order or decree the foreclosure of the interest of the person or company owning or entitled to such railway or such section, with the rolling stock, equipment and other accessories thereof, or the equity of redemption therein, whenever in like circumstances of default the high court of justice in England can, at the time this Act comes into force, so order or decree with respect to mortgaged premises situate in England.

As has already been pointed out, they do not order the sale of the road; they simply put the road into the hands of a receiver and take the tolls, and I submit that these lines should be striken out, or otherwise we will render the whole Act inoperative. I would make another suggestion in regard to this clause and the preceding clause, and that is, that the power of sale should include the power of selling the franchise as well as the railway equipment and accessories. The franchise would hardly be considered within the term 'accessories.' I presume that the mortgages in the past always covered the franchise, but we do not say in this section that we will sell the mortaged premises; we say we will sell the railway and the equipment and the accessories. Where you are defining, it seems to me that these are words of limitation and would exclude the franchise, unless it is expressly provided in the statute.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the words of the statute. Provision is made for the sale:

> Whenever in like circumstances of default the high court of justice in England can, at the time this Act comes into force, so order or decree with respect to mortgaged premises situate in England.

Not, with respect to railways, so that we give to our Exchequer Court in dealing with this railway, the same power as the High Court in England with respect, not to railways, but mortgaged premises; thus avoiding the very difficulty that my hon. friend suggests.

On section 3,

Mr. FOWLER. What do you mean by the word 'making' in this clause?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I understand it aright these are alternative powers; they may make a sale of the road or they may appoint a receiver.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Under the direction of the court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are rather interlocutory powers; things to be done in the meantime pending a suit.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The clause seems somewhat involved. The word 'making' seems to be out of place.

Mr. RUSSELL. It seems to me that some of the functions given here to the receiver are more than what are ordinarily given to receivers. Some of them are rather the functions of a manager, and it might be well to use that term in the statute.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As used in our statutes, we know what the word 'receiver' means, and I would not like to change its meaning very much. But I do not see very well what meaning can be attached to the word 'making.' The receiver is not appointed, as a rule, for the purpose of building a railway, but for the purpose of operating a railway. I do not see the sense of the word being used here.

Mr. WADE. I think the word, as it is used here, is important, and it should be left in, because the railway might not be completed, and it would be necessary for the receiver to go on and complete it. I had some experience of that kind myself. I was the receiver of a railway for some six years. In that case the road was not completed, although it was nearly so, and it was necessary for me to obtain a special order of the court to have power to go on and complete the road, and I did so. The same thing may often be the case, and it may take months to get final order from the court to give the receiver power to complete the road, which may be necessary in the interest of all parties concerned. I think the word 'making' should remain in the Bill.

Mr. FRASER. What the hon. leader of the opposition said is, I think, correct, that this is not an Act for the building of a railway, but for the sale of a railway. If it were intended that the receiver should have power to build a railway, or a section of a railway, he might go on and wreck the property worse than it was at the time he was appointed receiver, and the consequence would be that the creditors would get nothing, and the railway might not be sold, but be kept in the hands of the receiver. This is going to be an Act which will be the foundation for the Exchequer Court dealing with railways in Canada in future; and, in view of the very extensive building of railways in Canada, we should wisely see that nothing is put in this Act other than what would be used in the interest of the creditors and the railway itself. If a railway has to go into the hands of a receiver, the stockholders are not likely to get anything; but if the stockholders lose, I do not want those who have advanced money on mortgage or the workmen to lose. But do not let this man who is appointed receiver go on and build the railway in sections. I think that is too much power to give to a receiver, who, as the hon. leader of the opposition said, is only an interim official appointed to keep the railway in operation and to see that the money, as it comes in, is deposited in a bank and kept. That is what I look on as a receiver, and not a person to build railways.

Mr. FOWLER. The word 'making' is so wide in its meaning that it would enable the receiver to extend the railway in all directions, and even to build branches. He could ruin the whole property if he were so minded.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It has been suggested to me that the word 'making' was put there for the purpose of meeting a specific case which we have in the

province of Quebec. There are six miles of a railway to be completed to an important centre, and the word is put in to enable the receiver, if so ordered, to complete that road. The section provides that the receiver shall act under the direction of the court; and, that being the case, I do not see any great objection to the word.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The receiver is not necessarily an interim receiver. He may continue to manage the property for years.

Mr. FOWLER. The receiver would be an interim one, no matter how long his duty would last.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All receivers are interim in that sense.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the words are clear enough. 'A receiver is appointed for the interim preservation of the property.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is well known that in the western states a great many railways, which went into the hands of receivers because of over capitalization or because they were built where they were not needed, were operated much more successfully than those which remained in the hands of the original companies. This power being exercised, as has been pointed out by the Minister of Justice, under the constant direction and control of the court, no such difficulty as my hon. friend apprehends will be encountered in the operation of these roads. As to giving the receiver the right to complete the road under direction of the court, that may be very necessary in order to enable the road to make any profit. As regards extending the powers of the receiver, I remember distinctly that when my hon. friend from Annapolis (Wr. Wade) was receiver of the road to which he has referred he was also made the manager, and he could not have operated it as successfully as he did if he had not been given the functions of manager as well as those of receiver. The courts have found it necessary to appoint receivers to be managers as well, in order that they might have the powers included in both offices. If you give by this Bill to a receiver all the powers of a manager, it may be immaterial whether you use the word 'manager,' but there may be powers which it is necessary for the official to have which are not expressly given by the statute but would be dependent on the general principles of law, and in that case unless the term manager was used in the statute these powers would not be possessed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the word 'making' used in this section serve the purpose intended by the Minister of Justice? It seems to be rather a casual way of dealing with a pretty large subject. A matter of that kind is perhaps worth the dignity of a separate section and a somewhat more elaborate provision. I would suggest that the word 'completion' would be much better than the word 'making.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps it would be better to allow the section to go through omitting the word 'making' altogether and then make special provision for the completion of the road as suggested by my hon. friend.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 4,

The remuneration of the receiver shall be fixed by the said court, and shall, as also shall the expenses lawfully incurred by him as receiver, including the expenses of working, operation, maintenance, renewal and institution and defence of actions aforesaid, be a debt of the company and be the first charge upon the railway, or section, and upon the rolling stock, equipment, accessories and earnings thereof.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section provides that the remuneration of the receiver shall be fixed by the court, but it does not provide that the other expenses shall be approved likewise by the court. The receiver therefore would pass upon his own expenses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In order to save time perhaps we might as well let this clause stand, and I shall endeavour to have an amendment drafted by some of the officials of my department to meet the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be as well also to have a special section drafted giving the receiver the right to complete the road.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the power does not already exist in the Exchequer Court to make regulations as to practice, it might be as well to have a section conferring that power. The general powers of the Exchequer Court may be sufficient, but I doubt if they would cover these matters.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It has power to make rules with respect to matters now within this jurisdiction, but I think not with regard to new matters such as these.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 5,

A railway company is insolvent within the meaning of this Act, in all cases which constitute insolvency under sections 5 and 6 of the Winding Up Act, except that paragraph (g) of section 5 of that Act shall not apply to cases where possession of any railway or section thereof has been taken by trustees for bondholders under the provisions of section 94 of the Railway Act, and except further that the delay to secure or compound allowed in the case mentioned in section six of

the Winding Up Act shall be fifteen days instead of sixty.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the case of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway in this connection. This road was transferred, in 1900, to trustees for the bondholders. It is, to all intents and purposes insolvent, owing a large sum of money. I would like to know whether they are exempt under this law ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is impossible for me to say whether the law would not be applicable to a particular case, because I am not aware of the facts. But I apprehend that the Atlantic and Lake Superior is vested in trustees under terms of mortgage.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Trustees for the bondholders ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That would be under terms of mortgage. I think the creditors under this Act would have the right to apply for the appointment of a receiver.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Prefontaine). To make the point clear, I would move that the following words be added at the end of section 5 :—

But such transfers to trustees shall not exclude such railway from the provisions of the present Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Suppose the bondholders got possession of the railway under the Act of 1899, and they did not pay their debts and became insolvent, what remedy would you have against them?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like to consider this amendment. It would be better to let this section stand.

Section allowed to stand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the committee reports, I would direct the attention of the Minister of Justice, and also the attention of the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), to subsection (a) of section 1. Perhaps our attention was more particularly directed to the form of that section than to the substance of it. You will observe that under the terms of subsection (b), a creditor can have the railway sold. But still, in addition to that, it is provided in subsection (a):

At the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or of any creditor of any person or company owning or operating such railway or section, to order or decree in such manner as it may prescribe, the sale of such railway or section of railway, and of all the rolling stock, equipment and other accessories thereof, whenever such company has become insolvent, or has for more than ten days failed to efficiently continue the working or operating of such railway or section or any part thereof, or has become unable so to do.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Now it seems to me that this is a pretty wide power to confer upon a creditor. If he has a lien or charge, he can enforce it. But if he has not, is there any special reason why he should be empowered to move against the company in this way. You are giving authority to sell the entire railway in three cases, insolvency, failure to operate or inability to operate. It seems to me it would be sufficient if you conferred that power upon the Exchequer Court at the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not think that powers of that kind ought to be invoked simply to enable a creditor to get the payment of his debt. The power might be used oppressively. I think the creditor has ample protection under subsection (b), so far as the payment is concerned.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). I do not think that by the old law the ordinary creditor is protected.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Demers) is that the ordinary creditor, who is without a lien or claim upon the property, is without recourse. It is not open to him to take any steps, and it is unfair that he should not have, in any of the three cases, the right to apply to court for a receiver, or exercise some recourse against the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In my own province the creditor would get a lien upon the reality by registration of judgment. But I suppose that is not the case in the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has not the ordinary creditor, then, a perfect remedy ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The leader of the opposition says that the creditor obtains a judgment against an individual, and, if the individual has property, the creditor becomes by registration a judgment creditor secured by mortgage. I have never entertained any doubt of that being the law in the province of Quebec. The creditor could take suit, register his judgment against the property, and then it becomes a mortgage. It is suggested to me that that is not possible in this case, but I must say I have never entertained any doubt that that was the law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Assuming that that is the case, I would suggest that the ordinary creditor has very good protection under subsection (b).

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If the action is against the railway company there might be some difficulty there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There would be no difficulty in my own province, as there is a registry office in every county through which the railway runs.

Progress reported.

PENITENTIARIES ACT.

Bill (No. 217) respecting penitentiaries (the Minister of Justice) was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this Bill a consolidation ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick). It is really a consolidation of existing laws for the convenience of those who are consolidating the statutes. There are certain changes, but they are of no importance except the one with respect to the schedule of salaries. The only important thing in this is the schedule, and when we reach that I will point out in what respect changes are made. I am endeavouring to reduce the salaries in two or three directions.

On section 23,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is new. I have found it convenient in the course of my experience, when an inspector goes to a penitentiary for the purpose of making an inspection, to occasionally give him power to take control immediately of the penitentiary so that he may be in a position to make an examination with greater freedom than if he were subject to the warden.

Mr. FOWLER. It might be necessary to summarily suspend the warden.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

On section 27,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the present law the appointment of officials is distributed between the Governor in Council, the Minister of Justice, and the warden. I do not think that it is right that the warden should appoint clerks, keepers and guards. The minister should have the responsibility for these appointments so that he may be able to answer to parliament, and this section provides that he shall have it.

Mr. FOWLER. Would it remove these appointments from politics if they were left to the warden rather than to the minister ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The minister ought have the responsibility direct, and as a matter of fact it eventually comes back to the minister, because the warden applies for his authorization to make these appointments. At present the minister can fall behind the warden and put the responsibility on him. It is a roundabout way of getting rid of responsibility and it should not be so.

On section 28,

Mr. MORRISON. Does this section alter the present condition of affairs which allows the warden to reside outside the penitentiary inclosure ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no change in the law. The warden's residence is always declared to be part of the penitentiary.

Mr. FOWLER. At Dorchester it is outside the penitentiary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And at St. Vincent de Paul it is separated by a street from the penitentiary, but the grounds of the residence are maintained by the convicts and in order that we may have control over them, the residences are proclaimed to be part of the penitentiary.

Mr. FOWLER. There is a farm at Dorchester and it is under the same rule.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, and the roads connected with the farm are also proclaimed part of the penitentiary or otherwise it would be impossible to keep control over the convicts.

On section 33—warden, &c., not to exercise any other calling,——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I move to strike out the words, 'except by consent of the Governor in Council. That is a power I do not care to exercise. I think it is safer not to do so.

Mr. FOWLER. Would that apply to the chaplains ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Even with respect to chaplains, my desire would be to give them larger remuneration, and endeavour to have their duties confined exclusively to the penitentiary. That would not imply that a minister of the gospel would not be able to render services occasionally for one of his friends, but he should not have any regular charge. It has been suggested that instead of appointing regular chaplains to the penitentiaries, we should authorize the ministers of the different denominations in the locality to attend the penitentiary in turn. I do not know how that would work. Of course, in the penitentiaries there are men belonging to different religious denominations, and the complaint is that we have ministers of the Church of England to attend constantly.

Mr. CLARKE. What does the hon. minister propose doing about that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I throw out the suggestion, because I want to hear what others who are qualified to speak on religious subjects have to say about it.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 34,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I move that the following be added to subsection 2 :

In the event of a penitentiary being established in and for the North-west Territories, the salaries of the several officers and em-

ployees of such penitentiary shall be the same as those prescribed in schedule 'a' for the officers and employees of the Manitoba penitentiary.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 35,—gratuities or retiring allowances.

Mr. MORRISON. What is meant by retiring an officer to promote efficiency? Is it supposed that if a man is found obnoxious or inefficient, he can be retired without a retiring allowance.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This section is new. My experience is that men who have been in the service of a penitentiary for a number of years get very lazy and indolent, and it would be very much to our advantage to be able to remove them and put in their places men who would be able to perform their duties more satisfactorily. In some of our penitentiaries I have been able to reduce the staff by six or seven by placing young and active men in place of those who have grown fat and lazy. It is a good thing for the men to have the possibility of removal before their eyes, but if a man has been in the service for a number of years, I would not want to remove him without giving him some retiring allowance.

Mr. FOWLER. Does that apply to the warden?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it would apply to the warden.

Mr. FOWLER. I think you ought perhaps to except the chief officers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think we might let the whole section stand.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it is a very good provision if it is confined to the inferior officers.

Mr. INGRAM. Are the wardens and deputy wardens considered civil servants?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that you provide for a gaurantee by private bonds as well as by the bonds of the company. Have not the departments given up the idea of private security, and do they not require bonds by guarantee companies? I notice also that in case of the absence of the head of the penitentiary and the deputy head, you give the chief keeper power to act. That does not seem to be the rule throughout the departments of the government, but it is one that I strongly approve of.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I find that the best way to maintain discipline and secure the effective co-operation of your employees is to make them feel that you are standing by them. With respect to security by private bonds, I think that is rather a mistake. A man who gets a public position asks his friends to sign, and generally they do not like to refuse. If it be in the power of the minister to insist on the bond of a guarantee company, we get rid of much difficulty and hardship.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 229) for the relief of Ellen McDermid.—Mr. Birkett.

Bill (No. 228) for the relief of Stephen Wilson.—Mr. Wade.

SUPPLY—SOUTH AFRICAN MEDALS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I desire, Sir, to draw attention to the conditions of the regulations which have been issued in connection with the granting of the King's medal to soldiers who served in South Africa. There were two medals given. There was the Queen's medal given to all who disembarked in South Africa before May 31st, 1902, the day when the war ended. In this connection, I may say that several contingents of the Canadian Mounted Rifles were deprived of this medal because they disembarked a few days later. There was also a second medal, the King's medal, given to those who had served for eighteen months on South African soil, or up to the 31st May, 1902, and part of whose service was after December the 1st, 1901. Complaint is made that, owing to the nature of the regulations, it is impossible for any Canadian soldier who served in a Canadian corps to get this medal. It could not have been the intention of the imperial authorities to deprive His Majesty's Canadian subjects of the honour of obtaining this medal. About two hundred non-commissioned officers and men served in more than one Canadian contingent during the war. The first service was for twelve months, and those who served in that contingent, if they had re-enlisted at the earliest practicable moment in another Canadian corps intended for service in the Boer War, and immediately returned to South Africa, could not have put in the length of service in the field necessary to entitle them to this medal. There are, as I have said, about two hundred non-commissioned officers and men who went from Canada in the first contingent and who, on their return, re-enlisted and went with the second contingent. But it was impossible, owing to the length of time it takes to

reach South Africa, for any of these men to put in the full service in the field which would entitle them to receive the medal. A petition has been prepared by these men asking the government to request the imperial government to modify the regulations in this respect. It certainly does seem an invidious distinction that Canadian soldiers of the King should be the only ones who served in the war who, owing to the regulations, cannot receive this medal. Australians, New Zealanders, South Africans, as well as the regular troops, have received the medal. But it is impossible for any Canadian who served in a Canadian corps to receive it. The medal is greatly coveted by those who have seen service and who would like to wear it as an honourable reminder of the services they have performed on behalf of the empire. I am sorry the hon. the Minister of Militia is not here, because I propose to read for the information of the House a copy of the memorial submitted to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, asking him to take action, so that the men who volunteered twice for service in South Africa in Canadian contingents may receive this medal.

The petition is as follows :

To His Excellency the Governor General of Canada in Council.

The humble petition of the undersigned late non-commissioned officers and members of Canadian contingents who have served twice in South Africa, during the Boer war, 1899-1902, humbly showeth.

1. That the present regulations for the King's medal demand eighteen months service in South Africa.

2. That the voyage from Canada is longer than from any other colony, the double trip occupying at least four months.

3. That under the present regulations, no Canadian can obtain the King's medal, from his service in Canadian contingents.

4. That your petitioners, whilst few in number, being scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, feel confident in addressing your Excellency that they voice the feelings of all the non-commissioned officers and men (who your petitioners believe, number some 200), who served twice in South Africa, during the Boer war.

5. That your petitioners therefore humbly pray that application may be made to His Gracious Majesty that the regulations for the King's medal be altered to provide that in all cases in which a man has gone twice from Canada to South Africa for the purpose of taking part in the war, fourteen months service in South Africa may be held to entitle him to receive the King's medal.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Dated this 25th day of April, 1903.

I am perfectly satisfied that, if the attention of the imperial authorities were drawn to the peculiar disabilities under which our Canadian soldiers were placed in view of the conditions of the regulations, some mitigation of them will be ordered, so that these men may obtain this much-coveted medal. I should like to know from the government if this petition was received, if it was forwarded to the imperial authorities through the proper channels, and if any recommendation or any request was made by His Excellency to the imperial authorities that the regulations for the issuing of the King's medal might be altered to the extent suggested to His Excellency in connection with the service of the Canadian volunteers ? I repeat that I am sure it was not the intention of the imperial authorities to frame the regulations in such a way that our Canadian soldiers, who did such splendid service in the South African war, should be excluded from this honour. If the government have not taken action, I think they should do so, in order that this invidious distinction may not be perpetuated. I am sorry the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) is not present. I gave him notice of my intention to bring this matter up on going into supply, and had hoped to receive from him information as to whether the petition had been received and what action had been taken, and, if it was forwarded, whether any answer has been received.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I regret the absence of the Minister of Militia and Defence. In his absence I would not feel at liberty to make any statement on the subject referred to by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). But I will see to it that his attention is called to the matter, and, if any action has been taken, the information will be given to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) at a later stage.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I would like to say a word in support of what has been said by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). There can be no question, that the regulation which provides for the issue of the King's medal to those who have served eighteen months in South Africa was meant to cover the case of those who enlisted a second time. I believe that all the colonial contingents were enlisted for a year's service. It is merely the fact that Canada is more distant than the other colonies that shuts our men out from this honour, whereas the very fact of that distance entitles them all the more to the honour, if it is to be given to any. I am sure that shutting our men out was the furthest from the thought of the imperial authorities and I have every confidence that if the matter is placed before them the oversight will be rectified to the advantage and to the credit of those amongst our people who deserve it. I take the opportunity of speaking on this subject because from the constituency which I represent more men went to South Africa than from any other constituency in the Dominion of Canada, and therefore, I believe there are more of my constituents interested in this matter, possibly, than those of any other member of the House. I know personally a number of men who were out in the first Canadian Mounted Rifles, and also in the third contingent who took part in the battle of Hart's

River, the final battle of the war, the one which practically decided the war—and it is no news, I presume, to members of this House that, in the estimation of those competent to judge, it was very largely the presence of the Canadians at that battle which produced the result which was achieved by that battle and in closing the war. Before sitting down, I would like to say that there was a Canadian corps which did serve throughout the war with very considerable distinction. I refer to the Canadian Scouts, organized at first by Captain Howard, and afterwards commanded by Captain, or Major, Ross. I do not know whether the Canadian authorities have taken any cognizance of this corps or not; but it was known as the 'Canadian Scouts.' It was principally composed of Canadians, though not altogether, and it served with the greatest possible distinction for the longest possible term. And, certainly, while I do not think that anything we can do can add to their credit, I am strongly in favour of doing what we can to secure for ourselves as much credit as possible from their very gallant and distinguished actions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to add a word in support of what has been brought before the House by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) and supported by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). It seems to me that a very good case might be made out—has been made out—for these Canadians who served twice in South Africa. The fact that the war ended when it did, prevented them from coming within the terms of this regulation, notwithstanding that they had gone to South Africa for the purpose of giving a second term of service which would have brought them well within those terms. Under the circumstances, I hope the government will be able to make such representations as will do to these men what I believe is no more than justice by placing them in the list of those who are entitled to receive the medal.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Will the minister be good enough to tell us if the South African Constabulary will participate in the receipt of these medals ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will call the Minister of Militia and Defence's attention to my hon. friend's (Mr. Sproule's) question.

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There are a few items still left in the supplementary estimates of last year. One is item 114, the expenses of the commission to inquire into the tobacco trade. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) informed me that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) expressed a desire to have this item discussed at another time so that he might be present. If it be agreeable I would be glad to have the item passed, with the understanding that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier should be able to speak on it on another occasion. I do not understand he wished to oppose it, but there were some facts in connection with it to which he wished to refer. With this item and another item passed, the whole Supply Bill for the last year will be ready. There are many services in it that are very urgent and I will be glad if the committee would pass these two items, particularly so that we may take concurrence. Although the Minister of Justice has to some extent consented that it should stand over, and we will let it stand if desired, that means the standing over of the whole Supply Bill. I would be glad if the committee will pass the items, with such information as the Minister of Justice can give now, reserving the right of the member for Jacques Cartier to discuss the subject in some other item.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On what item ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On any item.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My arrangement with the member for Jacques Cartier went further, and I absolutely agreed that the item should not be pressed in his absence. He mentioned that the amendment to the Criminal Code deals with the subject and might be discussed at the same time, so I think my hon. friend will have an opportunity to say all that he wishes to say when we deal with the amendment to the Criminal Code, which is passed as a result of this investigation.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that would be satisfactory, so long as we have full latitude to discuss it.

Galops rapid—deepening and widening, $25,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What item will we be able to discuss that on ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Any canal item.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) requested me to ask that this item should stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been standing several times at the request of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose he will have the liberty of moving to strike it out on concurrence ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When will the hon. member be here ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He will be here on Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we pass the item now, the hon. gentleman can make his motion on concurrence on Monday.

Mr. CLARKE. We will have an opportunity of discussing it on concurrence ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but it is equally urgent that we take concurrence and get the Supply Bill. Therefore, I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to be present on Monday.

Mr. BLAIN. If he is not present then, we will not ask it to stand any longer.

Railways and canals—Intercolonial railway—to strengthen bridges, $165,100.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You were to give full details about that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understood the hon. gentleman wished to have a statement in detail as to the bridges to be strengthened. Of this sum $77,000 is a revote standing over from last year. I have here a list of the names of the bridges, which is of some length, but I will read it if the hon. gentleman desires. The number of spans in each case is also given.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended up to date, and what is the probable amount required to finish this work of strengthening ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The statement is made up to January last, at which date these papers were prepared. The amount expended up to that date was $451,680. I have given the hon. gentleman the names of most of the bridges for which the additional amount of $87,000 is required. There is also a list of bridges which are to be doubled up, as it is described in the department. As respects this $77,000 revote the items are given as follows : Balance due on bridges tendered for $31,000; floors ditto, $4,000; painting ditto, $1,400; false work, $4,500; doubling up, $3,500; inspection, &c., $1,811.10. These items make $77,711, which is the revote of last year's estimate and the other items which I have read represent the items which make up the additional expense to $87,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that complete the whole work of strengthening ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The deputy informs me that he thinks this will finish the work of strengthening these bridges.

Mr. FOWLER. What expense has been put upon the bridges at Torryburn and Brockville ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The list I have read only refers to the bridges which it is expected to deal with during the present season and the money has not been expended yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there any estimate as to the probable cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not in the case of each separate bridge. The estimate is general.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is a total amount required for strengthening these bridges of over $600,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $451,000 up to the end of January.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And $165,100.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been some expenditure since that to which is added the appropriation in these estimates. The hon. gentleman's figures, I think, are about correct.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister say how many bridges the department have on hand now that there are doubling up ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The list contains seventeen bridges which are to be doubled up out of this vote.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand that $3,500 is for the strengthening of bridges ? The hon. gentleman gave an item of $3,500 to cover the doubling up of bridges. He surely does not intend to say that that is going to cover all the cost of strengthening these bridges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $3,500 has reference to moneys expended in doubling up in the past. It will not pay for this list that I have read. The list that I have read in detail is for the bridges to be doubled up out of these estimates.

Mr. INGRAM. Then you are only estimating $3,500 to be expended that way ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount set apart for doubling up is $33,988.

Mr. FOWLER. Are all these repairs to bridges chargeable to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not for repairs to bridges. It is really for the betterment of the road by the strengthening of the bridges, and is therefore chargeable to capital account.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the strengthening of the bridges being done because these bridges have become weakened by the lapse of years ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is because of the heavier locomotives and rolling stock which are required to pass over these bridges. Having increased the weight of the locomotives and rolling stock the bridges which were good in the past are not strong enough now to bear the additional weight.

Mr. FOWLER. Are they new bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Doubling up of course, means the taking of two bridges and putting them together. These are not new bridges, but they are good bridges.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you charge the cost of doubling up two bridges to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where one bridge is transferred from one place to another it is not charged to capital.

Mr. INGRAM. We want some details of the number of bridges which you are doubling up in that way and we would like to have in connection with that the reasons for doing this. This method is not adopted by other lines of railway very extensively. I have never heard of it before.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of old bridges doubled up the amount charged to capital account is the cost of making the change, not the cost of the bridge itself. The bridge itself, having been charged to capital account originally, remains in capital account, but the new bridges are charged to capital account.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Would it be fair to charge that to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If you take a bridge from one portion of the road and put it in another portion of the road you still have it on the road and you have lost nothing.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I mean the expense of doing this work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, I think the expense of the work of changing the bridge from one part of the road to another is fairly chargeable to capital account.

Mr. FOWLER. I think we should have some details as to what becomes of the bridges which are replaced on the road. Do they go into scrap or are they used elsewhere ? We want to know where credit is given for them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In one or two cases these bridges are being transferred to the Prince Edward Island road and of course they are charged up against that road and credited to the Intercolonial Railway. Where the bridges are being doubled up they are still utilized on the road. I have asked the deputy minister whether any cases have occurred in which they have gone into scrap and he thinks not.

Mr. CLARE. If you move a bridge and build a new one and charge the expense of that to capital account that cannot be right.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose it would be a proper thing that the value of the bridge occupying the place of the old bridge which is removed should be deducted from the capital charge. I take it that when a bridge is found on the main line insufficient to carry the weight of the heavier locomotives now in use and you have to remove it and put a stronger bridge on the main line, removing the old bridge to the branch, the charge should be credited with something for the value of the bridge which is dispensed with on the branch.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be quite correct if the bridge were sold off the road. If the bridge remains in the service of the road and is made use of elsewhere, you still have its value for the road.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, but if you do not make this substitution and have to replace the bridge on what I call the branch line for illustration, you have to do that out of revenue, and if you simply take a bridge from the main line and put it on the branch that will simply be relieving the working expenses to that extent ; so that, if you strengthen a bridge on the main line and take the old bridge to another point you save the working expenses of that line of what would be necessary to renew the bridge on the branch. There is always a charge made for that purpose against revenue, and it saves capital so much money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the bridges are used either for the doubling up process, or, in one or two cases they have been moved to Prince Edward Island. If you take two bridges and put them together they still remain on the road. It is not a question of renewing; it is simply adding to the equipment of the strength of the road, and in the new bridge you have so much additional capital on the road.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps I did not make myself quite understood to the Minister of Finance. If you renew a bridge on the Prince Edward Island Railway you would have to do it at the expense of revenue, but instead of renewing it at expense of the revenue you bring an old bridge from the main line and put it there. You charge the whole expense of increasing the strength upon the main line to capital. Surely revenue has gained by this manipulation, and revenue should bear some portion of that charge. The result of this is that revenue has escaped the charge of renewing in the case of the Prince Edward Island Railawy. I am quite sure the deputy minister would thoroughly understand that if he were keeping his accounts for an ordinary railway company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The error in my hon. friend's statement is that he asserts that this work in Prince Edward Island is renewal.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a fatal error. It is not a renewal; the bridge is used on a new line and properly charged to capital account.

Mr. BARKER. All the same, if a bridge that has gone out of service but is still of value is taken off the main line, the capital

account should receive credit for the value of the bridge. A manufacturer would easily make that charge as a matter of bookkeeping. If you are building a new line in Prince Edward Island and had to buy a bridge you would have to charge that to capital account, but the Minister of Finance goes to the main line of the Intercolonial Railway and gets that bridge for nothing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What the hon. gentleman says should be done is just what has been done in this case. The bridge is taken from the Intercolonial Railway to Prince Edward Island, and it is charged against the Prince Edward Island road and credited in the Intercolonial Railway accounts against capital account.

Mr. BARKER. If that is so it is all right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The bridge having been taken off the Intercolonial Railway goes into the stores account, and when it is taken out of the stores account it is charged to the Prince Edward Island Railway. Is it credited then to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that it is.

Mr. BARKER. Can the minister point to any place in the public accounts where a credit of that kind is shown ? I have never seen it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend could not well see it in this case because the transaction has not taken place yet.

Mr. BARKER. But these things are going on for the last three years and we have been complaining that we cannot get at the truth as to whether these accounts are credited or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am glad to assure my hon. friend that what he thinks ought be done is being done in this case.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The Minister of Railways and Canals explained last year this bridge was taken from the Miramichi river and transferred to Hillsborough.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It would seem that any old bridge is good enough for Prince Edward Island. Has the minister the information he promised us as to what is being done with the approaches on the Hillsborough bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will give this information on another item.

Mr. INGRAM. It seems to be that you must have an interminable number of bridges of the same span on the Intercolonial Railway, because you have been doubling them up for the last three years. Unless the spans are about the same length I cannot see how you can double them up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of the bridges proposed to be doubled up the spans of some of them are as follows : 27 feet, 44 feet, 36 feet, 23 feet, 29 feet, 56 feet, 32 feet, 28 feet, 54 feet, 54½ feet, and so on.

Mr. INGRAM. How do you double them up ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By taking two of the same size.

Mr. INGRAM. Where do you get two of the same size in that list ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I do not find them I will be in trouble. There are two of 44 feet and one of 29 feet and another 28 feet, and I suppose, although I am not an engineer, that they can double them up to that extent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Stretch the short one.

Mr. BARKER. This is the first time I have heard the statement made specifically that when bridges are removed in this way a charge on capital account is made to the Prince Edward Island Railway, and a credit given to the Intercolonial Railway. How much has been charged for this particular bridge to the Prince Edward Island Railway and how much credited to the Intercolonial Railway, and where does that appear in the accounts ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has not been charged yet because the transfer has not been made, but the amount to be credited to the Intercolonial Railway is $32,000.

Mr. BARKER. Is that the amount charged to the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. What was the original cost of that bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will get the information later.

Mr. LEFURGEY. How old is that bridge?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bridge was built in 1876, but it is not right to say that any old bridge is good enough for Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is pointing out that it is a very valuable bridge and that we should be careful to charge it. The bridge is not strong enough for its present purpose but it is a perfectly good bridge and is perfectly adapted for the traffic on the Prince Edward Island Railway which is a narrow gauge line and does not require such a strength of bridge as the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Could I get any idea of what is the difference in cost between that bridge and a new bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is the same question as was asked by the hon. member (Mr. Barker).

Mr. LEFURGEY. It seems to me that it is very poor policy to take a bridge twenty-seven years old, and practically useless, and transport it to Prince Edward Island at great cost, and put it on a substructure costing half a million dollars or more. This amount is being charged up to Prince Edward Island, and when we come and ask for a few railway facilities or means of transportation across the straits, there is always the cry that Prince Edward Island is asking too much.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not from this side.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Yes, from that side. I think it poor policy to send us second-hand stuff, which probably in a few years will have to be changed ; and, according to the manner of bookkeeping of the last few years, this will be charged up to capital account, and it will be detrimental to the Prince Edward Island Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend does not help his case by stating that the bridge is worn out and no good. That does not happen to be the fact, but it was essential to my hon. friend's case to put it that way.

Mr. HACKETT. From what part of the Intercolonial Railway was this bridge taken?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. From the Miramichi river. It has not yet been taken, but is to be taken.

Mr. HACKETT. This was a light bridge when it was constructed, and I understand that the ordinary life of an iron bridge under good care is fifty years. The bridge, which is over half worn out, you are placing on a superstructure that is costing the country an immense amount of money, and in twenty or twenty-five years you will have to replace it by a new bridge. As the hon. member for East Prince says, it is poor economy. When you are building a new railway in Prince Edward Island, and when you are constructing a bridge across the Hillsborough river at a great expense to the country, the least you can do is to put new material into it. But it appears to be the policy of this government, and especially of the Department of Railways and Canals, to send any old bridge across to Prince Edward Island, where it will have to be renewed in a few years. That is a policy of which I disapprove, and in the name of the people I represent, I must protest against it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has fallen into the same error as his friend from the other district in suggesting that this is a worn-out bridge. All I can say is that it is not an old bridge, and that the ordinary life of an iron bridge is very much longer than the term the hon. gentleman has mentioned. At any rate, I am informed on competent authority that this is a stronger and better bridge than any new bridge which would be built for the railway at that point.

Mr. HEYD. I want to ask these hon. gentlemen, do they want us to throw away this bridge and build two new bridges ?

Mr. HACKETT. I would suggest that the government use this bridge in doubling up the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway, and give us a new bridge on the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. LEFURGEY. No, put it on the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I cannot understand how these bridges appear as a credit capital account on the Intercolonial Railway. First of all, if they are taken from the Intercolonial Railway they go into the stores' account, and they are afterwards used on the Prince Edward Island Railway. By what process of bookkeeping is credit given to the Intercolonial Railway capital account for the amount expended on the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the stores' account will show it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That does not appear in the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway. The expenditure for the purpose of strengthening and renewing the bridges on the Intercolonial Railway within the last few years has been over $1,000,000, besides an expenditure for repairs on the different bridges of nearly $700,000. The department has been running heavy locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway during the last two or three years ; and how is it that the government risked the lives of the employees on the railway during that time if these bridges were not sufficient to sustain the locomotives ? I suggested that if the bridges were not strong enough to bear the locomotives, new bridges should be built in the first place. But after the purchase of these heavy locomotives, and after they have been running three or four years, here is an expenditure of over $1,000,000 for the purpose of building new bridges and strengthening old ones. We have had no explanation as yet in regard to capital account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought that was made quite clear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is clear, I suppose, to the Finance Minister. The bridges, after they are removed, are put into the stores' account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And credited there to capital account.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, credited to the stores' account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that this bridge, when it goes to Prince Edward Island, will be credited to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway and charged to the capital account of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. BARKER. I understand, from the statement of the hon. Finance Minister, that it is the intention that this particular bridge or material which is sent to Prince Edward Island shall be credited to the Intercolonial Railway. The Minister cannot tell us that that is done in any other particular case, and he cannot show that it will be done in this case—because the change is yet to be made. Now, the bridges are put into the stores' account when they are removed from the railway. I quite understand that the stores, having received this bridge along with $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 of other material, may issue bridges or anything else, and charge something to expense account and something to capital account. That must have been going on for years, and what I would like to understand is this. When we find year after year a sum put into the public accounts as charged to capital account, is that a charge of everything that is put in, or is it only a balance that is charged after crediting certain things and deducting the credits ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case of an item on capital account, where there is to be a deduction later, we would have to take the full vote on capital account to enable us to have the money to buy the material ; but when the material enters into the actual construction of the road, then the account is credited with the proceeds of the article to be sold, and only the balance is charged to capital account.

Mr. BARKER. What I understand is this: Supposing $5,500,000 has been expended on capital account in the actual operations of the year and $500,000 is credited the item for such things as these, what appears in the public accounts is only the difference between $5,500,000 and $500,000. In other words you only charge up $500,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be correct. But you might have to take a larger appropriation, in the first instance, to enable you to buy the goods. In the statement of the account later, it would be as the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. BARKER. Let me suggest this. It would be of very great value to the House if the Department of Railways and Canals would show in its capital account the gross amount expended on capital and the credits on account of capital, so that we would see clearly that such items as these are credited to capital and only the net expenditure actually charged. I have over and over again in the last three years endeavoured to get at the facts, but I have never yet been able to ascertain that in any individual case a credit has been given. The hon. gentleman can only tell us now that it is intended to be given in this case. He cannot tell of any particular case where such a credit has been actually given. It is most desirable that in future the railway reports should show the gross expenditure on capital account and what credits are deducted, difference being in the amount actually charged against capital account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It looks to me as if the suggestion of my hon. friend has much to commend it. I would not like to commit myself too hastily, but I shall talk it over with the officials of the department. I do not see on the surface why the hon. gentleman's suggestion should not be carried out.

Mr. BARKER. It would be of great advantage to the country.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. Finance Minister says it has been done already.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's suggestion is that it should be shown in the account as well as done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. $500,000 is voted for the purpose of building a bridge. The whole amount is expended upon the bridge, but there is $50,000 from the old bridge, which ought to be credited to the new structure, but which goes into the stores account. By what process is credit given back again to the construction of that bridge or does it ever appear in any of the books ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Hamilton tells me it does not, and I must not contradict him. I am sure it does appear in the stores account. The only question is whether it could not be shown in the manner he suggests. I am sure it does appear in the stores account.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No doubt it does but not in the capital account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But for these credits the capital account would be so much larger.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. minister will admit that no person can take the public accounts and say whether anything has been credited or not. There is a certain sum charged as expenditure on capital account, but there is nothing to show whether that expenditure was half as much more and was reduced to the amount charged.

Mr. HEYD. As I understand the position, assuming that $100,000 was expended on a new bridge on the Intercolonial Railway and $10,000 received for the old bridge, instead of charging $100,000 to capital account, they only charge $90,000. If that is the method pursued, the result is correct, but it does not show the amount actually expended and the amount credited, and I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton that that ought to be shown.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know the total amount expended for the strengthening of bridges and putting in new bridges on account of these new locomotives. The total amounts expended on the Restigouche and the Miramichi bridges are two independent items. Add the two together and the amount expended on the other. I think it must be over $1,000,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total amount is made up to the 31st of January last. We have not the figures to the close of the fiscal year. Leaving out the bridges at Miramichi and at Restigouche, the amount is $461,680.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what the hon. gentleman said before. Then there is the vote of $165,000 to be added to that, and the hon. gentleman says that will complete the repairs on those bridges.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I stated that this appropriation for the year will probably finish the work, but the general manager says it will take another year. There will be something further to be done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You do not know what the amount is ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the estimates at hand.

Mr. INGRAM. For the total repairs of bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For strengthening the bridges ?

Mr. INGRAM. I have always understood that the department makes an estimate of the probable cost of strengthening bridges on the Intercolonial Railway. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what is the estimate cost of strengthening these bridges ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was an estimate made by the general manager and the recollection of my deputy is that it was about a million and a quarter dollars.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely there must be some mistake. That includes the bridges at Restigouche and Miramichi ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimate is substantially correct—over a million dollars, including the large bridges as well as the process of doubling up. It would be subject to some deduction if bridges were sold off the road, but that has not yet been done, most of them being used in doubling up.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the department in making up these estimates would estimate what it would cost to strengthen the old bridges and what it would cost to buy the new bridges. Could the hon. gentleman tell us the items of these two classes of work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) that information at the present time.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have not yet understood the method of bookkeeping in dividing these items between capital and revenue accounts. Suppose a bridge costs $50,000 and $1,000 to put it in place, and it is to be replaced with a bridge costing $100,000, which it will cost $2,000 to put in place. Surely it cannot be said that the $1,000 spent in placing the original bridge is not lost ? At least $1,000 of the cost of putting in the new bridge should be charged to revenue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I have not understood my hon. friend's (Mr. Lefurgey's) question.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If it costs $1,000 to put the first bridge there, and you are taking that up, you have lost $1,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A good deal depends upon what you do with it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. But the expense of putting it there is lost. Either that, or, what would amount to the same thing, the same amount in the cost of putting in the new bridge should be charged to revenue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if that were correct, it would not be a large item.

Mr. LEFURGEY. If you were putting in a hundred bridges, it would amount to $100,000. Of course, that is not large in these times.

Mr. BARKER. The question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Lefurgey) involves a point that we have been discussing for the last two or three years. Supposing a bridge as originally put in costs $1,000 and it is being removed and a bridge costing $5,000 is to be put in its place. The question is what is to be done with the original charge of $1,000. The revenue should be charged with whatever is necessary for the work up to its original value, and capital should stand the difference and also the $4,000 of the betterment. The objections that I have been trying to press upon the government are these. In the past the government have been practically adding the whole $1,000 to revenue account, and revenue has not been charged anything for superintendence. Suppose that this bridge costing $1,000 in the course of time becomes worth only $500, revenue should be charged with $500 and capital should be credited with $500 against the new one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. According to the statement of the minister it will require $1,250,000 to do this work. I should judge from the estimates for this year that he expects that the expenditure for the year will be $1,000,000, and it will require some $200,000 more to complete the work. How

was it then, that the minister made the statement last year or the year before that the total expenditure would be only about $600,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figures are certainly in excess of those the hon. gentleman mentions. I do not recall what the minister said. In view of the figures, $600,000 would fall very short. I think there must have been some misunderstanding as to what the minister said.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister spoke at that time about the contracts that had been made with the Hamilton Bridge Company and some others, and about the trouble he had to get the work done, and evidently speaking about the two bridges, the Miramichi and the Restigouche, said :—

We have only expended $225,000 out of the $600,000 which it was originally estimated it would require.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That would be far short of the actual——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Just about half.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Before we pass this item, I would like the committee to fully understand the method of bookkeeping of the Intercolonial in this matter. I think the minister has acknowledged that the illustration I gave of the bridges is practically the way they are keeping their capital accounts. The Intercolonial charges to capital many items such as a man in keeping his accounts of his own business would charge to the expenses. That being so it can easily be understood how the Minister of Railways and Canals has been able to show a surplus on the Intercolonial. If the people fully understand this, they will certainly condemn the administration for this attempt to deceive them by their method of bookkeeping.

Intercolonial Railway—air brakes to freight cars, $25,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister promised us, when this item was under discussion before, that he would give us a full account of how many freight cars were to be furnished with air brakes, and the cost. We would like to know also whether this is done under contract or whether there is a supply on hand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contractor is the Westinghouse Air Brake Company of Hamilton, Ontario. The total number of freight cars, June 30th, 1902, was 9,689. The number equipped with air brakes at that time was 5,568; so that there remained to be equipped 4,121. There were equipped in the year 1902-3, 449 cars, so that at the end of the year there remained to be equipped, 3,672 cars. The average cost per car is about $50.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When will this work be completed, and what will it cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About one-third of the total number remain to be equipped, so it will take several years.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the contract price ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that is the schedule price which the Westinghouse establishment charges to all railways.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the cost per car for the air brake, and what is the cost of the draw-bar ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About $50 per car for the air brake, and $40 for the draw-bar.

Mr. INGRAM. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals last year stated that the air brakes would cost about $40 and the draw-bars $25. There ought to be some reliable figures.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps the difference arises from the fact that the one item includes labour of putting on the brakes, while the other does not.

Mr. BARKER. The minister says there are 9,609 freight cars. Is that the total stock-list of freight cars ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Well, there are several hundred freight cars out of service that will have to be purchased or rebuilt. Does the hon. gentleman include these in the number for which he is going to take a special vote? —because nowadays, the hon. gentleman knows, he can buy them equipped with all these appliances. I would like him to explain that, so that we may not be putting four or five hundred too many on one side of the account.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figgures I quoted include every car on the list.

Mr. BARKER. Then the cars out of service, there are 400 or 500 of them, will be bought as new cars, and they will be bought, no doubt, with the full equipment of modern cars. The hon. gentleman will not want to buy the Westinghouse equipment to put upon them as if they were old cars.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am told that when the cars get out of service they will be rebuilt in the shops and charged to renewals, with the exception of the air-brakes, which will be charged to capital in as much as the old cars did not have the air-brakes.

Mr. BARKER. This is an opportune time, as the general manager is here, to ask why they have not already been dealt with in that way instead of the government buying new cars.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is because of the increasing business of the

road they need both, not only to buy new ones but to repair old ones.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps the minister could tell us why these cars that are out of service, and have been out of service year after year, have not been restored instead of buying new cars. The hon. gentleman knows there would have been a very large addition to the working expenses of the railway. But by not doing that and by buying new cars, there has been no addition to the working expenses of the railway, and there has been a large addition to the debt of the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The manager informs me that they were doing all they could in this direction, they are constantly buying new cars as well as constantly repairing and improving old ones, to the extent of their facilities.

Mr. BARKER. The extent of their facilities seems to be getting behind, and we are paying year after year large sums to increase the equipment at Moncton to enable the department to do this work. I would like to point out that a far more profitable answer is this, that if the department had replaced these cars in their shops, the charge would have been to working expenses ; but by buying them from the United States and elsewhere, it has gone to capital account ; and the company is supposed to have been making a profit on the road when there has really been a large loss.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that the proportion of these cars which are out of service now is not larger than that of other railroads. They have perhaps in the past not been able to overtake them, but they have now caught up, and there is not more than the usual proportion of cars out of service.

Mr. BARKER. Two years ago I went into that question particularly, and I cited the reports of the Grand Trunk Railway and other companies as to their equipment of locomotives, and showed that the Grand Trunk Railway, two years ago, I think, it was, was actually ahead of its stock list, while the Intercolonial Railway was 700 cars behind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was correct a few years ago, but I am glad to be able to say we have done better since.

Mr. BARKER. No, you have done worse.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the capacity of the box cars they have been buying ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 60,000 and 80,000 pounds, the size of modern cars.

Mr. BENNETT. What has been done under the recommendation of Mr. Muhlfeld as to the equipment of certain cars and locomotives with what was known as the Chapman ball bearing apparatus ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Nothing has been done.

Mr. BENNETT. Was anything done on the report submitted by Mr. Muhlfeld ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He made a report, but the officials tell me it was not acted upon.

Mr. BENNETT. Then there are none of these ball bearings in use now on any of the locomotives or rolling stock of the Intercolonial ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None.

Mr. INGRAM. While dealing with that phase of the question, I would like to know what has been done with Mr. Cleveland's patent for cylinders ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is being used on several locomotives at the present time.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand Mr. Cleveland has had his patent put on some 18 locomotives on the Intercolonial, they have been on for some time, and that gentleman can get no information as to whether they were regarded as satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that the reason why they have not furnished information as to the success of these appliances is that the officials wish to test them for a longer time.

Mr. INGRAM. They have been on for some years, I understand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The first was put on three years ago. These gentlemen have been making changes in the appliance since that time and improvements as they claim and the officials have not felt justified in giving any report up to the present time.

Mr. INGRAM. And no report as to how it acted in the first place or as to these improvements from time to time ? I understand that in the state of Michigan there is a gentleman who has got out a patent which is becoming a very serviceable one. By reason of using it the locomotive consumes less fuel and greater speed is attained and the patent is becoming very valuable. It does seem to me strange that after these gentlemen have submitted this appliance to test on the Intercolonial for three years they could get no report upon it. It is not fair to these men and there must be some cause for not giving a report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that the people interested in this appliance have received some reports as to what is being done, but they would like a more general report. They have reports from time to time as to the fuel consumption, &c., which are important elements in the matter, but they have been applying to the department for a general report, no doubt,

with the desire, should it prove satisfactory, that they should supply some more of these appliances.

Mr. INGRAM. When may we expect that they will be able to get that report ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One of the gentlemen concerned in the patent, I am informed, has spent most of his time at Moncton up to a comparatively recent date and is perfectly familiar with the operation of the appliance. He was there observing it himself and therefore did not need any report.

Mr. INGRAM. I am bound to say that if I read the letter that I have in my possession, it would ensure the hon. Minister of Finance that this gentleman has become very tired waiting around Moncton to get a report. I think if I read the letter it would raise the hair of the hon. gentleman' head, but I do not feel like doing so because I do not think it would be a good thing to put on record. He complains very bitterly that he cannot obtain any report from the Intercolonial in reference to this test, that he can get no satisfaction at all and that the officials of the Intercolonial Railway simply ignore him. There are three gentlemen interested in this patent, one of them is in San Francisco and another is in Toronto. One of these gentlemen was here endeavouring to get some information, but he could get no satisfaction from the department and he was forced to leave Ottawa. He is a poor man without the means to enable him to remain around and I think he has hardly been treated fairly. If his patent is no good he should be told so at once.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the gentleman who was recently here was the one who has been at Moncton ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that there are several parties connected with this patent and I am not sure that they all take the same view.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who are the other gentlemen connected with it ? There are three of them, are there not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are Peterson and Cleveland and there are several members of the concern. There are two Petersons and two Clevelands.

Mr. INGRAM. I am informed that the patent office only recognized two—Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Peterson. The trouble, Mr. Cleveland tells me, is that there are some parties associated with the concern in Moncton, some gentlemen who have become interested in it in a way, Mr. Cleveland thinks, that is causing it to be a case of freeze-out, and Mr. Cleveland objects to being frozen out. Yet, he and the other two control the patent as far as the patent office is concerned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will have to settle the patent question among themselves.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the Intercolonial Railway should give them some satisfaction.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the intention of the department to go on and instal this Chapman double ball bearing apparatus on certain locomotives and cars on the report of Mr. Muhlfeld ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The privilege has been accorded to these parties to make a trial of this apparatus, but they have not so far availed themselves of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. At their own expense ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there is no present understanding as to any further action.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you much of a supply of these air-brakes on hand ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are some on hand.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not a large quantity ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think not.

Mr. INGRAM. Can the hon. minister say definitely whether the estimate he is making for the air-brake and draw-bar includes the labour or not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This $50 I have quoted as the cost of the air-brakes does include the labour of putting them in.

Mr. INGRAM. And the $40 for draw-bars also includes the labour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. I find by a circular issued by this company that the arrangement is not as the hon. minister has stated it to the committee. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) is president of this company and with the view of selling stock they have issued a prospectus purporting to give a copy of a report by Mr. Muhlfeld. It says :

> The railway to pay the cost for the expense for the application of the equipment only to such an amount as may be occasioned by the removal of the present equipment. If, after one year's continuous service, the equipment has demonstrated that it can fulfil all of the requirements, in accordance with the claims made for it by the inventor, and the company who may control the invention, the railway to pay the additional amount to defray the cost for the initial application.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is my hon. friend reading from a prospectus ?

Mr. BENNETT. From the prospectus which is purporting to give a copy of the report of Mr. Muhlfeld, superintendent of machinery and rolling stock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Muhlfeld has not been in the service of the Intercolonial for some time.

Mr. BENNETT. He was in the service at the time this report was written, in May, 1902. Is that still the standing of this company or is the company sailing under false colours in making this publication to the people ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I cannot add anything to what I have already stated. The officials of the department state that the privilege was accorded to this company of making a trial at their own expense, but that they have not availed themselves of it.

Mr. BENNETT. Then this report is misleading ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not say anything about that. I do not form any opinion as to the report.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that the privilege is cancelled or is it still open on the terms of the report of Mr. Muhlfeld ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will have to be considered if they should make an application. It is intended that they should have the privilege of having a full test made of this apparatus, and if they make an application to us we will consider it.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the report correct in stating that the department were to pay as set forth in the report which I have read?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The understanding of the department was that the trial was to be made at the expense of the company.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the report is misleading.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not say anything about the report.

Mr. BLAIN. Is not the cost of putting on air-brakes cheaper now than it was a year or two ago Two years ago the minister said that these air-brakes cost $70 each and now we are told they only cost $50.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot explain that. Things have not become very much cheaper, the good times continue.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the reduction of duty on the air ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. Labour is higher now than it was two years ago ; perhaps the reason is that you are buying a larger quantity and are getting them cheaper.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The prices may vary a little, but I have no information that would enable me to explain the difference between $50 and $70.

Mr. BLAIN. Which is correct, the $50 or the $70?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can only be responsible for the $50.

Mr. INGRAM. When did you first commence buying air-brakes from the Westinghouse Company at Hamilton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Railway Department has had relations with the Westinghouse Company for a long time, and since they have established themselves at Hamilton we have been doing business with them. That may be two or three year ago or perhaps longer.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose it is another evidence that the protective tariff brings manufacturers to Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no doubt that the manufacturing industries of Canada have prospered enormously under the administration of the present government. I cannot deny it.

Mr. INGRAM. But that is due to the tariff of the old government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But hon. gentlemen opposite are complaining that this is a wretched tariff we have now ; I cannot understand them at all.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps they are cheaper because they are manufactured in Canada.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say. It is since this government came into power that most of these things happen in that way.

Mr. BARKER. Is not the explanation that that since the Westinghouse Company came into Canada they have entered into a new contract with the government at a reduced price ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no information as to that.

To exchange draw-bars on freight cars, $46,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The cost per car is $40. The total number of freight cars on June 30, 1902 was 9,689 ; the number equipped with master car builders couplers was 5,743 to June 30, 1902 ; there remained to be changed 3,946 ; there were changed last year, 1,008 and there remained to be changed 2,938. This vote is supposed to deal with 1,150 cars.

Mr. BARKER. As I have the report of the Railway Department here now, I find that the exact number of cars out of service to the end of June, 1902, is 571 ; I said 560 from memory. The minister thought they were improving, but the report shows that at the end of the previous year the number out of service was 361, so that he has gone 210 to the bad during the year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am assured that in the report for the present year the situation will be improved.

Mr. BARKER. Distance lends enchantment to the view.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you taking them off one class of cars and putting them on another ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are exchanging the old fashioned coupler for the modern appliance.

Mr. BARKER. Are you charging the whole cost to capital?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes ; the old ones are used in repairs to the old cars.

Mr. BARKER. That will not do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a fact.

Mr. BARKER. That is too thin.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On what principle do you charge changing draw-bars to capital ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a decided betterment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But a thing of that kind is never charged to capital.

Mr. BARKER. Betterment is one thing and charging the whole cost is a very different thing.

Mr. INGRAM. Do you manufacture them in the shops at Moncton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some have been bought in Walkerville, some in Montreal, and some in the United States.

Mr. INGRAM. What becomes of the old draw-bars ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are used in repairing old cars.

Mr. INGRAM. But if they are smashed they cannot be used.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then they go into the scrap heap.

Mr. BARKER. And if they do go into the scrap heap does not the minister see that revenue is bound to replace them ? He has no right to charge their replacement to capital. He has 900 old draw-bars, he throws them into the scrap heap, and he has not charged anything to revenue. The revenue of the company has got to replace the old ones, and if they are not worth replacing you must charge the difference between what it would cost to replace the old ones, and the cost of the new ones to capital account. Your revenue has to bear the expense necessary to replace the old ones.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know what railway system in Canada or the United States follows a system similar to that followed on the Intercolonial Railway? Or is this system followed on the Intercolonial Railway because the management can get a vote of government money whenever they want it ? It is easier to buy new material than to replace the old, and charge it to capital account under these circumstances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer that.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, I think if a little common sense were applied that system would not be adopted merely because the money is voted so easily.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not find that the money is easily voted. We get it with great difficulty.

Mr. INGRAM. The managers of other railways do not get their money so easily.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister is not entitled to say that he cannot answer for that, because for two or three years past he has voted squarely in the House for the very things we are contending for, and he must take the responsibility for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I take the responsibility of it ; but what I cannot answer is as to the affairs of other companies.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely the superintendent can give the information. Where are all these Master Car Builders' Associations we have heard so much about? Surely the government railways are not run without the managers having an interchange of ideas with the managers of other companies. Surely they are not conducting this railway on their own ideas, and not inquiring how other railways are conducted. Will the hon. minister say that any officer of the Intercolonial Railway associates with the officers of other railways and attends the meetings which are held occasionally with a view to finding out the best way to conduct the railway? I am afraid there is something wrong about this whole business.

Intercolonial Railway—new machinery for locomotive and car shops, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The details of this are as follows : Ferguson flue welding furnace, operated by oil as fuel, $200; 300 horse-power engine, $3,000 ; buzz planer, $120; 100 horse-power engine, $1,500; turning lathe to take 16 feet between centres, $1,600; little giant pneumatic drill, $40; combination cold saw cutting-off machine, $1,000; belting, &c., $540. The machinery asked for is of the latest and most improved design, and is to facilitate the repairs of locomotives and cars. The present engines are too small to furnish power required to run shops with the new machinery placed and enlargements made, and it is proposed to replace them with engines asked above. The present engines will be used at other points on the line.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was the $10,000 voted last year all expended for machinery?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total cost of the machinery in these shops now?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give that to the hon. gentleman, but I will give it to him at a later stage.

Intercolonial Railway—to equip ten passenger cars with Pintsch gas apparatus, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is found to be the latest and most satisfactory system. The cost is $800 per car, and we propose to equip 10 cars.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many remain to be equipped ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total number to be equipped to the end of the year will be 26. That will complete the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When you discard one system of lighting on the Intercolonial Railway and introduce another, you charge the cost to capital account?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The apparatus for the Pintsch system is entirely new, and is charged to capital account. All the new cars are fitted with that apparatus; and when we take an old car which is only fitted with a gas lamp and put in the Pintsch system, that is charged to capital account.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Many of the cars were lighted with electric light.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were a number of cars equipped with electric light on the storage battery system; but that was found to be inconvenient and not economical, and we are adopting the Pintsch system instead.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You put out the electric light and put in this, and charge the whole to capital account?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Then, the principle on the Intercolonial Railway seems to be this, that if the management in one season fancy a particular lamp and buy it, and the next year think another kind is more suitable, they turn out the first and put in the new one, and charge both to capital account. Is that the principle? If it is, it is a most extraordinary one.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a cheaper system of lighting than electricity?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the officials think it is decidedly cheaper than the system of a storage battery. Some railways are introducing dynamos, but they have not been introduced on the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BLAIN. Does it cost less to fit up a car with the Pintsch system than with the electric light apparatus?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, that is the opinion of the officials.

Mr. FOWLER. How many of these cars are fitted with electric light?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the number, but I will get that at a later stage.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the nature of this new system ? Does it generate gas ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a system of cylinders and piping—a storage system of gas. The gas is made at the shops in Moncton and stored in these cylinders and pipes. It is called the Pintsch gas system, which is used on most of the railways that do not use the electric lights. It is made from oil.

Mr. SPROULE. It is very costly, $800 per car. Is it expensive to keep up afterwards ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The chief expense is in the fitting up.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think there is much dispute about the Pinsch system being a good one. But I think the real question is this. If the officials of a railway, who may change from year to year their ideas with regard to the kinds of lamps to be used in the cars, are allowed to have their way, we will have all sorts of experiments tried, according to the fancies of the gentleman, who for the time being is the superintendent. If you adopt the ordinary principle that when officials want to try from one year to the other, which is the better system, they must do it at the expense of their current account, they will have some motive to be economical and careful, but it is almost historical that when you allow officials to expend anything they like and charge it to capital, they will say : Why should we not expend the money so long as parliament votes it. There is no check whatever and no inducement to officials to be economical and careful so long as they can get whatever they please without adding one cent to their working expenses. The only safety in the operation of a road, whether run by a government or a company, is to have the officials who are responsible run up their working expenses by every purchase they make and not have these purchases treated as an additional mortgage on the property.

Rolling stock, $637,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to reduce that to $327,000.

Mr. BARKER. We should have an explanation why the amount was put in the first instance at $637,000 and why it was subsequently reduced ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I give an explanation of the sum I ask the House

to vote, the hon. gentleman should be content.

Mr. BARKER. Certainly not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We propose to furnish :

Six second-class sleepers at $10,000.. ..	$ 60,000
Four parlour cars at $20,000	80,000
Ten first-class cars at $16,000..	160,000
Six baggage cars at $4,500..	27,000
Total..	$327,000

Mr. FOWLER. We are entitled to know why the first amount was reduced. Before this amount of $637,000 was arrived at, the estimates must have been made up by the officials, passed upon by the minister, submitted by the minister to the council, and passed upon by the council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend insists on giving me the whole amount of $637,000, I will have to take it.

Mr. BARKER. We want to know why you have changed your mind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not an uncommon thing to reduce estimates. So long as we do not increase them, there is not cause to complain.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not quite agree with the hon. minister. This first amount of $637,000 was not put in the estimates without having been carefully considered, and we should know why this serious reduction is now being made in it. Is it because we do not require as much rolling stock as the government thought at first we did ? Does the hon. gentleman find that the trade on the Intercolonial Railway is not increasing but diminishing or is it not increasing at the rate expected ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. minister is going to charge the rest to revenue instead of to capital. He has found he has made a mistake.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a very charitable suggestion.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to have it confirmed by the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want to contradict the hon. member for Lanark, who is an old and experienced railway man.

Mr. FOWLER. If the minister accepts that explanation and says that what the hon. member for Lanark stated jocularly is really the case, we must accept his statement, but we should have some reason given us. Some one must have erred greatly in connection with the matter.

Mr. BARKER. I think that possibly the explanation of the hon. member for Lanark may throw some light on the matter, but they would require a little more than this reduction to make up for the cars out of service and which ought to be charged to revenue account. There is another explanation to which I might probably draw attention. In the revenue account for the year ending 1902, I find that the government has received for mileage of its own cars on other lines in excess of what it has paid to companies for mileage of their cars on the Intercolonial Railway, $16,743. This indicates that instead of the government wanting freight cars, it has more than it needs, and probably after attention was called to this during this session, the government reconsidered the matter and deemed it expedient to take $300,000 or $400,000 off what a month or two ago it thought it should ask parliament for.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. minister is to be commended for striking off this sum. It is the first reduction we have seen for a long time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must thank my hon. friend for coming to my rescue for I felt I was being badly treated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. minister give a statement of the total amount expended on capital account in the purchase of rolling stock from 1896 up to the present day, including this vote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The expenditure from the 30th June, 1896, to the 30th June, 1902, which was the last official report, was $4,896,843.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. With this vote, the total is about $5,200,000. The government, through its Minister of Railways and Canals, congratulated the House upon having a surplus instead of a large deficit. But I find that for the year ending June 30th, 1902, the number of cars of the Intercolonial Railway that were on other roads was 1,012, with a day use of 13,100, and for last year there were 1,522, with the number of days nearly 15,000.

Mr. BARKER. An increase of nearly fifty per cent in the number of cars.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the minister give us an idea of the present value of the rolling stock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not, off-hand, give that information.

Mr. FOWLER. But, surely, with the general manager at his elbow, the hon. gentleman can get the facts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The books are kept at Moncton and I presume they include that item. The valuation is not made every year, but only from time to time, I will get the latest valuation for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOWLER. You do not take stock ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, but the cars stand at their cost.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the rolling stock purchased in Canada, and is it purchased by tender, or how ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Cars are purchased in Canada whenever they can be obtained here, and always by tender.

Mr. FOWLER. As to the system of stock-taking, if the replacement of cars were charged to maintenance, the system of taking the cars at cost would be fairly correct. But where the replacement is charged to capital, as on the Intercolonial, to take the cars at cost does not give a fair estimate of the present value of the rolling stock. An ordinary railway is supposed to keep its rolling stock up to the original valuation, and, in the case of such a road the valuation at cost would be fair. But that is not the system on the Intercolonial, and to take the cars at their original value would be to represent the rolling stock at a much higher value than it actually has.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in his assumption that all these renewals and repairs are charged to capital. That is not so; on the contrary, once a car is bought on capital account it has to be maintained, and the maintenance is charged to current account. Only additional purchases or improvements are charged to capital.

Mr. FOWLER. Where do you draw the line? For instance, in the matter of lighting, you put in electric light and charge it to capital. Soon after that you throw out that system and put in the Pintsch system, and charge that to capital. If, next year, some better system is invented, you discard the Pintsch and put in the new one and charge that to capital. You will have all these changes, costing an average of say $800 or $2,400 per car, charged to capital. In view of the hon. minister's explanation of this subject, I think I was justified in the assumption I made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There may be some room for the hon. gentleman's point as respects the lighting; that may be a matter of discussion. But as respects the general maintenance, I can assure him that it is not so charged.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Some time ago when the minister was making a statement as to the benefit accruing to the Intercolonial from the cars that were being procured, I said I thought most of the small railways in Nova Scotia had their rolling stock virtually supplied by the Intercolonial. I find full confirmation of that in the return. For instance, here is the railway of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, the number of cars of the Intercolonial they had was 59 for 297 days; and we had ten of their cars for fifteen days. The Sydney and Louisburgh road had eighty-four cars for 281 days; we do not appear to have had one of theirs at all. The Nova Scotia Steel Company had 135 cars for 1,073 days, but the Intercolonial does not seem to have had any other of theirs. The Inverness and Richmond Railway had 115 Intercolonial cars, and we had six of their cars for thirteen days. The Dominion Atlantic Railway had thirty-three of the Intercolonial cars, but we do not seem to have had any from their road. The Quebec Central Railway had 137 Intercolonial cars for 1,936 days; and we had seventeen of theirs. Under the system in use, it would appear that these concerns are supplied with Intercolonial cars to run their roads.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I want to know what is the reason for this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The traffic goes in that direction. Take Cape Breton for example, the cars go down loaded with the produce of the west, and then they are sent to these various coal mines where they are loaded with coal to come back. The traffic is chiefly going down, and when the cars are there they want to make some use of them.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you charge anything for the use of these cars?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The usual charge is 20 cents per day.

Mr. BLAIN. Is any portion of thise $637,000 for the purchase of freight cars?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose all this, the supply of cars, buildings, and everything else, is done in the usual way by contract and tender?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, all are matters of public tender.

Mr. FOWLER. Where will these cars be built for which you are asking this appropriation?

The MINSTER OF FINANCE. They will be built either in Ontario or Nova Scotia.

Increased accommodation at Stellarton, $32,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That item is made up as follows: New station, $16,000; machine shop, $4,500; car repair shop, $4,000; building to store wrecking train, $1,500; building for stores and offices, $3,500; engineer inspection, $2,500; making a total of $32,000. Stellarton is an important junction and locomotive station, the centre of the Pictou coal fields. A large business is done in connection with the coal trade, and it is necessary to do considerable repairing of cars.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There were $32,000 spent last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The appropriation last year has been largely spent in providing yard room and an engine house. The present appropriation will finish all that is contemplated.

Mr. FOWLER. When was the old station built?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. At the time of the construction of the Pictou town branch, in 1889. The business has outgrown the station facilities, but the old building will still be used.

Mr. FOWLER. As the general manager is present, I want to call attention to the lack of station accommodation at Sussex. That is one of the most important towns on the Intercolonial. A very large amount of business is done there, and it is the largest railway town between Moncton and St. John. There is a station there, built when the railway was first constructed, some forty odd years ago. It is an old wooden structure, and is a disgrace to the Intercolonial and to the town itself. I am afraid that if the people of the town were not so law-abiding, some one would apply a torch to it and get rid of it in that way. This is a matter that ought to be taken into consideration at once. Besides the lack or station accommodation, they have a disgraceful old shed for an engine house, entirely dilapidated ; indeed a man out in the new North-west would not use such a structure to keep his hogs in. There is a train made up at Sussex which runs only between Sussex and St. John, and the engine is kept there all night. There was an engine house, a brick building, but it burned down, and instead of erecting a new brick building the old bricks were actually carted away to some other point, and this old shed put up, out of old second-hand boards—I do not know where they obtained them—with a wooden smoke-stack sticking out. No one-horse railway through a back country district would have such a structure as this. I hope the acting minister will attend to this. I am sorry the hon. gentleman whom we expect to see occupying this important post in the near future, is not here, so that I might bring this matter to his attention, and that it might be one of the first acts of his administration to provide decent and reasonable railway facilities to the important town of Sussex.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Sussex case must stand upon its own merits. Of course, there is no comparison between the business of Sussex and that of Stellarton. However, there is no reason why the case of Sussex should not be considered. In regard to the engine house, I may say that it is the intention of the department to rebuild the engine house, and I am sure my hon. friend would be pleased to learn that it is not going to be charged to capital account either. The old engine house was burned down, and recognizing the sound principle that only proper things should be charged to capital account, we shall charge this to income. As to further accommodation at Sussex, I will give the subject consideration, and our desire is that these stations shall be properly equipped all along the line.

Mr. FOWLER. I would say to my hon. friend that I might find it in my heart to forgive him if he gave us a really first-class building, even if he did charge the cost to capital account.

Mr. GOURLEY. I regret very much to have to object to this expenditure at Stellarton, but I am instructed by the people of Truro to protest against this aggrandizement of Stellarton at the expense of Truro, because that is what it amounts to. All these votes which have been made during four or five years past have been made in furtherance of a departure in policy since the incoming of the present government. Under the old administration Truro was the central point for the management of the Cape Breton Railway. After the advent of this government, with the view, perhaps, of strengthening some political interests in the county of Pictou, and in the vain attempt, I presume, to defeat my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell), or perhaps in the attempt to aggrandize Stellarton, a policy was adopted, the result of which has been that Truro has been distinctly and permanently injured. Numbers of people who formerly lived at Truro have been obliged to remove from that place. That is the point at which trains were made up for the Cape Breton Railway, and at which trains coming from Cape Breton changed their conductors and their men. Consequently, Truro was the central point from which this railway was operated. Now, an attempt has been made, and successfully made, to take away a large number of railway men from Truro and locate them at Stellarton by making that the divisional centre, and the result has been a complete drain upon the population of Truro. The people of Truro have put up with this injustice without complaining publicly to the House, thinking that the government, and especially the members of the government representing the province of Nova Scotia, would no longer tolerate an injustice of that character. Truro has been one of the centres of education and one of the centres of general intelligence in the province of Nova Scotia for years. It has led in dominating the public sentiment of the province and counties like that represented by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance have derived whatever intelligence they possess in a large degree from the overflow of intelligence and education which exists and which is growing in the town of Truro.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. Minister of Finance emanate from there ?

Mr. GOURLEY. No, but I say that the county he represents is indebted largely for whatever intelligence it possesses to the overflow of education and intelligence that has its home in Truro. Truro was the Athens of Nova Scotia, and when the hon. Minister of Finance wants a little inspiration, he stops off and rests in Truro.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought it was a temperance town.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have wondered if that is not the attraction which causes members of the government to treat Truro with great deference in stopping there for a few hours. It has become a crying shame that every vote is given for Stellarton, and that that town is being built up at the expense of Truro. We have a miserable station at Truro. The government have a large railway property there and, while the rest of Truro is made beautiful these large railway grounds are permitted to have anything but an aspect of cleanliness or beauty, and the result is that the town is disfigured. We tried to improve these grounds a few years ago, but we were prevented, and the railway will not improve it. The station is a laughing-stock as far as railway accommodation is concerned, and as far as the requirements of travel from and to Truro are concerned. The point I am chiefly desiring to urge now is that the government should reconsider this whole question of Stellarton. It was done purely as a political move, and the result of it is that they have prevented the town of Truro from being the headquarters of the Cape Breton branch, from which it should be managed, and from which it had been managed very largely since the building of the Cape Breton branch. Then, the government decided upon a change, and during the last four or five years Truro has been passed by and an abnormal terminal point has been established at Stellarton, from which the Cape Breton branch of the Intercolonial Railway has been managed, with the result that there has been a lessening of population, wealth and of business in the town of Truro. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance to look into this matter and attempt to cure this grievance. I have no doubt he will receive some assistance from his officials, because I have no doubt that his officials at Moncton, as well as the deputy minister, have received many petitions and communications with reference to this matter, because the people of Truro, a few years ago, endeavoured to impress the government with the iniquity of the whole proceeding and to have it corrected. I hope that will be accomplished. I could not allow this vote to pass without making these representations as strong as I could. I can assure the hon. gentleman that when a change of government comes, which would not, from the state of public opinion, I think, be considered very far away, we shall have to make a prompt and immediate change if it does not occur before that time.

Mr. BELL. I feel sure that my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) has not considered this matter as fully as he should have or he would not attack this particular vote. It is quite possible that to a certain extent the gain of Stellarton has been at the cost of Truro. That is probably a result of the change of management upon the road, but I do not see any reason why the people of Truro should have any ill-feeling against the people of Stellarton on that account.

Mr. GOURLEY. We have not.

Mr. BELL. Or against the railway management for making a change in the method of conducting the business of the road. It is quite clear that at the time of the adoption of Truro as the terminal, Truro was the chief headquarters, but as soon as the Eastern Extension Railway was built the business of the Eastern Extension leading from New Glasgow to Cape Breton was made independent and separate, and now in reality the business of the Oxford to Sydney line is managed from New Glasgow, which is two or three miles from Stellarton, and that has been done because that is the junction of the Sydney and Oxford road with the old Pictou extension, running from Truro to Pictou. I would remind my hon. friend from Colchester that an enormous part of the business which is done on the road between Truro and Sydney and between Oxford and Stellarton originates either in New Glasgow or in the immediate vicinity of Stellarton. There is an immense traffic in coals, all of which originates at Stellarton or Westville, two or three miles distant. The large works of the Nova Scotia Steel Company at New Glasgow have given an immense proportion of the business which has been done over the Intercolonial Railway for a very long term of years. It seems to me that that point at which the business of the road to a very large extent originates is entitled to derive a greater part of the benefit from the working of the road, if there should be any discrimination at all between the different points. I have no doubt that the road can be managed there efficiently under the system that has been adopted. Practically Stellarton and New Glasgow are almost one point; there is only two and a half miles between the stations, the despatcher's office is in New Glasgow and the engine house and round house are at Stellarton. In reference to this particular vote, I feel that there is every justification for giving the people of Stellarton, or the people of the county of Pictou who have to use that junction constantly, a much better station than the one that is there now. The present station is an old building entirely inadequate to the business of the day. I am inclined to think that it never was large enough to afford convenience for the immense passenger traffic at that point. At no station in Nova Scotia, except possibly Truro, are so many people brought together by the passenger traffic of the county as at Stellarton. The passengers for Prince Edward Island leave the main line there; it is a very important point and certainly it

deserves a better passenger station than it has. I am glad to see that the government is recognizing the requirements of the road, and I trust they will give Stellarton a building that will be suited to the large passenger traffic that passes that point. The fact of a certain change in the management of the road may have diverted some business from the town of Truro, and that we have to regret, although, I suppose, it is of benefit to the county which I have the honour to represent. But, that is not a reason at all why Stellarton should be denied what are its rights. I travel around Canada a good deal, and I really do not know of any place, considering its size, where you see such a thronging passenger traffic. There are a great many trains in the course of a day between Stellarton and New Glasgow and they are all filled and very often crowded. I have no doubt there is no part of the Intercolonial Railway that pays as well as the small section in the vicinity of New Glasgow and Stellarton. I presume that it is the intention of the government, judging by this vote, to put up a decent station building at Stellarton. I am very glad that they are making this provision.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I can bear testimony to what the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has said. Last January and the January previously, I passed some hours at Stellarton station, and it is as shabby a railway station as a person could see. There is no comfort for the passengers in it, and it badly requires to be put on a modern footing. I was pleased at the remarks made by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) about that higher education which permeates the whole province of Nova Scotia, and that of course explains the large number of Liberal members that are returned from Nova Scotia to support the present government.

Mr. FOWLER. I call the attention of the minister, and of the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway who is on the floor of the House to the barn-like structures that are being put up as stations along the Intercolonial Railway. They might have been well enough forty years ago, but they are out of date to-day. They are a disgrace. On other lines of railways you see artistic stations, pleasing to the eye, but when you approach some of those new Intercolonial Railway stations you do not know whether they are farm barns or what. At a very slight additional cost, and perhaps at no additional cost, artistic buildings could be erected which would be a credit to the road. This is a thing the management should attend to. Of course this criticism does not apply to expensive structures; the station at Moncton for example, is a very handsome building and so is the station at Amherst, but I refer to the smaller stations, and there is no excuse whatever for building them in their present style. In my county there have been several new stations erected in the last few years, and there seems to be an entire lack of taste in the architect who designed them. If a nice artistic building is put up the person in charge would take a pride in it and in the grounds around it. Any one who has travelled on railways in western Canada or in the United States must be charmed with the ornate appearance of the small stations and their surroundings. It adds much to the appearance of the country and strangers are much impressed, just as they are disenchanted when they see these hideous barn-like structures which characterize the line of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has appealed to my artistic taste, but, I am told that some of these stations are copied from models on the lines of railway which he commends so highly. However, if the great railways of the United States are deficient in taste, that is no reason why we should be. It is possible to put up a small building of artistic design, and I should be glad to have the attention of the engineers and architects drawn to it, so that we may do better.

Mr. FOWLER. If they copied from models in the United States they have selected the wrong railways to imitate. The stations on lines running out of Boston are in marked contrast to the stations on the Intercolonial Railway, in the vicinity of St. John, for instance.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the Minister give us a statement of the details of the $32,000 expended at Stellarton last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The accounts for the year are not closed, but the manager tells me the money was chiefly expended for yard room, and some of it for finishing an engine-house previously commenced.

Mr. FOWLER. Was it for the purchase of land?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Some portion of it was for land. I have not the figures of the quantity, but it was not a large sum.

Mr. BLAIN. Was a new building put up last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A building which had been begun before was finished.

Mr. FOWLER. How was the land purchased?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Valuators were appointed, and it was purchased at the price they put upon it.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you an official valuator?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In this case the engineers of the department made the valuation. In special cases valuators are appointed from time to time. There is no one person whose special duty it is to value.

Mr. FOWLER. Judging from the number of officials appointed lately on the Intercolonial Railway, I cannot understand why valuators have not been appointed.

Mr. BLAIN. Last session when this item was going through, the minister made a statement which I will read. He said :

We intend to put up a two-story building for the accommodation of the engine men, register rooms and foremen's office, master mechanics office, train engineer's lunch room and oil room, which will cost $6,500; heating offices and building, $1,000 ; new electric lighting plant, $2,000 ; office furniture, $1,000 ; building for storing wrecking car, $1,500 ; tracks and laying tracks, $5,000, which makes a total of $17,000.

The minister now states that most of the money was expended for yard room. Will the hon. Minister of Finance say whether this money was applied in the way the minister said it was intended to apply it last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, the items which the hon. member has read do not correspond with the information which I have given. I will look into the matter and see what the explanation is, and bring it down at a later stage.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the estimate of $16,000 to complete the station ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Does that include heating and fitting ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no special item for heating, and therefore this covers everything.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the work done by contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. This must be an important point, because I believe there has been more than $150,000 expended there. Last session the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) asked : 'What is the total amount expended at Stellarton ?' The answer was $116,000, then $17,000 was voted last year and now the committee is asked for $32,000 more. When is this to stop ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When the hon. member is asking for a sum of money to be voted, he should be able to state the total amount expended at the place in question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will promise when later estimates come on to have the information.

Intercolonial Railway—new superstructure for Restigouche bridge, $123,000.

Mr. FOWLER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $42,000 of this is a revote. The estimated cost of the steel superstructure is $163,000; for flooring, $6,000; for handling and storing, $5,000; for painting, $2,500; for inspection, $500; for engineering and other expenses, $6,000; in all, making the total cost of this work $183,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you charge the taking down of the old bridge and the putting up of the new one to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. How long had the old bridge been in use ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Since 1876.

Mr. BARKER. That is twenty-seven years, and there has been nothing charged to maintenance for that worn-out bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question of what credit, if any, is to be given on account of the old bridge has yet to be considered. Because no determination has yet been reached as to what is to be done with it.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). In the closing days of last session I had the opportunity of calling the attention of the members of the government to certain petitions which had been sent here from Restigouche county and Bonaventure county. You are aware that the Restigouche river forms the boundary between the province of Quebec and the province of New Brunswick, and when it became known that the government were going to put up a new superstructure, inquiries were made by the hon. member for Restigouche and myself as to what was to be done with the old superstructure. We have since ascertained that it cannot be put to any use on either the Intercolonial or the Prince Edward Island Railway, and if this superstructure is removed, probably the only opportunity which that district will have of having an interprovincial bridge will be gone.

Restigouche river is very shallow in the summer, but in the spring it carries large quantities of ice, and up to the present the district has not been able to put a bridge across that river. Farmers coming down the Matapedia valley have to go to Cross Point, a distance of twenty miles in order to cross the river to Campbellton, or to Dee Side, eight miles above the bridge, to wade across the river. Petitions have been presented to the government asking the government to allow us to use the old iron structure as a highway bridge. The piers are wide enough for two bridges. The hon. gentleman for Restigouche (Mr. Reid) and myself expect, if the Dominion will allow us to use the old bridge, to get sufficient assistance from the provinces of New Bruns-

wick and Quebec and the municipalities immediately interested, to meet the requirements regarding the approaches and the enlargements of the abutments. I hope that the government will give this matter full consideration. It is one of great importance to the district. When the Intercolonial Railway was first built the Matapedia valley was a wilderness, but during the past fifteen years settlements have sprung up all along the line. The parish of St. Alexis, situated near the bridge, has a population of nearly 2,000. The market town for all this Matapedia valley—the lower portion of it—is the town of Campbellton, and this river has to be crossed in order to reach it. As this superstructure is not being used anywhere else on the Intercolonial Railway, it seems almost a pity to demolish the bridge and carry the iron elsewhere, when it could be of such service to the people of that district and a connecting link between Quebec and New Brunswick. The district is not very rich. It is settled largely by pioneer settlers, farmers who have gone in there during the last few years, and who consequently have not the means to erect an interprovincial bridge of their own. If this opportunity be not taken advantage of, we shall probably not see an interprovincial bridge there in our own lifetime. Besides there are precedents for the government coming to our relief in this matter. The Dominion government has already paid money for an interprovincial bridge over the Ottawa river. We are not asking the government to spend anything, but to allow us to use the superstructure on condition that the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec and the municipalities interested will meet any additional cost required for making this bridge serviceable as a highway.

Mr. BARKER. On the statement of the hon. gentleman, it seems to me that if this bridge cannot be used for railway purposes elsewhere, this might be a fair opportunity to utilize it for the purpose he mentions. I presume that the two provinces and the municipalities would be willing to allow the government the fair value of the superstructure for the purpose for which they need it. Assuming that it cannot be used for any railway purposes, it would possibly have to be converted into scrap or used for the purpose mentioned by the hon. gentleman, and in such case the parties interested would no doubt pay a reasonable price for it.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The hon. member for Hamilton has not caught what I intended to convey. If this bridge is demolished and taken away, it will lose all its value. It is twenty-seven years old. If we had to purchase the bridge outright, it would be a very good transaction on the part of the administration of the Intercolonial Railway to sell the bridge, but the district is newly settled and I do not believe that I could induce any of the municipalities to pay the amount that would be required to meet the value of this bridge, which, I think, is estimated at some $40,000. All we ask is to be allowed to use the bridge as a highway and let that be the contribution of the Dominion to the interprovincial bridge, the province of New Brunswick paying the additional cost on the New Brunswick side, and the province of Quebec the additional cost on the Quebec side. The Restigouche is a very difficult river to cross, especially in the spring, when the ice is sometimes twenty feet high at that point. Any bridge with wooden pillars which the municipalities might put up would be swept away. We want to use the large piers, which are sufficiently wide, and ask the Dominion government to allow the old bridge which cannot be used anywhere else, to be used by us. It would be a pity to remove it when, by keeping it in position, it would be of such good service to the district.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Could they erect a new railway bridge on the same piers and let the old bridge remain as it is ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Yes, by enlarging the abutments, I understand there would be room for both bridges.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it in a good position for crossing ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). The province of Quebec side is all that could be desired, but there would be some difficulty on the New Brunswick side because it is right at the base of a mountain. That difficulty, however, is not insurmountable. For all these reasons I hope that the government will consider our request favourably. The population of Bonaventure has increased 5,000 in the last ten years, which increase is largely due to the opening up of the Matapedia valley. The Dominion government has a direct interest in developing that region. We voted last year and this year certain sums for the purpose of enabling a Montreal colonization society to send settlers into this Matapedia valley. From Matapedia to Ste. Flavie, you have a distance of seventy-five miles, partly not settled at all, and you have a railway running through that district. By encouraging the development of that district, you will furnish the Intercolonial Railway with the means of meeting the expenses incurred in running through this Matapedia valley. All through the valley new settlements are springing up, but these people, if they are going to live along the government line and give it business, must have some encouragement. I would refer the government to what the Canadian Pacific Railway has done in Algoma and Nipissing during the last few years as an example which should be followed. All we ask of the government is to not demolish

the old bridge, but allow it to remain so that our people can reach the market town of Campbellton over it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has made out a very strong case. We do in some cases grant aid to interprovincial bridges. If that precedent were to be followed, I suppose that something could be said in favour of the policy suggested. If we were willing to do that, we could put some value on the bridge and make it a gift to the place and credit it to the Intercolonial as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) suggests. These are matters of detail. I will bring the subject before my colleagues, and, perhaps, later on, we can give the committee some further information. There is some force in the suggestion that, if this bridge is not useful to us and we should only have to take it down, the least we can do is to make it of some use to the people of the locality. If the province of New Brunswick and the province of Quebec and the municipalities interested were prepared to contribute a fair share, I think that would be a reasonable and fair arrangement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not say anything in opposition to the request of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). But I think that the widening of the piers and erecting of a new bridge would greatly exceed the cost of providing for a carriage way on either side of the new bridge that is to be constructed. If this is regarded as a necessity in that section, I would advise my hon. friend (Mr. Marcil) to use his influence with the government—and I think the influence of an important supporter like the hon. gentleman would have great weight —to get a carriage way put on either side of the new structure.

New superstructure for South-west Miramichi bridge, $90,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The whole cost of the steel superstructure will be $170,000, of which there was to have been paid during the past year according to the estimates, and, I suppose, has been paid, as the year is closed, $75,000. So, we need $95,000 more to pay for the steel structure. Then we have to provide for labour, false work, painting new spans, flooring, engineering and other expenses, and other items which will bring this $95,000 up to $122,000. Against that we have the value of the old span which is estimated at $32,000, leaving $90,000 to be provided. These are the spans which it is proposed to transfer to Prince Edward Island.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this amount will be taken out of the vote for Prince Edward Island, and the cash made available for the Intercolonial ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it will be charged to one and credited to the other.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure).

Hon Mr HAGGART. This is the first time we have had a clear statement of a proper credit. Does this finish the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year, the minister stated that $60,000 was to be received for this old bridge. How does it come that the value has shrunk $30,000 since last year ? Then, we were told that the superstructure would cost $132,000. It seeems to have crept up about $40,000 above that amount.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) sure it is the same bridge ?

Mr. BLAIN. The item of last year is to provide a new superstructure, six spans, for the Miramichi bridge, $72,000, which sum the committee was asked to vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are two Miramichi bridges. The appropriation for this one last year was $123,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, this is the one.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot explain the difference.

Mr. BLAIN. How much is the total cost of this to be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $200,000.

Mr. BLAIN. For the superstructure alone?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, for everything.

Mr. BLAIN. How much for the superstructure ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $170,000.

Mr. BLAIN. That is $40,000 more than the minister said it would cost. And we were to get credit for the old bridge which was to be sent to the province of Prince Edward Island, this is the same bridge, I take it of $60,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps the contract was not let at that time. Which may explain the difference.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. gentleman will find that a statement was made by the minister last year as to the purchase of the bridge to be made from the Hamilton Bridge Company or the company in Toronto. Evidently, he had an understanding and a price fixed before he asked for a vote ?

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister bring down a fuller explanation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will bring down the exact contract price and all the other information possible.

Mr. BLAIN. And perhaps he will give a reason why he is charging the old bridge at $30,000 less than last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will get that information if I can.

Mr. BARKER. No doubt the minister last year had details before him as the hon. minister has now. Perhaps they can be produced, they would give the explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will look into it.

Improvements at Point Tupper, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have spent more of the vote of last year than we had supposed, when these estimates were prepared, would be spent. Therefore, I propose to reduce this item to $6,000, all of which is a revote. I move that the item be reduced to $6,000.

Item, as amended, voted.

Yard for freight business at Rivière du Loop, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to continue the work started in 1902-3. It was estimated that the $25,000 would be expended, and, as the year has since closed, I suppose it has been expended. The work consists in filling, grading, renewing of sidings and so on. And this $10,000 is for the building of sidings and to provide additional yard accommodation, including the removal of buildings.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a total of $35,000, which seems an enormous sum for a freight yard at Rivière du Loup.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Rivière du Loup is an important station.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But there is another very important vote besides, for Rivière du Loup, of $50,000, for engine house, machine shops and cars. This is only the expenditure for the yard.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to finish the yard improvements, irrespective of the vote for buildings.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Out of this $35,000, what is the amount for building? $35,000 would buy the whole place.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total expenditure on this particular time to the end of 1903 will be about $26,000 for the yard only. My papers do not contain the information as to the total expenditure, but I will get that. To what particular date does the hon. gentleman want it ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What has been done at the yard there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Grading and laying the sidings. This is asked now to complete the sidings and other necessary work, and provide the necessary accommodation, including the moving of the building.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you charge rails and ties in that also?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, these will be additional sidings, which will be a proper charge to capital.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are rails and ties charged in these improvements?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then there is a double payment for ties and rails. All the ties purchased for the Intercolonial are charged to capital account. You take them out of store and charge them to it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When they are purchased they are charged to stores account, when they go out on the road they are charged against it.

Mr. BARKER. What additions to the lengths of the siding have been made in this yard for this $35,000?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a considerable increase in the length of the sidings. I will get the figures later.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was spent last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $25,000, and $10,000 more is wanted.

Mr. BLAIN. Last year, under the item 'To provide yard for freight business, Rivière du Loup, $25,000,' the Minister of Railways and Canals made this statement :

This is for yard room and track. The yards are altogether too restricted. A portion of this is for land. We have not got the land yet, but it is estimated that $15,000 will be sufficient to buy the land and grade it and put it in shape, and $10,000 will put down the tracks.

There is a straight statement from the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals when he took his $25,000 vote last year. Now the acting minister comes forward and says that he wants $10,000 more.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The manager informs me that he is not aware at this moment of anything having been spent for land. But the location was changed from the point where it was first contemplated, and yard improvements were made upon our own land, and we did not buy land.

Mr. BLAIN. That makes the position worse. They asked for $15,000 last year for land, and now the minister says they did not require to purchase the land because they had land of their own. Notwithstanding that, he comes forward and says he has expended $15,000 in improvements that were voted to purchase the land, and $10,000 in addition ; and now $10,000 more are wanted. Is this the old policy, or is it a new one under the new minister?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to investigate before answering that question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is extraordinary. You get a vote of $15,000 for the purpose of purchasing land, but instead of purchasing land you use it to build a yard.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister bring down an explanation about this?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly. But the explanation why the land was not required is because there was a change in the location.

To change air-brakes of passenger cars to quick action brakes and apply air signals, $2,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you want to change your air-brakes and apply your signals, you charge the amount to capital account?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is an improvement.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly it is, but why charge these things to capital account? Last year you took $20,000 for this purpose, and now you want $2,000 more. Will this new vote complete the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. Up to the end of 1904 there will remain 55 cars still requiring this change.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the minister to take measures that whoever has charge of that department shall see that none of these items after this are charged to capital account. In fact, the whole capital account should be closed on the Intercolonial.

Mr. BARKER. On how many cars were brakes changed for the $20,000 authorized last year? I ask this because, from the quotation made from the 'Hansard' last year, it is clear we must have these details, or the money will be applied as the department pleases. Money is asked for a particular purpose, and there is no security whatever that the money will be expended in the way it is voted. The only security we have is to get the minister in charge of the estimates to commit himself on 'Hansard' to precisely what he is going to do with the money.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Up to June 30, 1902, the number of cars equipped was 55; to be equipped in 1902-3, estimated, 100; to be equipped for the current year, 1903-4, 40; making the number to be equipped at the end of 1904, 195. The average cost per car is $50.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. $50?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How could you expend $20,000 last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not a statement of the actual expenditure for the year just closed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was $20,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was the appropriation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, and it is marked as the expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. That would be $400 a car. The money must have been used for some other purpose.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It may have been used in the yard at Rivière du Loup.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will have to give the hon. gentleman a statement of the actual expenditure for the year.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. minister ought to look into this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will allow the item to stand if the hon. gentleman wishes it.

Item allowed to stand.

To extend freight car shop at Moncton, $27,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount of this appropriation last year was $25,000, and the expenditure estimated to the end of June, $12,500, showing the revote necessary to be $12,500, and an additional amount of $15,000 is asked for the work. The total estimated cost of the extension is $40,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will that complete the work?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it is intended to complete it.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it a new building that is being put up there?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is an extension of an existing building.

Mr. BARKER. Can the hon. minister tell us the area of the extension?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The extension is to be 345 feet x 78 feet.

Mr. BARKER. In wood?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, a wooden building.

Mr. BARKER. And it costs how much?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $40,000 is the total expenditure estimated.

Mr. BARKER. For the extension of a wooden shop? It is a pretty good price.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) did not get it for an extension at all last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The item read: 'To extend freight car repair shop at Moncton.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The ex-minister said last year:

We propose to put up an entirely new building, 150 feet x 50 feet and about 50 feet high.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is referring to another item?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said that this was to provide an addition to the workshop at Moncton. Here are his words :

We propose to put up an entirely new building 150 feet x 50 feet and about 50 feet high.

It may refer to another item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The item was $25,000 in last year's estimates and it read :

To extend freight car repair shop at Moncton.

Mr. SPROULE. It was the same last year.

To extend freight car repair shop at Moncton.

This is an extension of the car shops at Moncton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a one storey building ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is practically a one storey building ?

Mr. SPROULE. And a wooden building ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. And it is to cost how much ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $40,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of a finish will there be ? Will it be dressed lumber and finished with California siding ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a plain wooden building.

Mr. SPROULE. There would be a material difference in the price if it were a plain wooden building in the rough as compared with a building constructed of dressed lumber which would make it more suitable for cold weather.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This includes the heating, I am told. It is under contract so that it is fair to assume that the estimate is reasonable.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended on the building last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is estimated that for the year just closed there was spent $12,500. This is not the actual sum but it is the estimate made some little time ago.

Mr. BLAIN. That was the expenditure last year and the hon. minister is asking for $15,000 this year to expend upon this building.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $25,000 was voted last year.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the hon. minister asking for now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. $27,500—$12,500 of a revote and $15,000 additional.

Mr. BLAIN. To further extend the building ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. To cover the cost of the same building that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals referred to last year.

Mr. BLAIN. How are these estimates made up ? Is there any plan prepared in the department upon which the minister asks for an appropriation ? I suppose that before he asks for an appropriation an officer from the department goes to the place, looks over the ground and estimates as to how much the work will cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the engineer makes a plan and estimate.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it possible that the officers of the department are so wide of the mark in their estimates as they appear to have been in this case ? I am quite sure the hon. minister does not endorse that sort of thing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would certainly like to see estimates made more closely.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. minister not think that it is misleading ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it needs an explanation.

Engine house, machine shop, car shop, stores, office at Rivière du Loop, $50,000.

Mr. BARKER. This is a revote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is entirely a revote.

Mr. BARKER. Perhaps this may be considered unnecessary after a little inquiry. Do you really want such an expenditure at Rivière du Loup ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This money was not expended because the work was not needed but there was some difficulty in getting a site and therefore the work has not gone forward. There is no question that the work is needed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not find the engineer's estimate for this work, but tenders are being invited now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. After the experience we have had in the past I am afraid we must insist upon the details of the expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very good; let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Engine house, &c., at Chaudière Junction, $50,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to provide for a stationary boiler plant, 80,000 gallon tank, water service and heating, sidings in new yard, grading, ballasting, &c., for same, engineering, inspection, &c. The stationary boiler plant tank and water service and heating are required in connection with the round house at this point. The yard room at Chaudière Junction is not sufficient for the business and it is proposed to provide additional siding accommodation. The estimated cost of the work was $113,000. We took an appropriation last year of $63,000 and we now add $50,000 to it, making $113,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That covers the whole ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. How many stalls will there be ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not that information. I think the questions are very fair and reasonable, and I do not want to press the item if hon. gentlemen wish it to stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Increased accommodation at St. John, $106,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The estimated cost of the new round house is $38,000 ; the balance on the machine shop, $25,000 ; coal shed, $10,000 ; engineers and so forth, $3,000 ; making $76,000, in addition to $30,500 which is revoted from last year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You spent $60,000 last year and you are asking for $106,000 this year. What is the total amount required ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total expenditure on work under this head up to the end of 1902, is $2,366,536, and since then we have expended last year $60,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. One would think you would have accommodation enough at St. John for over $2,000,000. Is there any portion of this expended outside of St. John where you intend to build these shunting yards ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was paid for the land ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the expenditure of last year included any land. Of course land was purchased before and I will get the information later.

Mr. BARKER. Has the new engine house been completed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is contracted for and some work done.

Mr. BARKER. How many stalls are there ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say.

Mr. BARKER. How much has been expended on the new yard at St. John, and how much on bridging the creek and laying the tracks on the new sidings ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not got these figures but we will get them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We must get that information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Increased accommodation at Halifax, $104,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a revote for a round-house, re-arrangement of yard, and additional sidings. It has been delayed owing to the difficulty of getting a suitable location. The memo. here says that the railway is much cramped for room and although the matter has been given a great deal of attention, it is impossible to come to a decision as to what shall be done. The available land is very limited and some land may have to be acquired and a considerable amount of rock has to be blasted. There has been difficulty in obtaining the land and we do not wish to indicate the precise place because that would probably not lead to a decrease in the price.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It would be an interesting comparison to know what has been spent for terminal facilities at Halifax and St. John.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The total cost to January, 1903, which is the latest date I have, for improvements under this head at Halifax was $2,521,193.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are running St. John pretty close.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These comparisons between St. John and Halifax are very invidious, and I hope my hon. friend will not press them. I do not see any one here representing Halifax to-night.

Mr. SPROULE. Better hold the vote until the member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) comes in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You had better pass it or he will want more when he is here.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much do you intend to spend on the round-house and how much on the land ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will get the information later.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Let it stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Increased accommodation at Pictou, $36,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a revote of $16,500. There is a dispute here about the value of land.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How did you expend $50,000 last year if you did not buy the land ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When these estimates were made up it was explained that this expenditure would be made, but the land has not been bought and the expenditure did not amount to that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps we had better adjourn. The minister has not the information regarding these items. It is now twelve o'clock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have the information, but some of the questions asked are a little unusual. However, I am not complaining ; they are perfectly fair.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Nonsense ! It is stated in the estimates that $56,000 was expended last year and now we find out there was no money expended at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only difference is that at the time that estimate was prepared it was expected that that expenditure would be made. The actual expenditure last year was not so large as that, and we will have to ask for a supplementary vote. There has been some expenditure besides the purchase of land, and when the further estimates come down we will bring the information with regard to that.

Mr. SHERRITT. I would like to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Railways to a state of affairs that exists in Toronto and west of Toronto, in connection with the shipping of stock over the Grand Trunk Railway. There seems to be some difficulty between the Union stock-yards at Toronto Junction and the old stock-yards, and I have been credibly informed that the Grand Trunk Company are discriminating against the new stock-yards to the amount of $7 or $8 a car. Not only that, but at Stratford they selected the cars with stock for the West Toronto yards and left them standing on a switch at Stratford for about eight hours. The minister will pardon me bringing the matter up at this time, but I thought the attention of the government should be drawn to it, so that if anything can be done by the acting minister to remedy this state of affairs, the sooner it is done the better. It is a matter of great importance to the stock shippers that they should be able to send their cattle to these new stock-yards, and it is a very serious matter to have the stock left eight hours in the cars on a siding.

Mr. SPROULE. I might say that this matter was brought to my attention, and the shippers consider it extremely urgent. It seems that the Grand Trunk Company sent out one circular to their agents instructing them not to receive cattle shipped to these yards. That was brought to the attention of the Minister of Railways, who, I believe, from what I have seen in the papers, obliged the company to countermand that order. The company have since issued another circular. The stock-yards at Toronto and those at Toronto Junction are about five miles apart, and the Grand Trunk Company charges from $8 to $10 a car more for shipping the cattle from the west to the Union stock yard at Toronto Junction though it is the shorter distance, and these are left to stand on the track, not eight hours, but twenty-eight or thirty hours, before they are unloaded. Now, the law provides that cattle must not be left in a car more than twenty-eight hours, but that they must be unloaded and fed, and the company have been openly violating the law in this respect. Then they instructed their agents not to allow stock to be shipped to those yards at all. They have made no provision for unloading the stock, and have no sidings at the yards although the owners offered to put them in at their own expense. It seems to me that the company are in every way violating the law. The stock-men feel so keenly about this matter that they have entered an action for $20,000 damages against the company ; but it would take a long time to fight that out in the courts, and in the meantime they are suffering in their trade from not being allowed to use the stock-yards which are most convenient and suitable for them, owing to the action of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I think the acting Minister of Railways has it in his power, if he chooses to put his foot down firmly, to bring the railway company to time. If he does, I am sure the stock-men will be very grateful to him, as every moment's delay is a serious matter to them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am informed that some representations were made to the department some time ago on this subject, that communication was had with the management of the Grand Trunk, and that there is a letter of explanation in the department from the manager. I have not personally seen it, but I will look into it, and if there is anything that can properly be dealt with by the department, I shall be glad to give it consideration. Of course, it may be necessary that formal application for a hearing may have to be made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, before which these grievances properly come and which has the power to deal with them.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the Minister of Railways compelled the company to withdraw their first circular, and then they devised some other means of trying to hold up the stock-men. While they have obeyed the command of the Minister of Railways,

they have endeavoured to accomplish the object they have in view in a different way.

Some resolutions reported.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—SERVICE MEDALS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden). Before the motion is carried, I would ask the privilege of saying a few words in reference to a question which was brought up this evening in my absence. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) notified me the other day that he would ask some questions with reference to the granting of the King's medal to certain Canadians who served in South Africa, and I had prepared myself on the subject; but, unfortunately, I was absent this evening when the mattter was brought up. I am sure that the hon. member who brought it up would prefer that the answer should appear in the same number of 'Hansard' as the statement he made. I am at the disadvantage of not having heard the hon. gentleman's statement; but I think I know what the purport of it was. I may premise by saying that the matter is purely an imperial one, and is governed entirely by the regulations of the War Office. These regulations were promulgated by an order of the War Office, dated 1st October, 1902, called Army Order No. 232, which was republished in Canada in Militia Orders on the 28th October, 1902, as No. 246. Without going fully into the details of this order, I may say that the same regulations apply to colonial troops as to the troops of the imperial army; there is no distinction whatever. One of the conditions with reference to the grant of the King's medal is that no one who has not earned or is not entitled to the Queen's medal can receive the King's medal. A further provision is that they shall have seen war service in South Africa, covering 18 months prior to the 1st of June, 1902, and the wording is this: 'Eighteen months war service in South Africa.' Upon this point the whole difficulty has arisen. Certain Canadians have contended that the time of the voyage from Canada, after enlistment and prior to landing in South Africa, ought to be counted. As I have said, the same rule obtains with reference to Canadians as to imperial troops, and the authorities of the War Office have construed the order to mean that the service must be eighteen months war service in South Africa. That is sufficient answer of itself, but I have a memo. prepared by my officers, which I would like to place on 'Hansard':

Memorandum respecting the conditions governing the issue of the King's South African medal.

1. It is an error to suppose that individuals who had not served under Her late Majesty can receive both the Queen's and the King's medals.

It requires eighteen months service to qualify for the King's medal, and as only sixteen and a-half months elapsed between the death of the Queen (14th January, 1901) and the termination of the war (31st May, 1902), it is manifestly impossible for any individual to qualify for the medal if he did not put in part of his service under the Queen.

2. The King's medal was bestowned for two objects, viz.:—'In recognition of the services rendered by the troops in the later phases of the campaign in South Africa, and to reward those soldiers who, by their long service in the field have brought the war to a successful termination.'

To qualify for the medal the following service is necessary, viz.:—

(a.) To have been actually serving in South Africa on or after the 1st January, 1902, and (b.) that on that date to have completed eighteen months war service, or subsequently completed such service before the 1st June, 1902.

No individual can receive the King's medal without being also entitled to the Queen's. If the whole of his service was under the King, he would be entitled to the Queen's medal not the King's.

Now, I come to the important point. The contention of certain officers and soldiers of the Canadian contingent that they should receive the medal, was sent to the War Office by the government, and an adverse opinion was given. Not being content with that, certain officers petitioned to have the matter referred directly to the Commander in Chief himself. This was done by the government, but, still the same adverse opinion was given. It has been contended that the time occupied going to and returning from South Africa should be reckoned to qualify for the King's medal. The question was submitted to the War Office by the Militia Department and the reply was unfavourable to this contention. An appeal to the Commander in Chief, asking for special consideration, was made. The Commander in Chief's reply, received on the 20th of May last, was that, 'the order should not be relaxed in favour of the above mentioned corps,' i. e. the Canadian corps.

Mr. SPROULE. The contention of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) was that, owing to the increased distance which the colonial troops from Canada had to travel in order to reach South Africa, as compared with the other troops, it was impossible for them to put in the time in South Africa that was required, and that if the attention of the Imperial War Office had been drawn to this fact, the regulations might have been amended.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not think it would be correct to say that all the troops from Canada were excluded on account of the distance to South Africa. The first, and I think, the second contingents were there in

time—certainly the first.—But in any case, the same rule applies to imperial troops.

Mr. SPROULE. They could get there quicker.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Very little. I may add that all the conditions in relation to this matter and all the arguments placed in my hands by the officers, notably, Colonel Evans, were made known to the Commander in Chief and the war office, and I have given their decision.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As Monday will be Private Bills day, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill will take up a good deal of the time, and we shall then probably go into the estimates.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, August 10, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MOUNTED POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 242) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894. He said: At present the North-west Mounted Police Act contains a disposition to the effect that the force shall not be charged with any duty under or in connection with any municipal Bill. There is no objection to that disposition as concerns the North-west Territories, because there the municipal authorities enforce their own by-laws. But in the Yukon Territory the mounted police enforce all laws and ordinances, including the by-laws of Dawson, and doubt has been raised as to their legal authority to do so. The amendment is merely to authorize them to enforce the municipal by-laws.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a first time.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. McCarthy for the third reading of Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and the amendment of Mr. Fowler thereto.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). When the hour for Private Bills expired on Wednesday last, I was pointing out the advisability of extending the proposed branch line of the Grand Trunk Pacific to St. John by way of the St. John river valley rather than by the proposed route by Chipman. The advantages which I stated existed in favour of the former route were that it would be much shorter than the proposed route by way of Chipman, very much shorter to the nearest Atlantic port, and at the same time the grades would be very much easier than could possibly be obtained for the route by way of Chipman. I pointed out that the Chipman route would carry the road to the interior part of the province of New Brunswick, that part which forms the watershed of the rivers Tobique and Miramichi, and that that part of the country is very rugged and mountainous, and abounds in lakes, which would necessitate very wide detours, thereby largely increasing the mileage. It is beyond question the fact that the road, if carried by way of Chipman, would be at least 50 or 60 miles longer than by the St. John river valley route. Going from Edmundston the road would be shortened by not following the western sweep of the St. John river from that point to Fredericton, but striking off and making a straight line direct from Edmundston to Fredericton, and then following the valley of the river down to the city of St. John. This would give not only a much shorter line than the proposed line, but very much easier grades, which is the most important consideration perhaps in selecting a line for the transcontinental railway. The grades upon the other route proposed would be very difficult indeed, and much greater than they are at the present time upon the line of the Intercolonial. I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, it is necessary for me to dwell any longer on these points at this stage. If we may judge from appearances, it is evidently the intention of the government to force this route by the way of Chipman. It is said to be by way of Chipman, but, as a matter of fact, following the route outlined by the Prime Minister, the main line will run some 30 miles from Chipman, which, of course, will place St. John at a still greater disadvantage than if the route went direct to Chipman. But the interests of St. John do not appear to be much considered by this government, nor do I think the interests of the country generally appear to be very much considered, because in considering the interests of St. John the government would be at the same time considering the best interests of the country with respect to this transcontinental railway. I therefore move this amendment:

That the said Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that a branch line be built from the proposed main trunk line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, beginning at a point at or near where said trunk line crosses the Nashwaak river, and thence extending, by way of Fredericton and the valley of the St. John river, to St. John city.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Lest there might be some request for an explanation. I simply desire to say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) moved the same

motion in Committee of the Whole House. It was debated for at least two hours, and at the conclusion of the debate it was voted down. I have not heard anything fall from the lips of the hon. gentleman in addition to what was said during the discussion in the committee, and, therefore, I do not think it is necessary that this should be discussed at this stage.

Mr. HEYD. Could the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) say what is the the mileage from Edmundston to St. John by his route ?

Mr. FOWLER. The mileage would be about 200 miles from Edmundston to St. John, whereas, by the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway it is 233 miles. This route would be shorter by at least 33 miles, as compared with the Canadian Pacific Railway, because, instead of following the bends of the river, we would strike across country direct to St. John.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). What would be the difference between the direct line I suggested the other evening from Rivière du Loup to Newcastle, and thence to Moncton and the road that the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) now advises by way of St. John ?

Mr. FOWLER. I have not measured the distance which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) suggests from Rivière du Loup, and I could not say what the difference would be.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that Moncton is the dividing point between Halifax and St. John, that when the road reaches Moncton they then have the option of proceeding to Halifax or to St. John. To divert this road so as to parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway I think would be very absurd indeed. It would make a detour in the line of the road that would certainly not be advisable in the interest of St. John. I only want to have my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) understand that an arrangement was made that Moncton was to be the point, and that any divergence from that would be an error on the part of any one advocating the route which he suggests.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) asked a question. I wish to state that in so far as any arrangement he speaks of is concerned in regard to Moncton being agreed upon, I had no part in any such agreement, nor was I invited to any conference that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) may have taken part in, nor was any Conservative member from the province of New Brunswick invited to such conference. I am not at all proposing to parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway as the hon. member from Lunenburg says, but I propose this route as an amendment to a very much worse scheme proposed by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). In the amendment of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) he proposes :

That a branch line be built from the proposed main trunk line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, beginning at a point at or near where said trunk line crosses the Nashwaak river, and thence extending by way of Fredericton and the valley of the St. John river, to St. John city.

Will he tell us what is the estimated distance between the point at which he would branch off the main line and the city of St. John ?

Mr. FOWLER. It is about 75 miles according to what the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) says. I have made the amendment read from the Nashwaak river or from the point near which the main line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway crosses the Nashwaak river.

Mr. LOGAN. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that one of the objections that has been raised against the construction of this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway through New Brunswick is that it will parallel the Intercolonial Railway. According to the proposition as contained in the Bill, the line will be built to Chipman, thence to connect with another line which will give it communication with Norton, thus giving the run from there to St. John to the government railway. Now, the hon. gentleman is certainly not very consistent when he desires to cut out this traffic from the Intercolonial Railway. At the present time we are proposing to give the traffic to St. John to the Intercolonial Railway, but according to the amendment of the hon. gentleman we will take that away from the Intercolonial Railway and we will parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway down the west side of the St. John river.

Mr. FOWLER. For only a matter of 30 miles.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Chairman, I gave notice of an amendment that I wish to have made to this Bill, which will be found at page 769 of the Votes and Proceedings. I explained the amendment at the time I gave notice of it, and I think it is an amendment that will commend itself to the favourable consideration of the government. It is an amendment to this effect :

That the said Bill be recommitted to add the following after section 12, as amended in Committee of the Whole : 'The branch line from the main line of the Quebec section to Montreal shall be begun as soon as the company have entered upon the operation of said line, and shall

be completed to Montreal as soon as the main line is completed on the said Quebec section.

The object is to secure communication with the city of Montreal while the main line is being built and to make that construction obligatory upon the company, and not leave it optional as in section 12 as adopted in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McCARTHY. This section was considered in Committee of the Whole and disposed of by the committee not adopting the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk), but I would like to point out what seems to be an inconsistency in the matter, namely, that this branch line has to be begun and completed simultaneously with the Quebec line which is not to be operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company until it is completed, so that you could not have the Montreal branch line begun at the time the company commenced the operation of the Quebec line, because it would be already completed. I do not think the hon. gentleman's motion is consistent. I would submit to the House, with all respect to the hon. gentleman, that it is not right to pick out one of these branch lines and make a motion of this kind when we have a number of similar branch lines provided for in the Bill. It is to be presumed that the powers of the company will be exercised consistently with the operation of the road on business principles under a business management, and I have not heard of a similar clause being inserted in the charter of any company which has hitherto asked for incorporation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). Mr. Speaker, as a representative of Montreal, I have no hesitation in saying that I propose to take a firm stand upon this question, and a stand against the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). As has been stated by the hon. gentleman who promotes the Bill (Mr. McCarthy), it is not right for us in the district of Montreal to insist upon some things, which, if they were granted, would certainly have the effect of inducing other districts to ask for the same things. You would have probably ten or twelve amendments of a similar nature with reference to branch lines to various points, and if adopted then, might have the effect of rendering the whole scheme impracticable. The business men of Montreal do not at all fear that this railway will not connect with their city. I have had communication with these gentlemen recently, and those whom I have met consider the Bill to be perfectly satisfactory. In view of the facts as they exist, there is no danger at all that Montreal will be neglected. You have the Montreal and Western Railway, for instance, which is built as far as Labelle at the present time, and which will be completed for 24 miles further on the 1st of October. Subsidies have been asked for another 35 miles so as to carry that railway as far as La Lievre. It is rather uncertain, of course, at what point the Montreal and Western can reach the new line, but from all the information I can gather and from the knowledge of the country which I have, there would not be more than 50 miles to build from La Lievre to connect with the government line operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, as proposed. There will of course be no danger whatever that Montreal will not have connection with the new railway. But even suppose that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not feel it in their interest to extend their railway so as to tap the new line, there is no doubt whatever that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would see its way perfectly clear, in its own interest, to connect with Montreal, and perhaps by a better route than that now existing via the Montreal and Western. Therefore, the Montreal district will have the benefit it is entitled to from this vast territory which is being opened up. As a representative of the city of Montreal, I have no hesitation in taking this stand on this question, and I am sure in advance that the business men of Montreal will support my view.

Amendment (Mr. Monk) negatived on division.

Mr. E. HACKETT (West Prince, P.E.I.) I beg to move the following amendment, of which I have given notice:—

That Bill No. 64 to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by inserting the following :—' The company may acquire and operate the railway from Sackville, on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, to Cape Tormentine, in New Brunswick ; and in the event of acquiring said railway, shall construct a pier at Carlton Point, in Prince Edward Island, place suitable steamships on the route, and maintain efficient communication, summer and winter, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.'

I move this amendment for the purpose of endeavouring to obtain a measure of justice for the people of Prince Edward Island, who have laboured so long and so patiently and so uncomplainingly under the difficulties they have suffered for the last thirty years. Thirty years ago Prince Edward Island entered the union and it was guaranteed by the government of Canada that there would be established and maintained efficient steam communication for the conveyance of mails and passengers, summer and winter, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Little or nothing has been done by the government of Canada in that regard, and I believe that the present is a very opportune time for a movement to be made towards a partial fulfilment at least of the terms of union. I think it opportune,

Sir, because we find that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are obtaining a charter for the purpose of operating a railway from Winnipeg to Moncton, a distance of 1,800 miles, which will cost the people of Canada some $75,000,000 or $100,000,000. And while the people of Prince Edward Island will be called upon to contribute their share of that large expenditure, it is only right that they should in some way participate in the benefits accruing from that expenditure of money. There is no proposition now before parliament to meet any of the claims of Prince Edward Island. In that province we are unable to develop its resources because of the non-fulfilment of the terms of union. We have resources which may be developed to a very large extent; and while everything appears to be going to the west, while this expenditure of money is for the alleged purpose of developing the west and carrying the products of the west to the markets of the world, nothing is being done to assist the people of Prince Edward Island to carry their products to these markets in the winter season when they are shut off from communication with the rest of the world. I therefore claim that while the government of Canada is about to expend this vast sum of money for the purpose of affording transportation facilities to the people of western Canada, the least that can be expected is that the government will connect the province of Prince Edward Island with this system of railways which they are now about inaugurating. While I had the honour of bringing this motion before parliamen the other evening, I was told by the Minister of Finance that this was a charter for a private company, and that the government were not interested. I say that the government are interested. They are building this railway from Winnipeg to Moncton, and when the railway is built the trains are to be operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The trains running over that system will pass Sackville, some 38 miles east of Moncton, on the way to Halifax. It is not intended that these trains should stop at Moncton; it is not a seaport, it is not an outlet for the products of the country, and so the trains will have to pass Sackville, summer and winter, on their way to Halifax. Now, Sackville is within 40 miles of Cape Tormentine, and from Cape Tormentine to Prince Edward Island it is eight or nine miles, so that in passing Sackville the trains of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be passing within some 50 miles of the shores of Prince Edward Island. All that the people of that province ask for, and all that is required, is the construction of a pier at Carlton Point on the Prince Edward Island side. There is now a good pier at Cape Tormentine and a harbour sufficient to accommodate shipping, summer and winter. All that is necessary, therefore, is to construct this pier at Carlton Point, place suitable steamships on the route, and bring Prince Edward Island in direct communication with the railway system of Canada. This is quite a simple matter. When there are millions of money to be expended in other parts of the country, we should certainly have a small expenditure to afford to the people of Prince Edward Island that accommodation which they so much require. The government of Canada entered into a solemn compact with us to maintain this connection. They have not fulfilled those conditions, but to-day they are conferring a vast franchise and great privileges on a railway corporation, and expending a large amount of money in the interest of that corporation, so that it may become a question in the future as to whether the government of Canada, elected by the people of Canada, shall govern this country, or whether the country shall be governed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I think it is an act of prudence on the part of a representative of Prince Edward Island to see that this company, as well as the government, are bound. in order that we may have one or the other to fall back upon. A petition containing thousands of names, was sent from Prince Edward Island to the government of Canada, asking for the construction of this pier at Carlton Point, but no attention has been paid to it. I asked the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago if he intended to construct another steamship to maintain that communication which was guaranteed to us at the time of the union, and his answer was no, that they were not going to do anything of that kind. Therefore, I regard the present as the opportune moment to bind this company to do something to connect the province of Prince Edward Island with this great railway system, which is supposed to bind together the whole of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and to allow the people of the province to benefit to some extent from this large expenditure of public money. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment which I have moved will be accepted by the promoter of this Bill and by this hon. House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from West Prince has quoted me as having said that the government had nothing to do with this matter. I am sure he did not intend to convey an erroneous impression, but he did so. What I said on a previous occasion was that there was no provision in this Bill for the expenditure of a penny of public money, and therefore that we were not in a position to discuss in connection with it the question of government aid. It is not a government railway Bill; it is a private charter. My hon. friend desires that there shall be a railway built to connect Sackville with Cape Tormentine, and that this company shall

establish a line of steamers to cross to Prince Edward Island and shall build some extensive piers ; and he says this is what the people of Prince Edward Island want. Within the last two weeks the people of Prince Edward Island sent a deputation to Ottawa to say that they wanted nothing of the kind. The deputation came before the committee, and all they asked was to be let alone, and to have the question of communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland left between Prince Edward Island and the government, and they protested against any private corporation coming between the two. My hon. friend is mistaken, what the people of Prince Edward Island asked and what he asked was, let us alone.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P. E. I.) Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to support anything brought forward by the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) that would be for the real benefit of Prince Edward Island. There are many things that that province requires as well as the other provinces of Canada ; but to establish a ferry between the capes is, in the opinion of a great many people of Prince Edward Island, myself among the number, entirely impracticable ; and therefore I should have to vote against this amendment if it were put to a vote. Generally speaking, the hon. gentleman advocates what is reasonable and fair for the province he represents, and if I thought he were doing so now, I would heartily support him ; but the amendment he now proposes I must vote against.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will you kindly allow me an explanation in reply to the hon. Minister of Finance and to the last hon. gentleman who spoke. With regard to the delegation which came from Prince Edward Island, I supported it against granting to a private company a monopoly of the waters between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse, and we had the Bill amended to meet the views of the people of Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no proposition for a monopoly.

Amendment of Mr. Hackett negatived, on division.

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

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS TO MONTREAL 'HERALD' PRINTING COMPANY.

Mr. ROSAMOND asked :

1. Is it true that the Montreal 'Herald' Printing Company has received $113,000 from the government since 1896 ?

2. Is it true that the Montreal 'Herald' is being offered to subscribers through Canada for a sum barely sufficient to pay postage ?

3. If so, is there any connection between these two facts ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The sums paid to the Montreal 'Herald' Printing Company for advertising, printing, and lithographing since the beginning of the year 1895-96 have been as follows :

	Advertising.	Printing and Lithographing.
1895-96	$ 6 25	
1896-97	994 88	$ 604 79
1897-98	1,946 37	2,349 70
1898-99	2,800 58	12,208 42
1899-1900	2,766 90	22,358 61
1900-01	2,697 53	49,068 79
1901-02	2,490 57	13,341 39
	$13,703 08	$99,931 70
Total		$113,634 78

2. and 3. We have no information.

THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. BARKER—by Mr. Clarke)—asked :

1. When did Sir William Van Horne decline to act on the transportation commission appointed by the Governor in Council on May 19, 1903 ?

2. Had Sir William Van Horne been informed, previous to the time when he declined to act on such commission, that the government intended to enter into the arrangements set forth in the Bill intituled : 'An Act respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway,' and in the schedule attached to said Bill, or into any arangements for such or similar purposes ; and did he, after receiving such information, decline to act upon the commission ?

3. Did the government ascertain Sir William Van Horne's views with regard to the government's proposed or contemplated arrangements; and did the government thereupon intimate to him that it was desirable that he should not act upon the said commission ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. The last letter received from Sir William Van Horne on this subject, wherein he declined to act on the Transportation Commission, is dated, Montreal, the 20th of July last.

2. No.

3. No.

LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette)—by Mr. Ingram —asked :

1. Has the government granted a grazing lease of any lands in the North-west Territories to Mr. George McDonnell or his wife ?

2. If so, how much, on what terms, and what is the length of the lease ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton):

1. No.

NOVA SCOTIA ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. BELL—by Mr. Maclean—asked :

1. Have the electoral lists for the province of Nova Scotia been printed by the Printing Bureau since they were revised in the current year ?

2. If not printed, have the changes necessary to correct these lists to date been set up in type ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. No, with the exception of Guysborough.

2. The changes necessary to correct the lists have been made in a majority of the Nova Scotia lists, but they have not been printed off yet.

DR. MOREAU.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. By whom was Hypolite Moreau, junior, of St. John d'Iberville, recommended as collector of the Chambly canal at St. John d'Iberville, and what is his salary ?

2. Is this Hypolite Moreau, the medical officer of the port of St. John ?

3. How much has the said Dr. Moreau received for his services as medical officer of the port of St. John for the year ending the 30th day of June last ?

4. Has Hypolite Moreau, junior, given security to the government, and of what nature ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine) :

2. Dr. H. Moreau is employed by the collector of customs when the services of a doctor is required for sick seamen at St. John d'Iberville.

3. Dr. Moreau during the year ending 30th June, 1903, treated 125 sick seamen and was paid $412.50 for his services.

Questions one and four are not in my department and will have to stand.

SUSSEX ARMOURY.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. What was the contract price for the erection of the armoury at Sussex ?

2. Who was the clerk of works and overseer of the construction of said armoury ?

3. What special qualification had said overseer for the position to which he was appointed?

4. Was he a practical carpenter or mason ; or if a mechanic at all, to what trade or calling does he belong ?

5. At what rate per day were his services rewarded ?

6. When did his services as overseer begin, and when did they end ?

7. When was work commenced on the erection of the armoury by the contractors for the building, and when was the contract completed ?

8. Was the overseer retained by the government after the completion of the building ; and if so, for what purpose ?

9. If employed, what salary did he receive for his services, and how long did his employment last ?

10. How much has been paid altogether to said clerk of works or overseer, as such overseer from the time of his first employment to date ?

11. Has any claim been made by the contractors for extras ; and if so, with what result ?

12. Was the heating contract let by tender, or how ?

13. If tenders were asked for, who were the tenderers, and what were the several amounts of their respective tenders ?

14. Has there been any difficulty experienced with the heating apparatus in the armoury since its installation ; and if so, what and how caused, and what person, if any, was at fault ?

15. If there has been such difficulty, what has been the financial loss occasioned thereby, and who has paid for same ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). On behalf of my colleague, the Minister of Militia and Defence, I beg to reply :

1. $4,537.97.

2. J. R. McLean.

3. He was reported to have had considerable experience in work of the kind, and had been appointed by citizens of Sussex to oversee construction of large public school building there.

4. Have no knowledge as to his trade.

5. $3 per day.

6. Appointed in July, 1901—ended April, 1903.

7. In July, 1901. Final estimate passed in April, 1902.

8. Yes, to oversee the construction of the heating apparatus, waterworks, to supply military camp and military buildings, plumbing, &c., &c.

9. $3 per day, from April, 1902, to April, 1903.

10. $1,920. Note.—This amount covers the cost of superintendence of the construction of the armoury as well as that of the construction of the heating apparatus, waterworks, plumbing, fittings, &c., which works amount to $10,288.71.

11. Yes, but nothing has, so far, been allowed.

12. Yes, by tender.

13. H. H. Dryden, $992 ; Pierre Leclerc & fils, $1,221 ; S. S. White, $1,269 ; P. Campbell, $1,320 ; Wallace Bros., $1,400. Lowest tender accepted.

14. No difficulty experienced with heating apparatus. One of the windows was accidently blown in, during a severe storm and the apparatus frozen. It is supposed that the party that delivered the coal on the day preceding the night of the accident, had not properly fastened the window.

15. It cost this department $409.40 to put apparatus in working order, including additional plumber's work.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to enact as follows :—

Advances may be made time to time, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, to the Minister of Railways and Canals, to enable him to purchase necessary materials and stores for the construction, renewal, maintenance, and operation of the Canadian government railways, and for the establishment and conduct of railway stores ; provided that the sums so advanced shall not exceed annually, for the Intercolonial Railway the sum of one million five hundred thousand dollars, and for the Prince Edward Island Railway the sum of one hundred thousand dollars.

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

Motion agreed to.

MORNING SITTINGS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That, commencing with Wednesday next, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet on that day, and on each subsequent sitting day, at eleven (11) o'clock in the morning. That in addition to the usual intermission at six (6) o'clock p.m., there shall be also an intermission every day from one (1) to three (3) o'clock p.m.; and that government orders shall have precedence at all such sittings, members having still the right to ask questions on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman what steps will be taken to secure the meetings of the standing committees, which still have work to do—the Committee on Public Accounts and the Railway Committee ? We are very anxious to hasten the business of the session, and perhaps the right hon. gentleman will indicate to us the general course of business to be pursued under this motion. Will we go on with the Grand Trunk Pacific contract until that matter is disposed of and then take up the Redistribution Bill ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The course of business will not be at all affected by the House meeting in the morning, but I am happy to inform my hon. friend that when we take up the government policy to-morrow we propose to go on with its discussion until that important subject is exhausted. After that I am not prepared to say what course will be adopted to dispose of the final business to be brought up by the government. As regards the committees, there is only the Railway Committee which has any important business. I did not know that it was intended to have the Public Accounts Committee sit again. It has had every opportunity to sit during the past four months. But there is one important matter before the Railway Committee which will have to be disposed of, and the only thing that can be done is to give it power to meet during the sittings of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. Are we to understand that no further provision is to be made for sittings of the Public Accounts Committee ? That committee has been waiting some weeks for the appearance of a witness, and I hope the right hon. gentleman will see the necessity of endeavouring to give that committee an opportunity to close its business.

The PRIME MINISTER. If a witness has been summoned and is going to appear, some provision will have to be made to meet a contingency of that sort.

Mr. MONK. There is one matter under investigation before the Public Accounts Committee which has not been closed. And it will be absolutely necessary for that committee to meet at least two or three times. Perhaps there may be other matters under investigation ; but the investigation of this subject has certainly not terminated, so that we must have sittings of that committee.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 21) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I desire to move that this Bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it by adding the following as subsection 4 of section 263 :

The maximum passenger tariff shall not exceed two cents a mile.

In this Bill there is a provision dealing with the maximum passenger tariff, but I propose that the Bill be made still more definitive in this respect so as to fix that tariff at two cents per mile. In Canada, in the older provinces, we have had railways for the last fifty years, and the passenger rate has been the same from the day railways were established until to-day. No effort has been made to reduce the passenger rates, although as I pointed out to the House before, all other forms of railway charges have been reduced time after time. Freight rates have been cut in two several times. And it has always been found that the effect of reducing the freight rates is to increase the business of the railway. Substantially my argument is that what applies to freight charges would apply also to the passenger charges, and if the passenger charges were reduced the railway would benefit and the public also would be advantaged. I have been in receipt of a great many letters on this subject; it is surprising the expression of public opinion which this proposal has evoked. As a matter of fact, many of the railways of Canada are charging people four cents a mile. I do not speak of the

new portions of the country; but there are old settled parts of Quebec in which a common charge for railway passenger travel is four cents a mile. I wish to give a few instances of such charges before I sit down. Here is a letter from Guelph :—

Re Railway Fares.

The rate should be reduced to a common level for every one. As it is now it is three cents per mile, but about two and a half cents if a return ticket is bought. Why should this be ? Why not have a level rate the same as New York Central Railway, or same price either for single or return ? They have also 1,000 mile tickets and commercial tickets. The plan has worked well on the New York Central Railway and should be tried here. The public are imposed upon by having so many special rates. Would it not be well to have a flat lowest rate adopted for all, even if you cannot get two cents, a two and a quarter or two and a half flat rate would be better than it is now.

Now, here is a letter from Ottawa :—

Mr. HEYD. We can take these for granted.

Mr. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) evidently does not want to hear the facts.

Mr. HEYD. We can take such letters for granted; no doubt you got many of them.

Mr. MACLEAN. This letter is dated Ottawa, July 10th :—

I read with a good deal of satisfaction your efforts at securing a maximum rate of two cents for the public on our railways and I would call your attention to the fact that your statement that the Grand Trunk now charging us three cents a mile is not a statement broad enough to cover the facts. Between Montreal and Toronto, or Montreal and St. Johns, P.Q., and many other points the rate is three and a quarter cents. For a fraction of a mile between each station they add a full mile, and besides they are privileged to take from one cent to four cents on every ticket they sell. So, if the distance is 11 1-100 miles, they charge for twelve miles, thirty-six cents and add four cents to make forty cents, making a clear gain over their honest due of seven cents. When their trains cross the river at Detroit, and they take a passenger for one mile they are obliged to give three cents change out of a five cent piece. God speed your efforts for equity to the public. Whom shall we look to if not our representatives to compel these public franchise holders to deal with us on honest business principles ?

I was much interested in reading the report of the debate upon your motion calling for a two cent rate on Canadian railways. I think the arguments adduced by you in favour of lower passenger rates are powerful ones, and I hope your ideas may in the end prevail. To me it seems strange that the people of Canada, who have given very large subsidies to railway promoters, should in the end find themselves obliged to pay a higher rate for the privilege of riding upon the Grand Trunk in Canada than upon the same line in Michigan.

Let me suggest to you that if you fail in your efforts to get passed a law calling for a two cent rate, you should then bring in a resolution saying that no railway shall charge more than three cents a mile. Some may exclaim at once that there is no need for such a law, since none of the railways charge a higher rate in the older provinces, at least. Such is not the case however. According to the Canadian Pacific Railway time table it is fifty-two miles from Ottawa to Prescott, and a ticket from here to Prescott costs $2.10 which is over four cents a mile.

So that from the very capital of this country to the St. Lawrence river the charge is four cents a mile and that charge has evidently been approved by the government and by the Minister of Railways and Canals :—

I have travelled considerably on the Grand Trunk and its branch lines and never paid more than three cents a mile ; but the Canadian Pacific Railway, that railway which, having received enormous subsidies from the people of Canada should show its gratitude by giving moderate rates holds me up for four cents a mile every time I use its Ottawa and Prescott line. And every time this occurs, I wonder what our representatives in the House of Commons are doing that they allow such extortion in a line running into the capital of this country. It is only charitable to suppose they are not aware of this. As a Liberal in politics I write to thank you for your effort on behalf of those whose desire to travel is greater than their purse; on behalf of those, who, paying their way wherever they go, do not object to reasonable rates, but do object to the extortionate rates that the Canadian Pacific Railway is at present imposing on some of its branch lines. I wish you success and thank you for your interest on behalf of the travelling public.

I have here a letter from Cobourg, one of the oldest towns in Ontario :—

The distance from Cobourg to Toronto per Grand Trunk Railway is 59·60 miles, and the fare is $2.35, or at the rate of 3·38 cents per mile. There is no reason for any such charge. The people of Cobourg are pleased with the stand you have taken.

Here is another letter from Oshawa, from an old Liberal—I believe he is a Liberal, Mr. Thomas Conant :—

I want to spur you on in your efforts for the two cent rate. We can afford to disagree on some other matters, but in this I am with you, and I would urge your continued and persistent efforts. No let up.

And here is a letter from a government official :—

I notice that you have been speaking of passenger mileage rates on railways. Recently I had occasion to-day to buy a ticket on the Gatineau Railway from Ottawa to Gracefield and return. The distance is 59·1 miles each way, 118·2 in all. The return ticket cost, $3.90 being a fraction over three and a-third cents per mile. This is only another sample of what the public have to pay.

These are only a few of the letters that I have received from all over the country. The fact is these railways are charging the people of Ontario from three to four cents per mile, even the older provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and, I believe, also in

some of the lower provinces. And some of the greatest of these railways which have received enormous subsidies of public money and have been given great franchises, are carrying people in the United States for two cents per mile. The Grand Trunk has a large system through the state of Michigan and is carrying people on its lines there for two cents per mile. The Canada Southern, now the Michigan Central, which crosses the western peninsula of Ontario is carrying people through the state of Michigan at the rate of two cents per mile while charging Canadians three cents per mile. The Canadian Pacific and its Wabash connection is doing the very same thing. And the Grand Trunk is also doing it in the state of Michigan. Now, here are four great trunk lines crossing the province of Ontario, all of them having lines in the United States, and they are charging on their Canadian lines three cents a mile, while, on their American lines in the state of New York and the state of Michigan, they are carrying people regularly at two cents per mile. And there is something worse than that. Those American railroads are selling tickets across Canada, making connection at their eastern end and their western end, and they are carrying Americans through Canada for two cents a mile, and the Canadian who sits alongside of them in the car has to pay three cents a mile. Now, that has been going on for years, and apparently there is no cure for it but a parliamentary agitation and the adoption of a maximum passenger rate. I say now that if the Grand Trunk Railway carries people in the state of Michigan for two cents a mile, as they are doing every day on the New York Central or, as it is called, the Michigan Central, in Canada, if it is carrying people for two cents a mile in the States, they ought to be obliged to do the same in Canada. The Grand Trunk are doing it and the Canadian Pacific Railway are doing it. Not only that, but they are doing even worse, they are selling tickets all over the States for people to go to and from New York and Chicago, taking them across Canada, for two cents, and making Canadians who sit alongside of them in the same car pay three cents a mile. Yet these same roads have had subsidies, and are enjoying exemptions in the way of taxation that none of the railroads in the United States have. Every railroad in the United States pays large taxes for every mile of its line, and they pay other taxes through charges that our roads do not have to pay; and yet, with all these subsidies, and with all these exemptions, they discriminate against our own people.

Now, let me point out something else. They have a two-cent rate, as I have said, in the United States in many places, and they have got it in every case by agitation followed by legislation, and in some cases by decisions of the courts, and in other cases by competition. But the great lever that brought down the rates was specific agitation to that end. In the state of Michigan, where they have now a two-cent rate, the railways opposed it, having organized a powerful lobby in the capital of the state; they stated it would injure the roads, but the legislature passed the law, and the railroads are carrying people and making money out of it at two cents a mile. Let me for a moment show you what they are doing in Michigan in this direction. The other day when I was discussing this question, the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) asked me what information I had upon which to base my statements. I made some general statements, which I said I gathered from various authorities on the subject, and he asked me for more information. Well, in order to supply him with that information, I may say that the management of the newspaper with which I am connected sent one of our young men into the United States to make an investigation, and some interesting letters from him have been published recently in that paper. Let me call attention to what he said about the Michigan railways:

> The Grand Trunk's main line through Michigan to Chicago is, in round numbers, 300 miles long. There is not a mile of this road that passengers pay to exceed two cents for travelling over. The moment this line enters Ontario the rate arbitrarily shifts to three cents and the rate is never reduced to two cents throughout the Canadian territory, but when the company passes again into the States to the east, once more the two-cent tariff becomes effective.
>
> The Michigan Central operates a main line in Ontario 229 miles long. Three cents per mile is the regulation local rate; that is, if a farmer desires to travel ten miles or twenty miles or a hundred miles, the rate is on the basis of three cents. The Michigan Central passes into Michigan at Detroit and operates a main line toward Chicago with a mileage of 291 in Michigan. Here the regulation rate is two cents, and the same farmer making the same distance in this state as in Ontario gets the service for one-third less than in the Dominion. When the Michigan Central's train gets through Ontario and crosses into the States again at Niagara Falls, the maximum rate is again applied, and the service is on a two-cent basis.

On the Wabash road it is the same, on the Canadian Pacific Railway it is the same in Michigan, on the Michigan Central it is the same. He also points out how the reduction of rates in Michigan was accomplished; it was only done by agitation in the legislature, and here is an item bearing on that point:

> It has been a recurring subject for legislation and debate. Each political party has made this question the slogan of its campaign. The present chief executive, Governor Bliss, came into power much through his known hostility to corporation domination. For more than fifteen years the main lines of the chief railroads operating in Michigan have been forced to conform to the maximum rate of two cents per mile for regular passenger rates.

Now, here is the Michigan law. Both parties, irrespective of politics, decided that the charges in that state for passenger traffic were too large, and that a reduction ought to be made in the passenger traffic rates, as well as in freight rates. After agitation in the community and in the papers, the legislature passed this law :

For a distance not exceeding five miles, three cents per mile ; for all other distances, for all companies, the gross earnings of whose passenger trains, as reported to the Commissioner of Railroads, for the year 1888, equalled or exceeded the sum of three thousand dollars for each mile of road operated by said company, two cents per mile, and for all companies, the earnings of whose passenger trains reported as aforesaid, were over two thousand dollars and less than three thousand dollars per mile operated by said company, two and one-half cents per mile, and for all companies whose earnings are less than two thousand dollars per mile, three cents per mile.

That law applies to every railroad in the state, with the exception of one or two in the northern portion, where the earnings do not come up to $3,000 per mile per annum.

Mr. HEYD. If that Michigan law was applied to the railways in Canada, how many would come under its operation ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Well, I will tell him of one.

Mr. HEYD. And that is all ?

Mr. MACLEAN. I will give him a case, it shows the great effect of the law of competition to obtain the rights of the people. The Michigan Central, by its returns to parliament here, shows that it earns over $3,000 a mile, and it therefore comes within the Michigan law. If we stated by an Act of parliament here to-day that any railroad earning $3,000 a mile for passenger traffic in a year was to give a two-cent a mile rate, irrespective of the fact whether the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway earned that much, they would all have to come to it. They would each give the two-cent passenger rate. In New York the New York Central was forced to do it over their road. Now, I cannot accept the figures in the parliamentary returns for Canada, and I have not seen the latest ones in those returns. The Canada Southern, according to its mileage and passenger earnings, earns $3,607 a mile in the year ; the Grand Trunk earns $2,073 ; the Canadian Pacific Railway, $1,261. I worked this out from the figures. Of course, the hon. gentleman can argue that because they do not come up to the Michigan earnings they should not be interfered with.

My answer to that is this : It has been proved in the United States that the earning capacity of a road does not go down because the passenger rate goes down, but that on the contrary, the experience in every case is that a reduction of the passenger rates stimulates travel and increases the earnings of the railway company. That is the point I wish to make, and I think if I have established that, the case is proven. If I have to go to a populous state for the proof of it, if I have to go to New York state and quote the results of the operation of the leading railway in the United States it may be said that this is an unfair comparison because New York is a populous state. Certainly, I answer, it is a populous state, but it is also populous in railway mileage, if I may so express it. There are thousands and thousands of miles of railway in the state of New York alone, and there is a great amount of railway competition in that state. But, I have for my contention the authority of the New York Central, of its passenger agent, and of its policy. Its policy above everything else goes to prove that when you reduce the passenger rate you stimulate travel and increase the earnings of the company. Some people will ask : If that is the case why do they not reduce the rate of their motion? I do not know why. Such action on their part is never voluntarily taken. You have always to wake up people to the demands of the public in order to get a reduction in anything. They have always argued that it would be against their interests to reduce the rates, but experience has invariably shown that when you reduce the cost of an article you increase the consumption of it, and everybody gets the benefit of it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Free trade.

Mr. MACLEAN. My respected friend from Victoria, N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) bears me out in that, no matter what we may call it. We have only to go to the Post Office Department for another proof of it. In the Post Office Department every time the rate of postage has been reduced the public have derived the benefit of the service and the post office earnings have increased. Another splendid instance is the case of the telegraph service in Great Britain. There was a time when you only got ten words for a shilling. They cut the rate in two and doubled the wordage ; that is, they made the rate sixpence and gave you twenty words at that rate with the result that it has proved a profitable business both for the people and for the post office service. There have been some deficits, but it should be remembered that the number of offices has been very much extended.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). The deficits have been caused by newspaper rates.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, they were caused by the newspaper rates. But, there is another instance of the effect of the reduction in rates, and the reduction in these telegraph charges was brought about by legislation. Of course, in England the government control the telegraph service, but they found it advantageous to the people and advantageous to the revenue of the post

office to reduce the rate. Let me give a little information upon this subject. In the state of Illinois they practically have a two-cent rate. They have made it compulsory for the railway companies there to sell a thousand mile ticket for $20, so that in that state they have a two-cent a mile service. In the state of New York they have a two-cent a mile service, and it was obtained by the adoption of one little act dealing with the New York Central, but by reason of that Act and by reason of competition, other railways in New York state were compelled to adopt the two-cent rate and the people have the benefit of it. A man can go from New York to Boston at two cents a mile. There are no return tickets. A ticket is made to read 'good both ways' and if you wish a return ticket you buy two of these tickets. They do not encourage people to buy return tickets by giving a cut on the return. People do not want that; they want a low level rate, so that they may return by whatever route they wish. A man going from Toronto to Montreal at the present time might wish to go by way of the Grand Trunk Railway and come back by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in order to transact his business, but as a result of the system now prevailing upon our railways he must return by the same road as that upon which he travels to Montreal if he desires to get the benefit of the reduction that is made on a return ticket. He does not want to return by the same road, he wants to return by another road, but if he wishes to do that he is obliged to pay so much per mile more. On the contrary, in the state of New York you can go by any line you wish and you can return by any other line simply by buying tickets at the rate of two cents a mile. In the state of Illinois practically the same condition exists when you buy a thousand-mile ticket. These thousand-mile tickets are good over any road, and surely, if they have conveniences like that for the travelling public over there, we should have the same here. Another great advantage that the railways of Canada have, which is an unfair advantage and one in regard to which great hardship exists and against which many complaints are made, and that is the advantage resulting from the law against the sale of railway tickets. The railway companies have an immense lever in that respect and they are using it to the disadvantage of the people in a great many cases. There is no such law in the United States. I do not believe in ticket scalping, and I would not like to see it justified, but if you have purchased one of these high priced tickets in Canada and you wish to go by another route, it is very hard to get your money back, and if you try to sell your ticket you are liable to be sent to jail. There is no such law in the United States that I know anything of. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always opposed paternal government, and yet we are pampering our railways in a way that is not thought of in the United States. In the United States they tax railway companies, they give them no subsidies, they prescribe a maximum rate and they oblige them to give a level rate for passenger travel. These things have been obtained as the result of agitation and legislation. Let me read a statement in explanation of the system in New York state:

The state law——

Of New York—

—does not compel a two cent rate on all lines here, but business sagacity on the part of the Central has resulted in this reduction. The other lines at competing points are forced to the same basis. Therefore, while wise business policy dictated originally this maximum rate in the Central management, other lines charging this rate in New York have come to the basis as a matter of competition. But in all cases it has proven a stimulus to business.

This company has been the pioneer in the two-cent rate campaign. It operates 78 passenger trains every 24 hours between New York city and Buffalo, covering four tracks.

The query is frequently made in railway circles why, if the Vanderbilt lines in New York state and Michigan find two cents so profitable and so stimulating in developing travelling, the officers should not enforce the same two cent maximun rate in Canadian territory. The company admits that its traffic on the passenger trains in Canada is very heavy. Then what is the secret of the higher rate there? There is active competition—four through-lines from Buffalo to Detroit through Canada. The reply is: the arbitrary agreement to keep up the rate to three cents in Canada.

In other words the New York Central, which is connected with the Michigan Central, would give the people a two-cent a mile rate over the Ontario peninsula were it not that they fear the antagonism of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are willing to give it to-day. It is their policy to give a two-cent a mile rate over every road that they control, and they would like to give it over their road in Canada, and they are willing to give it, as far as I can gather, were it not for the fact that they fear that they would incur the traffic hostility of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. American railway men speaking of this anomalous position in Canada say this:

Here is the reason as outlined by progressive railroad men in America; Canada has not insisted upon her passenger tariff being reduced since the era of railroad travel was introduced. The rate is the same to-day as half a century ago, when the Dominion possessed but the scantiest railroad mileage. Yet the expense of operation has decreased enormously and there is every economic reason why rates should have been readjusted every decade in Canada.

You cannot tell these officials that two-cent fares don't pay; that you can't enlist capital to promote railroad construction with a two-cent maximum rate. They know better, and so does all New York state know better. One pro-

minent New York Central man is credited with the assertion that his company contemplates establishing a two-cent maximum rate from ocean to ocean.

I saw evidence of it in one of the Ottawa papers last week. It was said that the New York Central, with its connections are forcing the two-cent rate through the south-western country, and that the great dream, or rather the great aim of the Vanderbilts to-day is to make a two-cent maximum rate across the continent. They say, and all their officers say, that the two-cent rate stimulates travel and makes it profitable to the company. Another official said in the state :

> The whole history of railroad progress shows clearly that rates seldom come down except when courts and legislatures order it.

That is the argument I have been making. I have never heard of a railway company in this country reducing rates unless it has been ordered to do so by the legislatures or the courts, except a few years ago when there was a war on between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but just as soon as the war was over up went the rates. I have not many extracts to read, and I do not wish to weary the House, but there are a few expressions of opinion which may be useful as bearing on the discussion. A member of the New York State Railroad Commission, discussing the Canadian conditions, remarked :

> An easy method of relief for Canada, without absolutely declaring for a two-cent maximum passenger tariff, would be the adoption of a general law that would provide that the through rates on all lines in the Dominion shall be the sum of the locals. In other words, the passenger fare in that part of Ontario between the Falls and Detroit, as applied between stations, could not exceed the amount charged for a through ticket over those lines. Invariably the through rate, where such a law is not enforced, is less than the local fares between stations. Most states of the republic have such a law. From the Falls to Detroit the through rate is on a two-cent per mile basis. Competition forces this concession. Yet the fare by local rate between those two points is one-third more. There are few points in Canada that are not affected by the competition in the States on this through basis. The Canadians could secure the benefit of this competition at least, if they could not force a two-cent maximum pasenger rate.

Mr. George Daniels, General Passenger Agent of the New York Central Railway expresses his opinion as follows :

> Mr. George Daniels, general passenger agent of the New York Central, is authority for the emphatic statement that the two-cent maximum passenger rate his line enforced for twenty years has stimulated traffic enormously. Further, Mr. Daniels is one of the progressive passenger men of the country who assert unequivocally that the passenger business of a railroad company is a source of revenue, and proportionately exceeds the freight revenue. . . . .
>
> During the last ten days 'The World' correspondent has talked with state officials in the capitals of Ilinois, Michigan and New York, and without an exception they have declared that the only way to secure reduced passenger rates is to enact laws to that effect ; that the railroad companies uniformly unite to combat this legislature and plead the loss of revenue it would mean to them. One well-known New York state official declared that it was not the wisdom of New York Central officials that caused them to adopt the two-cent maximum rate, but the refusal of the legislature twenty years ago to permit the consolidation of the several systems, except on a two-cent passenger tariff basis. But the experiment proved profitable, and did stimulate business amazingly. No one seeks to deny this proposition.

Then he goes on to give the figures to prove the statement. I shall conclude in the matter of evidence by reading a short extract from a statement made the other day by Mr. J. D. Youmans, the senior member of the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States. This is a body that was created by congress some years ago to regulate interstate commerce and to deal with the rates on United States railroads. Mr. Youmans is a man of the widest experience in connection with railroads and he unequivocally made this statement the other day :

> The lower the rate the more people travel. Low maximum passenger fares stimulate business enormously. These are but two propositions not to be disputed. . . . . The trunk lines of the east, of course, have the two-cent fare generally in effect by the purchase of mileage books, and the great suburban traffic is handled at even a cheaper rate by the commuter's ticket, but the rural communities are not favoured to this extent. I consider it almost an axiom that the lower the rate the heavier the travel. Therefore, the two-cent maximum passenger rate may be considered clearly as largely improving traffic, but it is a nice question as to whether the increased business will offset the loss of revenue incident to the two-cent maximum rate. It has been said that the New York Central, which has the two-cent rate generally, holds that the increased business does offset this loss of revenue. I do not know as to the correctness of this. . . . . .
>
> I understand, of course, that on through business across the continent the Canadian railroads are in accord with the lines in the States, but this would not apply to local business originating in Canada.
>
> Two-cent maximum rates follow more as the result of legislation than competition, though competition sometimes forces this rate into effect. As a result of the lower rate of passenger travel the business in the States has been enormously stimulated of late years. Lower rates stimulates travel. That is certain.

There is any amount of evidence that could be given on this point. It has been published by commissions, and the details of it are to be found in the debates in all the state legislatures where this question has come up. It has not been gainsaid, it is clear beyond peradventure, that the adoption of a two-cent maximum passenger rate has stimulated business, has increased the earnings of the company, and has been for the general benefit of the community. In

Canada for fifty years we have not had one single reduction; we are going on in the same old rut, and unless parliament acts we will be going on in the same way for fifty years to come. There is no means of providing a remedy except by inserting a clause in this Bill making the maximum passenger rate two cents a mile. In order to place the question before the House I propose to move a series of amendments. In the first place I will declare on the broad principle of a two-cent passenger rate. There has been something done in Canada to get a maximum rate of three cents a mile. First of all, let me say that the people's railway in Canada is the most friendly to the people in the matter of transportation. I have here the passenger tariff of the Intercolonial Railway which is to be found in the Orders in Council page 1017, and for 400 miles of its road the Intercolonial Railway is giving a two-cent a mile rate. It starts at three cents, but it grades down and the result is that the government road is carrying the people of Canada for two cents a mile over 400 miles of its extent.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is by Order in Council.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes, that is the tariff as approved. The people of Manitoba were unable to help themselves until two or three years ago they made an agreement with the Canadian Northern Railway dealing with the whole question of railway charges and here is one clause in that agreement, chapter 39, Ed. VII., clause 10, which settled the whole business :

> Commencing when this agreement takes effect the company shall reduce its passenger rates in Manitoba to not exceeding three cents per passenger per mile.

That little clause in the agreement with the Canada Northern Railway set the pace, and the Canadian Pacific Railway came down from four cents a mile and made their rate three cents a mile. In the province of Ontario, and in the province of Quebec, the people are paying in many places almost four cents per mile for their travel. It is time we should put an end to that. Some of the members of the west, for what reason I do not know, stated in this House that they did not want cheap travel in the west and that they were glad to pay four cents a mile. Well, if that be the view of the west it is not the view of the east, and the provision made in Manitoba would seem to indicate that it is not the view in the west either. However, if the people of the west want to pay more money I am quite willing to have the two-cent a mile rate apply only to east of Port Arthur. I do not want to exclude the west, and therefore the first amendment I propose to make is :

> That Bill No. 21 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the insertion of the following clause in section 263 :—
>
> 'The maximum passenger tariff shall not exceed two cents a mile.'

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I would like to have said a few words on this question, but the hon. member for East York has exhausted the subject, and I do not think he has left a word to be said that would not be a repetition of something that he has said. But if what he does say is true, the railway companies ought to extend their thanks to him for bringing the motion before the House, because, according to his argument, they would be benefited by adopting the lower rate. I think that is plainly shown every day by the fact that when there are excursion rates many more people travel. The Canadian people have friends living in various parts of the Dominion, whom they are anxious to visit ; and if the rate were lower, they would visit them more often than they do. A lower rate would facilitate business. People want to do business in different parts of the Dominion, but the rate being so high prevents them from going. The hon. member for East York referred to the passenger rate war, which I remember very well, between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, when they cut the rates in two, and more than in two. The consequence was that the travel became so enormous that the railways could hardly carry the people, and they made a great deal more money. As it is, the trains run on schedule time, and they start whether they have passengers or not, the trainmen have to be there, and they could just as well carry double the number they usually do, and in doing that they would make more money than they do now. Their excursion rates are sometimes as low as a cent a mile, and yet they make more money at these rates than they do at the ordinary rates. The government, I think, would be justified, for the benefit of the railway companies themselves, in inserting a clause in the Bill providing that in the older and more settled portions of the Dominion, at any rate, they shall carry all passengers for two cents a mile. In Great Britain every train is compelled to have a third-class carriage, on which the fare is a penny a mile, and the people of England nearly all travel third class. There are very few second-class travellers. There are some first-class passengers, noblemen ; but I have heard of a great many of them who travel third-class. I think we would be wise to do in this country as they have done in Great Britain—compel the railway companies to carry people at two cents a mile.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). Mr. Speaker, it is a pity our two friends who have just spoken are not on the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway boards. Their experience in railway matters has been so extensive that they would be quite an acquisition to the management. Our friend from East York has apparently

paid a great deal of attention to this question. He has devoted a great deal of space in his newspaper to elucidating it, and he has more information to-day than he had a week ago, when he received so much that I thought he would abandon the project and would not speak of it again in this House. He was not aware then that the Michigan law, if applied to Canada, would bring only one railway under its operation. It is easy to talk of a two-cent rate and to read letters from people who would like to travel for nothing. I presume that if more people had known that their names would be immortalized in 'Hansard,' he would have got more names, and that if he would advocate a one-cent rate instead of a two-cent, he would have twice as many letters while, if he would advocate that every man who travels on a railway should be paid two cents a mile for travelling on it, he would have more letters still. There is a happy medium in this matter. Railways are not organized for philanthropic purposes, but for the purpose of making money for the people who put their money into them, and I take for granted that Mr. Shaughnessy and Mr. Hays know best whether a two-cent rate would be more profitable than a three-cent rate. If they do not know that, I would advise them to come to our two friends here in order to be properly informed how to run a railway system. Our friend from East York made us acquainted with the Michigan law, although he did not know, at the time he printed it, how it was going to operate. He has quoted it correctly to-day. He says that law demands a two-cent rate. There is not a law of that kind in Michigan. They have a law there providing that when a railway company earns $3,000 a mile on its passenger trains, the rate shall be two cents a mile, that when it earns between $2,000 and $3,000 a mile, the rate shall be two and one-half cents, and when it earns less than $2,000 a mile the rate shall be three cents. Now, the condition of that three-cent rate applies to every railroad in Canada to-day, except one. Would it be fair to apply the Michigan law to eighty different railways in Canada when only one comes within the condition of the law? I have selected two or three of our best railways in Canada to see how the Michigan law would work if introduced into Canada. The Canada Atlantic, with a mileage of 458 miles, earns $316,000, or at the rate of $700 a mile. It would require to earn just four times as much to come under the operation of the Michigan law. The Canadian Pacific, with its 7,321 miles, earns $9,000,000, or $1,300 per mile, which is two and one-half times as little as it should earn in orler to come under the Michigan law. The government railways, with 1,301 miles, earn $1,770,000, or $1,250 a mile, two and a half times as little as they should earn in order to come under the Michigan law. The Grand Trunk, with 3,142 miles, earns $6,500,000, or $2,100 a mile; the Canadian Northern, with 1,248 miles, earns $262,000, or $210 a mile; and the Canadian Southern, with 382 miles, earns $1,377,000, or $3,600 a mile. This is the only railway, out of the eighty railways which we find mentioned in the Blue-book, that earns enough to come under the operation of the Michigan law. Now, what is the status of the Canadian Southern Railway? It has a capital of $28,000,000, and its surplus, after paying its running expenses, is $519,000. The dividend on the $28,000,000 of capital is 2 per cent, and the price of the stock to-day is 62 cents on the dollar. If my hon. friends held that stock, would they think that the earning power of the road justifiel a reduction of the passenger rate from three cents to two cents per mile? I do not think they would. Even if we were all willing to adopt the Michigan system in this country, it would be of no earthly use, because it would only apply to this one railway, whose stock is selling at 62 cents on the dollar, and which only earns 2 per cent on its capital. It is very easy to place yourself at the head of certain popular movements, and, by considerable waste of gas and fuss and printers' ink, to create the impression that you are working in the interest of the great mass of the community; but some persons may be suspicious enough to suppose that the real object is to alvance the man who places himself at the head of these popular movements. And up to the present, the doubts which people entertain of the sincerity of the hon. gentleman cause them to look askance at these various popular movements simply because he puts himself at their head.

Mr. MACLEAN. I will follow you, if you will lead, and let you have the glory.

Mr. HEYD. I am not seeking notoriety. Besides it would not be in the interests of the country to apply the rule which the hon. gentleman advocates, because the conditions are different here from what they are in the thickly populated centres of the adjoining republic. If the Grand Trunk Railway charges two cents per mile in Michigan, it is not because it is compelled to do so by the Michigan law. It does not come under that law because its earnings in passing through that state only reach about $1,600 per mile; and if it charges a two-cent per mile rate, it does so because it is in competition with the Michigan Central and other railways, which come under the operation of the Michigan law, and charge a two-cent rate. In self-defence, the Grand Trunk Railway are compelled to do the same thing. But to compel Canadian railways to charge a two-cent rate instead of three, would simply beggar them. Before applying a rule of that kind, you should ascertain what effect it is going to have; and you will find that a rate which might be applied from New York to Buffalo would

not suit this country at all. There are 80 railways in Canada, comprising 18,730 miles of railway lines. The entire passenger earnings of these roads last year amounted to $22,600,000 or $1,200 a mile.

Mr. BELL. Passenger earnings ?

Mr. HEYD. Yes, the Michigan law only deals with passengers. The entire earnings were $22,600,000, or $1,200 per mile, or two and a half times too little to justify the imposition in this country of the Michigan law. In order that we might be in a position to apply such a law, it would be necessary for the Canada Atlantic Railway to earn $1,300,000, instead of $316,000. It would be necessary for the Canadian Pacific Railway to earn $20,000,000 instead of $9,231,000. The government railways would have to earn $4,000,000 instead of $1,770,000; the Grand Trunk Railway, $9,000,000 instead of $6,515,000, and the Canadian Northern Railway, $2,500,000 instead of $262,000. Or all the railways in Canada, which now earn $18,000,000, would have to earn $55,000,000. When that time comes, I shall then be prepared to support a resolution such as the hon. gentleman has now introduced, and I have not the slightest doubt that every other hon. member will do likewise.

Mr. CLARKE. Are there any railways in the state of Michigan which charge two cents ?

Mr. HEYD. They are not compelled to charge less than three cents unless their earnings are over $3,000 per mile.

Mr. CLARKE. Are there any which charge three cents?

Mr. HEYD. I do not know. There are railways in New York state which charge more than three cents per mile, but they only charge two cents in Michigan and where they are forced to do so by competition.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the law in New York state ?

Mr. HEYD. I cannot say. I have only learned what the law in Michigan is from my hon. friend's newspaper, and then I sought to ascertain how the Michigan law, which he wants us to adopt, would work out in Canada. It could not possibly work here. The only railway to which we could apply it would be the Canada Southern, whose stock is quoted at 62 cents in the dollar, and which pays a dividend of two per cent.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the amendment introduced by the hon. member for East York has given rise to a discussion which is worthy of attention. It cannot be gainsaid that railway companies, in certain parts of the country have, at present, rates which are excessive, almost prohibitory. Thus, to limit myself to the constituency which I have the honour to represent here, the Grand Trunk Railway charge 50 cents for a twelve mile run from Stottsville to St. Johns. The fare from St. Johns to Montreal, a distance of twenty-seven miles, is one dollar. Fifty years ago, when the road was started, the fare from St. Johns to Laprairie and from Laprairie to Montreal and return, was only one dollar. To-day, the Grand Trunk own the Victoria Bridge, which, as we know, was built by means of the subsidies of the various governments, and yet the people in St. Johns are compelled to pay $1.50 for what used to cost $1. That is evidently an abuse on the part of the railway companies, and I congratulate the hon. member for East York on having brought the matter before the House. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that in the state of Michigan the earnings of the railway companies are taken into account. If the hon. member had introduced a resolution based on the Michigan law, I should have considered it my duty to support it. But I trust the Railway Commission will be instructed to inquire into that grievance and to remedy it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.) We can all sympathize with the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) and supported by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Robinson). If we could travel upon the railways as we travel upon the King's highway, without paying toll to any body we should be glad to dispense even with this amendment. But, unfortunately, my hon. friend from East York will admit, and in this also I suppose he would be supported by my hon. friend from West Elgin, that if the public travels upon the railways they must pay some tolls to the company for the service they receive. The only point is, as has been stated by my hon. friend from East York himself, that we should pay a reasonable toll. We all agree upon that. But the difficulty arises as to what is a reasonable toll. My hon. friend wants to make a cast-iron rule for all cases that the rates shall not exceed two cents per mile. But, I desire to observe that it is not possible under the present circumstances to fix one rate, as he proposes to do by this amendment. There must be elasticity ; the rate cannot be the same in all sections of the country. Railway traffic, like all traffic depends for its profits upon the conditions in the locality in which it is carried on. There are some localities where a rate of two cents per mile would be very high ; there are some localities where a rate of three cents per mile would be very low. We must take account of the circumstances ; and the only way in which this can be done is that proposed in this very Bill. Instead of making a cast-iron rule from which the railways cannot deviate we leave it altogether to the commission

which is established by this Bill. I would call the attention of my hon. friend from East York, and also of my hon. friend from West Elgin, to section 257 of the Bill, which says :

> The board may disallow any tariff or any portion thereof which it considers to be unjust or unreasonable, or contrary to any of the provisions of this Act, and may require the company, within a prescribed time, to substitute a tariff satisfactory to the board, in lieu thereof, or may prescribe other tolls in lieu of the tolls so disallowed, and may designate the date at which any tariff shall come into force.

There is the remedy for the evil suggested by my hon. friend. For instance, if the gentleman who wrote to my hon. friend to complain of the rate from Ottawa to Prescott, instead of seeking to force upon the community an arbitrary rate of not more than two cents per mile, will apply to the board, the board will hear his complaint, will investigate the matter, and will say whether or not the rate shall be decreased. My hon. friend has said truly that competition brings traffic, and he has said truly that generally a decrease in tolls will ensure a larger profit. That is true generally, and it is true absolutely in the densely populated portions of the country. But my hon. friend knows that there are some parts of the country in which the population is so sparse that it would be impossible to carry out that rule. Now, I know for a fact that the population between Prescott and the city of Ottawa over what is now the Canadian Pacific road is very thin, and I am not prepared to say that a rate of two cents would be sufficient to give a profit to that railway carrying on this service. That would be a question to be investigated by the board. On the other hand, my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) has told us of a rate of four cents a mile through one of the most densely populated sections of the province of Quebec, between Montreal and St. Johns. This rate of four cents per mile, I must say, seems to me extravagant, and, if it is found to be so, it will be reduced. The board would investigate such complaints, and in one case they might say the complaint is well founded and in the other it is not. That is substantial reason why parliament must come to the conclusion that such cases as have been referred to must be left to the board, which is empowered to deal with all such questions.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MACLEAN. I desire to present another amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), has exhausted his right to speak on this motion.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is, on the amendment just lost.

Mr. SPEAKER. On the third reading of the Bill. When the motion for the third reading is made, the hon. member has a right to speak. He spoke by moving his amendment, but if he were to speak again, he would be speaking twice on the same question.

Mr. MACLEAN. And, do you, Mr. Speaker, rule that I may not move another amendment ?

Mr. SPEAKER. When the hon. member has moved an amendment to the third reading, he has exhausted his right to speak on the motion for third reading.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would be disposed to move that the rate be 2½ cents per mile, if that was confined to Ontario. It seems to me that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) was not very fair in his remarks. He was not justified in trying to heap ridicule upon the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) for making an effort to secure for the people of Canada the same rights as are enjoyed by the people in adjoining states of the American union under practically similar circumstances. It comes with very bad grace from one sent here to look after the interests of the helpless to abuse those who endeavour to do this, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) himself does not try to do it. If the hon. gentleman were a solicitor for or an advocate for railway companies, I could understand him. But certainly this is not the duty he is sent here to discharge. The hon. gentleman said that because the Canadian railways did not earn as much as the railways in the United States, therefore, their rates should not be reduced to two cents per mile. But he seemed to forget one very important feature in connection with this matter, which is that, whereas the railways of the United States have received no state aid whatever, but were built with private capital, and therefore, must earn a reasonable dividend upon that capital, the roads in Canada, with which they are compared and which the hon. gentleman says should show as large earnings as the railways in the United States, were built very largely out of public money. So, if the earnings of the Canadian railways are not as large as those of the United States with which they are compared, that fact of itself is no argument in favour of a high rate here as compared with the low rate in the United States. I would like to ask the hon. member for South Brant a question. The state law in Michigan provides that railways whose earnings reach a certain figure shall not charge more than two cents per mile. Will the hon. gentleman say that only those railways whose earnings have reached this figure have made the reductions ? I am credibly informed that this is not the case, but that several other railways have made the reduction, notwithstanding that their earnings are not such as to compel them to do so. And I am informed also, that instead of that reduction

reducing their earning power, it has had the contrary effect, so that these railways have been benefited by the change. It does seem to me a clear case of hardship that the rates in Ontario should be higher than in Michigan on the same railways. Take the case of a man living in Chicago and travelling to Detroit. He travels over the Wabash system, 300 miles and pays $6. He enters Canada and travels over the same line 220 miles, paying two cents per mile or $4.40. But a Canadian gets on at Detroit travels on the same seat with the American for this 220 miles in Canadian territory, and pays $6.60.

Now, the Canadian pays $6.60 for travelling 220 miles, while the American pays 60 cents less for travelilng 300 miles, both travelling over the same road. The difference should be in favour of the Canadian, because that railway through Canada was subsidized by the state, whereas the same road through Michigan was not subsidized by the state. There would be no great injustice done to the railway company if we compelled them to give Canadians the same advantages that the party who lives in Michigan enjoys when he travels over that railway. While I do not think it would be fair to apply what the member for East York calls the flat rate of two cents a mile all over the country, I do think it would be no great injustice to the railways, especially those that run through the more thickly settled parts of Ontario, if we compelled them to charge no more than two cents a mile, or two and a half cents a mile. Therefore, I move that the Bill be referred back to the committee to insert a clause that the maximum passenger rate should not exceed two and a half cents a mile east of a meridian drawn from Port Arthur.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have listened to the answers that have been made to my arguments. I might refer to what the member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) said about me, and my desire for notoriety. I am very anxious for that notoriety, if he chooses to call it that, and I shall pursue it, irrespective of what his view may be. It is a pretty hard thing to fight the battles of the people in this country against some of the powers arrayed against you. There is no glory in it, it costs a good deal of money, and it is a very hard thing to fight your way through the mazes of parliament. You have to fight by yourself, you have no party behind you, you have no caucus behind you, you have to meet the derision of both sides, and sometimes an arrangement between both parties to side-track any progressive movement of that kind. I have fought for this reform for a good many years, and it is making headway. Take the question of government ownership. There was hardly a man beside myself to stand up for it, and I was said to be seeking notoriety. But the other day we saw the Prime Minister of this country stand up and make a proposition for a transcontinental railroad that implied so he said government ownership. So the movement is going forward, the idea is progressing, even against the wishes of a majority of the House, and I shall live to see it win out. I shall live to see this two-cent maximum passenger rate the law of the land, and when that time comes, if it does give me some notoriety, I do not care, because it is and idea that is worth fighting for. The people are all thinking about it, I could quote letters by the thousand about it. I have seen many letters written to the newspapers about it. This thing was worked out in the states, where it has been accomplished by agitation in the legislature. It was not worked out by a railroad commission, it was worked out by legislation wherever it has been accomplished. The legislature of the state of New York did it by a little amendment to a small Bill of the New York Central, 30 or 40 years ago, and all the other legislatures have come to it. The people of Manitoba have got it by a law of their legislature; in England they have got it, because they have got what is called the penny-a-mile rate, which is a parliamentary rate. They have it all over Europe. They have a one-cent a mile rate for passenger travel, and even less than that for labourers. In all these cases it has been obtained by an Act of the legislature, and not by an act of a commission. My right hon. friend is evading his responsibility, he is juggling with the question, and he has made no argument here at all. He says we have got a Bill before us, and there is a provision for regulating these charges, the commission will undertake to deal with it. I say they will never deal with it until they have parliamentary instructions to do so. We have given a large amount of consideration to this Bill. I compliment the premier and his government on this Bill, a great deal of consideration has been given to the commission and its duties. But, after all, it is only minor matters that are left to their discretion. For instance, we have defined what a railroad train shall be, and how it shall be equipped, with what sort of brakes. I say the time has come when we ought to define what the maximum passenger rate ought to be. It is easy to say that there are a lot of little railroads, as the member for Brant said, that cannot pay the axle grease by their passenger traffic. But their main revenue is from freight rates, and is it not fair to the people who travel in this country that if passenger rates have to come down, freight rates should go up a little? An adjustment could be effected in that way and the road would not lose a dollar.

If railroads running into thinly populated portions of the country are free to charge four cents, those sections will continue to be thinly populated. The Cana-

dian Pacific Railway want to get people into the North-west, and are carrying them from portions of the United States for one cent a mile into that country—so I am told; and they are charging them four cents a mile to get out. It is a good way to get them in, and it is a good way to keep them in. But they will never get population in that country until they are able to promise them not only a good country for raising wheat, but a good country to travel in, where they can go for two cents a mile. Then we hear a good deal about the Grand Trunk, and the member for Brant tells us it is a great, big corporation that spreads all over the country, and only earns a little over $2,000 a mile. The great bulk of its earnings come from the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec, and they are charging the people of those two populous provinces three and four cents a mile, and they say they have not got traffic. Why, sir, the traffic between the Detroit river and Montreal never was so great as it is to-day. They have not trains enough, they have not engines, they have not cars enough to handle the passenger traffic. Every train is overcrowded and belated by reason of the large traffic. Every night when you go from Montreal to Toronto you ask for a first-class ticket, and you pay three cents a mile at least, although every train between Montreal and Toronto, two and three trains a day, are loaded with people paying three cents a mile for that run. The company could carry them for two cents a mile and still make money out of it. Yet we are told that parliament should not interfere, that parliament should not make a maximum rate. I say again that there is a parliamentary way of getting reduced passenger fares. You could say to a railway company: If you give a cheap through-rate you must give a cheap local rate. I think I have proved my whole case. If you adopt the Michigan law it will settle the whole question. I would be quite willing to have the Michigan law applied to all roads that earn $3,000 a mile on passenger traffic, because, if the Michigan Central had to give a two-cent rate by reason of earning $3,000 a mile the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway would give it next day. Yet, we are told by the right hon. leader of the government that we must not interfere with railway traffic because he has established a commission to do that. This reduction will never be attained except on the floor of parliament through the passing of an Act to that effect. What I would have liked to have heard the right hon. Prime Minister say is: This question is one that the people are talking about. We will instruct the commission to make a report upon it, to present the facts and then we will bring in a law. You can have a sliding scale applied to this question, either a geographical scale or a sliding scale based upon the earnings just as they have in Michigan, and the remedy can be accomplished in that way. But, we will not get that if we leave it to the commission. We could easily pass a law to-day on the lines of the Michigan law providing that any road that gives a two-cent a mile through-rate shall also give a two-cent a mile local rate. It need not be a very big Act of parliament. It could be put in three lines as they have it in Manitoba. Yet, the right hon. gentleman is going to give a hundred millions of dollars of the people's money to a railway corporation without imposing one condition upon that company. He came to parliament some years ago with the Crow's Nest Railway proposition and he said: I introduce a new doctrine into the legislation of Canada. I am the apostle of a new gospel and it is that when you give a railway company a great subvention you get some corresponding concession from it for the people. That is a good doctrine, but before you give the Grand Trunk Railway a single dollar for building a transcontinental railway you should say to Mr. Hays: One of the conditions of this concession is that you shall carry people in Ontario and Quebec for two cents a mile. If he did he would get it immediately. The Grand Trunk Railway Company having adopted that rate the Canadian Pacific Railway would be obliged to adopt it and the reduction would be brought about in that way. You could get it in a hundred ways, by diplomacy, by the exercise of political sagacity and by being ready to take advantage of every opportunity that comes. But when you say, merely; we are going to refer it to the railway commission you are not dealing with the question in a way which will bring about the remedy that we desire. If a man travels from Prescott and they charge him four cents a mile will he go to the commission and say that they have overcharged him and will the commission fix it for him? They will never do it, but a little political strategy in dealing with these companies when they are asking for great concessions would bring about this reduction in rates. You will get it in the way in which the Conservative government in Manitoba got it. The railway company came for concessions, they got their bonds guaranteed but the legislature of Manitoba said: We are dealing with you and we expect some return for the concessions that we are making and you must reduce the charges that you are imposing upon the public. The right hon. gentleman says that they are building railways, but you are not solving the transportation question by building railways. You are not solving the transportation question until you compel the railways to treat the great mass of the people reasonably in the matter of rates. Giving public money and public land away to the railways, running railways through inhospitable and unknown portions of the country is not solving the transportation problem, but you are solving it when you demand fair con-

sideration for the people and when you impose upon the railway companies the condition that they shall charge so and so. You give the Grand Trunk Railway Company $75,000,000, yea, $100,000,000 of the people's money and the same government that gives it to them allows them to charge, in the populous provinces of Ontario and Quebec, in some places, four cents per mile and in other places three cents per mile and yet does not impose a single condition upon the company. That is not a railway policy, that is not what the public expect and the public does not expect that any one who is stating his case, or at least is trying to state his case fairly in this House, will be subjected to the criticism or to the opposition that I have met here to-day. There is something else expected from this House. We are the guardians of the public interest, we are sent here to protect the rights of the people and we are not here to unload that responsibility upon a commission. Hon. gentlemen will find that the public expect that of them and they expect in some way that we in this House shall apply ourselves to the transportation problem and they do not expect that we shall give away more money without getting more concessions from the railway companies than we have. There is no other way to meet the situation than by dealing with these companies on a business basis and insisting upon concessions at a time that the agreement is made with them. It would only need three lines in a note from the premier sent to Mr. Hays to the effect that complaints have been made in parliament and that complaints have been made in the press about passenger rates in Ontario, that the people have been complaining especially that you carry people in Michigan for two cents a mile and carry them in Ontario for three cents a mile. How do you justify that? If he did so, the coon would have to come down. It does not need an Act of parliament; it simply needs an intimation from the leader of the dominant party in this country that if a reduction does not come then parliament will have to intervene in order to bring it about. Simply to dismiss this question by saying that it should be settled by a railway commission is not treating it as I think it ought to be treated by this House. The reduction should be brought about by a clause in the Railway Bill defining what the maximum passenger rate is. You can give it a sliding effect, either a geographical sliding effect or you can base it upon the earning capacity per mile of the road, or you can get it by agreement with the railways. In some way it can be done, the people expect that it shall be done and in order to test the question I am quite willing that the House shall vote upon my amendment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) say that the Roblin government secured a two cent a mile rate in Manitoba?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, three cents a mile.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Does the hon. gentleman say that that rate applies to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. MACLEAN. No, but by simply applying it to the Canadian Northern Railway the Canadian Pacific Railway adopts it and that is the object of that kind of legislation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Why did the Canadian Pacific Railway adopt it?

Mr. MACLEAN. They are carrying people at three cents a mile in Manitoba. My hon. friend said that it was four cents a mile all over the North-west.

The PRIME MINISTER. Competition, as was stated a moment ago.

Mr. MACLEAN. Competition based upon the agreement between the government and the railway company. That has been the effect in New York and Michigan. The law in Michigan is based upon an earning capacity of $3,000 per mile, but by reason of the competition they have a two cent per mile rate.

Hon. Wm. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I have listened with considerable attention to the two speeches that have been made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) and I find in a great many instances that he is a greater reformer than the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd). The hon. member for South Brant speaks about undertaking to teach Sir Thomas Shaughnessy how to run a railway. We have nothing to do with anything of that kind, but what we have to do is to see that something is done in the interests of the people of Canada and that is to apply if possible the reform of cheaper rates to the railways of Canada. The hon. gentleman commenced, I think, by making a very fine free trade speech because he gave us the assurance that whenever rates are reduced there is an increase in the consumption and that is an increase in the consumption and that in this case there will be an increase in the traffic. When the subject of the government railway will come before the House I hope to be able to prove, that in the case of the government railways of Europe where a reduction in traffic rates has been made, the amount collected in six months was more than was collected during twelve months when the rates were high.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear. Was that reduction made by Act of parliament?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I will get the particulars when the proper time comes. Now, we must not look upon the day of small things in the question of reforms. It took Wilberforce almost thirty-five years before he was able to secure the emancipation of the slaves, and people laughed at him in derision when he first brought that subject up in the parliament of

Great Britain. The greatest reforms begin with the smallest agitation, and while I disagree with my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) as to the manner in which he seeks to bring about this reduction of rates, I think that public opinion will be able to operate on the government to such an extent that they will eventually call the attention of the commission to this reform. I think it would be very desirable that the government, in anticipation to the Bill that will be introduced some day, should have their eye on cheap passenger rates on this railway when it is constructed. While the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) may be called an agitator, and while it may be said that he is speaking and writing for notoriety, yet he is speaking in the interest of the public, and the public will take note of what he is saying. Anything that tends to increase the benefits to and the comforts of the people of Canada is bound to receive attention from the people of Canada. This is not at all a small question, but I do think that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) has not taken the proper way of bringing about the reform he desires.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. Maclean) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Avery,	Kidd,
Bell,	Lavell,
Bennett,	Maclean,
Birkett,	McGowan,
Blain,	Monk,
Cargill,	Morin,
Christie,	Oliver,
Clare,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clarke,	Roche (Marquette),
Demers (St. John),	Rosamond,
Earle,	Sherritt,
Gourley,	Sproule,
Hackett,	Taylor,
Halliday,	Tolton,
Hughes (Victoria),	Turgeon,
Kaulbach,	Vrooman,
Kendall,	Wilson.—34

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Loy,
Beith,	Macdonald,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McCarthy,
Calvert,	McCool,
Copp,	McCreary,
Desjardins,	McEwen,
Douglass,	McGugan,
Erb,	McLennan,
Ethier,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Fielding,	Matheson,
Fisher,	Mayrand,
Fitzpatrick,	Mignault,
Fortier,	Morrison,
Fraser,	Paterson,
Gibson,	Préfontaine,
Harwood,	Puttee,
Heyd,	Riley,
Holmes,	Ross (Ontario),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Lang,	Russell,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tucker,
LeBlanc,	Wade.—45.
Lewis,	

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria).

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson (Haldimand),	Ingram,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Gauvreau,	Ganong,
MacKinnon,	Roddick,
Smith (Vancouver),	Hale,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Broder,
McIsaac,	Carscallen,
Bazinet,	Pope,
Martineau,	Lancaster,
Cowan,	Pringle,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Sutherland (Oxford),	Haggart,
Girard,	Léonard,
Tobin,	Ball,
Scott,	Boyd,
Davis,	Bruce,
Malouin,	LaRivière,
Stewart,	Kendry,
Parmelee,	Wilmot,
Brown.	Henderson,

Amendment negatived, main motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY DEBTS.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 155) respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts.—The Prime Minister.

On section 4,

Mr. MONK. This Act is merely to apply to the future, I suppose ; it is not to apply to any proceedings already begun ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. I move to amend this section by inserting after the word 'renewal' the words 'and completion,' and to insert the words 'of the' between the words 'and' and 'institution,' so that the clause will read :

The remuneration of the receiver shall be fixed by the said court, as also shall the expenses lawfully incurred by him as receiver, including the expenses of working, operation, maintenance, renewal and completion, and of the institution and defense of actions aforesaid, be a debt of the company.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 5—when company is insolvent,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved :

That the section be amended by the addition thereto of the following words : 'But such transfer to trustees shall not exclude such railway from the provisions of the present Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. Minister of Justice intend this to apply where a railroad has passed into the hands of trustees under the Railway Act ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is expected by the section. The hon. member must bear in mind that this is not my Bill, but a Bill introduced by a private member. I do not know the effect of this amendment at present.

Mr. MONK. As I understand the section, a railway in the possession of trustees is excepted from the section as printed, but the amendment brings it back, and changes completely what is previously decreed in the section itself.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Section 5 of the Winding Up Act defines acts of insolvency; and paragraph (g) of that Act says that the transfer by a company of its assets to trustees is an act of insolvency; but here we provide that this transfer, if done by virtue of section 94 of the Railway Act, will not be interpreted as an act of insolvency; and under the amendment suggested that will not prevent the company from coming under the terms of this Act.

Mr. MONK. I have not before me paragraph (g), to which my hon. friend refers; but this section says that that paragraph shall not apply to cases where possession of any railway has been taken by trustees for bondholders; and yet by the amendment it is said that such transfer shall not exclude the railway from the provisions of the present Act.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Paragraph (g) of section 5 of the Winding Up Act says that the company is deemed insolvent if it has made any general conveyance or assignment of its property, and so forth. What we mean by this section is that the assignment will not be an Act of insolvency by itself; but by the amendment we provide that that will not prevent the company being subject to the provisions of this Act if it is otherwise insolvent.

Mr. MONK. Would it not be better to state that in the section? Because, as the section reads, with the amendment, I think it would appear that the assignment under paragraph (g) would take the company out of the operation of this Act, while further on the amendment seems to contradict this.

Mr. WADE. The provision of this section seems to be very simple. The effect of it is that all the provisions in section 5 of the Winding Up Act defining insolvency on the part of a company shall prevail except paragraph (g) and it shall be insolvent and subject to the provisions of this Act; but the conveyance of its property under paragraph (g) would not itself be an Act of insolvency.

Mr. MONK. Are there any companies in the hands of trustees to which this law would apply?

Mr. FRASER. If the section is a good section, it is indifferent to us whether or not there is a certain railway which is taken charge of by trustees of bondholders. There is nothing in the section which would hasten that if it were passed. That is to say, if this Act were in existence, it would not help them to take possession of it. They would do it as easily without this Act as with it.

Mr. MONK. It may be a very good section in itself, but it may not be wise to apply it to some company which is at present being administered by trustees for the benefit of bondholders. I do not know whether there is any such company. I have heard of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway or a portion of it being administered for the benefit of some bondholders in England. I believe there is a receiver acting on behalf of the bondholders and administering the railway for their benefit. It is only fair to ask if these bondholders, whose property is being administered under the existing law for their own benefit, will suddenly find themselves brought under the operation of this law.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I know of two railways now in the hands of bondholders, but there is a very considerable difference between bondholders and receivers. The Témiscouata railway has been taken possession of by the bondholders because of the default on the part of the company to pay interest on the bonds. The Lake St. John railway is also in the hands of the bondholders and administered by trustees. Neither of these railways will be affected by this legislation unless they come under the operations of its provisions with respect to the Winding Up Act.

Mr. MONK. They are provincial railways.

Hhe MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the Lake St. John is, but I am not quite sure. It is entirely within the limits of the province, and it crosses the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But whether it has been declared a Dominion railway I cannot say.

Mr. MONK. Is the Atlantic and Lake Superior?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know. That also is in the hands of trustees of the bondholders. That, however, is altogether different from its being in the hands of receivers. The trustees are not receivers. A railway may be managed by the trustees of the bondholders in such a way as to escape the application of this Act.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MONK. I have not had time to examine very carefully the amendment, but would like to call the attention of the committee to this section 5, which is being amended. In this section it is stated that a

railway company is insolvent in certain cases, but section 5 of the Winding Up Act is not to apply to cases where possession of any railway or any section thereof has been taken by trustees for the bondholders under the provisions of section 94 of the Railway Act. There must be some error there, because section 94 of the Railway Act does not seem to have any bearing upon this subject. It is more than probable that certain proceedings have been taken under chapter 44 of 62-3 Victoria, passed in 1899. That statute must have been intended to apply to some special cases where it was deemed necessary to protect the holder of mortgage bonds or debentures; and by that statute the jurisdiction is given to the Exchequer Court to order the sale of a railway and the placing of it in the hands of a receiver upon the demands of the bondholders. The effect of the measure now before the committee is to repeal the provisions of that Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court with regard to the rights of the bondholders. What I would like to call the attention of the government to is that if the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) is accepted and the statute of 1899 repealed, as it is by the following section, any steps taken by the bondholders for the protection of their rights under that statute will cease, and any railway company ordered by the Exchequer Court to be put under the sequestration of a receiver may, at the instance of any chirographic creditor, be put into insolvency and the conservatory orders made by the Exchequer Court to protect the bondholders and the other creditors may be interfered with. It seems to me that we have to be very careful about adopting this amendment, particularly as my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), who prepared this Bill, inserted in it a special proviso, which says that the provisions of this section shall not apply to those cases where bondholders, under the direction of the Exchequer Court, have obtained possession of a railway which had made default in the payment of interest on the bonds.

Mr. WADE. Section 94 of the Railway Act is the section with regard to mortgage liens, enabling a company to secure its bonds and debentures by a mortgage lien on the assets and revenues of the company present and future. This section reads:

> A railway is insolvent within the meaning of this Act, in all cases which constitute insolvency under sections five and six of the Winding Up Act, except that paragraph (g) of section five of that Act shall not apply to cases where possession of any railway or section thereof has been taken by trustees for bondholders under the provisions of section 94 of the Railway Act.

Mr. FRASER. That is, relating to mortgages?

Mr. WADE. Yes. Section 94, subsection 2, of the Railway Act says:

> By the said deed the company may grant to the holders of such bonds, debentures, or other securities, or the trustees named, in such deed, all and every the powers, rights and remedies granted by this Act in respect of the said bonds, debentures, or other securities, and all other powers, rights and remedies not inconsistent with this Act, or may restrict the said holders in the exercise of any power, privilege or remedy granted by this Act, as the case may be.

Now, if hon. gentlemen will look back to section 84 and sections in that context, they will find that there are powers of bondholders——

Mr. MONK. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Wade) quoting from the revised statutes?

Mr. WADE. I am quoting from the Consolidated Railway Act, the Act of 1888. This is the section referred to in the Bill, and it is the law as it stands to-day. We do not know that the Railway Act which left this House this afternoon will ever become law, and we could not legislate on the basis of that. This simply refers to the powers which may be given to bondholders under trust deed to secure bonds and debentures under the Railway Act of 1888. The company has the power to create a trust with which to secure the debentures, and they have a right under that deed to give power to the bondholders to take possession of the road; and the whole machinery is complete within the Act for the bondholders taking possession in that way, and operating the road. It is provided that subsection (g) shall not apply to cases of that kind. Subsection (g) in the Winding Up Act gives the following as one of the proofs of insolvency on the part of a company:

> If it has made any general conveyance or assignment of its property for the benefit of its creditors, or if, being unable to meet its liabilities in full, it makes any sale or conveyance of the whole or the main part of its stock in trade or assets, without the consent of its creditors, or without satisfying their claims.

The effect of this section is that it virtually declares that a deed of trust given to secure the debentures or bonds is not a conveyance within the meaning of subsection (g); and the only thing we have to consider is what effect the words proposed have upon that section, because without the amendment, that is not an act of insolvency. A company may be insolvent for other reasons mentioned in the subsections from (a) to (h) inclusive. There is no exception with regard to the others, but with regard to subsection (g), it says in effect that the giving over or taking possession of the property by the bondholders under the provisions of a trust-deed does not come within the class or conditions named in the subsection. Then it goes on:

And except further that the delay to secure or compound allowed in the case mentioned in section six of the Winding Up Act shall be fifteen days instead of sixty.

And this amendment:

But such transfer to trustees shall not exclude such railway from the provisions of the present Act.

That is, the mere fact of having given such a deed, the mere fact that the bondholders have taken possession of it shall not of itself bring that company within the operation of this Act. If it is insolvent for other reasons, then the provisions of the Act are applicable to it. To my mind, the adding of these words do not make any difference. The exception certainly does not go beyond what it expresses, and, if that be true, it is almost unnecessary to have these other words. I suppose they are put in to guard against any uncertainty. This Act is operative upon a company that has given a deed to secure its bonds and the bondholders have taken possession of the road under the provisions of the deed, then if there is default in these unsecured debts or if the company have failed to operate the road for the period named in the section itself, the creditors in the first place or any member of the public in the other case, may come to the Exchequer Court and commence proceedings for a decree for the sale of the road. I suppose the court has absolute jurisdiction to do what is right, and any order to sell granted under such circumstances would have due regard to the rights of the bondholders. In a case of this sort, where the bondholders have stepped in and are operating the road for the purpose of obtaining the payment of their bonds or the interest on their bonds, I think the court would be slow indeed to order a sale at the instance of unsecured creditors, if that sale would accomplish any possible injury to the secured creditors, the bondholders.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Under the Act of 1899, the Exchequer Court has the power to order either a foreclosure sale, where a railway is insolvent, or it may appoint a receiver. Suppose they appoint a receiver instead of ordering the foreclosure or sale, would the judgment creditor, under this Act, or under the amendment proposed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) have the power of superseding the order of the court and making an absolute sale?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think it would. I think I can point out to my hon. friend how we can make that clear, that nothing done now should interfere with any proceedings begun in the Exchequer Court under that Act. We might add to section 6 a few words so that it will read as follows:

Chapter 44 of the statutes of 1899, intituled: An Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to railway debts is repealed except as respects pending proceedings.

We might add these words 'except with respect to pending proceedings' to meet the difficulty I have suggested.

Mr. MONK. That proviso covers the objection which presented itself to my mind with respect to the section we have just adopted. But it is evident that the statute of 1899 was passed to provide for cases which were then presenting themselves. I suppose the wording of that amendment would cover not only proceedings actually pending, but, proceedings that had been adopted under the statute of 1899. A receiver having been named, the other proceedings would be continued. I have prepared an amendment in these words, but probably my hon. friend's is better:

But all proceedings begun under the provisions of the said Act shall be continued and terminated as if such repeal had not been enacted.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that is better than mine, I accept that. That has been thought out. I understand that all proceedings begun under the Act of 1899 are to be continued as if the Act had not been repealed.

Mr. MONK. Just so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As I understand it, any proceedings begun under an Act should not be interfered with by subsequent legislation, because it would render our legislation absolutely unreliable to attempt to do anything of that sort. We cannot by legislation give a court jurisdiction, and, then repeal it to-morrow and render void all proceedings taken under it.

Mr. FRASER. Unless there are words contradictory in the Act, saying that all proceedings under previous Acts must be stopped, otherwise they must go on.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When this Bill was up before, the leader of the opposition made some observation with respect to our taking from the provincial courts a jurisdiction which is now vested in them, and I promised to consider the matter. I have prepared and submit now an amendment for the purpose of protecting the provincial courts in rights they now have respecting their jurisdiction over railway corporations. I move that the following amendment be added as a subsection to section 1:

Nothing herein contained shall affect the present jurisdiction of any court of a province in any such matters as aforesaid affecting railways or sections thereof wholly within the province, and the superior courts of a province now possessing such jurisdiction shall, as regards such railways and sections of railways, have concurrent jurisdiction with the Exchequer Court now possessing such jurisdiction.

My opinion was that this Act should not interfere with such jurisdiction as provincial

courts now have, but the leader of the opposition was under the impression that there might be some doubt, and in deference to his opinion, I submit this amendment. Perhaps it would make it still clearer if we were to make it read this way: 'Should continue as regards such railways and sections of railways to have concurrent jurisdiction.'

Mr. FRASER. My only difficulty is this: In passing this legislation are we not assuming that we can take away the jurisdiction of the provincial courts? We should not assume that we can by any act of this kind interfere with the powers of the courts within the provinces and say that we leave that which we could not take away.

Mr. MONK. We do not say that in the amendment.

Mr. FRASER. You assume that or else you would not pass it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was of the opinion that in certain provinces the superior court had jurisdiction to deal with this matter. We want this jurisdiction to be continued but we do not want to add anything to it. We are creating a new jurisdiction in the Exchequer Court to deal with these matters that cannot be dealt with by the provincial courts. That is the intention of the committee as I understand it?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This amendment is merely to carry out the intention of the committee.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The committee will remember that when we were dealing with section 3 the last time this Bill was being considered the question was raised as to whether the receiver should have the right to make any expenditure in respect to the completion of the railway. I was asked to prepare an amendment so as to make it absolutely clear that the receiver should not have the right to do anything in respect to new works except under the direction of the court. I therefore beg to move for leave to insert a section between sections 3 and 4 which will be known as section 3a, as follows:

> The receiver may also, if the court so directs, either upon his appointment or subsequently do all acts necessary for the completion of the construction or equipment of the railway or any section

That is to make it sure that there shall be nothing done except under the direction of the court.

Section agreed to.

Mr. WADE. There is one matter that I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to, and that is the question of the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court and as to the advisability of extending the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court especially in view of the last amendment which seems to put it beyond peradventure that the provincial courts are not to have jurisdiction in regard to a railway which is only partially in a province and which extends beyond it. Section 75 of chap. 135 defines the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court. Subsection 2 of that section reads as follows:

> The Exchequer Court shall have exclusive original jurisdiction in all cases in which demand is made or relief sought in respect of any matter which might, in England, have been the subject of a suit or action in the court of exchequer on its revenue side against the Crown.

Section 76 reads as follows:

> The Exchequer Court shall also have concurrent original jurisdiction with the courts of the several provinces, in all other suits of a civil nature at common law or equity, in which the Crown, in the interest of the Dominion of Canada is plaintiff or petitioner.

Under section 76, if at all, the Exchequer Court would have the power of granting an injunction or the power of taking any extraordinary means of that sort. The wording of the section, as will be observed, is as follows:

> The Exchequer Court shall also have concurrent original jurisdiction with the courts of the several provinces, in all other suits of a civil nature at common law or equity, in which the Crown, in the interest of the Dominion of Canada, is plaintiff or petitioner.

If the provincial court has not jurisdiction over a road which runs through two provinces, then, under this section, the Exchequer Court would have no jurisdiction to grant this relief in respect to a road which runs through two provinces and its jurisdiction would be confined to that which is conferred by the provisions of this Act and that jurisdiction is confined to the matter of sale either upon the motion of a creditor, or upon the motion of a bondholder or mortgagee. It has not occurred to my mind until very recently, and I am not at all clear about it, but I would invite the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to it and also to the subsequent provisions of sections 86 and 88 in regard to the enforcement of the judgments of the Exchequer Court by execution.

Mr. FRASER. Does the hon. gentleman think that the words in paragraph (a) of section 1 of this Bill 'at the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals,' mean the Crown, because if not, there is no reference in this Bill to the Crown acting?

Mr. WADE. Then my argument has so much more force in that case. The creation of the jurisdiction which is conferred by this Bill as amended really is equivalent to

saying that the provincial courts have no jurisdiction in cases where the railway is partially in one province and partially in another; in other words, except within the boundaries of the province the provincial court has no jurisdiction.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) if the section which he read declaring that the Exchequer Court shall have concurrent jurisdiction with the provincial courts does not relate exclusively to cases where the Crown is a party to the suit.

Mr. WADE. Of course it relates to cases where the Crown is a party to the suit.

Mr. FRASER. Only ?

Mr. WADE. Yes only. It says :

The Exchequer Court shall also have concurrent jurisdiction with the courts of the several provinces, in all other suits of a civil nature at common law or equity, in which the Crown, in the interests of the Dominion of Canada is plaintiff or petitioner.

The case I have in mind is one like this : suppose a company has a contract with the government to build a railway and the government is to pay a subsidy for the building of the road ; suppose the government had paid a portion of the subsidy and they wished to enforce the contract. The question in my mind is as to the Exchequer Court jurisdiction ; and if it is a road which is partly in one province and partly in another, is there any court now that has jurisdiction ? It is not desirable that we should beyond doubt clothe the Exchequer Court with jurisdiction ?

Mr. FRASER. It seems to me that the Crown would never want to sell the railway although they might take possession of it. I doubt if the government would ever sell a railway unless the contract was specifically made to provide that the government can sell it.

Mr. WADE. If the Crown was a creditor there would be no trouble about the Crown proceeding under this present Bill, but I submit to the attention of the Minister of Justice the case in which the Crown is not a creditor.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

JUDGES' RETIRING ALLOWANCES.

House again in committee to consider the proposed resolution :

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts, and to provide as follows :

1. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of any superior court of Canada, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the Great Seal, reciting such judge's age and period of service, grant unto him an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life ; provided such judge has (a) attained the age of seventy-five years, and continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts, or as such judge and as stipendiary magistrate of the North-west Territories, for twenty years or upwards ; or (b) attained the age of seventy years, and continued in office, as judge of one or more of the said courts for twenty-five years or upwards ; or (c) continued in office as judge of one or more of the said courts for thirty years or upwards.

2. If any judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, or of the Exchequer Court of Canada, or of a Superior Court of any of the provinces of Canada, resigns or has heretofore resigned his office as such judge, to accept the office of lieutenant governor of a province, and if he serves, or has served as lieutenant governor, and is not otherwise eligible for any retiring annuity, as such judge, His Majesty may, at any time after the expiration of the term of service of such judge as lieutenant governor, grant unto such judge an annuity equal to two-thirds of the salary annexed to the judicial office which he held at the time of his resignation ; to commence immediately upon the issue of such letters patent, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

3. Every county court judge who has attained the age of eighty years shall be compulsorily retired ; and to any judge who is so retired, or who, having attained the age of seventy-five years, resigns his office, and who in either case has continued in office for a period of twenty-five years or upwards, His Majesty may grant an annuity equal to the salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement ; or if he he has continued in office as such judge for a less period than twenty-five years, equal to two-thirds of such salary ; provided that to any such judge who is so compulsorily retired, or who so resigns within years after the passing of the Act based upon these resolutions, there may be granted an annuity equal to the full salary of the office held by him at the time of his retirement or resignation, irrespective of the number of years he has continued in office.

4. If any judge of a county court, after having continued in office for a period of thirty-five years, and become afflicted with some permanent infirmity, disabling him from the due execution of his office, resigns his office, His Majesty may, by letters patent under the Great Seal of Canada, grant to him a pension equal to the salary of his office at the time of his retirement; the said annuity to commence immediately after his retirement, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.—The Minister of Justice.

On section 1.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). I may explain that the first clause makes provision for Superior Court judges, and the judges of the Exchequer Court and the Supreme Court : that they shall have the right to retire upon their full salary upon the occurrence of any one of the following conditions : That a judge shall be 75 years old and have 20 years

service ; or 70 years and 25 years service ; or 30 years service irrespective of age.

On section 4,

Mr. SPROULE. What difference do you make between stipendiary magistrates of the North-west Territories and other stipendiary magistrates ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I ought to say that this is a special provision made applicable to Mr. Justice Richardson, who went to the North-west Territories a great many years ago at the beginning of the organization of the territories and who served for many years as stipendiary magistrate. During the time he performed the duties of stipendiary magistrate he really was a Superior Court judge. He is a very old man and it would be unfair to allow others who have not performed any greater service than he has, to retire on full pay and not give him the benefit. This is to provide for the case of Mr. Justice Richardson, of Regina.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N. S.). What does the Minister of Justice propose doing in the case of judges who are not able to act, and will never be able to act, not because of old age, but because of infirmity. There ought to be some provision for a case of that kind. I have a case in my mind now in which a young judge has been striken with illness so that he is not able to, and will never be able, to sit on the Supreme Court bench of Nova Scotia again. There should be some provision for cases of that kind.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I presume that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Ross) refers to the case of Mr. Justice Henry, of Halifax, and that is a case of very, very great hardship.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It is to him I refer.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Justice Henry is a very distinguished man who was appointed by Sir John Thompson a few years ago and who in recent years has been afflicted with an infirmity which makes it impossible for him to communicate his ideas or to perform his duties. It is one of those cases of hardship which I find it very hard to deal with, and I would prefer not to be asked to deal with it at the present moment in connection with this particular Bill. We all sympathize with Mr. Justice Henry, and I would prefer if my hon. friend would allow the matter to remain in abeyance for the present at all events.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I am satisfied to leave the case in the hands of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. WADE. I also am quite satisfied that it should be left to the Minister of Justice to deal with the case, but I do not wish the matter to pass without saying a word in endorsation of the remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross). The case of Mr. Justice Henry is one of peculiar hardship. He is a comparatively young man who has not sat more than ten years on the bench, and I do trust that the Minister of Justice will see his way clear to give the greatest measure of relief he possibly can. Permit me to refer to the statement made by the Minister of Justice the other night, when he said that he did not propose to do anything at present with regard to the salaries of judges. I urge upon him now, as I have already urged upon a former Minister of Justice, the total inadequacy of the salaries that are meeted out to our judges in the province of Nova Scotia. They have only $4,000 a year, although they perform quite as important duties as the judges in the other provinces. I am at a loss to understand how any hon. gentlemen can defend the payment of only $4,000 a year to the judges of Nova Scotia, and $5,000 a year to judges in other provinces. It is absolutely unfair, and I think we can appeal to the sense of fair play and justice of members on both sides of the House, that these salaries ought to be readjusted.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The other day my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Robinson) mentioned the case of Mr. Justice Hughes, of St. Thomas, and I beg to say to my hon. friend that I hope to be able to meet his views in connection with that matter.

Resolution reported, and read the first time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the resolutions be now read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. Minister of Justice to allow the case of Judge Hughes, of the county of Elgin, to stand until he had served his fiftieth year as judge of the county, and the minister promised to do so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The case of Mr. Justice Hughes was brought to my notice by the hon. member, and I expect at a later stage to make a statement on that subject; but in the meantime, I may say that I have consulted those in authority, and we consider that this application on behalf of Mr. Justice Hughes is a very reasonable one, and one which we hope to be able to meet.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Thank you.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 243) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

PENITENTIARIES ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 217) respecting penitentiaries.—The Minister of Justice.

On section 42—visitors,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a slight change there. Under section 41 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 182, in addition to the persons mentioned in this section as authorized to visit the penitentiaries were the members of any local legislature. Now, the local legislature have no authority over our penitentiaries, and I thought it right to strike them out. I did not see why they should have authority to visit institutions that are under our exclusive control.

On section 45—receiving of convicts,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I thought it necessary to make the change in that respect by the addition of the words 'unless certified by the surgeon of the penitentiary to be suffering from any dangerously infectious or contagious disease.' During the prevalence of small-pox at one time at St. Vincent de Paul we received prisoners suffering from that disease, and were put to a great inconvenience for that reason. Now, if the prisoner comes to the penitentiary suffering from a contagious disease, we thought we ought to have the privilege of refusing to receive him until he is rid of the disease, otherwise all sorts of inconvenience to the penitentiary will result.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it would be better to add some words to provide that in that case the prisoner shall be taken back to the place from which he came.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I see that. We had better let that section stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 46, subsection 2—custody of convict from time of sentence,

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that this is before he has gone to the penitentiary. I would make that the certificate of the judge and not of the clerk of the court.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is intended to allow us to remove prisoners from a penitentiary which has become congested to some other. For instance, in Stony Mountain penitentiary we have more prisoners than can properly be taken care of, and it is necessary to remove some to St. Vincent de Paul. That is now beyond our control.

Mr. FOWLER. But suppose a man in the maritime provinces sentenced to the penitentiary and, instead of being taken to Dorchester, is taken to St. Vincent de Paul or Kingston. If the certificate is given by the judge it would be better than if given by the clerk of the court. The judge is the more responsible officer.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) will notice that this refers to a copy of the sentence taken from the minutes of the court and certified by the judge or by the clerk. That is the law as it now stands. I have no doubt there is a reason why it was made as it is, though I am not able to state the reason at the moment. I would not like to make a change without knowing more about it.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to ask the House now to grant concurrence in the items of the supplementary estimates of the past year which remain undisposed of, so that we may be able to complete the Supply Bill. Not only has the year closed, but the time fixed for closing the books of the year is close at hand; it is therefore very desirable that we should give preference to this business.

Railways and Canals, chargeable to capital, Galops Rapid, deepening and widening, $25,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) what this $25,000 is for. As I understand, these estimates are for expenditures that have been made between the 1st July, 1902, and the 1st July, 1903.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the hon. minister answers that I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Reid, Grenville) will have the same opportunity of discussing this as in Committee of the Whole?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no objection. The item is to pay the Gilbert Company for work done in the Galops Rapid channel which was the subject of some discussion in the House a year ago. There appeared to be some misunderstanding as to the orders for this work. The minister stated last year that he had not authorized the doing of the work, and at the time it was held up for further consideration. However, although there was some question as to the authority for the work, and the minister stated he did not give the authority himself, it appears that the work was done, and the minister also appears to have come to the conclusion that inasmuch as the work was done and was likely to serve a useful purpose, the government should make provision for payment. Accordingly he placed that item in the estimates and had it submitted to the House. The theory upon which, I presume, my late colleague took that step was that a very large sum of money had been expended on the work, and that it was wise

to finish it. The work has cost, I understand, $800,000 or $900,000. It was begun as far back as 1881, under the advice of the late John Page, who was the chief engineer of canals at the time. It has been going on for a series of years, and recently the minister had made up his mind that it was wise to complete it. He therefore put in his estimates this sum of $25,000 to pay this past claim of the Gilbert Company, and he also proposed in the main estimates a further appropriation with a view of finishing the work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I have raised objection to this work at different times in this House, but of course the present acting minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) does not understand the position of affairs as well as the late minister, who had been in charge of the department. I wish to explain now the whole position of this matter. The contract was let by the government in power in 1878 (not in 1881) to make this channel through the Galops rapids. It was originally let to Wm. Davis & Sons, and they assigned it to this Gilbert firm. They continued this contract for a few years under the late Mr. Page and succeeded—at least as they claimed—in making a channel 200 feet wide through these rapids. When the Hon. Mr. Haggart took charge of the Railway Department he came to the conclusion, after examination, that it would be an impossibility for steamers to use this channel even though it were widened and deepened as proposed, and so he changed the plans and built a lock adjoining the rapids which steamers could use in navigating that part of the St. Lawrence. That lock has been used ever since its completion, a few years ago, and it has overcome the obstruction to navigation presented by these rapids. The whole trouble with the channel is that it has been constructed across the currrent, and even though it were the required depth, which I claim it is not, it would be impossible for large steamers to navigate that channel with safety. That statement can be verified by the fact that even though the channel were 200 feet wide and had a depth of 17 feet—which I claim it has not—no insurance company in Canada or elsewhere would insure any vessel navigating this channel. Let me give a little information as to what lead the Hon. Mr. Haggart to come to the conclusion that the construction of this channel was not a proper work. While this channel was being constructed the vessel men who used it were continually protesting against the work and advocating the construction of a new lock. I will read some of the letters of protest that were sent to the government. I have here a letter addressed to the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald by Mr. Henderson, manager of the Montreal Transportation Company, which is one of the largest forwarders in this country. The letter is as follows :—

Montreal Transportation Company.
Kingston, October 21, 1879.

Sir John A. Macdonald, K.C.B.

Dear Sir, A circumstance has come to my knowledge this evening which I think is my duty to acquaint you of.

I was discussing with one of our best pilots the question of running the Galops Rapids with our barges and the difficulties attending same, and he mentioned that the government intended to commence work next spring and make a channel on the south side, and he remarked that it was a very expensive affair, and when made he would rather use the present channel as it now is, than attempt to take a tow through the new one when made, and the best improvement that could be made would be to remove a certain shoal that runs out on the north side of the present channel, which could be done at one-fifth of what the new channel will cost, and if that shoal was removed it would give them a straight run down, and they could take any reasonable number of barges down the Galops. This thing certainly should be looked into and we would recommend to you before undertaking the said improvement to call into your council a given number of the principal pilots that run the river. Engineers may be all very good in their way, but we would say that the pilots know best what would help the trade, and if you can make one dollar do more real good than five, by taking their advice why not do so ? Don't let this matter be overlooked for I would be sorry to see a repetition of the former blunders recently make in the board of works.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) P. K. HENDERSON.

Here is another letter from Mr. D. D. Calvin :

Kingston, Canada,
Garden Island, October 29, 1879.

Department of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Gentlemen,—I telegraphed the Board of Works on 27th in relation to the removing of the large rock in the channel of the Galops rapids (below Prescott) and as I have not received any answer I take the liberty of writing. What induced me to telegraph you was when I was in Ottawa a few days ago there was a man offered me two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to remove the rock. I wanted to find out if he had the right to let the job. There is no work on the River St. Lawrence that requires attention as much as the removal of that rock and in high water it is doubtful if it can be removed at all. The water now is three feet lower than an ordinary draft in midsummer, besides in midsummer it would block the channel to the injury of commerce. Excuse egotism but I think your ministry might be benefited by my presence before them for fifteen minutes to explain matters in relation to this subject.

(Sgd.) D. D. CALVIN.

I may say that the rock referred to in this letter was never removed; it is a different work altogether that was done. The following is a petition that was addressed to the hon. Commissioner of Works at Ottawa :

To the Honourable,
The Commissioner of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We are informed that the government contemplate deepening the Galops rapids on the southerly side of the river. Should this be done, we think it will prove to be an irretrievable mistake, as it will necessarily leave a wall on either side of the proposed channel varying from five to seven feet high, full of sharp, scraggy rocks protruding, and a wind across the river either way would drift a tow of crafts against this scraggy wall and sink them ; furthermore, the cutting of this channel would lower the water above from one to one and a half feet.

Now, there is already a channel on the north side of the river 400 feet wide and 13 feet deep, and the only obstruction in this channel is a large rock about ten feet in diameter and six or seven feet under water. To take out this rock would not disturb the depth of the channel above, and we trust that instead of cutting a channel on the south side of the river, the government will have this large rock removed and thereby furnish a good channel which crafts can navigate with safety.

Your obedient servants,

D. D. Calvin, J. A. Breck, Capt. S. Anderson, John Donnelly, Joseph Murray, John Gaskin, Folger Bros., A. Gunn, Hugh Scott, Montreal Forwarding Co. (Limited), James Stewart, agent ; St. Lawrence & Chicago Forwarding Co., John McFarlane, agent, D. Macphie, manager ; Montreal Transportation Co., Hugh McLennan, president.

P.S.—We would beg to refer you to Thomas Keefer's report on this subject whilst Hamilton Merritt was chief commissioner about the year 1841 or 1842.

Here are some other letters :

Kingston, November 1, 1880.

To the Honourable,
The Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir, I have been a pilot on the River St. Lawrence ever since the year 1828, and I know what I am saying when I state that if the channel is made in the Galops rapids where your chain tug is now at work, it will certainly lower the water above. Even now the small amount of work they have done is decidedly noticeable and detrimental. To use a homely illustration, it has the same effect on a stream that the taking away of a mill dam would have. Now, instead of making a new channel where your men are working, if you let the chain tug take away the big rock that obstructs the present channel we could then take down ten or eleven barges instead of four as at present, It has been stated that the chain tug cannot be placed at the rock, but I would agree to place her there myself, and could furnish a guarantee that I am able to do what I say.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) JOHN SUGHRUE,
Master Steamer 'Chieftain.'

I also have been a pilot on the St. Lawrence for thirty years, and concur in the within.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) CAPT. S. ANDERSON,
Master Steamer 'Hiram Calvin.'

St. Catharines, June 1, 1881.

To the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper,
Minister of Railways and Canals.

Dear Sir,—After a long and careful consideration of the contemplated removal of the rock that obstructs navigation at the Galops rapids in the St. Lawrence river, I feel confident that if the work of removal be successfully accomplished, that the desired results will not be obtained, for the very reason, that in removing the obstruction out of the river, it will give the water a free course to run off that much faster, and as a natural consequence lower the river at the head of the rapids in proportion to the obstruction removed, and in place of eight or nine feet of water (as the case may be) at the entrance of the canal, as at present you will find that it will be reduced in proportion to the channel that you make for the escape of the water, I have, I believe, matured a plan which, if carried out, will give the desired depth of water on the rapids, and at the same time give you, from eighteen inches to two feet more in the head of the canal than you have at the present time—I should take pleasure in coming to Ottawa free of charge and explain to you my plan, if you think it worthy of consideration, which if adopted would I am certain produce the desired results, and at less than half the cost of removing the rock, which if successfully accomplished will not remove the evil complained of. All that I require is that if you adopt my scheme that you will give me the preference of doing the work. I have the honour to be,

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ELI HIGGINS.

Kingston, August 15, 1884.

To the Minister of Public Works,

Dear Sir,—Our oldest tug captain has made a representation to me in such emphatic terms that I consider it my duty to communicate his opinion to you. What I refer to is the blasting forming a new channel in the Galops rapids. He says they are making a new channel the last six years in a place where the volume of water naturally does not run, and never can be made a successful channel to run down with a tow of barges. Some four years ago the writer addressed a letter to the same effect, a short time after the work was begun, but no notice was taken of the matter. Engineers may be all very well in their way, but we would suggest that pilots and parties who know about the river and its currents should have been consulted. This morning the matter was again pressed upon me, as the pilots say that during low water this new current is going to draw off some of the water from the natural channel and make it unnavigable for large tows. This letter is not sent in a fault-finding spirit, but with the best intentions. The new channel when finished can never be used for a tow of barges, as the current does not enter straight at the upper ends, and barges will tail down on the port side before they can be entered. Six barges now in the natural channel, but four barges cannot be taken down the new when finished. It will be a great calamity if you destroy this channel.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) P. R. HENDERSON.

There is here letter after letter to the hon. minister protesting against this channel being made where it was, not only for the reason that it would be impossible for vessels to navigate it safely, but also because it was making a cut by which the waters of the St. Lawrence above would be greatly reduced in depth. I suppose that may have been one of the reasons which influenced the hon. minister in office at that

time to change the plan and put a very large lock at the head of the canal, so that vessels could enter the canal and lock through and go out again safely into the river, thus avoiding any chance of accidents in the rapids. The same thing applies to vessels coming up. However, I might say that these contractors proceeded with the work and handed it over to the government. While the work was going on there were rumours all through that part of the country that the contractors had not carried out their contract, or, in other words, that although they were paid in full for making a channel 200 feet wide, and although they stated that there was 17 feet of water clear in this channel, it was reported that they had left it, after dredging out part of the rock, with only 10 feet of water in the channel. In fact, the whole public believed that to be true. They left it in that way because they believed that no large vessel could ever navigate it safely, and because they had obtained another contract on the Cornwall canal from the government, thus having something to do. However, shortly after I was elected in 1891, parties who were on this work came to me and made statements to the effect that the contractors had left it in this state. The parties who made these complaints were honourable men, two of them government employees, one being in charge of the government vessel on that work. He stated to me that he wished to give me this information, because if any vessels did attempt to run that channel, they were sure to meet with mishaps. I asked him if he would give me the information under his own signature, which he did, and this is the statement he gave :

I, John Stitt, of the village of Cardinal, in the county of Grenville, caretaker of Chain Tug, do hereby declare :

1. That I was caretaker of this dredge during the last season (1888), that she was employed by Messrs. Gilbert Bros. making what is known as the Galops Channel.

2. That I was on the dredge during the time she was working in that season, and constantly and repeatedly saw the soundings of the work done on each shoal taken.

3. That the said dredge went away from the following shoals in said channel, leaving the work in the following way, viz. :

1. On or about July 16, 1888, she was working on North Shoal on cut No. 5, 169 feet east of O—she went away from here leaving a lump on which there was only ten feet of water. She never went back again and took it out, this is situated above what is called 'Island Shoal,' and below Adams Island and north of Caledonia Shoal.

2. On or about October 6, 1888, she was working on Island Shoal on cut Nos. 3 and 4, 250 feet east of O. She went away from here leaving only fourteen feet of water, she never went back again and took it out.

On same shoal 200 feet east of O, on cut No. 7, she went away, leaving sixteen feet of water. On same shoal cut No. 2, she went away leaving sixteen feet and two-tenths.

On September 19, 1888, on lower bar, on cut No. 6½, on three positions she went away, leaving it within two feet of being grade. On or about July 9, 1888 at the head of Caledonia Shoal there was a large stone the tug Gilbert struck.

On cut No. 8, Island Shoal 35 feet east of O, there is a large stone that was never taken out.

On both sides of the channel the dredge piled the rocks up so that in places there was not over four or five feet of water, these rocks were put there then, could be seen then, and can now be seen at any time.

4. I saw Mr. Rubidge with the steamer 'Alert,' at the Galops during the last three days and have heard he was there resounding this channel and it is currently reported here that he found the channel correct, and if the full depth of seventeen feet with nine feet of water on the mitre sill, notwithstanding these statements, if such have been made by Mr. Rubidge. I positively state the above statements are true, and a proper sounding will show them to be true.

At the time I saw said soundings taken, I made memos. in my book, which are correct. I give this information feeling an unjust claim is being forced on the government.

(Sgd) JOHN STITT.

Cardinal, May 25th, 1891.

I, Gideon Adams, have read the statements of John Stitt, and fully corroborate them. I have no hesitation in saying there is not seventeen feet of water in all of the new channel in Galops.

I was master of Messrs. Gilbert's tugs during the whole work, and never during the whole contract did Mr. Haycock take one sounding. W. A. Logan seemed to be the man who run the whole work. After the work was done and finally passed, I have struck on the sides of the bank with the tug 'Gilbert,' which only draws seven feet of water, and since the new channel has been made, I have been running the tug down through the channel and repeatedly saw bottom plainly, and I know from my experience that I could not see it if there was seventeen feet of water.

I also positively state that for one season G. H. Logan, a brother of W. A. Logan, who was chief man for Gilbert Bros., and who was getting a commission in the work dredged, took all the soundings and measurements himself (or his men), and no government man in it at all, when as we were informed this work was supposed to be done by W. A. Logan, they were never resounded, so that it was on these soundings, I believe that the government paid for the work.

(Sgd) GIDEON ADAMS.

In addition there is a long statement, showing the soundings taken and showing that they are not of the proper depth. This was after the work had been completed and taken over by the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What date ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). May 25th, 1891. As soon as these men made these declarations before me, I appealed to the hon. Mr. Haggart, then Minister of Railways and Canals, for a thorough investigation. I took the stand that if these statements were true and any vessels ever attempted to navigate that channel, they would meet with mishap and perhaps loss of life. Mr. Haggart then gave instruction to Mr. Rubidge to investigate the charges. Mr. Rubidge was the man who had been in charge of this work with engineers under him. However,

I said nothing until I got his report. He examined the work, and after examining it he could not take time to write a report but immediately telegraphed to Ottawa. 'Have finished the examination at Galops and have found no truth in the charge.' That was July 6th, 1889. Here is his first report after having made this examination :—

Cornwall, 16th June, 1891.

A. P. Bradley, Esq.,
Secretary Department of Railways and Canals.

Re Galops Rapids Improvements.

Sir,—In reply to No. 84,792, 13th May, 1891, inclosing a letter from D. J. Reid, Esq., M.P., re the contract with Messrs. E. E. Gilbert & Sons, for making the new channel at the Galops Rapids.

I beg to state, that from the 21st to the 23rd of May last, I was personally engaged in making preliminary tests of the new channel, with this result, that at several points bottom was struck at a depth of sixteen feet (lowest water) but that owing to the limited means at my disposal I found it impossible to ascertain, whether at the point so struck, the bottom was composed of solid rock, or of the debris from rock blasted fine—this latter I considered most probable—but in order to at once set the matter at rest, I have to suggest, that a further and more searching examination be made at an early date, to accomplish which I purpose applying to the Messrs. Gilbert to assist me, and to furnish their tug the 'Gilbert' together with her necessary appliances for controlling her in the rapids.

The estimated cost of the proposed examination is as follows, viz. :

Tug 'Gilbert,' fully equipped	800 00
Wire cable, 1,000 feet	150 00
Tug 'Alert,' including scows, &c..	300 00
Total	$1,250 00

The above sum of $1,250, or so much thereof as may be required, I respectfully request authority to expend, in order that I may be in a position to submit a full report to the chief engineer on the present state of the new channel.

It is proposed to commence preparations at once in order that the soundings may be completed during the present high stage of the river.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) TOM. S. RUBIDGE,
Supt. Engineer.

Mr. Rubidge got instructions to go ahead with the examination and expend $1,250. He then made this report :

Cornwall, 8th August, 1891.

A. P. Bradley, Esq.,
Secretary Department Railways and Canals, Ottawa.

Re Galops Rapids Improvements—Test.

Sir,—Referring to official letter No. 85211 of the 17th June last, authorizing me to proceed with the work of testing the character of the bottom of the new channel, but limiting the expenditure to my estimate therefor of $1,250, I beg to report :

1. That all points indicated by Mr. Reid, M.P., where obstructions were supposed to exist, were thoroughly examined by me under the direction of and with the assistance of Messrs. Stitt, Warner and McCartha, employees of the department, and Messrs. G. Adams, formerly employed by the contractors, and F. MacDonell, a young man representing Mr. Reid.

2. That this examination occupied three days and resulted in our failure to discover the obstructions referred to in Mr. Reid's letter of the 6th May last to the late minister.

3. That subsequently, and for several days, I was engaged in sounding with a view to obtain some characteristic cross sections of each of the shoals, in order to represent the present state of the bottom of the channel and compare it with that shows on the cross section upon which the final estimate was based.

4. The channel was further tested to a depth of sixteen feet at low water, by running the tug up and down several times on the range marks without striking.

The result of my testing operations was generally satisfactory, sufficiently so to convince me that the contractors had conducted their work in good faith, and had honestly endeavoured to fulfil the terms of their contract to form a channel 200 feet in width and seventeen feet in depth at low water, and also that the resident engineer and his staff had faithfully performed their duty. Nevertheless, Mr. Reid expresses great dissatisfaction with the test on the ground that it was not sufficiently extended, or was too hurriedly performed to disprove his charges.

For this reason, but more particularly with a view to obtain additional data whereby the contractor's unsettled claims may be intelligently dealt with, I respectfully ask to be authorized to make a thorough survey of the channel and its approaches embracing the banks on either side, and such other portions thereof as may appear to me to be necessary, also to ascertain the strength and direction of the various currents, and to lay down permanent anchorages for buoys, where required, and generally to perfect the ranges and other leading marks, in order to inspire confidence in its safety, and thereby bring the new channel into general use.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) TOM. S. RUBIDGE,
Supt. Engineer.

Now, at this time, the investigation was over, and I was complaining to Hon. Mr. Haggart that Mr. Rubidge and his staff were entirely responsible for this trouble, that they had not performed their duties satisfactorily, but had allowed these contractors to go away and leave the channel in this shape ; and I demanded and insisted upon a disinterested party being placed there to investigate and make a report which would not only satisfy me but would satisfy the public generally and set the whole question at rest. Accordingly, Hon. Mr. Haggart wrote to Mr. John Kennedy, the chief engineer of the Montreal Harbour Board, and asked him if he would undertake this work of investigation and thus give the public confidence in the channel. Mr. Kennedy undertook the work. I need not read the correspondence, but I will read his report.:

Montreal, January 16, 1893.

Collingwood Schrieber, Esq.,
Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer
of Railways and Canals.
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—The examination of the new channel of the Galops rapids of the St. Lawrence was continued after my report of 19th September last, and, excepting in some minor items, it was completed as far as proposed with the closing of navigation. The plans and calculations are now finished, and I beg to report the result :—

The method of conducting the examination was described in the former report but for convenience the description may be here repeated in brief. The elevation of the entire dredged bottom as it now is was ascertained by levels taken on cross section lines above twenty-five feet apart and at points usually twelve and a half feet apart on these lines, but at closer distances at the banks of the channel and other necessary places. The bottom grade line of seventeen feet below the surface of normal low water (which is when there is nine feet depth on the upper sill of the entrance lock of the Galops canal) was deducted from a profile of the water surface of the channel taken when it was very near the normal low water stage. Since the former report, and at the request of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals an effort was made to ascertain what the bottom consists of, and whether loose or solid, by the use of such appliances as could be readily obtained and could be used with the surveying steamer. For this purpose two appliances were used. One of these consisted of a steel bar supported and guyed by tackle at the steamer's side in such way as to hold it against the current, and at the same time to allow its being moved in various directions by hand, so that the bottom could in some measure, be felt as with a common pole. The bar was two and a half inches in diameter, and its lower end was provided with a stout foot projecting six inches inside to one side. The other appliance consisted of a pair of stone grips or hinged grapples, of about four tons lifting capacity, worked by suitable tackle and steam winches. While either bar or grips were being used the steamer was moored by two anchors placed one ahead and one over one bow, with cables carried to steam winches in such way that the boat could be held still or slowly moved about at pleasure.

The chief items of general examination work are the following :—

Upper bar was cross-sectioned. A profile of the water surface was taken when there was nine feet and half an inch depth on the lock sill, for determining the bottom grade line. The bottom was swept over by the horizontal bar so as to find the areas clear for navigation at depths of 14 15, 16 and 17 feet at low water. The character of the bottom was tried at a great many points both by bar and grips.

The space between Upper Bar and the North and Caledonia shoals was tested for navigation by sweeping it over with the horizontal bar at a depth of seventeen feet at low water.

North and Caledonia shoals were both cross-sectioned, and the termination of the excavation at the sides of the channel was determined. A profile of the water surface was taken when the water was at 8·95 to 9·15 feet on the lower sill for determining the bottom grade line. The areas clear for navigation on Caledonia shoal were found by sweeping at depths of 14, 15, 16 and 17 feet at low water.

Island shoal. The examination work was detailed in the report of the 19th September last, but for convenience is here repeated in brief. The shoal was cross-sectioned and the sides of the excavation determined. The areas clear for navigation were found by testing to depths of 12, 13, 14, 15 and 17 feet at low water. The conditions for taking a profile of the low water surface on Island shoal were more favourable after the date of the September report than those which prevailed before, and a new profile was therefore made. This gives a grade line averaging about two inches higher than that deduced from the former profile, and also nearer by that much to Mr. Rubidge's grade line. In order to secure exactness in figures this new grade has been adopted and the excavation in Island shoal has been re-computed to agree with it, as hereafter noted.

The space between Island Shoal and Lower Bar was tested for navigable depth by sweeping it over with the horizontal bar at seventeen feet depth at low water. Lower Bar was cross-sectioned between the normal side lines of the channel. The side limits of the excavation outside the normal lines were not in all cases determined because the strength and irregularity of the current, as also the conditions of the banks made it impossible to do so without more time and more outlay for special appliances than appeared justifiable. A profile of the water surface was taken, when the depth on the lock sill was 9—1 to 9—15 feet— for determining the bottom grade.

The areas clear for navigation were found by sweeping with the horizontal bar to depths of 10½ and 12 feet at low water.

Lower bar extension was cross-sectioned throughout. A profile of the water surface for determining the bottom grade line was taken when the depth on the sill was 9·1 to 9·15 feet.

The areas clear for navigation at various depths were ascertained by sweeping with the horizontal bar at depths of 12½, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 feet at low water.

Quantities of Excavation.—In giving the quantities of excavation which follow there are conditions which require to be explained and noted.

1. The quantity of excavation performed is to be understood as being that which is measured by the difference between the original bottom as it was before excavation was commenced and the bottom as it is now found. There are no exact data for computing it otherwise, nor in any condition previous to the present.

2. It is to be particularly noted that the line of present bottom shown in the accompanying cross sections and from which the excavation is calculated, is its average height as ascertained by taking levels at the points indicated and drawing straight lines from point to point. This is a sufficiently correct factor for the computation of the quantity of excavations, but it must not be taken as having any relation to the navigable depth of water. The tests by the sweeping bar show that in large areas of the channel where the average depth is fully down to grade or even much below it, there are high grade points which make the depth available for navigation, or for any other present use to be very much less. These high points are in most cases more isolated rocks or stone snags, which count for nothing in cubic yards of excavation, because they only balance correspondingly deep holes, but they enormously affect the navigable depth of the channel. This suggests the desirability of some estimate of the contents or dimensions of these points alone, so

as to deal more intelligently with the problem of their removal down to grade, but this was not included in the scope of the examination, nor would it be practicable with accuracy or at any reasonable cost. Their location and the depth of water upon them has been found, and the areas of navigation which they affect are shown upon the plans accompanying this report, but more detailed measurement was not attempted. It is therefore to be understood that the quantities hereafter given are calculated from the average level of the bottom.

3. For computing the quantities of excavation the original bottom has been taken from plans furnished by Mr. T. S. Rubidge, superintending engineer of the St. Lawrence canals. These plans consist of cross sections showing all parts of the bottom which were above the grade line adopted by him, and of a plan of the soundings taken on the preliminary survey of the channel. These preliminary soundings have been used only to determine the original bottom level of certain limited areas which were below grade line and not shown upon the sections but upon which it was found excavation had been done. For all other parts, that is for all parts above Mr. Rubidge's grade line, the original bottom has been taken from the cross section. In the case of the island shoal preliminary soundings are now available which were not so in September last. These have slightly altered the quantities on that shoal and have contributed to the need for recomputation.

4. On lower bar the quantities outside the normal side lines of the channel, have not been computed because the banks were not fully defined as above noted. On lower bar extension no computation of the quantity below grade can be made, because of insufficient information as to the original bottom level, and this item was therefore omitted. The quantity outside of the normal side lines is also omitted because it cannot be satisfactorily defined and measured.

5. The grade line now used in defining the excavations is the new one ascertained as already described. It differs somewhat from Mr. Rubidge's, mainly no doubt because it was taken from the low water surface as now found in the channel, while his was taken before the channel was excavated. The quantities of excavation performed in the parts of the channel named as computed from the data described and divided under the required headings are as follows :

These, it will be noted, comprise the excavation of the entire channel except that below grade and outside the normal side lines in the extension of lower bar and that outside the normal side lines of lower bar.

Navigable Depths.—The sweeping of the channel with horizontal bar in order to find the areas clear for navigation at different depths at low water of nine feet on the sill, gives the following main results, viz. :

Upper bar is clear to fourteen feet deep at low water but is not clear for fifteen feet.

North Shoal, in common with Lower Bar, has the shallowest water in the channel and is at one point clear to only ten and a half feet.

Caledonia Shoal is clear to fourteen feet but is not clear to fifteen feet.

Island Shoal is clear to twelve feet with exception of a short piece at the south bank.

Lower Bar is clear to only ten and a half feet.

Lower Bar extension is not clear to fourteen feet but is all clear to thirteen feet except at one small place which is clear only to twelve feet. The spaces between the several bars and shoals are all clear to seventeen feet.

Now, the minister will see by that report that on every shoal where these men were working they went away and left it with, you might say, only ten feet and a half of navigable water.

The areas which are clear at different depths in each of the bars are shown on the accompanying plans. The lines inclosing these areas it must be noted are not ordinary contour or shoal lines ; they are merely the boundaries of areas in each of which there are points having less water upon them than the depth which the line signifies.

I may say that immediately on Mr. Kennedy's finding these spots—which were well known to Mr. Rubidge and the engineers, but on which they reported to have seventeen feet of water—they started a report in order to cover up their tracks, that these were spots on which loose rock had swept in this channel. Now here is what Mr. Kennedy states :

Character of Bottom.—The examination of the composition of the bottom with the steel bar and grips was not undertaken till November. The time which then remained to be devoted to such examination was necessarily brief and it was spent in trying the character of Upper Bar and Island Shoal as furnishing the best examples of two opposite conditions. The first was chosen because being at the head of the channel and well clear of any dumping ground it is a place where the bottom may be supposed to be least changed. The second was chosen because it is that into which loose stuff is most likely to have been carried and deposited by the cross current of the Gut. On the upper bar sixty-six places were examined by the steel bar. On probing as with an ordinary sounding pole the bottom almost invariably gave evidence of being rocky and firm ; nothing soft could be felt and very seldom anything at all loose. At some places the rock felt fairly smooth and level, at others jagged with small points and invariably on feeling over any considerable space high points of rock were found which might be either projections of the solid or large detached pieces. On putting the bar upon the bottom and turning it round so that the projecting foot when revolving might drop into interstices and move anything movable, it was very seldom that any such thing could be found. The foot often dropped into well defined crevices at a particular point of each revolution, sometimes being freed under strain and catching at the next revolution but often being held entirely fast until freed by being lifted.

The bar used in this way had much displacing power because the foot was only six inches long, and there was a cross bar above water of two and a half feet long by which the strength of two or three men could be put upon it. The indications obtained were almost always that the bottom was of rock too firm to be disturbed, but whether of solid bed rock or of very heavy detached pieces could not be distinguished. Masses of rock of every size and shape were met with.

Some were undoubtedly projections of solid rock, some had steep or perpendicular sides and others allowed of the foot of the bar being hooked under them. Of these latter some could be lifted up a foot or so before the hold was lost but in the majority of cases the bar hooked under something which could not be lifted but

from which the hold slipped on steam power being applied.

In a few instances the foot held fast and the rock could not be started with such lifting strains as could safely be used probably up to three tons. The indications of the bar are by no means clear or satisfying. As a whole, however, they lead to the belief that upper bar is of rock with practically no small loose stuff upon it, but having masses, some of solid and some of detached rock which project above the general surface and are the measure of the difference between the average bottom level found by sounding and the clear navigable depth found by sweeping with the horizontal bar.

The grips as already described have four feet breadth of opening and have gripping power sufficient to hold fast on a stone with parallel sides if of ordinary roughness. They were first used with two fingers on one arm and only one on the other, so as to give easy penetration into interstices of rock, and they were afterwards fitted with two fingers on one arm and three on the other so as to more easily scatch small stones. They were rigged so that they could be placed where desired in spite of current, and either held rigidly upright or allowed to suit themselves to the bottom, and so they could be opened at pleasure or closed with force while held hard on the bottom.

They were tried in these different conditions in some twenty-three different places on upper bar, and nothing whatever could be picked up. Generally they scratched over the bottom and got no hold. In a few instances they caught an imperfect hold and let go before much lifting strain was exerted. In two instances they got a better grip and held till the lifting strain reached three or more tons and then lost hold. It does not follow from this that there is nothing on the bottom which could not be grasped and lifted by a pair of four foot grips, but it shows that loose pieces of rock within their compass are so few that in about one hundred trials they got hold of none. Time did not permit of the grips being used elsewhere than on upper bar. On island shoal the bottom was examined with the steel bar and the indications were that its character is substantially the same as that of the upper bar, except that it is rougher and that in the spaces and holes between the masses of rock small loose stones are frequently felt. The composition of the bottom was not particularly examined in other parts of the channel, and the behaviour of the sounding rods and sweeping bar and the appearance of the cross sections indicate that it is all rough and rocky. Careful observations were made of the velocities and directions of the currents in different parts of the channel when the river was at about low water stage in 1891, and the results are shown on an accompanying chart.

Yous respectfully,

(Sgd.) JOHN KENNEDY, C.E.

I may say to the hon. minister that there is a report from a straight, honourable, disinterested man, after these men in charge have had an opportunity of examining the channel and making two reports, which are entirely opposed to what Mr. Kennedy has reported. However, after this had been investigated in this way an arrangement was made, as I understand, with the Gilberts that they were to clear out this channel and see that it was 17 feet in depth, and the government were to pay them so much per day for doing this work, but the Gilberts were not to be paid for taking out any rock they could find that was solid. So far as I can learn, they were paid for every day they were there, and they never gave the government to understand that there was any solid rock found. I protested against the work on this channel being proceeded with when I came to this House, I protested against these men being allowed to leave the channel in that condition, and I protested against the arrangement made by them that they were to take out what they would only admit was loose rock. I never can believe that the department made an arrangement under which they were to pay them by the day, and pay them such an enormous amount. The people there could not believe that any government would pay $425 a day for a dredge, a tug and a couple of scows. Statements have been made that it required special plant to do this work. The plant that these parties had consisted of a good tug and good scows, but the whole important part of that plant was a dredge, and that dredge is simply an ordinary small dredge. It is an old dredge. The whole plant to-day is not worth $15,000, and why the government would think of paying $425 a day for it is something I cannot understand. Of course, I believe that it has been pressed upon the government that there was this great danger, and that the Gilberts had a very expensive plant. If the hon. minister will take a look at that plant, I am sure he would not put it at any ordinary work. It has been there since a year ago last fall, and while every other dredge is busy the Gilberts cannot get any work for it that would pay the company, because the dredge, as I am informed, is not fit to do any work. Let us see what the government pay other parties for dredging plant. I find that in 1902, according to the Auditor General's Report, the government paid Mr. McAuliffe for dredging work at Trenton, done by a small dredge similar to that of the Gilberts, a tug and scows, $8 an hour, or $80 a day for ten hours, or $96 a day for twelve hours. W. E. Phin, for dredging at Toronto harbour, from June 3 to October 23, received $8 an hour, making $80 a day of ten hours, or $96 a day for twelve hours. I understand that 12 hours was supposed to constitute a day for the Gilbert Dredging Company. The Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company received for the services of the dredge 'Lockerbie,' from November 10 to December 2, 14 days, $100, and for 6 days $50. They also received for the use of the tug 'Vic' $9 a day for 20 days. Bowman & Company, of Port Elgin, received for the services of the dredge 'Hackett' $8 an hour, or $80 a day of ten hours. The Owen Sound Dredging Company received for the services of dredge 'No. 9' and plant, from May 13 to August 27, $8 an hour, or $80 a day of ten hours. The Owen Sound

Dredging Company received for the services of dredge 'No. 9' and plant at Midland harbour $10 an hour. The Marlton Dredging Company received for services of the dredge 'Arnoldi' and plant in Goderich harbour $8 an hour. Now, I come to the government dredges. First there is the dredge 'St. Lawrence,' which the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) stated the other night in this House cost new $15,364. The average cost per day for running that dredge was $76.82, and yet I should say that she was twice as large as the Gilbert dredge. Here is the dredge 'New Brunswick' a dredge similar in size to the Gilbert dredge and she cost $7,368, and the average cost for running her per day is $36.84. The dredge 'Challenge' cost $8,903, and the average cost per day for running that dredge is $44.50. The dredge 'Nipissing' cost $10,307 and the average cost per day for running her is $51. The dredge 'Ontario' cost $7,338, and the average cost per day for running her is $36.69. The dredge 'Sir Richard' cost $6,044, and the cost per day for running her was $30. I see here an account: paid A. D. Cameron for dredge 'Nithsdale,' tug and scows, 206 days at $40 per day. I see here an account of the Canadian Construction Company at Farren's Point, right on the St. Lawrence for a better dredging outfit than the Gilbert Company have: Use of dredge, 642 hours at $12 an hour; scows, 409 hours at $2 per hour; tug, 420 hours at $6 per hour, making $20 an hour for the whole dredging outfit. I see in the Auditor General's Report an account from M. A. Cleveland, who is working within half a mile of Gilbert, and who would be ashamed to admit that his dredge is not twice as good as Gilbert's; he gets $10 an hour for his dredge, $2 an hour for his tug, and fifty cents an hour for his scow, or $150 a day for his whole plant. I have met many of these contractors and I have asked them if they made any money at these prices, and they said of course they did and any one of them would be delighted to take this contract in the Galops at these prices. Here is an account from Larkin & Sangster who are working at Iroquois three or four miles from the Gilberts; they charge $7 an hour for their dredge, 75 cents an hour for their scow, and $6 an hour for their tug. William Davis & Sons who are working half a mile from the Gilbert people charge for their dredge and crew $7.50 an hour, dump scow, 50 cents an hour, and tug and crew, $4 an hour. Here is the government again, and the dredge 'Prince Edward' she cost $16,357; she is a very large dredge and it costs $81.88 a day to run her. The dredge 'New Dominion' cost $42,078, and it costs $60.39 a day to run her. Everybody knows that it is supposed to cost more to run a government dredge than a private dredge. The dredge 'George MacKenzie' cost $10,049.83, and it takes $50.24 a day to run her. The dredge 'Canada' cost $15,863 and it takes $79.31 a day to run her. I find in the Auditor General's Account for 1902, that T. F. Moore is paid an account for services of the dredge F. F. M., tug and scows, 504 hours at $8 an hour. I mention these instances to prove to the minister that these private dredges simply cost $100 a day for the whole dredging outfit, and that the highest cost per day of the government dredges runs from $35 to $75. In view of these figures the minister will see that $425 a day is an outrageous price to pay the Gilberts, and I may say that the people of that locality are complaining bitterly of this enormous extravagance. I find from the Auditor General's Report that the Gilberts got their draw back of ten per cent paid them last year, and as I understood, that settled up the whole claim in full. Last year the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) admitted to me that the whole work was completed; and if these contractors went on after the 1st of July last year, they would do so at their own risk; that they should not have gone on without instructions from the department, and therefore if they did so, they are not entitled to this $25,000. I appeal to the minister and to the government in the interest of the country that this expenditure should not be continued. I have made this appeal in vain to the late Minister of Railways and Canals. The work is not necessary, and I am satisfied that if the deputy minister and chief engineer of Railways and Canals were put on his honour, he would not disagree with me. I believe that he would say that under the present conditions the vessels coming down the north channel through the Cleveland works and using the present lock going up; this work on the Gilbert contract is not necessary at all and will never be used. Why these contractors should be continued as a leech on the government at such an enormous cost to the country, is something that I cannot understand. It is time it should be stopped. I should like to hear from the acting minister whether the government intend to continue this extravagance. The work cannot be proceeded further this year, and the new Minister of Railways and Canals will have ample opportunity of going into the matter before the next session of parliament. I appeal to the government not to vote money for the work now so that the new minister may not be harassed by these people and their friends to proceed with the work. I believe in all sincerity that the government should drop any appropriation for the work until next session of parliament, between now and which time the new minister will have ample opportunity to look into the matter and be enabled to give his candid opinion upon it. I trust that the government, will take my suggestion on this. because I believe it would be in the best interest of the country that they should do so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already spoken, Mr. Speaker, but with your

permission, I trust I may be allowed to say a few words. I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) supposed that we are now dealing with the appropriation of the coming year which of course has not yet been reached, although I stated that it had been the intention of the late minister to proceed with this work during the coming year, and that an appropriation for that purpose is being asked for in the estimates. That, however, is not the particular item that is now before us. If the House at a later day should grant the sum which is in the main estimates, of course the Minister of Railways and Canals, whoever he may be, will have to consider all that has been said on the subject, and judge for himself whether or not he will deal with this work in the manner in which it has been dealt with in the past. The vote we are asking for now is entirely for the payment of past work, and although, as I have indicated, the minister had it in his mind to proceed with it, it does not necessarily follow that he is bound to spend the $75,000 asked for in the main estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you go on with the work last year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not last year. This is to pay for work that was done in a previous year, which was the subject of discussion last session, but for which no appropriation was taken. My hon. friend from Grenville has read a number of letters, most of them very venerable, from away back in the year 1888, which after all only prove that doctors differ. He has read letters from a number of people in the transportation business who do not think the channel is necessary. We could also produce letters from people in the transportation business who say that the channel is very necessary, and who are anxious that the government should continue it. That is a matter on which there is a difference of opinion. The hon. gentleman seems to be very much in the position of the juryman who said that he had never met with eleven such stupid jurymen in his life, because they would not agree with him. It is the hon. gentleman's misfortune to differ with all the engineers. That work was commenced by Mr. Page, for many years the chief engineer of canals; it was continued by Mr. Trudeau, his successor, and by Mr. Rubidge, than whom no man understands the St. Lawrence better. He has lived almost half a century on that river, and we ought to yield very much to his judgment. The hon. gentleman has appealed to the present deputy minister and chief engineer. All I can say is that the work is continued with the hearty concurrence of the deputy minister and chief engineer on the ground that whatever may have been the opinions with regard to it in the past, after so large a sum of money has been spent on the work, it is a wise course to proceed with it and finish it. My hon. friend read the report of Mr. John Kennedy, a very estimable engineer connected with the Montreal harbour board ; but all he said was not that the work was not very useful, but that it had not been completed. I think I am justified in saying that the work was suspended for a time under the impression that it was completed, but when it was found that it was not, further estimates were asked for, and we ask the present estimate in the light I have stated, that although there have been differences of opinion among the transportation people, and possibly among the people of the community, on the subject, it is the fact that many engineers who had the confidence of the government and who were high in their profession, recommended this work, and it has been carried on for years with the hearty concurrence of Mr. Rubidge. As to the charges, it is only fair to say, that these cover more than the mere dredge, and include a variety of other plant. I must confess that my own knowledge of dredging plant is not enough to enable me to say whether it is a fair sum or not ; but the minister who made the contract considered it a fair sum, and was advised that it was fair by Mr. Rubidge. However, in view of the immense sum of money, approaching $1,000,000, spent on that work, we think it is the part of wisdom to go on and spend the small sum necessary to finish it and make it available for the transportation of the country.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the plan been changed any ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, for the purpose of widening the channel from 200 to 300 feet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When was that plan changed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Whatever work was done in recent years was done under that plan of 300 feet in width.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood that last year those parties went there with their plant, without any instructions whatever from the government, and, if so, they were there at their own risk. Then, I suppose the hon. minister is aware that this whole channel, where he is spending all his money, is on the American side of the river. It does seem strange to me that, if we are to depend on making a channel there, it should be done by the American government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that this work is not on the American side. Some of the dam is on the American side, but this work is not.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I will tell the minister what gives me the impression that it is. The minister is, of course, aware that there is a duty on American coal coming into this country, and when this firm started

this work a number of years ago, they refused to pay any duty on the coal they used on it. They appealed to the Department of Railways and Canals, and that department, under their own signature, certified that this work was all on the American side of the river, and these parties never paid any duty on the coal they used on the work. I can prove that, if necessary. I know that, because I remember the appeal being made, and a certificate was given by an engineer of the government that this work was on the American side of the river. I think Upper Bar is on the Canadian side, but three-fourths of this work is on the American side. As for the work being of any use to marine men, I am quite satisfied that the hon. minister cannot produce any of the best marine men who will take one of the large steamers down. It is true, a very small steamer will run down there; but the large steamers run the old channel, which they have run for thirty or forty years.

There does not appear to be any more than nine feet of water. I understood that some little time ago the Gilbert people went around hawking a petition among the captains, asking them to sign it. This petition was for the purpose of getting this work going again for their benefit, and it can be easily supposed that some steamboat captains would sign the petition in order to help these people. I know for a fact that all the time that these parties were there they never expected that this work would be used. They always felt that they had a sinecure for life. It was suggested to me several times that if I would not do anything, they could keep this work going as long as they liked. I can quite well understand that the hon. minister is not aware of the condition of affairs, but I have lived all my life within a mile of the rapids and know what I am talking about. Of course, Mr. Rubidge has been on the river a great many years, but if hon. gentlemen heard the reports of these steamboat men, they would not have the impression that Mr. Rubidge knew it all. These men navigate the river and know exactly how the currents run. I must say that the work done in what is called the north channel is an excellent work. Nothing could be more needed. When the government undertook the work, it was very expensive, and one of the reasons given was that if the old channel were used, the steamboats would have to go through American waters. The engineers, therefore, took this very expensive route, which makes a splendid channel. to avoid going through American waters. But now that we have had all this expenditure made and got the channel into good shape, these people seem to be able to influence the government every year to continue placing a large amount in the estimates simply to keep them going. The north channel and the deepening of the old channel to the lock which was put in when enlarging the Galops canal to Iroquois is a good piece of work and one that will always be very useful. Why the government continue giving these people money every year I cannot understand. I have been making this appeal year after year, and was in hopes that this year the government would see its way clear to put an end to the expenditure. If they continue this expenditure, I will have to continue opposing it, and see if it is not possible to put an end to what the people in that locality consider an outrage and a scandal. I would rather see the government put an amount in the estimates to pension off this firm, because in that way the government would save from $100,000 to $200,000 per year. I shall therefore have to move that this item of $25,000 be struck out. I do not believe that this firm ever earned it. I am satisfied that if the government should place that other amount in the estimates and allow these people to continue, the government will have in the end a scandal in their hands. I have been urging the minister from year to year to drop this work, because it is no earthly use, and if he cannot see his way clear to do so, I can only continue protesting. I move that this item be struck out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When was that contract changed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Respecting the width, in 1897.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The width extended?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, by the contract made in 1897. That contract refers to additional work, which must mean the increasing of the width. If that is not so, I will have to try and get information later.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The deputy minister should know that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was done under that contract in the time of the late minister. I cannot give the precise date.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not think the late minister changed the width at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised he did.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The first contract was let by Mr. Mackenzie in 1878. The total prism quantities were 200 feet and the depth then perhaps would money out about $312,000. In 1896 there was paid to Mr. Gilbert by the department and on a judgment of the Exchequer Court, $629,000. The contract was not extended in 1897. For the prism quantities only the amount required was $312,000 in 1896. The amount paid by my predecessor and by myself and on the judgment of the Exchequer Court

was $329,000. These parties were paid in full, and they had no other claim. The contract has not been extended from that day to the present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was a new contract in 1897 to continue the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. To clean it out and at a rate per day, which was paid before for the dredge, but the extra width was not contracted for in 1897.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's (Hon. Mr. Haggart) judgment ought to be better than mine.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But we ought to have accurate information about it. Let the Minister of Finance consider the facts for a moment. The contract price, with the quantities moneyed out, was $312,000. This contract was let in 1878. There was paid in 1896 on that contract $629,000. That included the judgment of the Exchequer Court and the amount that had been previously paid to Mr. Gilbert. The Minister of Railways and Canals continued the employment of these parties, and his justification was that he employed them at the same rate that I paid them. I had paid them $425 a day for the use of their dredge while Mr. Kennedy was making an examination of the channel; and the hon. minister continued the contract with them for the amount that I was obliged to pay for the use of the dredge for the examination of the channel. The expenditure was to cease in 1896, for the hon. member for Grenville showed the uselessness of the work, and, besides that, there was a lock built in the canal for the purpose of overcoming the difficulty and rendering any further expenditure needless. The Galops channel is not used by the big boats coming down to-day. It is used by the boats—just as it was before—in going up, if what I am told is correct. Every boat coming down goes down the canal to the new lock and out into the river below the rapids. The work, as originally contracted for by Mr. Mackenzie, which amounted to $312,000, was increased, if the deputy minister is correct, by 100 feet more. But that would add only one-third to the quantities, making a total of about $416,000. And what is the result of it all? The expenditure of nearly one million dollars. We have already paid $800,000, the hon. minister asks here for $25,000, and in the other estimates is an item of $75,000. And still we have no promise from the minister that this is the end of the work—an expenditure of a million dollars on a work which was contemplated originally to cost $416,000, and the expenditure still going on. And, as has been shown, the expenditure is entirely useless. More than that, we had the promise of the minister that there would be no more expenditure on that contract. The minister asked us for a vote of $50,000 last year, and for what? Not, as he said, for a work which had been authorized and done, but for the purpose of paying a percentage or drawback due to the contractors, and also a small sum of $15,000 to remove such rocks as had fallen into the prism of the canal. Here is what the minister said on May 1st, 1902:

> But simply for the purpose of removing the rock which has already been disturbed and is lying loose on the surface, and is, I am told, an obstruction to navigation. I cannot say that I see any particular advantage myself in having the work continued, since the canal will afford all the navigation that is necessary.

Then the minister, justifying the expenditure of even this small amount, said:

> The appropriation, I am advised by the chief engineer, is necessary—not for the purpose of continuing the work, I do not propose to ask parliament for any money beyond this, a part of which is needed to pay the drawback. There is the amount of the drawback which we have to pay out of that $50,000. . . . There is nothing in the estimates inserted with any intention to continue this expenditure or to continue this work.

I asked if any report had been received by the department or any estimates prepared for this work. I had the assurance of the minister that no account had come into the department for any work being done upon that canal or any certificate from the engineer. He gave the promise that the work would not be continued. But in spite of that, we have now a further expenditure of $25,000 asked for, and also $75,000 in the other estimates to continue the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The minister's statement last year with respect to continuing that work would not necessarily be at variance with this item, though it might be at variance with the item in the main estimates. The sum now under discussion is entirely for past payments. With regard to the statement that no work is being done and no certificate given, of course, that would be a grave matter. All I can say is that the engineer has reported that these people have done work to that amount, and has certified accordingly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All I say is that I give the statement of the Minister of Railways last year, made on the authority of the chief engineer, that he had no demand for any claims on the work last year. The statement was made in this House that there was no work of that kind. This item, I understand, is for payment of work done last year, but, as I understand the minister, there is another item to come down for $75,000 for the continuance of the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is already down.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the item now under discussion for work done last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For work done the year before last. It was the

subject of discussion last year, but the work was done the year before.

Mr. SPROULE. I was here when the discussion took place. The minister had no information that the work was going on, and distinctly intimated that, so far as he knew, no contract would be given in future. And now we are given to understand that the work is likely to go on. What reason is given for this change ? In view of the case made out by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), and the facts he has presented here during the last two or three years, the continuance of this work by the government is a burning scandal, it is a disgrace to the government and to the country. When Mr. Kennedy, a disinterested and capable engineer, made the report he did, declaring that there was not the depth of water and there was not the condition of bottom that Mr. Rubidge had reported, and when, without making further inquiries or satisfying themselves of the truth or falsity of that report, the government go on with this work, we certainly have a condition things that the country would not have expected. For the government to continue it now, leaves an impression on my mind that there is something behind it that neither the country nor this House knows, as otherwise it would not be continued. Now it is said that the government engineers have reported on this from time to time. So they have, but as the minister says himself, Mr. Rubidge has practically lived on the St. Lawrence river for years : he has been doing the same work for the same contractors for years : and it is a fact that cannot be denied that we sometimes have engineers playing into the hands of the contractors in a way that is neither creditable to themselves nor in the interest of the country. Now, grave suspicions have been aroused that that may be the case at the present time, and I am justified in coming to that conclusion from the fact that Mr. Kennedy, an entirely disinterested party, made a contrary report. The minister himself has not said one word to discredit the professional ability of Mr. Kennedy, and his report is the very antipodes of that of Mr. Rubidge. Now in face of that fact the government is going to commence work again after telling us that last year it was closed up for the purpose of effectually wiping it off the books, and they were paying a percentage which up to that time had been held back for the due fulfilment of the work. Now we are told that the work is going on again.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing being done now.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a sum in the estimates for that purpose. Then why should we go on until we know more about it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not reached it.

Mr. SPROULE. But it must have been considered by council, and the minister is responsible for what has passed in council. These estimates are before this House, and in face of the allegations made by an hon. member of this House and who is in a position to know, in face of the letters that have been read from respectable captains who have been on that river for a quarter of a century, in face of the affidavits that have been read to this House, the government are going to go on with it, notwithstanding the burning scandal that exists. I say that if the government continue that work they will do it at their own peril, and an indignant public will rise up against them and condemn them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to what the hon. gentleman said about Mr. Kennedy, I hope there is no misunderstanding. Certainly I would not attempt to discredit Mr. Kennedy, for I have had the pleasure of knowing him for twenty years ; he is an eminent engineer, a gentleman of high standing. But I wish to point out that Mr. Kennedy did not report on the question whether the work was useful or not ; he reported that the work had not been completed, had not been done.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he not report that he found only fourteen feet of water where it was declared in this House there were seventeen feet, and where Mr. Rubidge reported there were seventeen feet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even if he did, that might be the best possible reason why we should proceed to get seventeen feet of water.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not discredit Mr. Rubidge who had made this report, and against whose report Mr. Kennedy reported after a careful examination that instead of seventeen feet of water there were only twelve, fourteen, fifteen feet, and in some cases not that much.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then if it discredited the report of Mr. Rubidge it also discredited the late government. If Mr. Rubidge was a discredited official, why did they keep him there and continue him doing that work ? This report was made in the time of the late government, all these documents which the hon. member for Grenville has read related to the time of the late government, the whole transaction relates to the time of the late government. The hon. gentleman should be more careful about raising suspicions in that unpleasant way, he should not hit his neighbours in that unpleasant way.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may say to the minister that though Mr. Rubidge's report was made in 1891, Mr. Kennedy's report was made at the same time. But after these reports were made the work was absolutely stopped right there. Mr. Rubidge had been

in the service of the government for, I suppose, forty years, and I presume the government felt that the men who were underneath him were to blame. The minister asks why did they not dismiss Mr. Rubidge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not complaining.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like the minister to be fair. Mr. Rubidge was the engineer in charge of canals on the river from Montreal to Trenton. He had under him several contracts; he had two at Cornwall, one at Farran's Point, one at Morrisburg and a couple at Cardinal. On each of these contracts he had an engineering staff, that is, an engineer and two assistants. When this matter was brought up and my charge was proved, proved to the entire satisfaction of the minister, the hon. gentleman the Finance Minister asks why they did not dismiss Mr. Rubidge. Simply because the then minister brought Mr. Rubidge before him, and Mr. Rubidge threw up his hands and said: These men underneath me were doing the work; I had to depend on them, my work is from Cornwall to Belleville. But the engineers who were in charge of that work were promptly dismissed by the minister.

Mr. FRASER. They did not dismiss the right person, they should have dismissed Mr. Rubidge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Rubidge was travelling and superintending the whole of them. But the other engineers in charge of the work, the men that should take the soundings, made reports to Mr. Rubidge from time to time, on which he acted. The only trouble was where Mr. Rubidge made an examination afterwards, that is where he was to blame and liable to censure. But the other engineers were promptly dismissed, and the work was promptly stopped. Now there is one great question about this work going on. There is a general complaint that if that work is proceeded with and more cuttings done there, it is going to lower the St. Lawrence above. Now there was a judgment of the Exchequer Court for $173,000. This firm sued the government for what they claimed was below grade. The government had paid and settled up with them in full for making seventeen feet of water, but in order to get seventeen feet they claimed that the dredge had to go a little below seventeen feet, and it was for this extra below grade that they were paid $173,000. They then assured the court and the government that there was not only seventeen feet but more than seventeen feet of water because they had to go below seventeen feet to get the required seventeen feet. Notwithstanding all that, it was found out afterwards that they had left a space of 10½ feet. The original contract was for 200 feet, and any person would reasonably suppose that a vessel would go through a channel 200 feet wide when the vessel itself was only thirty-five feet wide. But I wish to state to the minister, knowing the place thoroughly as I do, living on the spot, and being around these rapids all my life-time, that it is really an impossibility, and will be, no matter what we do, for these large vessels, to go down that channel. I meet at least every week men interested in the marine business, and there is not one of them that will admit to me that they will ever go down these rapids and take the chances, with a vessel of any size or with a load.

At the present time only small vessels are running down this channel. In fact, vessels go by way of the old channel just as much as they do by this one. I know exactly how this thing is brought about. These people have sufficient influence to get the government to give them something to do, and in making this expenditure the government are not only giving rise to a scandal but they are injuring navigation above that point. If they put that through it will lower the level of the water in the north channel, and they will have to have Cleveland's channel, which is a very good channel, deepened. It would be a very good channel to-day if they only made it 17 feet in depth, but by making another cut through the rapids it will result in increasing the flow and giving a lower depth of water in the northern channel. If any person will go through the Cleveland channel into the canal and then through the lock, he will see that there could be nothing more suitable to navigation than that. I sincerely hope that the government will consider the matter and not go on with the work, but in the meantime, knowing that the Exchequer Court has settled up this claim in full, and after hearing the statement of the minister last year that the amount was only required to pay the drawback, I insist that these people are not entitled to this $25,000, and therefore I have no hesitation in moving that the item be struck out.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is one question that has not been fully answered by the hon. Minister of Finance. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) makes a statement that this money is being expended in the United States. He lives on the ground, and if that is correct I think the hon. minister should stay his hand until he is perfectly assured that no part of this money is being spent in American territory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am so assured. There are two or three different works going on in that neighbourhood. There is a dam being constructed in connection with the work in that vicinity, and one end of it is upon an American island, and possibly this has led to some confusion. At all events, I am advised that there is no part of this work being done in Ameri-

can territory, and that it is entirely in Canadian territory.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I can prove that a part of it is being done in American territory by correspondence in the department of the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson). This dam was only proposed to be built within the last two or three years. It never was in the original contract at all. I know that for a fact, and I will guarantee to prove it by the correspondence in the Department of Customs. These parties wrote to the Department of Customs and got a statement that the collector at Cardinal need not charge the contractors duty if they procured a certificate from the Department of Railways and Canals. I make the statement on the floor of this House, and I am prepared to back it up that a portion of this work is in American waters, and that these contractors were relieved from duty on obtaining a certificate from the Department of Railways and Canals. I saw the certificate at the time. I know it was forwarded to Ottawa. I know that the customs officer at Cardinal had to get instructions from the Customs Department at Ottawa instructing him that it was all right for him not to collect the duty, because the certificate of the Department of Railways and Canals showed that the work was done in American waters.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think a statement that the contractor submitted that it was in American waters would necessarily prove that we are wrong. I am quite satisfied that the channel is in Canadian waters, and I am bound to act upon that information.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Three-quarters of the work which is being done is in American waters. It is in the form of a large circle around an island. What is called the upper bar is in Canadian waters, while the other part is in American waters, and I know that if the hon. Minister of Customs will look it up, probably about the year 1888, or back there, he will find a certificate from the Department of Railways and Canals, or from the engineers of the department, proving that the work is in American waters. This certificate was forwarded to Ottawa and the collector got a letter back from the Department of Customs that in view of this certificate, they could not collect duty on the coal used on the dredge while doing the work.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. About what year was that ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). During 1888.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But this work was done in 1902.

Mr. REID (Grenville). 1902 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What work does the hon. minister mean ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work that we are taking this vote for.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That we are now doing in this channel ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, there may be one part on the American side and one part in Canada.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are three-quarters of it in American waters.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question is, is this work being done in American waters.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It must be. This was done for the purpose of clearing out these rocks that had drifted into the channel, and therefore if they were doing that, certainly part of it was in American waters and part in Canadian waters. I understand from general talk around there that these contractors were supposed to have cleared all this out. But these parties have not hesitated to say that they can handle the government, and they can get a contract to widen the channel, but they do not want anything said about it, believing that they could slide it through. I am satisfied that the government by doing this work are only going to injure the waters above. It is not necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the hon. minister give us any idea as to what the depth of the water is now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, depth of water it not what we desire now. Some blasting had been done, and rocks were left in the channel.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the hon. minister to say that there has been no work done since last year?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is true.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. minister told us that there were 17 feet of water.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid there is not 17 feet of water where these rocks are.

Mr. SPROULE. This matter has created so much suspicion that I think the hon. minister should stop the work until he gets a reliable report upon it. The government engineers, it has been proved by Mr. Kennedy, did wrong before, and the hon. Minister of Finance seemed to think that he had a good argument in the report that it was done by friends of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and that when it was brought to the attention of the minister he stopped it because he could not rely on the report of the engineer, and he sent out some other engineers to inquire into it. This would seem to be sufficient to arouse such

suspicion in the mind of the hon. Minister of Finance as to cause him to inquire into the situation. In addition to that we have the statement made by an hon. member of this House on his responsibility as a member, by one who lives right in the locality, who has been there all his lifetime and who ought to know the facts. Then, this hon. gentleman's statement is backed up by affidavits and letters from some of the most respectable, the most responsible and the most intelligent men who have been navigating the St. Lawrence for the last 25 years, many of whom I know personally to be men of integrity and truthfulness, and men who know what they are talking about. If the hon. minister, with all this information in his possession, insists on carryng out this work he will be doing something that will be a scandal and a disgrace to this government.

House divided on the motion (Hon. Mr. Fielding).

That resolution 296 for the deepening and widening of the Galops rapids, $25,000, be now concurred in.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bernier,	Loy,
Bourbonnais,	McCarthy,
Brown,	McGugan,
Bureau,	McIsaac,
Calvert,	McLennan,
Christie,	Madore,
Cowan,	Marcil (Bagot),
Desjardins,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Erb,	Morrison,
Ethier,	Mulock (Sir William),
Fielding,	Paterson,
Fisher,	Préfontaine,
Fortier,	Puttee,
Gibson,	Riley,
Holmes,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Kendall,	Russell,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Stewart,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Turgeon.—36.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Avery,	Gourley,
Blain,	Hackett,
Broder,	Halliday,
Clancy,	MacLaren (Perth),
Clare,	Sproule,
Clarke,	Taylor,
Earle,	Thomson (Grey).—14.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Thompson (Haldimand and Monck),	Ingram,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd.)	Tupper,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Guthrie,	Porter,
Sutherland, (Hon. J.),	Haggart,
Fraser,	Bell,
Tobin,	Ball,
Scott,	Boyd,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Kaulbach,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Borden (Halifax),
Martineau,	Barker,
Beith,	Birkett,
Campbell,	Bruce,
Bickerdike,	Cargill,
Wade,	Cochrane,
Galliher,	Culbert,
Grant,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Mackie,	Kendry,
McCreary,	Lancaster,
Roche (Halifax),	Maclean,
Talbot,	Monk,
Ross (Ontario),	Rosamond,
Schell,	Smith (Wentworth),
Tucker,	Tolton,
Power,	Wilson,
Matheson,	Richardson,
Macdonald,	McGowan,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Gauvreau,	Ganong,
McKinnon,	Roddick,
Smith (Vancouver),	Hale,
Davis,	Hughes (Victoria),
Parmelee,	Pope,
Bazinet,	Alcorn,
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Bennett,
McCool,	Brock,
Belcourt,	Calvin,
Costigan,	Carscallen,
Gallery,	Casgrain,
German,	Henderson,
Law,	Kemp,
McPherson,	Kidd,
Sifton,	Lennox,
Stephens,	McIntosh,
Tolmie,	Osler,
Ross (Yukon),	Seagram,
McEwen,	Sheritt,
Wright,	Vrooman,
Wallace,	Wilmot,
Fitzpatrick,	Léonard,
Heyd.	Pringle.

Motion agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These items have been collected by the proper officers of the House and are found to amount to $2,977,053.73. I beg to move :

That the House resolve itself into Committee of Ways and Means to consider a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee to consider the following resolution.

Resolved that towards making good a supply to be granted to His Majesty for certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1903, the sum of $2,977,053.73 be granted out of the consolidated revenue of Canada.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 241) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money required to defray certain expenses of the public service for the year ending 30th June, 1903.

Motion agreed, Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—GOVERNMENT SYSTEM OF TENDERS

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CLARKE. I beg to call the attention of the government to the following cablegram which appears in the Ottawa 'Free Press' of this evening:

INJUSTICE IS OBVIOUS.

Canadian Method of Calling for Tenders Might be Better.

London, Aug. 8th.—The 'Graphic' to-day referring to the manner in which Canada invites tenders, says that the injustice of the arrangement is so obvious that the government can hardly fail to redress the grievance.

Is the Minister of Finance aware of what tenders this cablegram refers to?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. I am not able to answer my hon. friend.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the business for to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. According to notice the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill will come up on the resolution on which the Bill is founded.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any notice that you will proceed with it de die in diem?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no formal notice, but I think that is the intention of the Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Prime Minister so stated this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was so stated to-day, I am informed.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, August 11, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. HYMAN moved:

That the following committees have leave to sit during the time that the House is in session: The Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 244) respecting the Western Assurance Company.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with the Bill now before this House, respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, to ratify the agreement set forth in the schedule to the said Bill, entered into on the 28th of July, 1903, between the government and certain persons on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by parliament at the present session thereof, and to authorize the government to do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said Bill and agreement.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Hon. A. G. BLAIR (St. John city). I do not, Mr. Speaker, find myself in any less unpleasant a position to-day than I occupied some two or three weeks ago in explaining the causes of my resignation from the ministry. It is a disagreeable task under any circumstances to criticise and perhaps condemn a measure introduced by a government of which one has so recently been a member, and there are, and there must always be, circumstances attending such criticism and such condemnation as will unfavourably affect many friends, many colleagues and many of those with whom one has been heretofore politically associated. I am pleased, however, Sir, to be able to avail myself of the present opportunity of exonerating the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) from the charge which has been frequently made against him since this difficulty has originated. The right hon. gentleman has been charged with having made a suggestion to me that I should, having the opinions which I entertain with respect to the railway scheme that the government have determined upon, remain a member of the government and should quietly and silently continue to act as a colleague with him in that administration. The charge which has been preferred is that this proposition was made by himself to me. I am bound to say, in justice to the right hon. gentleman, that the proposition did not emanate from him, and I make this statement, not at his instance, but as a matter of fair play to him and of fair play to myself. In the correspondence which ensued pending my contemplated resignation I referred, as you will remember, to the circumstance that such a suggestion had been made in Council, and I mentioned the reasons which I thought had rendered it impossible for me to favourably entertain such a suggestion. I did it because I thought that there were perhaps

members of Council who would think I was over punctilious in declining to pursue that course, and I was glad afterwards that I had mentioned it in the correspondence, because there are many warm personal friends on the government side who, between the time that my resignation was known and the time that the explanations were made, have criticised me because I had not pursued that very same course. I say, therefore, that I very gladly avail myself of the present opportunity to make that matter straight.

The right hon. gentleman has laid before parliament and before the country a statement of the reasons why he has presented this measure to the House, and the defence of that measure. He has given us to understand that this scheme is a scheme devised for the purpose of securing for the people of Canada a great transcontinental railway which will afford to the people of the east and west the shortest and cheapest route for the carriage of their traffic. And at the same time, and in the same connection, my right hon. friend, with a good deal of self-satisfaction I am sure, and with apparently much pride, told us that this great project was to be a grand national all-Canadian line. If such a policy well defined and well considered in all its bearings, and so studied that a just conclusion could be reached that it was a proper and necessary work in the interest of Canada, if such a project surrounded by these conditions were presented to parliament, then one might well be glad that such a venture should be entered upon by the government of the country, and it naturally would excite a very great deal of enthusiasm among the people of all shades of politics.

I followed the right hon. the Prime Minister in the statement which he made with the closest interest; and it is only fair to the right hon. gentleman to say that if the grace of eloquence, if the finest and choicest language, if eloquence coupled as I know it was with the sincerest conviction that the measure was a proper and judicious one; if these things could have carried conviction to the minds of members of parliament, then I say that members of parliament and the country generally would have been impressed by the Prime Minister's presentation of the case. But, Sir, speaking for myself and for myself alone, while I was impressed with the singular ability of the right hon. gentleman, and while I felt that all had been said by him that could be said by anybody, and much more than could have been said by any one else with the same effect; yet, I still felt myself absolutely and entirely unconvinced, and I still felt that the objections which existed in my mind against this measure almost in its entirety had not been removed except but in a very small degree.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The government of this country, realizing the enormous magnitude of this measure; realizing that it is perhaps a measure without parallel in the history of this country; realizing that no question so momentous in its nature, and involving such large responsibilities on the country had ever been presented to parliament since the confederation of the provinces of British North America; realizing also that this decision and determination to carry this project through, if it could be carried through this parliament, and if the assent of the country could be secured for it; realizing all this, my right hon. friend very naturally felt that the people of the country would expect that some satisfactory explanation should be furnished, as to why, with such unusual and such unexampled haste a measure of this magnitude and this character had been pressed upon them. My right hon. friend, realized this as any one with the same responsibilities and occupying the same position would have realized it, and therefore, we observe that the very first feature of this whole question to which the Prime Minister directed his attention, was to repel if possible the charge, or to answer if possible the accusation which must have entered into the mind of almost everybody from one part of Canada to the other, that this question had been sprung with undue haste and without due deliberation. The right hon. gentleman undertook an answer to that phase of the case, and I will give the House in his own words the answer which he gave. Let me tell the House in the first place, however, what the right hon. gentleman did not say in explanation of his course. He did not deny that there had not been deliberation; he did not affirm that the government of the country had availed itself of all proper sources of information, and had waited until they had exhausted all the means in their power to ascertain what the conditions were in the various portions of the country which this road was to traverse; he did not tell us the need which had arisen for us to jump headlong into a scheme of this kind; he did not tell us that he had summoned to his assistance the wisest counsels which the country could afford; he did not tell us that he had sought the assistance of experts in order to know what the traffic conditions were which would make this railway desirable; he did not even pretend to tell us that he had done these things; but, Sir, I will quote his own language as to what he did say, to repel what was almost a self-accusation. The right hon. gentleman said:

> Exception has been taken to the immediate necessity of building such a road, exception has been taken to the policy which we have to suggest for the immediate construction of such a road; but as to the idea itself I have never heard a word of opposition, nor do I believe that such a word will be heard in the debate. The first of these objections, that is to the im-

mediate construction of such a road, can be disposed of, I believe, with a single observation. To those who urge upon us the policy of to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow; to those who tell us, wait, wait, wait; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is: No, this is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood of tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again. If we let it pass, the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows. We cannot wait, because time does not wait; we cannot wait because, in these days of wonderful development, time lost is doubly lost; we cannot wait, because at this moment there is a transformation going on in the conditions of our national life which it would be folly to ignore and a crime to overlook. . . . . We say that to-day it is the duty of the Canadian government, it is the duty of the Canadian parliament, it is the duty of all those who have a mandate from the people to attend to the needs and requirements of this fast growing country, to give heed to that condition of things. We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people, to provide immediate means whereby the products of those new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost; and whereby, likewise, a market may be found in this new region for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces. Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that I should call the grave and serious attention of this parliament and of this country to the statement which the right hon. gentleman has made. As I said, it is not a denial of the charge that there has been want of deliberation and undue and improper haste in this matter. It is not a denial of the charge that the government have not studied the question, and before I conclude my observations on this Bill, this resolution and this contract, I think I will convince the majority—well, I will convince the minds of the majority of this House at all events, that what is alleged against the government in this regard is absolutely and entirely true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. What does the right hon. gentleman mean when he says—

> The flood of tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again.

What does the right hon. gentleman mean when he says:

> If we let it pass the voyage of our national life bright as it is to-day will be bound in shallows.

What does the right hon. gentleman mean when he says:

> We cannot wait because time does not wait.

I think, Mr. Speaker, and I say it with all respect to my right hon. friend, that it would have been as correct if not so poetic for him to have said: We cannot wait because Senator Cox cannot wait.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. What does the right hon. gentleman mean by saying:

> We cannot wait because in these days of wonderful development time lost is doubly lost.

What does he mean by saying: that to wait would be to destroy our future national life. Wherein is our national life going to be destroyed because perchance we take the proper time in order to study what we are doing, and in order to reach a wise and just conclusion with regard to an enterprise which is vaster, greatly vaster than any that has ever before engaged the consideration of this parliament. I fail to discover wherein we have to appeal to heaven against the possibility of a little delay in this matter. I know of no reason why the interests of Canada are going to be prejudicially affected because when we move forward we see the end, or think we see the end, to which we are looking, because we know the limits of the responsibilities by which we assume to be bound, and because we believe we understand the conditions under which we are operating. Why is it said by my hon. friend in this manner and in these terms, that we must not pause a moment to deliberate? Government may possibly not deliberate, but parliament has a right to deliberate, the country has a right to deliberate; and in my judgment, Sir, before we impose a burden of such great magnitude on the neck of the people of Canada, before we commit this country by an Act of this parliament to a scheme of such large and extraordinary proportions, it is only just to the people of Canada that they should have a chance to talk it over, and think about it, that the press should discuss it, and that everybody in the country should know what the government are contemplating. I cannot help feeling that it is rather a condition of hysteria than a condition of calm reason and judgment—I cannot help feeling that it is a condition of sentimental exaltation that has inspired the hurry and haste with which this measure is pressed forward; because I will not believe it possible that any other than a straightforward and honourable motive has inspired my colleagues in this transaction.

My hon. friend, having disposed of this question of want of deliberation, proceeds to take up another question which he regards as one of very grave and serious magnitude. With all the skill of an old parliamentary hand, with all the deftness and ability which we know he can successfully employ; my hon. friend, referring to Carnegie and his threats, quoting what was said by President Cleveland, reading from despatches, and otherwise, succeeded in working up our anxiety and arousing our

fears—and he must have succeeded in convincing many of our friends on this side of the House—that we were on the verge of a very grave calamity, that an awful abyss was yawning before us, that we were looking down a precipice, and were on the eve of being precipitated to its depths in everlasting ruin and disaster. And then, Sir, after my hon. friend had brought them up to the edge of that yawning precipice, he was to relieve them of their distress and anxiety by telling them, 'we have saved you by our measure; we have rescued you from the dreadful danger which was threatening you; we are going to give you an all-Canadian line, which is going to save you from the possibility of having your commerce destroyed and your business ruined by the action of the people to the south of you.' Let me refer to the language which the hon. gentleman used in that connection, in order that I may quote him with absolute accuracy. 'Luckily,' he says :

> Luckily, Sir, up to this moment, we have escaped the danger with which, on repeated occasions, we have been threatened. But, sir, what would happen if at any moment there should come one of those frenzies, one of those periods of excitement which we have seen sometimes amongst nations, the American nation included. At any moment we may be deprived of the bonding privilege which we have had up to the present. The only way whereby we can contemplate such a contingency with equanimity is to provide against it, and to have upon our own territory all the facilities by which we can get access to our own harbours. These are the reasons why we apply to parliament to give its countenance to the policy which I have outlined, a policy which will give to this new Transcontinental Railway at our own harbour, by an all-Canadian route to reach it.

Now, I want to ask the calm reason and judgment of this parliament—and, if need be, the appeal will have to be made to the calm judgment and sober reason of the people of Canada—when we have had the bonding privilege between Canada and the United States in existence for all these years; when, if ever there was a danger, that danger has been minimized; when the conditions existing in the United States are just as potent to prevent the possibility of any such action being taken by the United States government; when the number of American railways crossing our territory from one portion of that country to another, and the shipping which comes to the leading ports of the United States, are carrying to the merchants of Canada and from the dealers in Canada goods which are a profit to them; when they would be actually striking at and destroying their own trade and commerce if they adopted such a course—why my hon. friend should feel impelled at this late date, after all these years, and after we have been seven years in the government of this country and have never felt even a thrill by reason of that possibility—why my hon. friend and the government for whom he speaks should come to us now, in the frenzied rush, the impetuous haste, which has inspired this legislation, and tell us that we are in deadly peril, and in the utmost danger of having our commerce destroyed by the action of a friendly government ? I ask the members of this House why is this pretense put forward, or this argument—I will not knowingly use any term offensive to any of my hon. friends here—why is this argument put forward ? It must be because there is an absence of real, good, substantial argument to sustain the case itself, and my hon. friends feel obliged to appeal to the prejudices and feelings, and to arouse the passions of the people of Canada in order to carry through a measure which, on its merits, they would have no hope whatever of carrying. I noticed that when both this and the preceding defence were made by the right hon. gentleman, our friends on this side of the House were wild with enthusiasm. I do not know whether the enthusiasm was because of the relief which seemed to come to them after the period of strained anxiety was over, on account of the boundary peril or whether the real reason was that they felt great satisfaction in finding that even a flimsy argument could be made in support of the government's policy.

Now, Sir, what foundation is there, I ask, for the statement that our conditions, when this road is built, if it ever is built, will be any different from what they are to-day ? I want to know upon what foundation is the suggestion made that we are in deadly peril by reason of the possible action of a frenzied people, if frenzy should seize the people of the American republic. Why, Sir, we have to-day a railroad which traverses this continent; we have two railroads which run to the province of New Brunswick, with both of which connection could be made if need be; and we need not pass over American territory, even though the restriction were sought to be placed upon us by the American government. We could avail ourselves of those railroads, and they are just as transcontinental, just as Canadian, just as national, as any railroads we could construct in Canada. They are railroads on Canadian soil, and one of them at least is owned by the government of the country itself.

For myself I would have much preferred that this argument, at all events, had not been presented by my right hon. friend. I would have much preferred that it had been left to somebody else to declare to the world at large that the Canadian people are at the mercy of any other people. I am loath to acknowledge that we have not in ourselves to-day the means to protect ourselves against any such possibility, and I do not like to have the word go across the ocean and throughout the wide world that Canada is hemmed in by the United States and unable to protect herself, or, what is very much the equivalent, that it requires

the expenditure by Canada of one hundred and odd millions of money in order to get relief. I do not think that there is any such question to-day to be feared as the abrogation of the bonding privilege. The period when we might have feared it has long since passed away ; and whatever may be the merits or demerits of this government scheme which we are now discussing, I do trust that no man's judgment is going to be influenced in favour of what he would otherwise consider a defective and unjustifiable measure because this bogey of the abrogation of the bonding privilege has been raised.

The next leading proposition which the hon. gentleman presented was that we need an all-Canadian transcontinental line from ocean to ocean. Let me again quote the hon. gentleman's language, in order that I may be entirely accurate :

> We ask parliament to assent to this policy because we believe—may, we feel certain, and certain beyond a doubt—that in so doing we give voice and expression to a sentiment, a latent but deep sentiment, which is to-day in the mind, and still more in the heart, of every Canadian, that a railway to extend from the shores of the Atlantic ocean to the shores of the Pacific ocean, and to be, every inch of it, on Canadian soil, is a national as well as a commercial necessity. That such a road must be built, that it is, in the language which I have used, a national and a commercial necessity, that it is a corollary of our status as a nation, that it is a requisite of our commercial development, is a proposition to which, up to this moment, I have heard no dissent.

The necessary implication from that argument is that a road from ocean to ocean through Canadian territory does not now exist; and if we are to accept this inference, if we are to allow it to influence our judgment, then we will be misled—misled unquestionably, although I would be sorry to convey the impression that I thought my right hon. friend would wilfully attempt to mislead this parliament or the country. But certainly, if parliament were to accept this implication, it would be misled beyond all doubt and question. What constitutes an all-Canadian national line ? Does it mean a railway line spanning the continent from ocean to ocean and owned entirely by one corporation ? Well, we have such a line now. We have even, I might almost say, got two such lines. Then why should we be influenced by this implication ? We ought not to be influenced by it. If that is the sole necessity, and my right hon. friend said that were it not for this question of the bonding privilege he would not now be asking this parliament to assent to this proposition of a transcontinental road.

Finding the reasons assigned in support of the proposition inadequate, finding the ground giving way and the foundation dropping out, what is to be the outcome of the measure itself, if it is to be dealt with as similar measures, under other circumstances, would be dealt with by any deliberative body ? The line, my right hon. friend claims, is both a national and a commercial line, but yet he says it is not a commercial line in the sense that you are to count on a profit or loss. Well, Sir, what is a commercial line if it is not a line constructed according to the dictates of commercial needs and which involves, necessarily and inevitably, the idea of profit or loss? You may build a sentimental line, but if so, tell the people that it is a line which you are building for sentimental purposes. Or, if you are building it for commercial purposes, say so. But my right hon. friend does not seem to be willing to consider it entirely the one or the other. It is a compound of both. He says it is not, in the ordinary sense, a commercial line, but is an all-Canadian line. Well, unless there be some pressing need for it, I do not see why the people of this country should be saddled with an obligation of $100,000,000 of money and an addition to their liability, as I shall show, of an amount exceeding that. Unless there be something behind which has not been disclosed and which renders it necessary, I can see no reason now for the construction of this proposed national line. Both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway are national lines in the widest acceptation of the term. They do not traverse the whole country from ocean to ocean, but if you will look across the border, I think it will give you some difficulty to point to any transcontinental railway there in the sense mentioned by the right hon. gentleman. You cannot find any railway in that country which starts from the Atlantic and ends at the Pacific, and which is under one control. I do not know of any. Their great lines east and west meet about the centre of the continent, and are the result of a process of development. Our American neighbours have not been trying to perform any spectacular feat by spending a large amount of money unnecessarily. They have done what the business needs of the country called for. Less than that we ought not to do ; more than that we would be wrong in doing.

These are the four chief reasons which I gather from a careful reading of the right hon. gentleman's address why this measure should commend itself to our approval. But there is another, a general reason, which he gave. The country, he says, is crying out for another transcontinental railway. Mr. Speaker, my ears have been open, I have been a willing listener to any demand of this kind, and I am bound to say that I have not heard any great outcry for another transcontinental line from ocean to ocean. I do not know where the cry was made that it reached others. It was not made, at all events, so that it reached me.

I may have occasion, before concluding my remarks, to refer to this question again, and therefore will pass from it for the moment. Those who have been criticising this

measure, myself among the number, as an opponent of the Bill, are taunted with being timid, with being deficient in pluck, unable to grasp a large problem, somewhat provincial in our ideas, and incapable of appreciating the increasing growth and progress of Canada. I deny this charge, and, as far as my denial may be of any value, I want to make it emphatic. I am not open to any such reflection. I do not admit at all that a well digested, well considered scheme of railway development, a scheme called for by the needs of the country and to be proceeded with as soon as it could be reasonably proceeded with, would be opposed by me. I would not be found placing any opposition whatever in the way of such a scheme. I am as willing that the resources of this country should be taxed to the full ability of the country for the purpose of railway development, reasonably necessary to develop the illimitable resources of this great country, as any man in this House. But, Sir, I am not thereby prevented from saying to those who ask me to give my assent to this project: How do you reach your conclusions? On what information are you going? Have you exhausted the necessary sources of information, and where is this thing going to end? It is only the part of reasonable prudence for a man to do that. Nobody is worthy of the great trust which the people of the country is reposing in those to whom they have intrusted the administration of their affairs unless he is prepared to resist pressure brought on him to act hastily, and unless he is determined to give to the subject that careful study and deliberation which will justify him in assuming the responsibility of proposing the legislation asked for. I felt, Sir, as one, and particularly, as Minister of Railways in my hon. friend's government, that the country would expect me to apply my judgment to the questions which came up. Having somewhat more experience in the matter of railway construction and railway operation than many of my colleagues, and being charged particularly with the government's business in that regard, I felt that on me would rest a larger measure of responsibility; and I was entitled to know enough, and to see into the matter far enough, to justify me in asking parliament with a clear conscience and well settled conviction to give its assent to the proposition to be laid before it. Barely six months ago this question was first mooted. Six months is not a long time to consider and weigh and look into a project of this kind, which had not been mooted before; particularly when it is borne in mind that a large portion of these six months has been occupied by the sitting of parliament, when every minister has his hands full, when his thoughts are fully engrossed with the business of the session, and when some have particularly important measures pending before the House. In that, I speak for myself, because, as Minister of Railways, I was charged with the carrying forward of a piece of legislation which was very important, and which required the best thought and attention I could give it, in order that it might be perfected at every point. This being the case, was this the time for one to endeavour to comprehend and shape and advise upon, and think out a proposition of this magnitude? Why, you have only to dwell upon it for a moment to see how unreasonable such a suggestion is. Every session of parliament we put off things of the most trivial moment because we have not time to deal with them. Every session, Bills that are pressed upon us are put by until the following session, simply because we have our hands full. Yet, right on the eve of the sitting of parliament, after we had taken up large policies, after we had arranged to propose large expenditures, when it was known that we were going to have our best thoughts and acutest judgment strained to the utmost to do justice to the subjects with which we would have to deal, we undertake to grapple with a problem of this immensity and complexity, and one involving such great financial and other responsibilities. Well, Mr. Speaker, the bonding privilege up to that time had never impressed anybody; the imperious need of a great transcontinental all-national line had never forced itself upon anybody's mind. Within a few weeks of this sitting of parliament this thing is first mooted. And here we are now putting the final ratification—if we shall do it—upon a measure, which, when it is once passed is beyond recall, which, when once passed is so irrevocably done that the people of Canada will have no more to say as to whether this thing shall go on, than will the common council of any county in the land. My hon. friends have taken the precaution—I do not say they have unfairly taken the precaution, but the precaution has been taken—of making a contract with somebody representing the Grand Trunk Pacific, a company not even yet incorporated, somebody who undertakes to speak for the Grand Trunk Pacific as to what the company will so do, and also with somebody who undertakes to say what the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada will do; and they have signed this contract in all its details, with all its clauses and conditions, and they have put that upon the Table, and they say to us: Accept this or reject it; take it as it is, or leave it; you have but one alternative, to swallow the whole, or reject the whole.

Now, I want to know also, in all calmness and all frankness, from the members of this parliament, from whence comes this irresistible and compulsive pressure under which we must drive this thing through now? The thing was never mooted before, and the government took no action, until

the Grand Trunk Railway Company conceived that it would be in their own interest to have the railway project liberally aided by the parliament of Canada which they desired to promote. That is the secret of the whole business; that is where it originated. All the other considerations fell upon unheeding ears. All these dangers never struck our minds, never seem to have entered into our calculations; it never occured to us that we were under such imminent peril; it never was suggested by anyone that the great future of Canada, the very life of Canada was at stake—until the Grand Trunk Railway Company made a call and laid their proposition before my hon. friends and colleagues of the government. I make bold to say that there is no evidence that the people of this country demand this legislation. I will commence with the province of British Columbia and ask you: Is there any call, loud or weak from the province of British Columbia that another railway should be put through the passes of the Rockies and carried to Fort Simpson? If there is, I have not heard it. I would like to see the proof that can be brought in support of any such statement. Such a feeling does not exist. I have no doubt that the people of the province of British Columbia, if this railway venture is going on, would like to see it pushed through their province. But I know that when it comes to the question of railway aid and construction in that province, the files of the Department of Railways will show what railways they want; and among them is not included a transcontinental railway into that province. Go over the files of the department, and you will find that the railways that they chiefly want are those that will go through southern British Columbia and give means by which the mineral products of that country can be taken to market. That is what they are asking for. Therefore, I say that, from wherever else the cry may come calling for the building of such a line as my hon. friends propose, that cry does not proceed from the province of British Columbia. Well, have we heard any loud appeal from the sister province of Ontario? Have we heard even a whisper of it before this thing was suggested? Of course, I do not deny that the very moment it is known that the government of the country is determined upon carrying out this project, you will hear cries innumerable in favour of it. Then all the papers and all the men who are friendly to the government will take up that cry, if their judgment or their consciences will allow them to do so. When the project is announced, then the cry will exist; but it did not exist, there was no voice, there was no word of it before the suggestion came from our friends in Montreal. Now, is there any cry in the west for a transcontinental railway? I dare say I may be taking up a position which is singular to myself, because I observe very little in the public press suggesting a doubt as to the necessity or advisability of more railways in the West. I have studied the question somewhat, and I do not know just how soon or how far in the future the time might be when such a line as this would be called for by the West; but now or in the immediate future there would have been no demand for any such railway project as this.

Mr. McCREARY. Does the hon. gentleman mean on the Western prairies?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Yes.

Mr. McCREARY. I say there is congestion there through which the farmers of the country lost over six millions of dollars last year.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. My hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) will find that I have not altogether lost sight of this question of the congestion of which he speaks; he will find that I have considered it. Whether I have reached a just and proper conclusion or not will remain for those who consider the subject——

Mr. McCREARY. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Yes. I intend to present the argument. Let the arguments be dealt with, as they will be in the discretion of every one who hears them. I say, there has been no cry in the west for more railways, in the way of east and west long lines. My hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) says that there was a great deal of wheat remaining to be taken out last year. Was that because of the lack of another railway up through the undeveloped northern portion of that western country? No, Sir, that cry came not because there were not railways enough, but because the railways they had were not equipped with enough locomotives and enough cars. That is what the congestion arose from. These people have had no difficulty at all from any other cause than the shortage and shrinkage in the equipment upon these railways. If you have read carefully what has been said by these people, you will find that there is a general consensus of opinion that that was the trouble, and not because they wanted other railways to be constructed just now in the unpeopled territory. The traffic was congested, but I think the congestion will very soon be overcome. I think perhaps it may be pretty well provided against now. But I state now that the three railroads—and I am including the Manaitoba and North-western, for although they are branches they are still extending largely to the west and north-west—they are providing that country with all reasonable railway facilities that are needed at present.

Now, there has been no press agitation. Let me add that I have not heard of any agitation in the maritime provinces or in

the province of Quebec. In the city of Quebec and neighbourhood there is quite a feeling in favour of some assistance being given to a railway that was to travel over much this same route; and so far as that sentiment has been expressed it is entitled to consideration. I, myself, have been in sympathy with it, and I am going to state fully what my opinion is in that regard before I conclude my observations. But I do say that there has been no demand in the North-west for a grand transcontinental line from ocean to ocean; there has been none in the maritime provinces. I never heard of any, and I would have heard it if it existed. Nobody ever heard of this project, at all events, until this session of parliament was half way through; no one ever heard it mooted as a scheme that was under consideration by this government, or likely to be submitted to parliament for an extension of this line to Moncton. There has been no press agitation in favour of it during the last six months, no platform agitation, no discussion in parliament, nobody has risen in any numbers, or even in units, and said that we want another transcontinental railway, moving motions, urging the government to that course. Nobody has been calling for this, therefore it is a mistake, it is misleading, to say that there is a great cry in the country which impels this government to adopt the policy that has been determined upon. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, it is fair to add that when this matter did first come up for consideration, when the Grand Trunk Railway Company first moved in this direction, it was not for this scheme that they moved; they moved for a much more limited scheme, they moved for a scheme which involved aid to a railway to North Bay, as they told us publicly. That was their idea, these other features have been added since, and I suppose it was considered necessary by reason of the fact that these bonding privileges had been imperilled, and other direful consequences seemed to be imminent.

Now, Sir, when we consider all these facts, and other facts, it would seem to be almost incredible that, under such circumstances, no heed should be paid to an appeal that we should go slow, that we should see what we are doing, that we should carefully study the bearings of the question in all its aspects. I would have thought there is scarcely one minister in the government, burdened with all the duties which during a parliamentary session are cast upon members of the government, but would have hesitated to take a step of this magnitude during the present session. However, Sir we have the scheme before us, and we must deal with it as it is. I think that a different scheme might have been with greater advantage to the country devised. If we were to consider the interests of the country as being paramount to any desires or any wishes of any railway company, I think a different scheme from this could have been and would have been devised. The whole proposal strikes me as ill-considered. There are facts which should have been ascertained and which when ascertained would have sufficed to show us whether the step to which we were committing ourselves was one which we could safely take. The fact when available which would have given us confidence in either not moving at all or in moving forward in the direction we are now asked to take. But we are in the dark. We cannot say that things are not so, because we do not know; we cannot say they are so because we have not any information which would justify us in saying it. We may find, if this thing goes on, that it is a huge blunder, that is it a grave mistake. We may find when it is too late, that the best interests of this country would have been better served by waiting, by putting off till to-morrow, by delaying long enough to make a proper investigation and inquiries.

Now, we have this session—and I think that ought to be borne in mind—made large provisions for a western railway extending through almost the whole of the fertile belt, to Edmonton at all events. We are providing this year a guarantee of bonds for 600 miles, and another additional 100 miles in another direction. Now, that is a considerable thing for parliament to have done in one session, seeing, if I am not incorrectly informed, that the country through which that railway passes is not settled, that it remains to be settled, and we hope to invite settlement by means of it. That railway 600 miles long, benefiting a tract of country 15 to 20 miles on each side of it, will ultimately be settled, but it will take a great many people and it will take some time to settle it, even with all the railways to the south of it. It will be some time before you need to make a new railway to the north. I think the case is abundantly clear that we have done amply well this year, at all events, in the way of giving a guarantee amounting to $9,000,000 towards the construction of the Canadian Northern. We have done that after two years of consideration, and only came to a final conclusion during the present session of parliament. Now, my own view would be that if we wanted to pass railway legislation, if we wanted to do something of advantage for the transportation of the country, if we wanted to secure to our Canadian sea-ports the transportation of western products, we would have extended the Intercolonial to Georgian bay by acquiring the Canada Atlantic. Of course, Mr. Speaker, that involves a continuation of the principle of government ownership, a principle to which I know a great many people are hostile. It would involve the government doing something to which many people are not well disposed. I regret, I am sure, as much as any man can, that unfortunate visit which the right hon. gentleman paid to Depot Harbour on the oc-

casion which he mentioned in his speech. It left an ineradicable impression upon his mind, fatal to all ideas of government ownership, fatal to any progress in that direction. It is enormously regrettable, because that impression cannot be removed.

No amount of argument, no amount of reason, no amount of experience, could possibly lift from my hon. friend's mind the load of conviction that was brought to him by the visit on the occasion referred to. I know that some former colleagues of mine were not a bit more friendly to government ownership than he was; whether it was owing to a visit to Depot Harbour I am not at all clear, but I am not yet content to accept that explanation as to their attitude upon the question of government ownership. The impression that has been created upon my own mind is that they had made this question of the Intercolonial Railway so much a battledore and shuttlecock business between political parties in former times when they were on the other side of the House that they have become filled absolutely full of prejudice and it is impossible to enlighten them or remove this prejudice. If they wanted to do something which would give evidence of a response to the national aspirations they would have gone to Georgian bay and they would have found the great body of public opinion that would have justified and supported them in going there with the government railway. The opinion is that business can be brought from the western country by the lake route and down over the Intercolonial Railway which will never, perhaps, be brought by any other possible route that may be constructed in the country. When the Intercolonial Railway was extended to Montreal, I felt that that would be the next move that we would make. I felt that it would be a proper step to take. I have been four or five years struggling valiantly in order to achieve some success in that direction. The move will be taken though. Other views which are more potent, than mine have been will prevail upon the government, and it will adopt the policy because it has virtue in it, and it has hope in it, and it must become a means of realizing the national idea of using our own ports winter and summer for the carriage of the products of our own country. I am not going to undertake to enter, on this occasion, upon any elaborate justification of the policy of government ownership. I have, on many occasions, when I have been addressing the House in reference to my railway estimates, taken the oportunity of pointing the mind a little in that direction, and I have adduced arguments which, while not being put forward at the time as arguments in favour of government ownership, may have influenced the creation of a sentiment in favour of such a policy and I claim that whether it be due to any word that I ever uttered or to other causes, there has been a marked, strong, rapid growth of public opinion in favour of the extension of the policy of government ownership in Canada. I do not say that the government should own every railway. I do not say that the government should take up every railway enterprise which is proposed, but I do say that the government might very wisely own a trunk line here and a trunk line there, because it gives advantages to the people who use these lines and who use other lines, which they can never have in any other way.

The experience of the Intercolonial Railway, I think, so far from being an evidence that such a policy is an unwise and unsafe one and one which cannot be judiciously adopted by the government is directly and positively the other way, and I am only too sorry that so small a portion of our friends on this side of the House, and so small a portion of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House agree with me in that view. Then, I will say that if our friends had been anxious to hear what the people of the western country had to say and what their wishes were in reference to this railway they would have heard that no policy would commend itself to their judgment so heartily or so unquestionably as the policy which will ensure the construction of a railway through the western country which shall be owned and operated by the government. Now, we have been told a good deal by my right hon. friend in regard to the disadvantages of the Intercolonial Railway by reason of its circuitous route, and what the right hon. gentleman said in that respect is absolutely correct. He said what I have said over and over again in explanation of why better financial results had not been accomplished over the road, but because it is a fact in respect to the Intercolonial Railway it does not follow that it should continue to be a fact in respect to any extensions which take place, because, in my view, the more territory you extend the road into which shall be productive, the better it will be for the Intercolonial Railway and the more it will equalize and bring up the general results. When you talk about building a road through the central part of the province of New Brunswick in order that you might get a cheaper and better route than the Intercolonial Railway, I point to the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which crosses the state of Maine. What is the fact? The Intercolonial Railway has had a contest with the Canadian Pacific Railway—a contest in one sense—at all events, a test between the two roads has taken place. When did it take place and with what results? It took place last year when the Canadian Pacific Railway was barred, in consequence of the embargo laid upon cattle, from carrying cattle through the state of Maine. We were called upon on the Intercolonial Railway to carry these

cattle from the west, because as I have said they could not go by the Canadian Pacific Railway, we carried them, and what did we succeed in doing when we carried them ? The city of St. John is 259 miles further away from Montreal by the Intercolonial Railway than by the Canadian Pacific Railway ; yet, we hauled double as many cars to a train load over the Intercolonial Railway by reason of its good condition and level, easy grades, and we hauled them in less time than the Canadian Pacific Railway could haul their cattle trains over their own line 259 miles shorter in distance. That is a fact, and therefore I say that we can with good reason claim that the Intercolonial Railway can hold its own against the competition of any other railway which may be constructed in New Brunswick, except the railway which will run from Rivière du Loup directly down the valley of St. John to the city of St. John, which, of course, has very much more favourable grades than those on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I was going to add that it is clear from the information which is easily obtainable, and some of which I have in my hand, and which I would perhaps not be warranted in taking up the time of the House in reading, that there is a very large traffic done by the Canada Atlantic Railway in shipping from the head of Lake Superior, and that that business could unquestionably be increased. It follows then that it could have been, but as the officers of the Canada Atlantic Railway will tell you, they have been in need of additional locomotives and cars, and perhaps they have been at some disadvantage owing to the single track ; I am not clear about that. At all events, cars and locomotives are much needed by them if they are to increase their traffic, and if they did increase their equipment in that respect their business would also correspondingly increase. Now, then, the navigation at that point is very much later than it is through the canals. I understand from Mr. Booth that Depot Harbour is open at least a month or six weeks later in the fall, and some two or three weeks earlier in the spring, than is the navigation on the canals, so that they could take shipments across the lake during a period when the canal system is not opened. Therefore, you have advantages over that road which you cannot get in any other way, and you would be picking up the traffic at the points where it can be had, and from which it is seeking carriage. The traffic comes down to the head of the lakes on both sides of the line for the purpose of getting water transport, because they allege that water transport is very much cheaper than rail transport under any circumstances, and by this means you would be able to secure that traffic. Now, sir, so much for the Georgian bay.

It has been my first hope and my first desire that the government of the country should take up that question of the Canada Atlantic Railway and acquire it, as they could acquire it, I am pretty well satisfied upon reasonable terms, and the expenditure of a very moderate amount of money would have connected it with the Intercolonial Railway, and you would have then a railway which was running through our own territory, which was picking up the traffic just where the people wanted to have it picked up, and which would have given you an outlet and a gateway through our own ports.

Now, Sir, addressing myself to the present scheme of the construction of this railway from Quebec to the west, I am not going to say that it is a project that has not very much to recommend it, and perhaps a project which I would gladly see carried out, and which I would hold up both hands to support under proper conditions and in a proper way. If we could be satisfied that the country to be traversed by that railway from Quebec to the prairies is a fertile country which will invite and support settlement, and which will support a railway from a local point of view, then I should say, let us go ahead and build it as rapidly as the occasion arises as rapidly as the settlement of the country will call for it, and as rapidly as we can justify it under a proper administration of affairs. I would not put any obstacle in the way of the rapid construction of it, after you have possessed yourself of all information with regard to it ; after you have found out what it is going to cost, what is the limit of the liability you assume, whether or not you can get a suitable route, and generally possessed yourself of that information which any ordinary business man would put himself in possession of before he would embark in any such undertaking. So far as the construction of the Quebec portion is concerned, I would heartily favour its construction by the government, I would heartily favour its operation by the government, provided they had taken these proper precautionary steps, which, however, they have not taken. My quarrel with the government so far as this portion of the undertaking is concerned, rests almost entirely upon the consideration that they are plunging headlong into this thing, in a most unwise, injudicious, and unbusinesslike way, when by a little pause, by a year or two of delay to get information, we might be put in possession of facts which would justify us in proceeding. And surely a year or two is not a long time in the life of this Canadian nation ; surely Canada is not going to come to an end so soon that two years is a term of any importance to be considered in our national life. I apprehend that we would have needed two years in order to have obtained a thorough, complete, and correct survey and exploration of that whole country. And having that, the government could have come to parliament, and they could have gone to the country and given reasons for the faith that is in them,

and given substantial ground for asking the people to encumber themselves with a liability of $40,000,000, or $50,000,000 or $60,000,0000, or perhaps more for the construction of this railway. If you delay it in order to obtain this information, you could have come to parliament upon solid ground with your proposition, and if you had that solid ground the country would, I am sure, heartily and readily sustain you. But as you are going now, as you are plunging into it, you may possibly plunge into what is going to be a disaster. I cannot say; no man can say that that country is not of abounding fertility. No man can say that that country will not afford the amplest amount of traffic. No man can say that it is not rich in all the varied resources which distinguish other portions of Canada. No man can say that there would not be a mint of money made by any company that would operate a railway through that country. But the fact of the matter is, that we know nothing about it. We have no information about it. The government is not in possession of any information about it, or at all events if they are I have never known of it and they have not put this House in possession of it. And if it be that this country is not a fertile country. If it be that there is no local support for a railway; if it be that settlement cannot be successfully invited into the country; if it be that the rest of Canada will fill up with settlement before settlement will go into it; if there is nothing but pulpwood in that country which will not be hauled out until after all the pulpwood which is handier to the market is taken away from the other vast areas of Canada in which it is to be found; if there is no lumber there except the lumber that would enter into competition with the lumber of British Columbia which is much handier to get and better in quality; if that is all the business that a railway can take out of that country, what a calamitous plunge this government and this parliament would be taking in lending support to this scheme.

At all events, I am entitled to ask so far as I represent the people of my own constituency and the people of New Brunswick; I am entitled to ask as any other member of this House is entitled to ask, that I should have enough evidence before me, that I may be satisfied in order to arrive at an honest judgment, so that I shall feel that I am not by any possibility committing a grave and an egregious error which will deal disaster to the future of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Now, Mr. Speaker, such a railway as I would favour could be used for colonization purposes of course, and for what ever other western traffic would be attracted over that road—whatever other western traffic would find its way there in preference to seeking an outlet from the head of the lakes. If all that our friends confidently expect and believe with regard to the future prospect of the advantages which would come to the west from that railway, is fully realized, so much the better, and we will all be able to appreciate such good results. But we do not know that there is any possibility of such beneficial results; we have no information that would lead us to form an opinion on the matter, and therefore I say that the government may fairly consider whether they ought not to pause in the project which they are asking us to approve.

Now, Sir, my proposition is this: We ought to have come before parliament as a government, and we ought to have said to parliament and to the country: We are favourably impressed with the importance of the early construction of another transcontinental railway; but, as business men, as prudent and cautious men, we think that the proper course for us to take is to get an appropriation from parliament in order that this whole country which it is proposed the railway shall traverse in so far as it has not been officially explored, and in so far as we have not been made familiar with its conditions; shall be ascertained and made known to the people of Canada, laid before parliament at a later day; and then if these reports are favourable it is our fixed purpose to ask parliament to authorize us to go along with railway construction in that territory. My idea would be that we should go as far as we could reasonably and as the necessities woull justify, and when we got through to the prairie, that we should then call a halt until the necessity arose for further extension through the western country. We would have our officials on the alert and they would see when the growing needs and prospects of the country would justify a further extension, and when that time came, then if nobody else entertained it, and even if they did, my idea would be that we should continue our road along; go right along through, go along just as we required to do it in the true interest of the country. Then this discussion, which I have said was so necessary, would have taken place. The public press would take the project up; the public platform might, perhaps, be used to some extent, parliament would discuss the matter in all its bearings, and you would get the ideas of the people as to whether government ownership and government operation, or company ownership and company operation would be the most desirable, and the arguments would be brought pro and con, and you would have the people of Canada put in possession of all the facts of the scheme which was to be adopted, before they were irrevocably committed to its adoption.

The points that I think ought to be inquired into are: Is there a feasible and practicable route north of the height of

land between Quebec and the prairies? What will the railway cost? What are the prospects of settlement? What are the natural resources of the territory? Is there a good reason to believe that there will be a local traffic to sustain the road? These, and cognate questions should, I think, be first inquired into before we are asked by the responsible government of this country to commit ourselves to a work of this magnitude.

Now, Sir, I am brought naturally to call attention to some features of the contract in connection with the observations which I have just made. On the first page of the Bill you will have discovered a special feature indicated by the language employed in the preamble:

> Whereas, by reason of the growth in population and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada and especially of the western part thereof, and with a view to the opening up of new territory available for settlement, both in the eastern provinces and in the west, and the affording of transportation facilities for such territory, and for other reasons, the necessity has arisen for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

You will observe further on that it reads that you are to proceed to 'the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway to be operated as a common railway highway across the Dominion of Canada from ocean to ocean and wholly within Canadian territory.' It is to that particular feature that for a moment I desire to call the attention of the House. One of the fundamental grounds and bases upon which this scheme is founded—and you can see the consequences of this view later, when I further advance with my argument—is that it is necessary to furnish to that territory which we are opening up and developing a common railway highway.

Now, I apprehend that that language has been chosen for the purpose of conveying a specific idea. It is to be, not an ordinary railway in any sense, not a railway which could be owned and controlled by a corporation, although subject to all the powers of control which may be exercised through any tribunal which parliament may constitute but a government railway, to be used in a different sense from an ordinary railway—something in the nature of a highway, only with rails, so that every railway company which came along would have the right and opportunity afforded to it of traversing this railway with its trains; so that, as my hon. friend said in the course of his speech, a train could start at St. John or Halifax, run to Moncton, get on to this railway, and come out at Port Simpson; so that your locomotive, your train and your train hands could go on a long junketing tour across the continent from St. John to the Pacific ocean. That is to say, it would be a railway common to every railway company to use. That is the meaning, I apprehend, of the language used, or else there is no meaning in it at all.

Now, let me call attention to clause 24 of the contract, which contains two or three sub-clauses which point to the same idea: First, sub-clause (a), and next, sub-clause (b). On reference to these clauses--I need not read them—you will see that they fortify the idea that trains might come along and pick up this railway, and run along it in the ordinary way in which a man with a horse and cart may travel along the highway. To show that this is the idea that underlies the measure, I will read a brief extract from what was said by the right hon. leader of the government on this subject. At page 7692 of 'Hansard,' my hon. friend says this:

> So that under this agreement an Intercolonial train can leave St. John or Halifax and proceed all the way to Port Simpson. Under this agreement, a train of the Great Northern or of the Canadian Northern can enter upon this road at any point and go as far as the maritime provinces. So we have guarded this point in every way, and I believe that in this respect the provisions we have made will command the full satisfaction of the Canadian people.

If it were possible to produce the most conclusive and striking evidence that some features of this contract were framed without consultation with and without the advice or the opinion of anybody who knows anything at all about railroading, these clauses in the contract and this clause in the preamble afford that evidence. A more absolutely unworkable, and, in the opinion of every railway man in the country, a more senseless suggestion it would be difficult to make. The idea of commencing a scheme involving all the millions of expenditure which it is proposed that this scheme shall involve, and then saying you will do it in order to establish a common railway highway, so that 'a' company, 'b' company, 'c' company and 'd' company may have their trains travel thousands of miles over this railway. I have endeavoured to urge the view, but without the slightest success, that that was not railway usage or practice or possibility; but it is here all the same. I have no doubt that if my hon. friends had appealed to the honest opinion of the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway himself, he would have pointed out to them the utter fallacy of such a suggestion as that—the absolute and utter impossibility of any such plan being worked out. Just look at it: What does it involve? It involves that a train shall leave the Intercolonial Railway, with its train hands, its locomotives and its cars, and shall start out. It runs its first day; what will it do? It has either to lie at some particular point over night, or get fresh men and a fresh locomotive. You have to have your locomotive looked after and repaired; you have to have your men sleep and your engine cooled, and other things attended to. Or, take your time and

stay on the road. In that case, you would have to pay your board, or be looked after in that way. You would have to provide rest houses for your men and engine houses for your engines. Every company would have its engine houses and its rest houses, and every one of its trains would have to lie over after it had gone as far as it could in a day, until it rested and was ready to go on again the next day. Would not that be a very comfortable way of conducting the railway business of the country? You could not do that, you say; that would be absurd. Well, what else would you do? There would have to be some authority in charge, which would have spare locomotives and spare men whom you could utilize to look after and repair them at every 120 or 140 miles along this railway. Then, that thing would have to be repeated all over the line. Why is that not done now? Because it is utterly impracticable. The only practicable way is to have some railway commission or some general tribunal deal with the matter. When different railways are anxious to use a road in common, they constitute themselves into a board, which board appoints its officers and employs its men, who will have general supervision over the common road so as to ensure its equitable use to all. This association would have to own the locomotives and manage everything in order to ensure fair play. But such a body could not operate a transcontinental line running its trains three thousand miles to the Pacific coast. Right of way is sometimes given by one railway to another over its line, but only for short distances. The Canadian Pacific Railway use the Grand Trunk Railway between Toronto and Hamilton. But that is a very short mileage; and when you talk of giving various railways the use of a line a thousand miles long, the thing is not possible. A common railway highway is not feasible. You cannot work out any such idea. The idea is however put forward, as one of the great merits of this scheme, that it will provide a common railway highway which may be used by all the railway companies that may desire to connect with this line across to the prairies. It is claimed that all these other companies may send their trains over it. That, Sir, can never be worked out. There are good reasons why the latter feature of this scheme, involving the leasing of this road to a private corporation, will defeat the possibility of this road being utilized to any extent by any other company doing business in the western country. The same reasons which would justify the construction of this road by the government call for its operation by the government. There is no other way in which the advantages which are supposed to accrue from government ownership can accrue to the people. When I speak of government ownership, I do not necessarily mean the operation of the road by the Railway Department. It does not matter a jot whether the road be in the control of a department of the government or some tribunal which the government may create, it must be operated by an independent tribunal which has no interest in any other railways that are competing for the same traffic. Therefore I say that when the government took the responsibility of building this line, it should also have taken the responsibility of owning and operating it. It should not have parted with it for a period of fifty years. Its leasing of it for fifty years is equivalent to their giving up its ownership during that period. It ought to own the road and operate it, and in this way confer on the country the advantages, whether great or small which follow from government ownership. The people would then enjoy those advantages which they will not do now under the system adopted. After going to the enormous expenditure of building this line, the government intend handing it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for fifty years. Thus during two generations this property will be out of their hands. But they say, 'Oh, we have put some very binding clauses in the contract, we have tied them up hand and foot, we have compelled them by agreement to do this thing and the other. That does not help the government in the least. I do not say that these restrictions will be of no advantage at all, but I say that there will be no advantage to the people from the construction of the road, after you once lease it, commensurate with the loss incurred by your parting with its control and putting the road into other hands. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not in a position to attract a great deal of business to this road. If the tendencies were all, as my hon. friend thinks they are or will be, in favour of this road securing transatlantic traffic with equal advantage compared with any water route, when the government lease it to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, they give it into the absolute operating control of that company. You can not constitute any committee of investigation able to watch those men close enough to prevent their giving the advantages to their own company's traffic in preference to any other. No ingenuity you can display will enable you to provide yourself with safeguards sufficient to prevent the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from giving the benefits and advantages to themselves and with holding them from others. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is practical owner. Every man engaged on that road will be in their employ, looking to them for wages and promotion, and anxious to win the confidence and goodwill of his employers. Every train despatcher, along this strip of 1,800 or 1,900 miles, will be naturally inclined to favour the company which pays him. It will be of the greatest importance to him to see that no delay occurs in the despatching of their trains

and the carriage of their traffic. He knows that if he does that, his people will appreciate his zeal in their interest, because they are keen competitors with all the other people who are supposed to want to use this railway line. What are the other railways that are going to use this great common railway highway? They will all be competitors with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, hauling grain in competition with that road, and they will be sure to suspect that they have not been given fair play. They will not send their business that way if they can find any other way. Those people will suspect, and they will act upon their suspicions even though these may not be well founded. Let me give you some of my experience as a member of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Five or six cases have occurred in which companies have come before the Railway Committee to have their disputes settled concerning the user of single or double tracks by two or three different companies, and the amount of jealousies, suspicions and difficulties experienced, in getting those companies to come to any sort of an agreement, whereby one of them was to be allowed to handle the trains and serve the others, one could hardly imagine. Even if it is only a few miles, the struggle for advantage, the time taken up, the controversies that arise, the suspicions that exist will not be allayed, they cannot be allayed—it is not in human nature. Therefore, I feel as though I am bound to say that it is perfect moonshine, it is misleading the people of this country, to try to make them suppose that they are to have a grand transcontinental highway at their disposal, to be used in common in the way this Bill declares and this contract contemplates. So, one of the bases on which this thing is being pushed forward now with this prodigious haste will bear no weight, by reason of the utter impracticability of working it out in actual railway practice. The way to do this, as I have said, would be, if you like, to put a commission in charge of the road. Then you might rest assured that, with a commission that has no interest in either of the competing railways, no interest in the traffic, would have the confidence of all the railways that might want to use the road. And the way they would use it, and the only way they could use it, would be by bringing their loaded cars up to the point of intersection and handing them over to the commission to be hauled over the road to the point of destination. But when we are told that we can pick up trains at this place or that and carry them, if necessary, with their own crews over hundreds or thousands of miles, we are being led in a kind of hysterical frenzy, it seems to me, to adopt ideas that are wholly and absolutely impracticable, and which show that a little thought and a little time, and a little more thought and a little more time, and still a little more thought and a little more time, would not have been wasted if devoted to the consideration of this scheme. Now, for these reasons, I am unable to understand, after we had adopted the principle of government ownership down to this point, what are the reasons, what are the cogent and convincing reasons why we should divorce the principle of public operation from the principle of public ownership and hand the road over to the operation of a private company. There is no reason to my mind which at all ought to commend this idea to one's reasonable judgment. Therefore, I complain of that feature of the scheme. I think it is in this respect, radically defective, and that it cannot be worked out successfully. I think it contains defects which will impair the successful working of the railway and which will prevent rather than promote the successful working out of financial results. And it will strike a blow, which I regret to see struck by the government of this country, at the principle of government ownership.

Of course, this contract contains a very great many clauses for the purpose of securing this and assuring that. But, I have yet to learn that you can frame clauses which will meet the ingenuity of company officials, or prevent a company which may be operating the road from having very much its own way in the premises. And when you consider that railway interest in this country has become so powerful, that even within a few weeks of the present session of parliament, they can get a scheme sprung upon the country involving many millions, what reasonable ground have you for expecting that, in these minor things which affect only individuals doing business with the road, you can enforce the clauses and provisions which you have incorporated in the contract in order to bind and hold them? I think we are building upon very slight foundations the hope which my hon. friend has expressed.

Now, passing from what is called the eastern section, I wish to make a few observations upon the question of the prairie section. A curious condition of things is developed here. The policy of even government construction and ownership is abandoned when you come to this portion of the line. Why should it be thrown aside here? I fail to understand—that is, I fail to reconcile it with any interest which Canadian people have in the matter or with anything calculated to serve the welfare of the general public. If it is simply because a railway company desires and prefers to own the prairie section that we think it is proper or if we think, on balancing the advantages and disadvantages it is better that a company should own and operate it, very well; I can see the force of that. But these reasons have not yet been made apparent. If it is a sound principle to own your railroad from Moncton to the prairies, to the confines

of that portion of the country where you hope the business will, in course of time, develop to a paying point, why should you virtually give away, and not only that, but also substantially aid, the line through this valuable and fertile country ? What are the compelling reasons ? I see none, none whatever. There is no reason in the experience of the Intercolonial which will justify the inference, that such a road being owned by the government and operated by a commission, could not be made as much a success, so far as the general interests of the country are concerned. It might not yield us large dividends, because you might not develop the same large amount of business. But the people of the country—and it is the people whose interests we are supposed to consider—would be far better served, their rights would certainly be better secured, by continuing a policy of public ownership and also carrying out the principle of public operation when you come to the fertile belt, that portion of the road which is going to create traffic for you. Now, on the very threshold of this question, I make this inquiry of myself : Is there now, or is there likely to be in the immediate future, any need for our embarking on another railway through the North-western country ? Are we not actually anticipating the requirements of that country by a considerable number of years ? Now, the idea, if it is entertained, that the whole western country can be filled with railways, and that it will attract innumerable millions of people to fill it up at once, is not well founded. Yet that is the idea that seems to underlie this proposition. There does not seem to be any impression that you may be putting a railway into that country long before the time when it need be put there. Are you or are you not doing that ? My hon. friends, if they have not information on that subject—and they cannot have it—might well have inquired into the matter. They might well advise the House as to what are the facts, and what are our own needs. Where are the men who are competent to speak who have advised this government that another railway through that country, north of the Canadian Northern, is required at this time, or that it will be required in the immediate future ? I have no means of knowledge myself upon that point. But is it not a natural query to raise ? How many transcontinental railways do you want to construct in one year ? One has already been sanctioned. Is there no limit, or is that limit only the number of demands made upon us by influential corporations ? Is that the limit ? Now, that is not a proper limit, that is not a legitimate limit, that is not a limit that this parliament ought to listen to, that is not a limit that this government should respond to for one moment. The question is, whether there is real need for another road through that fertile country. I can understand that if it was thought desirable to construct another government railway you might run it down between some of these roads that are now in existence, so as to have some effect upon their rates; but to run another railway north thirty or thirty-five miles from the first railway, will be to encroach on its territory. We ought to have evidence as to whether such a condition of things exists in that western country which renders it necessary for us to rush with headlong haste to authorize the construction at enormous cost of two lines of railway through that same country at the present time.

Now I wish to direct attention for a moment to the question of the location of this new railway. I have spoken of it as drawing to the north. I have heard it said by people who profess to know whereof they speak that the Grand Trunk Pacific have some assurance or expectation that they are going to be allowed to run south of the Canadian Northern, and through some of these other roads that are already constructed in that section. Well, if that be true, and I cannot believe it is true, I think I find evidence, conclusive evidence that it is not true—but if it is true, then I say unhesitatingly that no railway company that comes to parliament and gets a charter to construct another line between them, south of the northern line and north of the southern line, ought to get one dollar of money from the public exchequer, or one dollar of guarantee. I say it would be an outrage upon the people of Canada. After that country is beginning to be peopled, after a traffic exists in a rich country like that, if a company gets a charter, let it go in and build a railway with its own means and on its own financial strength, and not a farthing should pass from the treasury of this country in aid of its construction. If another railway was considered to be needed, it is the government that should put it there, if they are going to spend any money in railway construction at all. Now I have reasons for thinking that that cannot be so, and I will tell you why. I find this in the preamble :

> Whereas, by reason of the growth in population and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada, and especially of the western part thereof, and with a view to the opening up of new territory available for settlement.

Now you see lying at the very threshold of this whole measure is this solemn declaration that the object for which these enormous responsibilities are to be assumed is to open up new territory which is now unsettled. Then it must be beyond the reach and scope of the present settlements in that country, and so this question fairly arises : I want to know, you want to know, and the country will want to know, what is the extent of the country that needs to be served by railroads and which is still unpeopled ? What is the extent of that coun-

try, what are its capabilities in the way of attracting and retaining settlers, and how many years will it be before there will be need of their travelling further north in order to find places for settlement? That is information that we have not got, and yet it is vital for a proper and judicious consideration of this whole question. Now not only does the preamble of the Bill contain language which I think is open to the interpretation that I give it, but the contract does also. Let me read some lines of it, and I ask you if it does not mean exactly what I state:

> Whereas, having regard to the growth of population and the rapid development of the production and trade of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and to the great area of fertile and productive land in all the provinces and territories as yet without railway facilities.

Now that is clear. So we have got to go outside the range of the country which is supplied with railway service, and where will that take us? I think that is a simple question, easy of solution—it must take us north of the Canadian Northern, after you get out of Manitoba, and perhaps before. As I say, when you run that road from Gilbert Plains through to Edmonton you cut through an unpeopled country, you have to go north of that again, and where are you as to the needs? Where are you as to the requirements of a railway? Where is the evidence of a need for another railway traversing that country, as the Bill itself declares?

Now there are some reasons which I think ought to influence this government or any government when a question of this kind arises for solution. You have a great unpeopled country in our western domain. Statesmanship requires that the government should exercise a guiding influence in the direction of settlement, so that it may take place in the best way for itself, that it may be located in the best interests of the country and of the people who are to settle there. In other words, it is the business of the government to see that when people go into that country they should not be encouraged to scatter in isolated settlements, far apart from each other. They ought to be brought together as closely as conditions will warrant. Many reasons require that they should not be scattered too far apart. The social conditions call for it, the comforts of life demand it, municipal organization and municipal government all call for the same thing. The educational needs of these people require imperatively that they should be settled as closely together as convenient; and when they begin to spread out, and fresh settlers come in, then further portions of the country can be opened up. But to build two or three different railways at one time through an unsettled country, and drop down the people here and there, 10, 50 or 100 miles apart, and continue that policy for a long period of years, when they must remain for an indefinite time without the advantages of roads, and schools, and the ordinary conveniences of life, is to my mind a great mistake, not only in the interest of that country, but in the interest of the settlers themselves; it is to make a serious blunder which will greatly injure the prospects of our western country. Therefore, when you are building another road in the west in addition to the one you are sanctioning this year, you are contributing to bring about these undesirable results; and I say the government should hesitate, if there was no other reason, they should pause before going further. They should be able to tell us what are the prospects, what are the reasons which have induced them to ask us to legislate in the proposed direction, and under the conditions as they exist to-day.

Now, in brief, my objections to the building of the prairie section are these: First, it is premature. I say it is premature because I have taken some pains to ascertain the facts. My own mind has been led to this conclusion because I have taken some pains to gather by conversations with people who ought to know something about this subject and who are familiar with the western country, some facts relating to it. The first fact which seems to be evidential is the fact that there is no settlement north of the Canadian Northern Railway, which we have authorized to be constructed during the present year. I have asked the question of a number of people from that part of the country: What are the capabilities of receiving settlers in the country between the two railways; that is, between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway? How many people can go there and find suitable land, can find desirable settlements within the area before settlement begins to overflow and spread further north? The lowest estimate that has been given me by any one individual to whom I have addressed the question has been five millions of people. I do not know whether that is right or wrong. I am giving it to the House frankly, just as it has been given to me. I have asked the question and the reply given to me is that five millions of people can be comfortably located within the area in that western country which these two railways, the Canadian Northern Railway on the north and the Canadian Pacific Railway main line can provide railway facilities for. If that is not true, I should think it would be capable of being very easily answered authoritatively and officially just what the capabilities of this section of the country for settlement are. If that statement is anything like the truth, then it is unreasonable to say that with room for five millions more to-day within that belt there can be no occasion for us to spend more money in order to provide

for settlement much further north at the present time. At the rate of 100,000 a year, as they are now going in, how many years will take to settle that country? Double that and you have over 25 years before you get your five millions of people in there. I hope it may be doubled and I hope it will still further increase beyond that, but at all events, many years must elapse before you will be required, it appears to me from what I can gather, to lay down any more railways in that particular section of the country for the accommodation of the settlers who will be going in. We have been told that settlers are teeming into this district. They may be teeming into a part of the country forty, fifty, sixty, seventy or eighty miles away from the railway; they may be teeming into another part of the country altogether. We are told that this country, which was once the home of the buffalo and wild tribes, is teeming with activity. If this activity is in another section of the North-west, and not giving any evidence of its existence in the particular section of the country through which this railway is to run, why build the railway now? It appears to me that our duty is plain now. Why are we rushing into this thing with such speed as if our very life depended upon it, as if the very existence of Canada depended upon it I want to ask is there any dark cloud overshadowing us that the ratification of this contract will immediately lift. If there is, I do not know it. Is there a well-grounded fear that the Grand Trunk Railway Company will not allow us, two or three years hence, to build and make them a present of this line, that they will not accept it? Is there any well-grounded justification for that fear? I think not. I think we will find them in just as receptive a frame of mind two or three years hence as that in which they are to-day. Is there any congestion away up in this country which requires a railway to be built? Is there any depression in business? We hear about the employment of the toiling thousands in the workshops and fields of Canada. They are, happily, now all employed, but is that a reason why we should start now to build another railway? I think not. It is not a cogent reason. I do not hear that labourers are seeking employment in vain, nor do I hear that there is any depression in the manufacturing industries of the country. I could understand that, if the conditions were entirely different, it might be desirable for the government to undertake a work a little in advance of the time that it was required to relieve, if possible, such a depressed condition in order that people might be occupied, but I never heard yet of a government feeling that they were in duty bound, when everything is booming, when times are prosperous and when men are employed, when wages are high and when conditions are as favourable as they ever have been or can be, to expend a large amount of money for such a purpose as this. Why not wait and be sure? If this is a wise policy, it will be wise two or three years hence; if it is a defensible policy, it will be easily defensible then. Then, it may be that one of those cycles which come about in all countries will appear, when business will become less active, when depressed conditions will occur, when the public exchequer may well be opened and when great works may be undertaken for the purpose I suggested a moment ago of helping to tide over the period of bad times until better times should appear? But I am told by one of the leading organs of public opinion in this country, which seems to be most extremely anxious to see this project go through, that we must build this road now or never. Now or never? What does this mean? Is it really a fact, now or never? What are the conditions which exist now which may not exist five, ten or fifteen years hence? Then, it says further that it matters not how we have drifted or have been drawn into it, we are face to face with a grave crisis. At the time this announcement was made by this leading organ, I thought it was striking, and I took it to ponder over, and I have pondered over it. 'It matters not how we have drifted.' If we had drifted we would not have moved with such celerity. We have more than drifted. We have been drawn into it. This editorial article says that we are face to face with a grave crisis, and therefore this railway should be built. It must be built from the east to the west, from ocean to ocean, even if $150,000,000 has to be expended upon it, because we are face to face with a grave crisis. I would like some one to tell me where or what the crisis is. Where is it located? Surely, if there is a crisis we would all like to know about it. If it is a tangible thing, we would like to feel it. Let somebody who does know locate it. If somebody has it in his pocket let him produce it. But, Sir, we have been left in blissful ignorance down to this very moment, that we were in the midst of any crisis. Somebody did try to make a little political crisis out of the recent changes in the Department of Railways and Canals, but that is a very small thing. This one we are speaking of, we are told, is a grave crisis; it is a grave crisis that we are called on to face, and because it is a grave crisis we must build this railway. I do not wonder, Sir, that such strained advocacy as this could find expression in one of the leading organs of opinion in this country, and that it ever could be considered as carrying any weight or impressing people successfully into the support of this project. I think, Sir, that the crisis ought be disclosed. If there is a crisis we should know the truth. If it does not exist now, but if it is impending, it would be well to warn us. If it is a crisis

of such grave character as it is said to be, and if it is liable to be attended with such disastrous results to the interests of Canada, then I for one, and I am quite sure the general body of this House will be prepared even to support a proposition of this character, if it is going to relieve us from such direful, consequences, rather than have that calamitous crisis come upon us.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. We are further told from the same quarter that we have got to decide 'now,' whether we will go into the undertaking. Mark you; we have now to decide, or it will slip away from us to our inestimable and irreparable loss. Well Sir, I have heard expressions of that kind used in some of the auction shops, but I cannot imagine how any one can think that such kind of arguing will impress the mass of the intelligent people of this country. One would think that the credit of Canada at the present moment was such that we could incur a liability of this kind, but if we did not incur it at this very moment, or if we allowed a year or two to pass by so that we might obtain information to enable us to proceed understandingly with this project, we would then be in a position to carry it out. Well, that kind of reasoning is futile. To my mind, Sir, Canada will be all the stronger in the estimation of the financial men of the world, if before entering into a proposal of this character, Canada shows that she is moving in it with judgment and discretion.

Now, Sir, I come to a question which has something of a new character; something rather which is an appendage to the original proposition, and which concerns more directly the department of government in which I had been serving. I refer to the extension of this railway from Quebec to Moncton. Let me say, that while I do not profess to know anything with regard to these other things and can only conjecture as to what would be the result of them, I do profess to know something about the extension of the railway from Quebec to Moncton, and I do profess to know something about its effect upon the public interest in relation to the Intercolonial Railway. My objection to this railway being constructed to Moncton has been stated in general terms in my letter to the premier, in which I stated that it was paralleling the Intercolonial Railway. I trust that no person who read that statement in my letter imagined that I meant the word 'parallelling,' as used in the sense that having got away from the Intercolonial Railway for a short distance it maintained an equal distance from the Intercolonial Railway all the way through. What I meant was, that in its broadest sense it duplicated the Intercolonial. I meant that it was proposing to take away the traffic, the through traffic, the largest portion of the traffic which the Intercolonial would have, and which would be calculated to carry. I meant that it was going to be a competitor and a rival for much the same business as the Intercolonial Railway does. I meant that the government was setting up another railway, building out of its own means a railway whereby the present great Intercolonial Railway would be dismantled, and would be depleted of its business, and would be practically destroyed, and that all the prospects of the Intercolonial Railway, and all its hopes, and all the interests which naturally centre around it, would be materially prejudiced and impaired. That is what I meant, and that is what I think I can establish to the conclusive satisfaction of any person who may care to hear me. I am not going to say that the Intercolonial Railway ought not have competition in any form, because it has always had competition and new competing lines have been chartered by parliament and subsidized by parliament from time to time, much to its injury. All that has been done I presume in the interest of the people, and therefore nothing can be said, I assume and believe that in every case in which any little line or branch line diverting traffic from the Intercolonial Railway was authorized, there was reason behind it, or otherwise it would not have been done. But, Sir, I maintain that in respect to this duplication of the Intercolonial Railway by the extension from Quebec to Moncton, there is no necessity, there is no reason, there is no justification, there is no object good, bad or indifferent to be attained.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Yes; it is absolutely useless. It is a total and absolute waste of the public money. It is not only a destruction of the Intercolonial Railway, but it is a sheer unjustifiable squandering of the public money.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I cannot speak less strongly because I feel strongly with regard to this. I feel strongly because I can realize as no gentleman in this House can realize the efforts which have been made, and the successful efforts which have been made during the past few years to improve the character of that railway, to give it a better standing and a better foothold, and to promote its earning capacity as it never had been promoted before.

An hon. MEMBER. What do the Conservatives say to that?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. You fellows are trying to kill it.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. We have expended upon that railway $70,000,000 of money, and now the government proposes to spend $15,000,000 more in order to make our ex-

penditure on the Intercolonial Railway less valuable, and less effective, and in order to injure materially the people who live along that line.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say in order to materially injure these people, because I take it that it is a matter worthy of some little consideration that the people who have been living on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, who have been enjoying the advantages of the service it affords and it has been a good service—these people have built upon the line of railway at different points in expectation that this condition of things would continue; but now the prospect is held out to them, that for the purpose of carrying out an idea, the origin of which I do not absolutely know and the purpose of which I have not been able to discover up to this moment; these people are to be deprived of those advantages and to be put as it were on a back street and on a local road, and deprived of these facilities on account of which they have invested their money in the expectation that they would always be permitted to enjoy the same consideration and advantages. And now, Sir, the people who live along the Intercolonial Railway are to be deprived of these advantages without rhyme and without reason, without a particle of justification and without a particle of warrant, and while the government is doing this, they are at the same time wasting a vast amount of public money in order to do it.

You will notice, Sir, that the Intercolonial Railway has greatly improved its business in the last few years. Seven years ago the total amount of business done on the Intercolonial Railway was about $3,000,000, and to-day, if my memory serves me right, it is nearly $7,000,000. The Intercolonial Railway came to Montreal to get business; it extended its line to secure through-traffic, and we expended a large amount of money and assumed considerable obligations in connection with that extension. We have expended $15,000,000 at least in extensions and improvements, in the betterment of the Intercolonial, in the modernizing of the Intercolonial. That has been the policy continued for seven years, constantly, without variation, uniformly, without a doubt expressed on this side of the House as to the wisdom of that policy until to-day. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition said the other night that we were reversing the policy which we had pursued during all these years. I go further; I say we are doing more; we are condemning that policy. We are not only condemning it, but we are writing our own condemnation in letters which will never be obliterated. We are saying that we did not know what we were doing—that we did not care what we were doing. It suits our purpose now to destroy entirely what we have done, and to belittle all that has been the result of our past policy. That is what is being proposed in this policy to-day. I protest against it. I think I can show this House that a little thought and consideration would have led to the staying of the hands of my colleagues who were determined that this thing should be carried out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a curious question as to the origin of this idea. We had this grand, from-ocean-to-ocean, transcontinental, all-Canadian line; we had all that; we were told about that, and the newspapers were advised that the Grand Trunk Railway Company was going to make this application. When the transcontinental scheme from Quebec to the Pacific ocean was in contemplation, we had discussed it for a long time before we heard of the idea of this Moncton extension. When did we first hear of it? We first heard of it when the session was half through. It was first mooted when the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill came before the House. I am told by those who profess to know—I do not know myself, and if it is not true it can be contradicted—that the reason why the Moncton extension was proposed was that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill was going through the Railway Committee, it was thought by those opposed to that Bill that it could be defeated by a proposition of that kind, because nobody would swallow it, and the whole Bill would be thrown out. That is what I have been told. What is the fact? The fact is that the proposition first appeared on a motion to amend the Bill by requiring that the line should be extended to Moncton, and the further proposition that construction should commence on that section at the same time as on the other portions of the road. A few days, possibly a few weeks—I did not count the time—are all that are necessary to pass by until we have this Moncton proposition as one of the essential elements in a grand transcontinental, all-Canadian line—something that was never thought of before. What would have become of this scheme if the Moncton addition had not been made to it, I do not know. It would certainly have been wanting in what is now regarded as a most essential element in the whole scheme—the all-Canadian idea of it; and probably it was in this connection that the right hon. leader of the government found warrant for his fear of the withdrawal of the bonding privilege. So that idea was given birth to only after the session had been pretty well advanced, and within two or three weeks after that it is adopted solemnly and seriously by the government of this country as a part of their transcontinental scheme. Whatever time or thought may have been devoted, in quiet or in secret, to the character of the scheme generally, certainly before that time no thought was devoted to this feature; and we have this element of it determined upon within the short period

which elapsed down to the present from the moment when it was first introduced in the Railway Committee.

Well, Sir, where is it proposed to locate this line ? I understand, from the explanation that was made the other day by the right hon. gentleman, that the road is to run back from Lévis across the height of land until it gets somewhere between the United States boundary and the height of land south of the Intercolonial ; then it is to run easterly by some route to be hereafter determined until it reaches Edmundston ; and from Edmundston it is going to pass by as direct a course as possible through the centre of New Brunswick to Moncton. I know nothing about the section from Lévis east to Edmundston. I do not think the government does ; that is my impression. I have a suspicion—it is a little more than a suspicion, but I cannot verify it convincingly, though it has taken a strong hold upon my mind—that if my hon. friends proceed with the construction of the railway as they are now contemplating, they will administer to that grand all-Canadian transcontinental line a very black eye before they get through ; because I believe it will be found that in order to build a line at all capable of carrying any traffic, they will have to slip into the American territory, run down a bit, and come back into Canada, before they get through. That is my impression ; it is only my impression ; I would not like to give it as absolute verity ; but I venture to hazard the prognostication that the railway will not be built by any such route as is proposed. In the province of New Brunswick the great body of the population lies either to the north, along the Gulf of St. Lawrence, or to the south, along the Bay of Fundy, and along the valley of the St. John river on the west. So that this railway, in going through the centre of the province, is leaving the population far removed from it on either side. There are a few settlements here and there on the rivers which will be crossed, but these settlements are mostly all reached by railways constructed along these rivers. The country which is to be traversed is largely a wooded country, or has been wooded. Very much of the timber has been cut away. The lumbermen have been forced further back, and there is not much promise of a lumbering business, because lumber would not be taken by the railway, but by the rivers, as it is to-day. You would have, therefore, a railway crossing the river and the heights of ground at right angles, and you have to cross a great watershed which divides the Gulf of St. Lawrence from the St. John river and the other waters on the west. You can imagine what the difficulties will be in constructing a railway under those circumstances. You can imagine what is likely to be the expense, the character of the grades, and the disadvantages under which such construction will labour.

My hon. friend mentioned to us the other day that a survey has been made by a Mr. Davey, and he said that a very considerable saving in the distance could be made. I have only this to say with regard to Mr. Davey's survey. I think he made the survey for a private company, desirous of obtaining aid from the government, and whether a survey, under those circumstances, would be quite as certain to be as accurate and careful a survey, showing all the disadvantages under which the route will labour, as if it had been made by a government engineer, I leave the people to judge for themselves. I would be inclined to give the preference myself very strongly to a survey made by independent engineers, who had no interest in connection with any company that was seeking government aid. I do not therefore, without any disrespect to Mr. Davey, place quite the same value on his survey as I would on the work of a government engineer. Moreover, I think very little of that work which was done was by Mr. Davey himself. However, if his report be read, as I read it, you will not be able to conclude that this survey shows a saving of from 120 to 140 miles. I do not find that any such saving will be effected. Mr. Davey tells us that the distance from Moncton to Halifax via the Central New Brunswick road, which he has surveyed, will be 759 miles, and I am giving Mr. Davey the benefit of the ten miles which the right hon. gentleman says he could save. But the mileage from Montreal to Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway is only 836 miles, so that the saving by the New Brunswick Central, according to Mr. Davey, is only 77 miles and not 120 or 140. Mr. Davey's report is available, and if hon. gentlemen think that I have at all erred, my statement is capable of being corrected. Now, I attach no importance to a saving of 77 miles under the circumstances. I would not attach much importance to a saving of greater mileage under the same circumstances. It must not be forgotten—and I wish to emphasize this fact—that the Intercolonial Railway has such exceptionally favourable grades, is so well laid, and is such an exceptionally favourable road for traffic, running along the coast line, that it can haul heavier trains 259 miles further than the Canadian Pacific Railway in shorter time. You can therefore see how small a figure 77 miles would cut under such circumstances. I venture the opinion, without fear of successful contradiction that there is no new railway which can be laid out in the province of New Brunswick that can reach St. John under as favourable conditions as the Intercolonial Railway. You may save fifty or sixty miles in distance by building an expensive line, but the more favourable grades on the Intercolonial Railway will make that line very much shorter in its actual operation than this new road.

It is not a question of mileage. It is idle

for the government to say: We will ask the people to spend $15,000,000 to give us a line 77 miles or 120 miles shorter than another line, when you can make better time and carry heavier loads on the longer line. This proposal is absolutely unjustifiable, and the people of this country will not stand it. Not all the influence which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway can bring to bear on the electorate will justify the outrage proposed to be perpetrated. The new line will have heavy grades and besides will go through an unsettled country, and we know how important an element local traffic is to a railway. How long will it then be before this government will have this railway thrown back on its hands and be told that it has made a useless expenditure which cannot be made productive, and whose only effect is to sacrifice the road we already possess. I say that a saving of 77 miles or 120 miles counts for nothing. There will have to be more intelligent reasons given to justify the government in pressing through this feature of the scheme. I regret that the Intercolonial Railway, which is the people's own road, has not a friend in the whole ministerial ranks. I propose at all events to stand by it while I remain in public life, and knowing what I do of that road, I will not permit its character and quality and services to be minimized or depreciated without entering my protest. I do not know why we should have this new road. Who wants it? We have had a resolution passed by the city council of Moncton. They think that they want it. But if I know anything about the possibilities and probabilities of the future, they will yet say that they wished they had never got it. Running another railway will not do them any good. There will not be another pound of traffic passing through that city which would not pass through it if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway were never built. But, there will be this result. Moncton is now a great railway centre. Arrangements were in contemplation, in fact the buildings are partly up, for the manufacture of cars and locomotives and other plant required on the Intercolonial Railway, in that town. All the machinery that would be required has either been furnished or contracted for. What for? In order that we might employ the labour of our own people in providing cars and locomotives required for the Intercolonial Railway. But you are going to dismantle those works as a necessary consequence of this new scheme.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. My hon. friends laugh. Don't you make any mistake; if this Grand Trunk Pacific is not going to be a total failure, you will have to do it. It is one or the other; one or the other of these is to be sacrificed. And will the government sacrifice its own infant? I do not think it is going to see its own well-beloved strangled. It is going to stand up for it, and the poor Intercolonial has got to suffer the penalty; there is no manner of doubt about that. I say that if you take away the through-traffic, as you would do, from that road, and leave it a local road, you make necessary the dismissal of a very large proportion—I would say half—of the men employed in the workshops in Moncton. My hon. friends laugh. There are many things that have occurred in this whole matter that would provoke laughter, but not laughter such as that of my hon. friends. Theirs is the laughter which suggests the want of knowledge of facts. And I say that want of knowledge exists. I appeal to my hon. friends every one of them, to know whether they ever took a single employee of the Intercolonial into their confidence, whether they advised with a single man of them as to what would be the effect of the construction of this line upon the business and interests and condition of that Intercolonial Railway. This whole matter was decided upon without a single Intercolonial official being called into conference and asked to say, calmly and of his knowledge, what would be the probable effect upon the Intercolonial of the adoption of such a policy as this. That is the conviction of the officials of the Intercolonial, and I think they ought to know. It is my conviction that it will dismantle the road. it will cut off its business, it will reduce the number of men employed. There would be no Grand Trunk Pacific shops in that locality. The people of Moncton ought to wake up to a knowledge of the facts that if they favour, as they appear to favour, the construction of this railway, they favour a policy which would be most injurious to their interest and which, under no circumstances, can possibly be of the slightest advantage to them.

Now, as to Halifax, I do not know what the attitude of Halifax is upon this subject. This much I do know—that nobody has better wishes for Halifax than I have, and nobody more wishes to see the traffic of the Intercolonial increase, and increase under such conditions that Halifax will get a fair share of that traffic. But I fail to see how the interests of Halifax can be in the slightest degree subserved by the policy proposed in these resolutions. There is not going to be more traffic over the two lines than there would be over one. I will show, before I sit down, why I say that. The conditions will be exactly the same as they are to-day as respects all the possibilities of traffic carried over the government railway. Now, you talk about the distances, and about the building of transcontinental railway. My hon. friend has said in his opening address on the introduction of this Bill, the great object they had in view was to get a railway which would give to the whole Canadian people the shortest and cheapest route between ocean and ocean. I want to know, if that is the object and the

design with which this great undertaking has been promoted, why he has not followed it out and effected the object to the fullest possible extent in his power. Why is it he builds the railway to Moncton, if his object is to get to the ocean by the nearest way ? What is he proposing to do with St. John ? St. John is a port, I apprehend of some importance and doing a very considerable business under existing circumstances, and capable of doing any amount more if increased business should offer. The harbour is open all the year round. No man questions the advantages of St. John as an ocean port. It is free from fog in the winter, a great source of trouble to many other ports. And it has also this great advantage, that there is a staple product which is always available to make up the balance of a cargo if required. You can always make up the balance of a cargo with lumber, if you cannot get other things. This is an advantage which St. John possesses in a greater degree than any other port on the Atlantic coast. Why is St. John passed over ? If the shortest line is the object why do you go 100 miles out of the way ? St. John is only 428 miles from Montreal by way of Lévis, Rivière du Loup and that St. John Valley. Buy that road if you want to get to the ocean, or expropriate it if you cannot buy. According to the shortest statement of Mr. Daveys, the distance is 150 miles longer by the centre line, but it is really 170 miles, as I shall show you. Why do you want to travel 170 miles further than is necessary ? There is no necessity for it in any business interest. St. John is passed by. The distance from St. John to Lévis by the line I have spoken of is, as I have said, 428 miles. From Lévis to St. John by the Intercolonial it is 578 miles. By the Daveys' line, taking his own figures to be correct, it is 501 miles. And from Lévis to Halifax by the Moncton and centre of New Brunswick line, is 597 miles. You have, therefore, 96 miles, by the best possible figuring you can make, by the Moncton and centre of New Brunswick line—96 miles further than there is any necessity for going or any justification for going. You are telling the western people : We are giving you the shortest and speediest route to the sea. Why tell them this, if you do not intend to give it to them ? If you do not mean to give them the shortest route, do not tell them you are giving it to them, do not spread it out in your Bill or announce it in your policy, but tell them the truth : It is not a commercial line, we are building, it is a political line. I do not object so much to these hon. gentlemen doing that if they think it proper, and if they think they are going to make friends in Nova Scotia by doing it. But let them not pretend to the people that they are giving them the shortest line and then withhold it from them by their own will and determination.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Speaker, as part of the new line which the government is proposing to construct from Lévis to Moncton, a portion of it, as the House understands, is to be built to the south of the Intercolonial Railway, between what might be described as the mountain range, if it is a mountain range, and the American boundary. On a portion of that line, I have been given to understand, though I do not speak from positive knowledge, there are considerable settlements, and a good deal of business could be done along that section, at all events railroad accommodation would be afforded to a number of persons who are now without it. It does not appear to me that in order to give railway facilities to the people in that section it is at all necessary to proceed with the extended line down to the centre of New Brunswick, because the people who would be served by such a portion of the line are people who would look altogether either to Quebec or to Montreal for their connections, and who would desire to reach these points to transact the business which would ordinarily call them in that direction. All the government would need to do, and to that I apprehend there would be no objection in parliament, would be to give such assistance to a railway, chartered for the purpose of building through that district of the province, such aid as is usual and customary, and which railway would serve, if it was part of a longer line or a portion of a transcontinental line, to the fullest necessary extent the people living in that section. I think, therefore, no argument can be used in this House for an extension of this line beyond the points to which this settlement extends.

I have stated to the House what was Mr. Daveys' estimate of the length of the road, and the number of miles that would be saved by the construction of that line through the centre of the province of New Brunswick to Moncton. I have taken the trouble to look up information upon that subject, which I think is available to everybody, and which perhaps some members of the House have already seen. It will be remembered that Sir Sanford Fleming and a corps or several corps of engineers were employed, under instructions of the government at Ottawa before confederation, to make numerous surveys to the centre of the province before the Intercolonial Railway was located through New Brunswick, in order to ascertain what would be the shortest and most desirable route for the railway to follow. Sir Sanford has furnished in his reports, and they have become parliamentary records, full and complete statements with respect to these different surveys. I desire to call the attention of the House to the records which there

appear, and which will more than confirm my estimate as to what, under the best possible circumstances, can be saved in mileage by the effect of this new construction. I quote from page 44, Sessional Papers No. 8, for the year 1865, referring to what he calls line No. 10:

> This is unquestionably one of the most direct lines between Halifax and Rivière du Loup and possibly it may be found practicable throughout; but it is impossible to speak with certainty without more information than is at present possessed.

Turning to page 49, I find these facts: That in 1864 no less than 10 different surveys of 10 different lines were made by the engineers down through the centre of New Brunswick, in order to find a route; and the result of all these surveys shows that, according to Sir Sanford Fleming, line No. 10 was the best line, and gave the shortest mileage. He says, at the page I have just named, that line No. 10 showed a total length from Rivière du Loup to Halifax of 496 miles. Now if that be a correct statement of the mileage on that route, and I take it, there can be no reason to doubt that statement after he had made so complete an engineering investigation of the capabilities of the central routes in New Brunswick from a railroad point of view, it appeared that he did not find anything better than 496 miles, which would add 14 miles on to the mileage or take 14 miles off the number of miles alleged to be saved according to the statement of Mr. Daveys. You would have, therefore, taking that line No. 10, a total of 63 miles difference between the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway, around a circuitous route as it is alleged, and the mileage down through the centre of the province. Now that is a very trifling saving indeed. You take the 115 miles off, which is the distance between Rivière du Loup and Lévis, and compare the result with the figures which Mr. Daveys has given. That still further reduces the advantages which the reduction in mileage would make, and it goes to show that any speculative statement as to 120 or 140 miles being saved, is quite unsustained, and is directly opposed to the result of all these investigations which were made by Sir Sandford Fleming. He gives the mileage of all these ten routes as running from 496 to 502, 536, 538, 552, 566, 572, 592, 574 and 616. From these figures I draw the conclusion that an engineer of the capabilities and standing of Sir Sanford Fleming, supported as he was by some of the best men that could be secured for the purpose of surveying that line of road, has given us the most favourable estimate which could be made of the mileage that could be saved between the proposed route and that of the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, Sir, this proposition, taken in connection with the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, is one which I think it will be impossible to defend or to justify. Both these lines after they are built will have to be maintained, both of these lines will undoubtedly continue to be a very heavy charge upon the exchequer of the country, because of the revenues of the Intercolonial Railway are not sufficient to pay the cost of operation, and the balance falls upon the exchequer. So in the case of this new railway, the maintenance of that road must necessarily be expensive, according to these grades there will be a loss, and whatever the loss is it will fall directly upon the exchequer of the country. The interest upon the money which is expended upon it by the government will not, in all probability, be paid when the road is being operated under the disadvantages which this road will suffer from.

In so far as the Intercolonial Railway itself is concerned, farther there is no earthly necessity for having another railway through that country. The Intercolonial Railway has been fully competent to take all the traffic that has been offered up to this date. The officials who are in charge of the Intercolonial Railway, and whom I have consulted upon this subject, while the improvements and extensions have been going on, having advised me that without having a double track, except at one or two minor points, the Intercolonial Railway can carry four times the amount of traffic that it is carrying to-day. Therefore, from the standpoint of the capacity to handle the traffic, that question is absolutely settled, and settled according to the judgment of men who are most competent to form an opinion upon it. You will have both of these lines operating and struggling one against another. Whatever business one may take it will take it away from the other. You will have the government in the anomalous position of owning both roads, of operating one and of being practically interested in the successful operation of the other, going in and destroying its own property, impairing the value of its own property, whether it be one or the other. Such a spectacle I do not think has ever been presented to the knowledge or observation of any human being since the world began.

It might be a fair matter for consideration: Where is this going to land the government of the country? What will be the consequences of such a step, which undoubtedly is going to entail an annual burden upon the exchequer of the Dominion? Will anybody be able to look forward with any hope or expectation of the Intercolonial Railway being able to pay its working expenses? We will relapse into the period of large deficits, because the heavier the opposition which is brought to bear against us by this new road the larger will be the deficits that they will have to face on the Intercolonial Railway. It requires no stretch of the imagination to conceive of the possi-

bility and of the extreme probability of the government and the people being called upon to make good these deficits to the extent of half a million or three-quarters of a million a year as the result of carrying out the policy which is now outlined and adopted; and of coruse, upon this new line they will be running a very great and very probable risk of not being able to pay interest. I do not care whether it is at an early period or not; it certainly would be at a remote period, if at all, that they were able to pay interest. Owing to the difficulties of operating a railway through that country, where there is no local business for it to do, winter being the only portion of the year when they will have any grain business at all to do, and with the disadvantages which it appears to me to possess from every point of view, put this question how you will, turn it over, turn it back, examine it right and left, inside and outside, it fails to present to me—I do not know how it may appear to other hon. gentlemen in this House—a single redeeming feature in any phase of it from beginning to end. I have yet to hear of the first man in the province of New Brunswick asking that this road shall be constructed. I do not mean to say that since it became the declared policy of the government people are not willing to have it constructed, but I say that prior to the time that this declaration was made I never heard of a single individual asking for its construction. We know that there has been a feeling—I do not know whether it continues to exist—in the province of Nova Scotia that they would like to have a shorter line of railway, and that they would be very glad if perhaps the shortening of that line, even by the construction of another railway, would bring that province closer to the western country. But when they have studied the situation, and when they have come to realize that there can be nothing done in the way of new construction that will give them better conditions than they have by virtue of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway, I think that if there is any enthusiasm over this project, it will rapidly abate, because there is no railway that can be constructed that can give Nova Scotia, or the port of Halifax, the same thorough, complete and advantageous service which they are getting and will get from the Intercolonial Railway, if left without this keen and destructive competition. You might go down to my own province of New Brunswick, where there are many men who are perfectly able to take advantage of such an opportunity, and I believe it would be utterly impossible to find one single individual who would be willing to invest one dollar in this enterprise if it were put forward in any shape and with any reasonable assistance that the government could give it as a commercial enterprise. They know there is nothing in it. They have never asked for it; yet we are told in some of the newspaper press that this railway will be a gift from the rest of Canada to New Brunswick. I disclaim the gift. I think I speak the sentiments of the great majority of the right thinking people, of people who are considerate and upright, in my own province, when I say that we do not ask for any such gift at the hands of the people of Canada. When we do ask for something, we will ask for something that has merit in it, for something that can be justified upon its merits. If we want a railway, we will ask for a railway which will serve the people, and which will not duplicate and destroy the roads there are. We have existing roads which are possessed and operated by the government, and therefore I have no thanks to offer to those people who say that we are getting this as a gift from the people of Canada. If I expressed my own mind, I would say: I decline the gift with thanks. We were also assured by the same authority that not a mile of the Intercolonial Railway will be disused or discredited if the new line is built. I answer: Disused, perhaps not; discredited, unquestionably. No doubt the road will continue to be used, no doubt the people living along the line will continue to be served, but with a much reduced and inferior efficiency, and therefore the railway will be operated and maintained, but that the road will not be discredited cannot be said by any one who has studied the situation or who knows the facts as they exist. We are told again, and I shall make one or two more references to the journal in question, that:

> The proposed trunk scheme will tend to benefit the Intercolonial Railway and all other railways by promoting the development of the provinces, increasing its population and infusing new hope into the whole community.

I would be very glad indeed if any such condition of things was brought about. I would be glad to see the province further developed, I would be glad to see its population increased, and I would like to see new hope infused into the community, but if we have to wait for this improvement in the condition of the province, in the hopes of the community and in the development of the province until that road is constructed, or until that road is able to bring about these ends, we will have to wait until the crack of doom. Then we come to the last assurance, which certainly is interesting to all those who have read it, but I think it will appear to be the product of some one who does not really know anything about the situation whatever. It is this:

> On this through-line through New Brunswick there will be both through trains and local trains in almost embarrassing abundance.

That is an illustration of the flimsy argument, of the stretch of poetic fancy that is relied upon in support of great propositions such as this before us, of great measures supposed to be promoted for the advancement of the country generally, that this

line through an unsettled country, with its heavy grades, with its many disadvantages, and only expected to be operated at a time when you cannot have access to the sea shorter than to cross through the province, is going to be furnished with trains both local and through in almost embarrassing abundance.

Mr. CLARKE. What paper is that from ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Well, I do not like to single out one paper more than another——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) What paper is it ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Well, it is the Toronto 'Globe,' if you wish to know.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. But there is a final, and to my mind a conclusive answer to this whole proposition; one which was well within the power of the government, and one which was well known to all who were concerned in promoting this enterprise. In the course of the correspondence which I had with the Prime Minister, I called attention to the consideration I am now about to speak of; I did more, at an earlier stage when this question was first mooted I took occasion in the Railway Committee of the House to express the strongest and most decided objection to this enterprise being carried down through the center of New Brunswick to Moncton, and I stated there was no occasion for it, because, whatever traffic there would be brought over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to Quebec which was seeking an outlet by our Atlantic ports, there was a simple, and easy, and prudent method by which that object could be attained, and I was satisfied that there would be no difficulty whatever in arranging with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, if it came to that, the making of an agreement between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for a simple exchange of traffic. It is possible and more than possible; it is probable and more than probable; it is absolutely certain that such a thing could be arranged. When this question was being discussed in the Railway Committee and when I was stating my objection to it, I took occasion to ask Mr. Hays, the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, whether in his opinion there would be the slightest difficulty on his part or on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in making a fair, and reasonable, and just arrangement with the Intercolonial Railway for the carriage of all traffic they might have to handle from Quebec to Halifax and St. John, and Mr. Hays's answer was : not the slightest difficulty in the world. Now, Sir, under that arrangement the traffic could be carried as advantageously for the Intercolonial Railway and as beneficially for all concerned; nay, more advantageously and more beneficially than it could be carried by any new railway that could possibly be constructed or by any other means than that of the Intercolonial Railway itself. There is no manner of doubt at all, that the Intercolonial Railway with its present splendid equipment, and with its officers and every form of machinery adapted for the purpose, could transfer this freight down at rates lower than is possible under any other new system, I do not care what it may be. If the interests of the country required that this traffic should be carried at cost, why, Sir, infinitely better is it to take the sum which might be required for that purpose out of the exchequer of the country, than to load us up with $15,000,000 or $17,0000,000 of debt in order to build another railway. If you wanted to enforce the idea of the utilization of the Canadian ports in the winter season as an outlet for western traffic, why not do it in that way by a subsidy, rather than by spending your money wholesale in a useless and unjustifiable manner. I believe, Sir, that an arrangement could be made without difficulty whereby a fair profit could be had perhaps, upon such business as did offer. I am not so sanguine about business to any extent offering in that way, but if it did offer the Intercolonial Railway would be able to take it. It would increase the tonnage of the Intercolonial Railway, increase its receipts, utilize its machinery which is available for the purpose and you would have no question of any responsibility in connection with such an outside undertaking as is now to be forced upon us by the policy of the government. I venture to say that that suggestion has not been made to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I do not think it has ever been made to Mr. Hays other than as I made it in the Railway Committee of the House of Commons. I think that if it had been made to him he would have readily availed of it; he would have gladly accepted some such plan as that so as not to be compelled, under lease or otherwise, to operate this line of railway which is now projected. All that would be necessary to do would be to embody a clause in this Bill, or if you like you could come to an agreement before you committed the government irrevocably to the undertaking ; you could have come to an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and have the matter settled finally and definitely for all time.

I think it would have been well—and this is all that I shall say on this branch of the subject—if the government were impressed as they appear to have been impressed with the possibility of operating a railway to advantage to carry western traffic to the ports of St. John and Halifax, it would have been well for the government to have come to such an arrangement as I have suggested rather than to decide on the proposition which is now before the House. My right hon. friend in the course of his speech told us that commercial considerations were not

to be taken into account entirely. Let me use his very words so as to avoid the possibility of misquoting him. The right hon. gentleman said :

> But before I proceed any further, let me say that the conception which we have of this work which we are now contemplating is very different from the conception entertained of it by some of our critics. Most of our critics look upon the scheme simply as a commercial venture to be judged by the only rule of profit and loss. We look upon it as a work of a national character necessitated by the status of Canada in the year 1903.

The right hon. gentleman here announces that most of his critics look upon this scheme as a commercial adventure, and are judging it differently from the way in which the government are judging it, as the government look upon it from a national point of view. The right hon. gentleman dismisses to a very great extent, if not entirely, the commercial idea from consideration altogether. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman that it is absolutely impossible for him to dismiss the commercial idea from the consideration of this measure. If it is not to be founded upon business principles and on a commercial basis it will not stand at all. If it is not to be tested as to the results of profit and loss, how is it going to work out successfully ? Are not the people who are going to use it going to judge on the question of profit and loss ? Are not the western people going to judge whether or not they can use this road to advantage by the question of cost ? Are they not told by the declaration in this contract and in this Bill and by the assurance already given in the declaration of the hon. gentleman, that it is not only an all-Canadian route, but the speediest and the cheapest route ? If it is, then the question of dollars and cents, the question of profit and loss is necessarily bound up in the enterprise. If the government wanted to spend $15,000,000—and this portion of the road will cost that much, as I will show before I conclude—as a set-off to the maritime provinces against the enormous expenditures which are to be made in other provinces, I could suggest to my hon. friends ways and directions in which the money could be expended to some advantage to the maritime provinces directly, and indirectly to the whole of Canada. I could have pointed out to my hon. friend that he could have taken a portion of that money and improved one or two of the grades on the Intercolonial Railway, which would have made some difference in the matter of time, and would have made it somewhat easier than it is now for that railway to carry heavy loads. He could have taken a portion of that money to the harbours of Halifax and St. John and could have equipped those harbours so that they could have handled the traffic coming there for ocean shipment. He would have done some good with the money in that way. He will do no good with it now, except the temporary good that may be done while the money is in the course of expenditure. I say it was the bounden duty of the government, if they were impressed with the idea that $15,000,000 or any lesser sum should be expended in the maritime provinces, to take council as to how the people would most desire that money to be laid out, and as to the best results to be achieved by the expenditure. We know that in the port of St. John, and perhaps to a less extent in the port of Halifax, though to that port the same remark can be applied, the people have expended of their own means, have imposed obligations upon themselves, have contracted debts through their city councils for the purpose of making those ports suitable for the handling of ocean freights and the transaction of ocean business. They ought not to have been compelled to do it, but they had to do it or go without the business and the progress they were anticipating or desiring. But the government do not make that proposition ; therefore, they fail, it seems to me, in grasping the needs of the situation, and are giving the people something they have not asked for, and something they do not need and do not want, and are denying to them what they could with advantage receive and the improvements which they could make with that money if it were at their disposal.

I come now to the financial aspects of this scheme. On these I will not dwell at great length ; but I would like to present to the House what my view of that branch of the question is. First, I take the question of the cost of the line from Lévis to Moncton. I make that mileage 425 miles. If the road is ever built, which I very much doubt, that mileage will not be found to be excessive, but a reasonable estimate. The government estimate is made that it will cost $30,000 per mile. From what I can learn, the cost of building the line through a considerable section of the province of Quebec, before it reaches Edmundston, will be very great. For a portion of the distance it will have to cross mountains, gulleys and rivers, and I believe it will cost more than $30,000 per mile ; I would not be surprised if it cost $40,000 to construct that portion of the railway. But I am going to take an average between the two, and I think I am on safe ground when I calculate on $35,000 per mile. That will represent an expenditure of $15,000,000.

I next take the section between Quebec and Winnipeg. We are told that it is 1,400 miles, some say 1,500 miles. I will take the lesser mileage. The estimate is that that will cost $30,000 per mile. I have made some inquiry as to what the cost of that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior was. That portion of the railway, as everybody knows, is

quite accessible from the lake ; and yet, its cost, apart from terminals, rolling stock and equipment, was $50,000 per mile. How can anybody say what this railway is going to cost 150 or 200 miles north of Lake Superior, where it is very much more inaccessible and probably therefore very much more difficult of construction than the Canadian Pacific Railway, and built at a time when wages are high, and when materials generally, with the exception perhaps of rails, are more costly than they were then ? What is going to be the cost of getting into that country and building this railway under these conditions ? It may possibly fall short of $50,000. No man knows. We have not the information, it is not laid before us, and we must take this leap in the dark. We will call it, if you will, $35,000 per mile. You see, I am only adding $5,000 to the present estimate, a very moderate computation, which makes the cost of those 1,400 miles $49,000,000.

Now, 1,825 miles from Moncton to Winnipeg, or to some point north of Winnipeg, wherever the line may be supposed to run to, will cost this country $65,000,000 upon the calculations which I have made. That may be somewhat in excess of the actual result ; but no man can say that the cost may not exceed the figures I have given, and it is a question which this House and this country may well pause and consider, whether such an obligation, incurred in the absence of information which I have tried to point out is so essential in arriving at a wise judgment on a question of this character, should be undertaken, and whether we can take the hazard of impairing the financial strength of Canada, to some extent at any rate, by undertaking an enterprise which may saddle us with an addition to our debt of $65,000,000.

The prairie section, we are told, will cost the country $13,000 per mile of guarantee. Then we have 600 miles of mountain section, which it is said will cost $30,000 per mile. Nobody, I think, is informed sufficiently to say whether that is very much of an underestimate, or whether it is an ample estimate. We know very well that mountain railway construction is expensive construction, although there are good reasons for supposing that this line can be built through one of those passes at substantially less cost than the mountains can be crossed at any point to the south of where it is proposed that this railway shall pass to the coast. I figure that $35,000 would not be out of the way. I want to make a fair and reasonable calculation. That means $24,000,000 of guarantee for the prairie section and $18,000,000 of guarantee in respect of the 600 miles through the mountain section. When we once have started on this enterprise, when we once have got into it——

An hon. MEMBER. We do not guarantee the whole of the cost.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. My hon. friend says we do not guarantee the whole of the cost. That is quite true, I am going to make my statement covering that point and my hon. friend need not be in the least concerned. We have to see this undertaking through, when we once embark into it, even though it should cost a great deal more than is estimated.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). We will go through with it.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. We will go through with it, says my hon. friend beside me. I have no doubt the country can do it, but you do not convince anybody by a statement of that kind unless you can show good and sufficient ground for calling upon the country to make this draft upon its resources. It is all very well to say the country can stand it. I have as much faith and confidence in the capabilities of Canada as any of my hon. friends, but I say that when you are incurring large obligations you should see that you are incurring them in the true interests of Canada.

I want now to examine for a moment clause 54 of this contract :

> Inasmuch as the bonds to be guaranteed by the government only made provision for a part of the cost of construction of the western division, the company hereby agree that the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada shall guarantee bonds of the company for the balance required for the construction of the said western division, exclusive of the said $20,000,000 required for first equipment, which the company is required to provide under paragraph 22 of this agreement.

There is a plain intimation, a plain expression of opinion by the government that the proceeds which would be supposed to be available ordinarily out of the stock and those which would be covered by the government guarantee, are not going to be sufficient to complete the undertaking on the basis of $30,000 per mile. The government estimates $30,000 per mile for the mountain section. $22,500 per mile of this is to be covered by the government guarantee and $7,500 per mile to be provided by the company. The company therefore puts up $4,500,000 in respect of such 600 miles. That disposes of the mountain section. Then we come to the prairie section, the estimated cost of which is $13,000 per mile. Of that amount the government guarantees $9,750 and the Grand Trunk Railway $3,250. Therefore the company puts up $3,250,000 for one thousand miles or $7,750,000 for both sections. This leads to the very proper and legitimate inquiry. What are the company's resources outside of the government's guarantee ? Well, they have $20,000,000 preference stock which is to be used for equipment, with the exception of $5,000,000 which is to be put up as a deposit to secure the carrying out of the contract. If you look at section 13 of the contract you will see this :

The government shall return the said deposit to the company on the completion of the construction of the western division and the first equipment of the whole line of railway, according to the terms hereof.

So, that you see the return of the deposit of $5,000,000 is provided, and it comes out of the $20,000,000 which is all the company engages to expend on equipment. I have pointed out that the $20,000,000 of preference stock goes to equipment, what else have we? We have $25,000,000 of common stock. Now the borrowing capacity on the Grand Trunk Railway guarantee, recognized by clause 34 of the contract, is necessary to furnish the balance over the government guarantee. One would naturally suppose that the $25,000,000 common stock in the treasury, in respect of which, if the company be prosperous, dividends would be expected to be paid, would have a value as an asset of the company, available for the purpose of building its line or for any other necessary purposes connected with the undertaking. But turn to clause 27, and what do we find? We find:

The company undertakes that the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada shall acquire and take the said common stock to the amount of $25,000,000, except shares held by directors, not exceeding 1,000 shares, and to hold the same during the term of the said lease, and so long as any of the bonds guaranteed by the government under the terms of this agreement shall remain outstanding and unpaid.

The agreement does not provide that the company shall subscribe for these shares, as everybody subscribes for shares, but that they may acquire and take them. That is a matter entirely of arrangement between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway may hand over these shares for a mere song. The Grand Trunk Railway may put them in their pockets and draw the dividends and keep them there fifty years, in their vaults not available at all toward cost of construction. It will not be compelled to pay anything for this stock because the Grand Trunk Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific are one and the same red-headed boy. They belong to the same family. We cannot conceive of a great deal of antagonism springing up between them in respect of the terms upon which this common stock will be acquired. They could make a snug comfortable arrangement between themselves.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Somebody says Oh. I think that is only human nature. It is what they are invited to do. They are invited to acquire, take and hold, and I am at all events justified in this inference because the government, by this clause 34, has told us that there is no money to come out of the common stock. Every farthing outside of the government guarantee is to be provided for under the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which are to be guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway. That is the language of the contract, and no one can gainsay it. So that we have this very nice little arrangement spread out right before the eye, so clear and plain that any man who runs may read. If there is any explanation of that, it should be forthcoming and I shall be glad to hear it because it is a matter that ought to be explained.

Now, I do not make any point of the fact that, so far as the present legislation extends, the Grand Trunk Railway Company has no power to give any of these guarantees or sign any of these obligations assuming liability as a company. They can get that power if their shareholders shall authorize them to do it; that would probably be only a question of time. But it is not capable of being harmonized very well with the declarations that were made at the annual general meeting of Grand Trunk stockholders last June, when the gentlemen who were promoting this enterprise took pains to assure the stockholders, as we know, that there was no responsibility to be assumed by the Grand Trunk Railway as a company, that their attitude was only that of a benevolent assisting party to the enterprise. They may change their minds. But, until they do change their minds, the inference is, and the fact remains, that there is no present authority, so far as we have been able to discover under which the Grand Trunk Railway Company can enter upon such obligations.

Returning to the question of the liabilities which the government assumes, on the eastern section it will assume $65,000,000. On the prairie section it guarantees $9,750,000, and on the mountain section $13,500,000. This will make a total on the three sections of $88,250,000. To this I add the 3 per cent interest on the cost, which for ten years on the eastern section would be $1,950,000 a year. I have taken this at ten years because that is the expectation of the contracting parties themselves. Thus is a railway which, for the carriage of western traffic, would only operatae through the Moncton end during the winter. So, I think we make no extravagant estimate when we say it would not be likely to pay sufficiently to enable it to pay interest until after the expiry, not of seven, but of ten years. So, we may assume that this interest will run for ten years. This will make a total of $19,500,000 to be added to the previous sum. Upon the mountain section interest will be borne for seven years, making $4,050,000 more. The interest on the prairie section for two and one half years, which would be half the time of construction, would be $750,000. The interest on the eastern section for half of eight years, or four years, would be $7,800,000 more. If, as is apparently the expectation of the government, the bonds or obligations to enable the government to

carry this large sum, may have to issue at a higher rate than three per cent, at say three and one half per cent, this would add a very large sum to what I have already given as the gross cost of this enterprise to the country. I only infer that it is regarded as possible by my hon. friend the Finance Minister that he may have to go into the market with bonds bearing interest at three and a half per cent in order to raise moneys he will require. If he has to borrow at that rate and get back three per cent only he will have to count on one-half per cent of a deficit during the life of this bargain, which is fifty years, to be added to this accumulated burden. If, you add $18,850,000 on this account, you have a total of $139,000,000 representing the direct and indirect liabilities which the government assumes in connection with this enterprise. But, even if you strike out this $18,850,000, I say you have a direct liability of $121,000,000 which this project represents to the country. That is a large proposition, I think a proposition of such magnitude that we may well think that some have seen visions and others have been dreaming dreams.

Now, we are told that it will be a very great thing to get the Grand Trunk Railway into the western country. I should have had no objection to have the Grand Trunk Railway in the western country long before this. I think that, with its large connections, with its network of railways through the province of Ontario and its railways in other provinces, it would have been very much to the advantage of the Grand Trunk Railway to have got into that western country years ago. But I think it is only fair to make this comment—that, if the Grand Trunk Railway gets in there, it will get in there very much more to its own advantage than to the advantage of the country. I think it is much more to their interest to get there than it is to the interests of the country to have them get there. That country, I say, is well served with railways now. With locomotives and cars in sufficient number the traffic would get in and get out, even if the Grand Trunk Railway never laid a rail there. Therefore, the need of getting the Grand Trunk Railway in is not so apparent. My hon. friends say: You are getting the Grand Trunk Railway in. But you are not. You are getting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in, which is a totally different organization, in a sense. True, the Grand Trunk Railway has the stock, $25,000,000, it has the voting power, and will control the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. But it would have been infinitely better that the Grand Trunk Railway Company should get in there itself, than that it should get in there indirectly through a company which it controls, which has no financial strength of its own, and which may be thrown aside at any moment, in connection with any portion of the railway, when it suits the purpose of the Grand Trunk Railway to do so. There is no clause which can be written in the contract, as I understand it, which would protect the government against the influence, the natural and ordinary influences which operate upon a government and which are brought to bear by railway companies, not in great things, but in small. We do not want to antagonize companies in respect to points which they think vital, if it can be avoided. It is rather difficult to suppose that this or the succeeding government will be likely to stand for any close supervision as against the wishes or desires of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in respect to operating the road, as it would be necessary that they should do if they are to be kept up to the mark, and of the assurances which appear to be contained in this contract are going to be realized. Now, I do not know what may be the view which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance may take of the financial question as I have presented it. I have no doubt he has given it careful consideration, and I have no doubt he will furnish the House with a full statement of the conclusions he has arrived at in respect to this phase of the question. It seems to me that, as I have stated already and shall repeat again, the government should show that it is imperatively necessary that this undertaking should go on, before we incur this liability. If this is what the country needs, then, the country must bear the burden and carry the responsibility. But I want to get the opinion of the Minister of Finance whether he does or does not feel that adding this large sum to the obligations of Canada, direct and indirect, will, in a measure, perhaps in a large measure, seriously affect Canadian credit on the other side of the water.

I should be sorry to suggest that there was any foundation upon which the strength of our credit could be questioned. But you know how sensitive financial men are, you know how sensitive the financial market is; and you cannot add 120 millions of obligations—because they would aggregate that amount—to the current obligations of the government of Canada without startling financial men on the other side, without leaving them to ask, where is this thing going to end? But of course Canada's position financially is extremely strong to-day. Our revenue is buoyant, but these things are not always going to last. The man who thinks they are going to last is living in a fool's paradise. We will have our reverses. The time will come when our revenue will cease to increase, perhaps will not be maintained; the time will come when the money market will not be as favourable to Canada as it is to-day, when we will have an experience similar to that of the Australian colonies, which, no doubt moved by influences similar to those which are now moving this government, added to their obligations to such an

extent that they practically destroyed their credit in the money market of the mother country. I do feel that this is a consideration which might well give us pause, which the government ought to consider before they have committed this country to so gigantic an undertaking.

When my right hon. friend introduced this Bill he made a remark which I find it difficult to believe is shared by the members of the cabinet. Is it possible that because they have a surplus of twenty million dollars this year, they assume that they can spend 120 millions? My right hon. friend says this thing is going to cost us but twelve or thirteen millions. Well, that is an extraordinary calculation for him to make. I am sure that the hon. gentleman did not study the financial phases of this question or he could not have reached such a conclusion. We have got to spend at the outset sixty-five millions on the eastern section. Is not that going to cost us money? My hon. friend will say that we have the road. All right, we have the road but remember that we are adding to our obligations, and I think we would fall short in our duty if we failed to realize the importance of keeping this matter well in mind. There are large obligations which we are incurring for a number of projects this year, and others will be taken up later. All these things go to show that we are in a very generous frame of mind, that we are ready to expend large sums of money for one purpose or another. All these things impose a solemn and serious obligation upon this parliament to consider where they will naturally tend in case of our realizing a change in our conditions, a change to a less buoyant revenue than that which we now receive, and to a corresponding large expenditure increasing year by year.

Now, Sir, there is one other clause in this contract which I desire to call attention to, and I think that will pretty nearly cover all the references I propose to make to the contract or the Bill. Clause 42 says:

> It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports.

Now, a little study of that clause might be usefully given, as well as to the following clause. I think some deductions can be drawn from them which will not support the conclusions which have been drawn by my hon. friends. It is said that goods not otherwise routed should be carried over Canadian lines, on Canadian territory, to Canadian seaports. Let me point out that if the company fail to do it you have not provided any penalties whereby they are going to be made to suffer for it. Why, you are simply trusting to the Grand Trunk Pacific to do what they say they will do. Well, I have no doubt that the gentlemen who are to-day associated with that enterprise would feel in honour bound to carry out this obligation. But, Sir, as time goes on, the feeling with regard to this clause will stale in recollection, and how long will it be before you will find that you cannot get this railway company to do anything more than you can compel them to do, and penalize them in case they fail to do it? There are no penal clauses or sanctions of any kind which would force them to an observance of these conditions. Then they refer to traffic that is not otherwise routed. Well, Mr. Hays very frankly stated to the Railway Committee when this subject was under discussion, that you cannot control the traffic of a railway, that people have a right to route it as they please. He frankly and openly made that statement. Now, I can imagine, and I need not attribute any improper conduct to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company either, I do not wish to make any unfair reflection upon anybody in this connection; but I can well imagine that while the Grand Trunk Pacific Company might be willing, as the result of a pious resolve, to adhere to this contract, the Grand Trunk would still have its agents at work in the western country routing this traffic. How? Not by Quebec, not by the seaports of the maritime provinces, but by North Bay and the Grand Trunk to Portland, and you could not stop them under any circumstances. You have only got an agreement saying that this shall be done, but the Grand Trunk Pacific is still in the hands of the Grand Trunk Company, and the Grand Trunk Company do not obligate themselves to do it, and there is no way of enforcing the obligation. And you are getting one step further away from the possibility of reaching the parties in the matter when you realize that this Grand Trunk Pacific Company are the people that have made this agreement. Now, let the Grand Trunk Company, as I have suggested, send their agents and solicitors for freight into that country, and what could withstand the pressure they would bring?

What is going to prevent them from exercising that pressure. I have had some little experience in connection with that important question on the Intercolonial Railway when we had our difficulties with the Canadian Pacific Railway. They sent their solicitors all over the territory which their agreement covered. They went after everything, freight as well as passengers. They threw their hands right and left upon everything. You could not stop them. People were routing as the Canadian Pacific Railway desired. They are a wealthy corporation and perhaps they could offer some in-

ducements to these people. We could not do as another railway might do ; we could not do anything of that kind in an underhand or concealed manner. But, we had this experience. You will have it over again with the result that the traffic which reaches the Atlantic will be outpouring itself at Portland and Boston and not at the two Canadian ports. Of course the Grand Trunk Pacific Company agree that they will not in any manner encourage the transportation of such trade by routes other than those provided. Of course, they agree to that and very possibly will adhere to the agreement as far as that is concerned. But they will say : We do not encourage the diversion of traffic. We have adhered to the letter of our contract. Whatever others may have done we have not done anything contrary to our agreement. These people have routed this traffic in that way and in that way it must go and I repeat you have the frank acknowledgment of Mr. Hays, that he would not undertake to control any traffic which would be routed in any other direction. All this, I think, points very clearly in one direction and one direction only that it emphasizes to my mind in a sense the position which I have taken for some time past and which I took in my opening remarks this afternoon in respect to this measure. It shows that if it were so important that we should spend $120,000,000 to try and get the western traffic to find its outlet through Canadian ports, then, it is vital that the government should not only own but operate the railway, because in no other way can you guarantee that the traffic will go through a Canadian outlet. We are spending the money and we are getting nothing for it. I know whereof I speak in this regard. I am satisfied that the position I take is sound and cannot be controverted. There is just one way of accomplishing this. Contracts will not bind. Contracts may be evaded ingenuity can be set at work, influences can be brought to bear, but with a government road you are safe and sure. The interest of the government is paramount, the interest of the government will carry out and be sure that the arrangement is carried out according to the wishes of the people whom they govern. I think that if we had all this money to spend there is another way in which we could spend it. If we want to spend it at once we could not spend it more usefully than to have it ensured that the inland ports in our great lakes should be so improved, so equipped and so provided with all the necessary facilities as to enable us to take the very best advantage of our canals and St. Lawrence system of navigation. Anybody who has examined the statistics and studies the facts knows that the business has increased very much within the year through the canals. That business will go on increasing, in proportion as the canals are less expensive, more attractive and better equipped.

If you do spend millions, as I dare say it is the intention to spend millions, you should make this expenditure for the purpose of equipping and improving the canals and the different harbours and points where grain and the other products of the west are received and handled and you should continue this work of improvement until you can present a route possessing advantages surpassing those of any route in the United States, so as to secure the traffic which you can secure by expending money for that purpose. You might go still further and improve the navigation of the St. Lawrence and the aids to navigation in the way of lighting which some people say are not entirely complete as yet. I know that there is quite a little opinion in the country which would favour your making free the two great ports of the St. Lawrence and the two great ports on the Atlantic seaboard. That may be a proposition in regard to which there are different opinions, but if the object which is professed to be sought after in this resolution is worthy of this effort, that object can be more largely attained now by making an expenditure for the purpose and in the direction which I suggest.

I will now bring my long, and I fear tedious observations to a close. I have endeavoured to put my position before the House as fairly as I could in defence and in justification of my own action in retiring from the administration upon this measure. I realize, and I regret that I do realize it, that as far as I may have made a strong presentation of the case against the government's policy just so far and to that extent what I have said will operate against and prejudice the status of many of my hon. friends on this side of the House. That I regret extremely. I wish it could have been avoided, but it was absolutely unavoidable. I had to justify myself and I have endeavoured to do so with no feeling of bitterness or of acrimony but with the determination to put the case as it has presented itself to my own mind and I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to take the consequences of my action.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Some hon. members behind me make sneering references to the course I have pursued on this important question, but, I have this to say, that I, at all events, have the satisfaction in my own mind and conscience that I have simply done that what I consider to be my duty. I would be glad if any appeal which I might make would reach the ears of those who have to deal with this matter, because, in their own interest, I believe it would be well if they would pause before they press this measure farther. I would like to ask them to consider, for their own sakes, if not for the sake of others, what will likely be the consequences of their persistent de-

termination to press this matter through parliament and to press it upon the country, and I would appeal to them on behalf of the party with which during my whole life I have been actively allied.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. My hon. friends may sneer. I understand the meaning of that sneer and I return it to them. I would like to have my record in public life compared with the record of some of these hon. gentlemen. I know that my motives will be misconstrued, I know that no man ever gets credit from a certain source for acting from a sense of public duty and I expect to have these aspersions cast upon me, but I have the consciousness of having done my duty. There are many on this side of the House of them who respect me and my action and whose opinions are not very far removed from those which I have expressed to-day and who will appreciate my attitude in this matter. And Sir, I would hope that they might bring to bear the great influence which they possess, to persuade the government not further to prosecute this Bill. I am satisfied that I have done my duty, and I leave the matter in the hands of the parliament and the people of the country. I do feel that every man in this parliament is just as answerable for the course which he himself takes as I am, and I am just as answerable as he is. Neither of us can shift upon other shoulders or cast upon the government the burden of responsibility which attaches to himself in our reception of a project of this character. I leave every man to act as his best judgment and his conscience dictates; and I claim the same privilege for myself.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, excuse the slight embarrassment resulting from changing seats, and from my resuming my usual position, from which I shall attempt to enunciate doctrines which are much more to my own satisfaction than those that have been promulgated for the last five hours from the seat which I now occupy.

We are engaged, Mr. Speaker, in discussing a question of very great importance. Never in the history of Canada has a question so important engaged the attention of parliament, and been brought before the people of this country. It is a question which we should attempt to discuss in a spirit of fairness, in a spirit of candour, in a spirit actuated by a desire to promote the best interests of Canada. This is a project which has to do with the future of Canada. It has to do with the future of our country far down in its history, and no individual in this House, no individual in this country has an interest in this matter different from that of other individuals. The interests of all are alike; all are interested in having a policy promulgated and carried out by this government which will be in the best interest of the country. There may be differences of opinion, honest differences of opinion. There inevitably will be such differences, and differences indeed have existed within the ranks of the Liberal party. This question has been discussed in all its phases within the ranks of the party. The most courteous consideration has been given by members of the government to the views presented by the members of the Liberal party with regard to this project. The policy has been thoroughly threshed out within the ranks of the Liberal party. There is nothing that has been presented here to-day by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) that has not received consideration, that has not been fully considered and a decision reached with regard to it. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) tells us that this measure has been urged with unexampled haste, that it has been sprung upon the country without due deliberation. Why, Sir, this question has been under discussion in the country and has received the attention of the public for months; for years almost.

Mr. BROCK. Almost.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, the question of another transcontinental line was dealt with nearly a year ago by the very gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) who has been addressing the House to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, and I will read in due time what that hon. gentleman said, and I shall contrast with a feeling of pain the difference between his sentiments uttered a year ago and the sentiments which he uttered to-night. The question has not been sprung without due deliberation; the question has been thoroughly considered. Of course, parliament has been delayed by the consideration of this question; we have remained in session much longer than we would have done if this question had not been under consideration. I have approved of the delay and the country will approve of the delay. The government has decided not to enter upon a decision as to this matter hastily. They have weighed all the arguments and all the conditions in relation to this case, and they have arrived at their decision after due deliberation. Whether that decision is correct or incorrect it has not been arrived at hastily; it has not been arrived at without full consideration of every circumstance and condition that had a bearing upon the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) says that the Prime Minister held that the necessity for the construction of this road was imminent, and he presented that statement as a reflection upon the judgment of the Prime Minister, as an evi-

dence that the Prime Minister has acted hastily, as an evidence that the Prime Minister has been influenced by considerations that are not considerations of wisdom, and that in fact, the statement of the Prime Minister for the construction of this road was imminent, is an ill-founded assertion. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) spoke as though the proposal was either to wait a little while, as he recommends, or to plunge into this project and have the road next year. Why, Sir, we are not to have the road next year; it is not a question as to whether we should have a transcontinental line immediately, but the necessity for it is imminent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. This line cannot be constructed in less than five years. In the meantime, a great tide of immigration is pouring into the North-west. What will be the condition of things in that country five years from to-day? Its productions will have increased; they may be doubled; they possibly may by that time be quadrupled, and the government is simply taking time by the forelock, taking into consideration conditions not as they exist to-day, but as they will exist as soon or sooner than they can provide the means to meet these conditions. And so, I repeat, that the necessity is imminent. We shall need transportation facilities in the North-west as fast if not faster than they can be provided. Every bushel of wheat that is raised in that country; all the productions of its soil, must find their egress from that country by rail. It is not situated as are the western states of the United States, with great channels of communication, with rivers flowing to the sea, rivers that furnish outlets to commerce; but the productions of our west must reach the tidewater or the great lakes by rail. Our prairie region must have railway facilities for every farmer there is in it, and so the government is not only taking into consideration the circumstances that now exist but the conditions that inevitably will exist. The government has made a reasonable calculation as to what conditions they have got to meet five years from to-day; they have realized that these conditions will imperatively demand additional transportation facilities, and they have set themselves to work, not with undue haste, not prematurely, but they have set themselves to work at a time when it was necessary to take action and enter upon a course of policy which will result in meeting this emergency when it does arrive.

My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) in the course of his speech indulged in one remark which possibly, upon mature reflection, and when he is cool, and has a candid moment, he will regret, and that is, Sir, to attribute to this government the desire to please Senator Cox.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Let my hon. friends on the opposite side cheer. I do not know whether such action is quite consistent with the course they have hitherto pursued, or whether it strikes them as a natural thing to do; but I do think it was an imputation unworthy of the hon. gentleman, applied to the colleagues with whom he had recently acted, and applied under these circumstances, when we are facing a great national emergency.

An hon. MEMBER. A crisis.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, not a crisis. When we are simply taking such action as prudence requires for promoting the interests of this young nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would inquire whether our judgment as to this measure should not be governed by a careful examination into the character of the undertaking? It is a very easy thing to raise questions to befog a case; a very easy thing to appeal to prejudices, to ascribe motives, to bring in Senator Cox and other irrelevant matters. But what we want to examine into on this occasion is this: What is the character of this proposition which the government have laid before this House of Commons? I think, Mr. Speaker, that the proposition is a good one. That is my opinion. I have examined it carefully, and I have arrived at that conclusion dispassionately, simply because an examination of all the conditions bearing on the case forces that conclusion upon me. Other gentlemen may arrive at a different conclusion.

An hon. MEMBER. Sure.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some hon. gentleman says sure. Quite likely many of them will. Their conclusions may be just as honest as mine. Mine may be based on fallacious reasons; the same may be said of theirs. It is for us to sit down calmly and argue out this question, to avoid appeals to prejudice and to party spirit, if that is possible, and to judge this proposition upon its merits. It may be that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways thought he was doing this; but if he did, I do not think he grasped very accurately or very fully the merits of the scheme.

The hon. gentleman chose to make a quotation from the speech of the right hon. leader of the government with regard to the bonding privilege, and to belittle the fears expressed by the Premier—to assert that those fears were groundless, and that it was all nonsense to talk about the danger of the abrogation of the bonding privilege. Why, Sir, said he, the Americans cannot afford to abrogate the bonding privilege; it would injure them; self-interest would prevent them from doing it. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Americans have threatened to abrogate the bonding privilege, not once, not twice, but repeatedly. Whenever friction exists, whenever bad feeling is aroused, one

of the first things suggested in the United States is to bring this 'spoiled child,' as Senator Depew characterized Canada, to its senses by shutting it from access to the sea by the abrogation of the bonding privilege.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Nonsense!

Mr. CHARLTON. Nonsense! It is absolute nonsense to suppose that we are not in danger from this source, and it is nonsense to suppose that we are giving evidence of prudence and evidence of thought and care for our interests if we do not attempt to place ourselves in the position where we shall be independent of this threat, if our friends on the other side of the line choose to carry it into effect.

Mr. ROSAMOND. What is the matter with us now?

Mr. CHARLTON. There is nothing the matter with us now. We are going down to the sea all right, and if my hon. friend had his way, we would go to the sea through American channels eternally. What is the matter now is that we want an alternative route; we want to place ourselves in the position where we can defy the application of this threat if it is ever made in the future. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) who addressed you is loathe to believe, he tells us, that the people of Canada are at the mercy of Americans. We are loathe to believe that. We do not believe it. But we simply want to take prudent steps to place ourselves in the best possible position in our relations with the Americans. We do not want to quarrel with the Americans. If the bonding privilege is abrogated, it will not be abrogated with our consent. They call it a privilege; and they hold that we are beholden to them for this privilege. But it is a privilege they can withdraw. They have threatened to withdraw it. That may occur again, and this threat they may carry into effect.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Not a bit of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says not a bit of it. Well, he knows the American character better than the most of us. He knows their magnanimity. He knows the generosity with which they have treated this country for the past thirty-five years. He knows how impossible it is for the Americans to be guilty of such an act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) characterizes this road as a sentimental road.

Mr. BROCK. Political.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not know that he characterized it as a political road. He characterized it as a sentimental road. Well, it is a sentimental road. At the back of the proposition to build this road is a sentiment, and that sentiment is the freeing of Canada from the danger of being shut out from access to the sea. That sentiment is the development of Canada upon broad national lines. That sentiment is the building of a transcontinental road from ocean to ocean upon Canadian soil. That sentiment is the carrying to our own seaports, on our own roads, of the products of our own lands. It is a sentimental road. At the back of this road is the loftiest and noblest sentiment that can exist—the sentiment of patriotism, of love of country.

My hon. friend says that the question of profit and loss does not enter into the calculation. Well, we have carefully considered that matter also. While the road is a sentimental road, I think we shall be able to show that the question of profit and loss has received due consideration; and the conclusion we arrive at is that profit on the right side of the ledger will unite with sentiment in justifying the building of this road.

My hon. friend tells us that he would favour the building of a road under certain conditions. He says he would favour a well-considered line proceeded with at the proper time. He intimates that this is not the proper time, and he goes on to say:

> Now in the immediate future there is no need of another road not even on the prairies.

Compare this with the speech made by my hon. friend less than a year ago, on the 9th of October, in Vancouver. He had been waited on by the Board of Trade of Victoria two days previous. He had been presented with an address, and the Victoria Board of Trade had in that address recommended government aid to the Canadian Northern Railway for the purpose of securing an additional line across the territory of British Columbia to the ocean. Inspired possibly by that address he made, in a speech at Vancouver on the 9th of October, use of the following language:

> There is no country where the soil is more fertile than in the millions of acres in Canada which the plough has not yet touched, and which man has not yet invaded. Railways were necessary to open up these great fertile tracts. If we are to invite the people from the world outside to immigrate here, they have a right to expect that the government can assure them the means of transportation. That means a great many railways in many parts of Canada and we feel as a government that we have ample justification in going to all reasonable lengths to meet this need. The tide of immigration was just setting in full and strong towards Canada particularly from the south, and he believed the time was near when there would be a greater immigration than ever before to Canada from the motherland. This influx of settlers, he said must bring its problems.
>
> It meant an increase of soil production and necessarily of means of transport. We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line. I am ambitious myself to see another right away. It cannot come fast enough to satisfy me, and I am doing all I can, in my small way, without public pretense about it, to insure its construction.

How does that compare with the language used by the hon. gentleman to-night? Has

he come around, after giving utterance to these sentiments, to the position that we are using undue and indecent haste in spending a few months in perfecting a scheme to construct a road which cannot be ready for use before four or five years.

We have the hon. gentleman's words quoted also in the 'Daily News' and 'Advertiser' of Vancouver. He is there reported as saying :

> This influx of settlers he said must bring its problems. It meant an increase of soil production and necessarily a means of transport. We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line, I am ambitious myself to see another right away. It cannot come fast enough to satisfy me, and I am doing all I can in my small way, without public pretense about it, to insure its construction.

Then there is another report of the same speech in the 'Daily Province' of Vancouver. I quote these three in order to avoid the charge that the speech was not revised by the hon. gentleman and that his sentiments were not correctly reported. This report says :

> We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line. I am ambitious myself to see another right away. It cannot come fast enough to satisfy me, and I am doing all I can in my small way, without public pretense about it, to ensure its construction.

These were, I think, sound sentiments, and I endorse them. It is unfortunate that there was a difference in tone and in position compared with the position occupied and the language used by the hon. gentleman to-night. I am at a loss to account for the discrepancy. I would hardly suppose that the hon. gentleman could have had so radical a change of views in eight or nine months, as he has shown by his speech to-night compared with his speech of October the 9th last. It has been suggested to me that, in quoting from these newspaper reports, I have overlooked something. I find that the hon. gentleman gave utterance to the following sentiments in Vancouver :

> There are young men, perhaps middle aged men, who are listening to me who will see three or four transcontinental lines running through Canada. And they will not see more than enough.

Three or four transcontinental lines, and these will not be more than enough. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to account for the difference in these expressions of opinions as indicated by these quotations and the speech of the hon. gentleman to-night.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). You would want to read the whole speech.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have read the essential part of it and will take another occasion to read the rest of it. There are some expressions in my hon. friend's speech, which perhaps indicate something that was not fully revealed, but persons skilful in such business may read between the lines and draw inferences. He says :

> As Minister of Railways I was entitled to know what was going on, I was entitled to know what the Premier of this Dominion thought about the matter, what he was doing about it. I was entitled to be consulted from day to day and step by step, if I was not entitled as Minister of Railways to dictate which course should be pursued.

Again he said :

> No Intercolonial Railway official was consulted about this matter.

I do not know what this means. It is not possible, I presume, that pique would have induced my hon. friend to resign. It is not possible, I apprehend, that a feeling of indignation because he thought he had not occupied that prominent position in shaping affairs in the councils of the state to which he believed he was entitled, could have influenced his conduct, but it was unfortunate that he introduced these illusions to the fact that he had not been consulted. Comparing his remarks to-night with his speech of eight months before, one is naturally led to look to some reason besides the one given that he left his position as minister of the Crown because the government had adopted a scheme for another transcontinental railway, much less radical and objectionable than the one he had proposed and advocated. He tells us in his speech that we want no railway, that there is no demand for it. How does that compare with his speech in Vancouver, where he tells us that we want railways to open up unoccupied territory, so that we may invite immigration ? The two positions are radically and diametrically opposed to each other. No demand for a railway through unpeopled regions ? I think I have heard that in the old Canadian Pacific Railway time. I think we ourselves made the mistake of using the same language, and I think we paid dearly for our lack of comprehension of the position of things. And we are not going to be led into that trap again. We are not going to take advice that will lead us into a line of action of which we have such unpleasant remembrance. The hon. gentleman tells us that there is no demand in Quebec for a transcontinental railway. Who promoted the project of the trans-Canadian line ? Was it a popular scheme in Quebec ? Had it no backing, no popular support there ? Why, Quebec was unanimous in favour of the transcontinental line, and the hon. gentleman's statement is absurdly unfounded. And, I may remark parenthetically, we are adopting a scheme that disposed of the trans-Canadian project with its demand of enormous subsidies in cash and land in favour of which there would have been pressure which it would have been difficult to resist.

Mr. CLANCY. How ?

Mr. CHARLTON. How is such pressure brought to bear ? Is my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) a novice in political matters ? Has he been living in the cool shades of opposition so long that he has forgotten everything except what is true and righteous and in complete accordance with the principles of the moral law ? Mr. Speaker, when the speech from the Throne was delivered, my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) was a member of that ministry. That speech foreshadowed a transcontinental road. We had not reached, at that period, a definite conclusion as to how this thing was to be proceeded with, but there was a broad statement to the effect that a transcontinental line was deemed to be a necessity, and the government was about to proceed to consider the best method to adopt for the construction of that line. Why did not my hon. friend resign then ?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. We got 600 miles of it authorized this very session. That is the thing that was in my mind.

Hon. Mr. CHARLTON. Now, the burden, of my hon. friend's speech was the question of government ownership. And I give the hon. gentleman credit of having honestly, energetically and without deviation advocated that principle of the construction of the road by the government. And I have this to say with regard to that matter, that I sympathized with that view myself. But I did not consider that my own views were entitled to be accepted by the government, as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals evidently did in his own case. I presented my arguments in favour of that scheme and those arguments were received with courtesy and given careful consideration. Then I heard the arguments against the adoption of the scheme, and I felt a little doubt whether I might not have been mistaken. And had my ideas been adopted, and had I been responsible for the adoption of that scheme, I should have trembled for the consequence, and, no doubt, should have regretted it was done. Government-ownership has a seductive appearance. It appeals to the imagination. It would be a bold policy. It would be just the thing for this country, granted two or three conditions. The first condition is separation, total separation from political management of the road. The second condition is honesty of construction. The third condition is honesty and efficiency in the management on the basis of a well organized and well arranged railway. If we could have all these conditions, government-ownership would be a good thing in my opinion. But the danger is that we might not be able to secure these conditions. The members of the ministry possibly in arriving at a conclusion on this matter may have had the Intercolonial road in view and may have had some doubt, owing to the results of the management of the Intercolonial, whether it was best to extend the principle further. And I presume their doubts were well founded. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that in his opinion we should have proceeded in a leisurely, careful, conservative manner. First of all, we should have secured an appropriation for surveys. Then we should have gone on and made the surveys, then, in due time, at the expiration of a couple of years, we might have proceeded with the construction; and, at the end of the next decade, probably, we would have had the road completed. And in the meantime, the congestion in the west would unquestionably have made us sorry that we had not got it sooner.

Now, with regard to exploration, we should not fall into the error of supposing that we are entirely without information as to the country through which this road will pass. We have a great amount of information. We have not actually located the line; we have not actually taken the level ? But we know what the general character of the country is between Quebec and Winnipeg north of Lake Nepigon. We have one survey made by Sir Sandford Fleming from the head of the Montreal river north of Lake Nepigon to Winnipeg. He tells us that it is a highly favourable line, with no grades more than one per cent and no bridges more than 300 feet in length and only a few of them; that the country is a level one and highly favourable for railway construction. With regard to the country east of the commencement of that survey to Quebec, we have abundant information which shows that it is of the same character as that reported on by Sir Sanford Fleming. This great country north of the height of land offers few impediments to railway construction. We know enough of the general character of that country to warrant us in definitely entering upon the scheme of constructing that railway. Then, with regard to the country form Winnipeg to Fort Simpson, through the Peace River Pass, that country has been traversed again and again not only by explorers but by engineers. The character of that country is thoroughly well known. For the whole territory from Winnipeg to Fort Simpson by way of Winnipeg, the government is in possession of all the information that is necessary to warrant it in embarking upon a scheme for the construction of this road. While they could not tell with definite accuracy what the road would cost, they could make an approximate estimate that would be within the cost per mile, and they knew definitely the character of the obstacles to be overcome in the building of the road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where is that information ? There has been no survey from the head of Lake Nepigon to Winnipeg.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is contained in a report of Sir Sandford Fleming. I think it is route No. 3. I will be happy to send the volume up to my hon. friend, I have it down at my room.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman will find on looking at it that it is the route from the head of Lake Nepigon down to Lake Superior, not from Lake Nepigon to Winnipeg.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend is mistaken. Surveys were being made for the purpose of securing a route to Winnipeg, to Red River from the east, and this was one of these surveys, embracing the country between the head of Montreal river and Winnipeg, and pasing north of Lake Nepigon, with a description of the character of the country north of the height of land. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend—I am going somewhat discursively over the notes which I made at random while he was speaking—my hon. friend tells us that the idea of developing a large lumber business from this country between Quebec and Winnipeg for the supply of the prairies, is illusory; that the British Columbia lumber is much handier, and consequently we cannot expect to do very much lumbering from the east of Winnipeg. I have been over to Vancouver a few weeks ago, and being a lumberman myself, I naturally looked into that business a little. I found that nearly all the lumber manufactured in New Westminister, Vancouver and at all points in British Columbia accessible to a railway for transport to the prairies, went up through the canyons of the Fraser and the Thompson, went over the heavy grades between Kamloops and the Columbia, went over the Selkirk Mountains, went over the Rocky Mountains, went up the Kicking Horse grade, a grade of four per cent, where it takes a powerful locomotive to go up with three cars, and went out to the prairies at great cost. With a well equipped road of easy grades we can reach the prairie section with lumber from all parts of the region that this road will open in Ontario; and from the western portion of Quebec, we can reach the prairies, in my opinion, as cheaply as the lumber from Vancouver reaches that destination. A railroad man, if you ask him about the capacity of a road, and whether its capacity for business is measured by the length of the line, will tell you, no; he will answer that it is measured by the length of the line and by the steepness of the grades. The grades over the Selkirk mountains are 120 feet to the mile, over the Rocky Mountains 200 feet to the mile for four miles, and 120 the rest of the way. These grades are equivalent to adding four miles to the length of every single mile of the road. So the assertion that we cannot reach the prairies with lumber from this hinterland of ours, is not well founded.

Now, he tells us that we know nothing of this country. Ten exploring parties were sent out last year by the Ontario government for the purpose of ascertaining the character of this country north of the height of land in Ontario; and the report of these parties was to the effect that in Ontario, in that region of which we previously knew comparatively nothing, there are sixteen million acres of land in what is termed the clay belt, of good productive land, of rich land, with a climate which fits it for agricultural operations, land which lies south of the latitude of Winnipeg, every acre of it; sixteen million acres have been discovered already, and it is useless to talk about a road passing through a howling wilderness where there are no sources of business available, a road will run the whole 1,300 or 1,400 miles from Winnipeg to Quebec without having any local business whatever.

Then, the hon. gentleman comes down to the question of running rights, and there he has a point on the government—running rights over the roads, one road giving another road a right to use its road-bed. He refers to the sections that grants these running rights, particularly section 24, and he tells us that this whole thing is a delusion, he makes merry over it. Why, he says, the absurdity of supposing that a railroad is like a wagon road, that you can set a train on it as you can put a wagon on a wagon road and run it to its destination. Why, the supreme absurdity of it. He tells us that the Premier knew nothing of what he was talking about, that the thing could not possibly work. Then he gave himself away a few moments later by saying that when the system went into operation the Grand Trunk Pacific would take advantage of other lines that were making use of the road and would not give them fair-play in the adjustment of the rules and regulations, and the despatching of trains. Now, Mr. Speaker, pullman cars run all over the United States and Canada without any reference to a particular railway. A pullman car will often traverse three or four different lines without a change of porter, without a change of passengers, without any change whatever. A car will go from Boston to Chicago, it will go perhaps from Boston to San Francisco, pullman car after pullman car, traversing a great number of different lines. Freight will go in the same way. One of the great reasons for securing uniformity of gauge was to avoid the necessity of breaking bulk. Formerly we had a five foot gauge, a six foot gauge, a three foot six inch gauge, a four foot eight and a half inch gauge; and wherever one of these roads connected with another having a different gauge, the freight had to be transferred from one car to another, had to break bulk, as it was termed. Now, by uniformity of gauge, there is no breaking of bulk. A freight car is loaded at Los Angeles, or San Francisco, or Portland, and it goes through to New York, or Chicago, or Boston, or wherever its destination may be, without breaking bulk; and then it goes back again, perhaps loaded and perhaps empty. The business of running two roads over the same track has been demonstrated, and it is successful. I live on the air line of the Grand

Trunk Railway, a line of road extending from Buffalo to Detroit 229 miles in length. That road is operated by the Grand Trunk and by the Wabash. The Wabash sends its through trains from Chicago, from Kansas city, from St. Louis, over that road to Buffalo and back again. It sends its freight trains over that road, the Grand Trunk Railway does the same. They have their running arrangements, a joint system of despatching; agents at stations are paid by each company according to the volume of business that each transacts, and repairs are kept up in the same way. There is no hitch, there is no friction. They change engines on that route, they have a division 110 miles long from Detroit to St. Thomas, and a division of 119 miles long from St. Thomas to Niagara Falls or Buffalo. Each road has its engine house, each road has its repair shops, and they can work them jointly if they choose. They have their joint-system of despatching, and of payment of expenses. That system of things has been operated for three or four years, operated successfully, operated without the slightest friction at all, operated to the advantage of both these companies. They use the same bridge going into Buffalo, everything in common, the respective expenses, arranged amicably between the roads. The Flint and Père Marquette road, which is a Michigan system exchange their traffic at St. Thomas with the Michigan Central. They send their freight trains over their own road from Walkerville to St. Thomas and over the Michigan Central to Buffalo. They have a joint arrangement in the matter of despatching and the whole arrangement is working harmoniously, efficiently and to the satisfaction of both parties. The hon. gentleman has not been Minister of Railways and Canals long enough to learn his trade. He has not been Minister of Railways and Canals long enough to learn some of the elementarry principles of the business.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Canadian Pacific Railway runs over the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Halifax.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, and the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals admitted that the Canadian Pacific Railway ran over the Grand Trunk Railway line from Toronto to Hamilton, but he said there was no change of engines and that they could consequently work that arrangement. If you can operate a road 229 miles long with two divisions and a change of engines between, you can have twenty changes of engines and work it satisfactorily. All you have to do is to have your despatching system properly organized and make your arrangements for the use of the road. In this instance the government steps in and acts as an arbitrator, and if any attempt is made to take an unfair advantage on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the government can see that the stipulations of this contract are carried out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You want the same parties to own the roads?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, the same parties do not own these two roads that I am speaking of. The Grand Trunk Railway owns the road and the Wabash Railway operates its trains over it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The same parties, the New York Central, the Canadian Southern and the Père Marquette own the road that the hon. gentleman is talking about.

Mr. CHARLTON. The same parties do not own the road. The Père Marquette, the Canada Southern and the New York Central do not own the road. The New York Central has the Canada Southern leased, and the Flint and Père Marquette road is entirely independent of both.

Mr. LOGAN. Another ex-Minister of Railways and Canals who has not learned his trade.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) wants to know why we cut off government ownership at Winnipeg. Why put this section of the road west of Winnipeg on a different basis from the section east of Winnipeg? In one sense the government has the same control over the western division that it has over the eastern division. The arrangement secures to other roads the same rights from Winnipeg to Port Simpson as from Winnipeg to Quebec. It gives these privileges to every road from ocean to ocean and the government exercises similar control in this matter. That is one of the conditions of the contract, but the government retains ownership in the eastern division while it leases the road to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Why does it retain it? Winnipeg is the great converging point of all the roads in the North-west Territories. Here the trade of that country concentrates and will do so for a long time to come if not perpetually. The government constructs a great trunk line from that point to tidewater, to an ocean port, for the purpose of securing Canadian trade for Canadian ports, and it does so because this is the great main artery into which will be poured, and over which will run the trade of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, of the Canadian Northern Railway, perhaps, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, possibly, and of any road that wishes to use it. Its use is free to all upon equal and equitable terms, and the reason for government ownership as far as Winnipeg is that Winnipeg is the great converging point, the great entrepot where the trade of the North-west Territories will concentrate and where the government road will bid for the transaction of the whole of the trade, or as much of it as it can do without reference to the other

companies whose trains may run down over this road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says 'hear, hear.' I think that is perhaps a good reason for having the road. The motives are all right and it remains to be seen how much traffic we can get for the road, but we cannot get anything unless we try. If we are to attempt to secure busines for our own seaports we must provide a road to get there.

My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair), at this stage of his speech entered upon the Intercolonial Railway question. He really feels sore over that. The Intercolonial Railway is no doubt a pet with the hon. gentleman, and the brilliancy of the management of the road, of course, entitles him to feel doubly interested in its welfare. The people's money, he tells, will be squandered by the construction of a rival line, but he neglects to tell us that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway promoters were in favour of building their short line, and making Moncton their eastern terminus and that they moved for this in the Railway Committee. He tells us that the building of this new line will save a very few miles of distance, that it will have heavier grades, that it will in every other respect be a less desirable road and that the whole thing is a supreme act of folly. I have never been over the line. He tells us what an excellent road the Intercolonial Railway is, how much business it is capable of doing, and in the next place he tells us that if we took some of this money that we are to expend on the short line and reduced the grades on the Intercolonial Railway, making it a first-class road, it might be able to do the business. What are the grades on the Intercolonial Railway ? There are 62½-feet grades and 50-foot grades to the mile. No road can claim to be a first-class road with grades more than one-half per cent or 26 feet to the mile. In the construction of this short line and in the construction of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg it should be an absolute condition that the road should be first-class in point of grades, in point of construction and in point of weight of rails. The rails should not be less than 90-pound rails, and the grades should not be more than four-tenths per cent, and if these conditions are complied with this road will compete with a water route or anything else. The object of the building of a short line from Chaudière Junction to Moncton is to correct the costly mistake that the country made when the Intercolonial Railway was constructed, and I regret not the correcting of the mistake, but the making of the mistake. All first-class railways in America for the last ten or fifteen years have been spending enormous sums of money in correcting the mistakes made in their first construction. The Pennsylvania, New York Central, the Grand Trunk Railway, and other first-class roads that I could name, have been pumping out money like water, quietly, without observation, for the purpose of reducing grades, correcting the alignment, taking out curves, and increasing the power of the road to do business and earn money. The Canadian Pacific Railway has built a short line from Ottawa to Montreal. It had a line already north of the Ottawa river. Why did it do that ?—because it was necessary.

An hon. MEMBER. No sentiment there.

Mr. CHARLTON. No sentiment there. It was business, it was necessary to have the best conditions they could obtain in order to secure the business. Why should we shorten, straighten and improve the Intercolonial Railway? It is simply because we have set out with the purpose of securing trade for our own seaports, and if we are to secure that trade we must have the best obtainable conditions with regard to our lines of transportation. We must not have to go away around by the sea 120 miles further than a short line would take us; we must not have grades of 62½ feet to the mile, but we must reduce the distance, reduce the grades, improve the efficiency of the road and secure the necessary conditions so far as it is possible to do so, in order to get the trade that we aim to get. That is why we dealt with the Intercolonial Railway. But the whole question is befogged by the course which the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) has pursued in talking about this line and that line, and about one line being 10 miles longer than it was represented to be, and about crossing so many gullies, and about this and that difficulty to overcome. We have got to overcome these difficulties; we are putting that road there for a specific purpose, and that purpose is to increase the capacity of the road, to reduce the cost of the transportation of the products of the west to our maritime seaports.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the object we have in view. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) tells us that the Intercolonial will have no business in case this is done except in the winter. Well, I do not suppose it ever had a local business that was a marked source of revenue to it. It is to be regretted that it was put where there was no business to do, and no particular use for a railway, and we have been pottering along with that road and paying deficiencies long enough, and now we want an efficient line of railway.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. When does the hon. gentleman think I made that statement?

Mr. CHARLTON. What statement?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. The statement the hon. gentleman has just attributed to me.

Mr. CHARLTON. What statement?

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. That the Intercolonial Railway had no local business.

Mr. CHARLTON. Except in the winter—would have, I said, in case this other line was built. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) misunderstood me. The statement the hon. gentleman made was that in case this short line was built the Intercolonial Railway would have no local business except in the winter.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. I said that this line would have no ocean shipping business except in the winter.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR. Oh, no; the new line.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose that is so. I suppose it is intended that this transcontinental line shall lay down the products of the west at Quebec during the season of navigation, and when the harbour of Quebec is closed it is the intention to carry that trade to Halifax and St. John, and for that reason we want a good road.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. It has not been asserted that we are going to carry grain to these maritime ports while the port of Quebec is open, but Quebec is to be our national port, and while it is open it will do the business that the transcontinental line brings to it.

Now, I think the trouble with my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) is that his view is somewhat circumscribed. He has not yet got out of provincial ideas and a provincial range of vision; he has not ceased to be provincial; he has not become continental in his aspirations, in his desires, in his grasp of affairs. We regret that the Intercolonial Railway will be injured by this new line; we regret that it is necessary to spend some millions of dollars to rectify the costly mistake that was made years ago, but we are dealing now with a question of national importance. We are dealing with a question that is national in all its bearings; we are dealing with the question of securing for our own seaports the business that would naturally go to the seaports of another country, and whether we can do it or not I cannot venture to say, but I do venture to say that we cannot do it unless we construct roads of the very best character with the lowest possible grades.

In regard to that matter, as I was going over to Vancouver a short time ago, I sat in the rear car of the train as we were passing north of Lake Superior, with General Manager McNicol, two or three American railway magnates and a number of railway men, and the discussion turned upon the question of water transportation versus transportation by rail. The subject of discussion was whether railways could be made to compete with water carriers, and Mr. McNicol stated that if the Canadian Pacific Railway over which we were passing had grades of four-tenths per cent per mile (that is 21 feet and a fraction) and some improvement in its alignment, that it could do four times the business it was doing now, and that it could compete with the water route.

Now, Sir, if we build a line from Winnipeg to Quebec, say 1,400 miles long, and if we can secure four-tenths per cent grades; if we lay that road with 90 pound rails, if we put bridges upon it that will carry the heaviest locomotives and trains of cars, each car carrying a load of 50 tons, we can carry, in my opinion, grain from Winnipeg to Quebec for 12 cents a bushel and perhaps even less. The lowest rate that I have known for grain from Chicago to New York was 12 cents per hundred, or seven and two-tenths cents per bushel for a distance of 1,000 miles. Now, if it can be carried at that rate with a profit, and I don't suppose it was carried at a loss, it is a reasonable calculation to suppose that we could carry grain over this road for 12 cents a bushel, if it is the right kind of a road. But if it has 50 feet grades to the mile; if it has a light rail, if it is a second-class road we can secure no business, we cut ourselves off from the conditions that are necessary to secure business, and so we must bear that in mind when we are building this road.

My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) in the course of his remarks had a thrust at the Globe. He stated that the Globe had an article which said that when this new road was built there would be freight trains and passenger trains on the road passing each way in embarrassing abundance. Well, it is a matter of conjecture, of course, as to what kind of business this road might do. The writer of that article perhaps looked into the future, and he saw Canada with vast developments, with a great increase of population, with a great increase of production, with a great increase of business, with business largely attracted over the transcontinental line, and perhaps his forecast of the future was not so extravagant after all. We do not know what the result may be; we have been guilty, constantly guilty, of underrating the capacity of our country. This gentleman perhaps overrated a little, but we cannot tell, and I would rather have speculation in that direction than in the other.

Now, I do not know but that perhaps my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair) would have looked with a somewhat greater degree of favour upon this scheme if the road had gone to St. John, and it would perhaps have served the purposes of the country just as well if it had. I do not know as to that, but the government were bound, in my opinion, to adopt a course that was fair and impartial. They could not properly discriminate between Halifax and St. John in

favour of the one and against the other, and they have adopted a plan which will serve the purposes of both, and if St. John wants to meet these conditions for reaching this business, let them promote the construction of a road up to this short line and nobody will have any objection to that.

Mr. TUCKER. There is a road to Chipman now.

Mr. CHARLTON. Let that road be improved and made first-class, and let them get the business at that point. The government, I think, acted with perfect propriety in placing the eastern terminus of the road at Moncton, from which point both St. John and Halifax will be accessible, though the advantage in distance will be in favour of St. John.

Mr. TUCKER. It increases the distance to St. John 89 miles.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, you want to cut that off. Now, Mr. Speaker, a good deal of criticism has been indulged in by the hon. gentleman in regard to the increase of our debt. We are to add $15,000,000 to it by the construction of the section from Moncton to Chaudière Junction, and untold millions by the construction of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg, and by the guarantees of the line west of Winnipeg. I did not hear the hon. gentleman make anything of the fact that this was in reality a mere lease to a railway company, and that the company was to pay interest on the cost of the line. We shall have some little burden on the country, of course. We shall have interest to pay for seven years on the cost of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg, and probably some little interest to pay on our guarantee of a portion of the cost of the line west of Winnipeg. All this may amount to $14,000,000 or $15,000,000; but that is a small consideration in comparison with the benefit to the country resulting from the construction of this transcontinental line.

The hon. gentleman refers to the premier's statement with regard to this road as a national line, and intimates that the premier paid no attention whatever to the commercial side of the question—that this had no bearing with him, but that the national consideration wholly governed his course in the matter. This was not a fair presentation of the views expressed by the premier. The premier did, as he was entitled to do, lay due stress on the importance of the construction of this road from a national standpoint, for the purpose of having a railway on our own soil from ocean to ocean. He took high ground in that respect, a ground which I think the country will support him in taking. But he did not lose sight of the commercial aspects of the case—far from it. While dwelling on the national importance of the road, he pointed out at the same time that its commercial results would be in the highest degree important and satisfactory.

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways enters into a financial statement with regard to this road, and estimates its cost from Moncton to Winnipeg at $35,000 per mile. Well, it is impossible to say whether that estimate is a correct one or not; the probability is that it is excessive. You must bear in mind that this is a question of the construction of a railway without equipment. The cost of equipment adds very largely to the cost of a railway line. This line is simply to be constructed and handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and that company is to place the equipment upon it. I do not believe that this road will cost over $30,000 a mile from Moncton to Chaudière Junction, and I doubt very much that it will cost more than $30,000 per mile, or even that, from Quebec to Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman, in reckoning the burdens that will rest on the government in connection with the guarantee of the western section, assumes that the government guarantee will amount to the cost of building the road. He overlooks the fact that the guarantee of the government is to cover merely three-fourths of the cost of the road, and that when the government advances this guarantee, it takes over the security of the road and its equipment, including what the company has put into it, so that the security is ample.

The hon. gentleman refers at some length to the question of the stock. What is there about this stock question? There is to be $45,000,000 of stock. Of that, $20,000,000 is to be preferred stock, which goes into the equipment of the road, and $25,000,000 is to be common stock. The hon. gentleman would lead us to suppose that that will all go into the pockets of the shareholders and directors. What will it be used for? Why, Sir, the company will require money with which to build elevators, to improve the road, and for various purposes in connection with the operation of the road. It will require money to carry out its stipulation with regard to providing vessels and shipping facilities at each end of the road. That is what that stock is set apart for—$20,000,000 of preferred stock for equipment, and $25,000,000 of common stock to be used for these various purposes to which I have referred.

The hon. gentleman regrets that it is not the Grand Trunk Railway that is going into the west, but the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Well, it strikes me that there is a distinction without a difference. I think we shall be thankful if we get the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway into the North-west, with the stipulations and conditions with which it is hedged round—with all these stipulations which place it absolutely in the hands of the government, as to the operation of the road, as to its maintenance, as to providing facilities at each end of the

road for the transaction of business, and as to not discriminating against Canadian ports and in favour of American ports. The hon. gentleman asks what that condition about discrimination amounts to. He says the company will send their agents through the North-west, and will quietly secure freight and have it shipped with their own connivance to American ports. Well, this company enters into a solemn agreement not to discriminate against Canadian ports. But he tells us that we have no penalties by which we can enforce the fulfilment of this agreement. Is the whole thing ended when this Bill passes? We have to go on and perfect the conditions by a lease ; and what does this agreement say in regard to that ? It says :

The said lease shall also contain such other convenants and provisions, including proper indemnity to the government in respect of the working of the railway, as may be deemed necessary by the government to secure the proper carrying out of this agreement.

Does not that cover the ground ? The hon. gentleman surely could not have read that. The government have a most carefully prepared agreement here. After reading it over and over again, I cannot see any point that has been neglected. I pronounce it a perfect agreement. The time that has been devoted to the perfection of this scheme has not been mis-spent or wasted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, 'I have got through with a sort of rambling criticism of my hon. friend's speech, and I have my own speech to make yet. As it is now a quarter to eleven, and as the newspapers have not been able to insert anything that has been uttered here for the last hour, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, August 12, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVERNMENT AID.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

How many miles of railway have been constructed in Manitoba, North-west Territories and British Columbia, without Provincial or Dominion government aid in money, land grant or guarantee of bonds ?

2. By what companies built, and what is the number of miles belonging to each road ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding).

(1.) 150·65 miles.

(2.) In Manitoba, none.

North-west Territories—British Yukon Railway	57·97
In British Columbia—Bedlington and Nelson	15·20
In British Columbia—British Yukon	32·35
In British Columbia—Lenora Mount Sickar	11·50
In British Columbia—New Westminster Southern	24·10
In British Columbia—Red Mountain	9·53
	150·65

DR. MOREAU.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. By whom was Hypolite Moreau, junior, of St. John d'Iberville, recommended as collector of the Chambly canal at St. John d'Iberville, and what is his salary ?

2 Has Hypolite Moreau, junior, given security to the government, and of what nature ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The appointment was made on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The toll having been abolished no security was taken.

LOUIS M. TROTTER.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. Is there a person named Louis M. Trottier in the employment of the government at St. John d'Iberville?

2. If so, what is his employment, and by whom was he recommended ?

3. Is this employment new, or has it always existed ?

4. If it is new, for what reason was it created?

5. What is the salary of the said Trottier ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier).

1. Yes.

2. Temporary excise officer. He was recommended by Mr. L. P. Demers, member for St. John d'Iberville.

3. It is new.

4. Increase of excise work and relieving officer.

5. He is paid at the rate of $400 per annum.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on a certain proposed resolution declaring :

That it is expedient, in connection with the Bill now before this House, respecting the construction of a National Trans-continental Railway, to ratify the agreement set forth in the schedule to the said Bill, entered into on the

28th of July, 1903, between the government and certain persons on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by parliament at the present session thereof, and to authorize the government to do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said Bill and agreement.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker. At the close of my remarks last evening I had very nearly finished my review of the speech of the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). I have only a word to add to what I have already said in that connection. I have thought over the position of that hon. gentleman ; thought it over carefully, and I am obliged to arrive at the conclusion that there was no sufficient reason for the course that he has taken. When I contrast his declarations in his speech made in Victoria last October, in which he asserted that we wanted another transcontinental road, that we wanted it right away, that we wanted to penetrate and open up new districts of country in the North-west and fit them for settlement—when I contrast that with his statement of yesterday : that we do not want a transcontinental road now, that we should delay in proceeding with the construction of that road, that the government were proceeding with indecent and reckless haste in the matter ; the two positions are irreconcilable, entirely irreconcilable. He puts me in mind of a story I read a few years ago as to the great riot in Chicago. A United States regiment of regulars who had been engaged in a winter campaign under General Miles against the Sioux Indians, were on their way to quarters in the east where they were to be granted a respite from their labours. They were ragged and toil-worn but they were veterans evidently, and as they were drawn up in line a person on the side walk said to the soldier nearest to him : you would not shoot us fellows would you ? He replied : I would not unless the captain told me to. Now, the difficulty with the ex-Minister of Railways is that he did not shoot when the captain told him to. It is necessary to have discipline in an army, it is necessary to have discipline in a party. Individual men may have very strong individual opinions—I belong to that category myself——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. But it is unreasonable for an individual to suppose that a party must accept his opinions and act upon them, and it is in the highest degree injudicious for that individual to kick over the traces because he cannot govern the party, for, in doing that, he destroys what little influence he might otherwise possess, and that is what my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, I fear has done.

Now, as I have said, there is no radical difference between the policy that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) advocates, namely a government road ; there is no radical difference between that policy and the policy adopted by the government, of a road partly of government construction, partly aided by the government, leased by the government to a private corporation, a road destined to serve the same purpose under the arrangement that is made that a road would have served if it had been strictly a government road—I say there is no radical difference between these two propositions ; no difference so radical between them as to warrant the hon. gentleman to resign his position as Minister of Railways, and to go against the government as he did most unmistakably and most bitterly yesterday. His position yesterday, lacking as it did that dignity which ought to pertain to the position of a gentleman who resigns on high patriotic and moral grounds, and the bitterness of his attack convinced me that there is something beneath and beyond the ostensible reason assigned for his leaving the cabinet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I repeat what I said last night, that the hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks gives us a clue to his feelings in regard to this matter, a clue to his action in this matter, when he tells us that he was not consulted, that no official of the Intercolonial Railway was consulted, that the government forsooth, that the Premier of this country and his advisers proceeded to organize and arrange a policy about which the hon. gentleman was not consulted and which he did not approve of. I imagine Mr. Speaker, that when that hon. gentleman resigned, he had arrived at the conclusion that he would make the captain shoot at his command instead of shooting at the captain's command.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. And the outcome was that the captain did not shoot, and that the rebellious member retired from the ranks, and he is out of the ranks. I am sorry for the whole incident ; I am sorry that the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) should have thought so highly of his own individual opinion ; should have decided that it was necessary for the government to accept his opinion and act upon it, and that if the government failed to do so he would leave the government in the lurch. Well, he has left the government in the lurch, if being deprived of the hon. gentleman's sanction could place them in that position. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) devoted a large portion of his speech to the Intercolonial Railway. As I said last night, I shall leave the detailed discussion of that matter to gentlemen better acquainted with the condition of affairs in the maritime provinces than I am myself.. Still, it is patent to me, and must be patent to any person who has a fair knowledge of the situa-

tion, that the hon. gentleman in his criticism upon the policy of the government with regard to the Intercolonial did not take the pains to put us in possession of all the facts. He laments the ruin of the Intercolonial. He laments that we did not adhere to the policy of attempting to create a business for our maritime ports by using a second-class road with an unnecessary mileage of from 100 to 140 miles, with heavy grades, and one that we know cannot fulfil the conditions that we must expect of it if the scheme of the government is to be made a success. He did not tell us that the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk are separate and distinct corporations. He did not tell us that the government had a contract with the Grand Trunk for 99 years to turn over to the Intercolonial at Montreal all freight the road brings to Montreal designed for points east of Quebec. The Intercolonial cannot be deprived of the business, one of the largest items of business it possesses. He made no calculation as to the great accession to this road of business at Moncton for Halifax and St. John. If the straightening of its line, if the reducing of its grades, if the increase in its capacity, which are making it first-class and shorter, will lead to bringing from the west of a large amount of grain for shipment at maritime ports, the Intercolonial must share in the benefit. The Grand Trunk Pacific ends at Moncton. There are 183 miles of the Intercolonial road to share in the business that will come to Halifax ; there are 89 miles from Moncton to St. John to share in the business. The gross business of the Intercolonial will inevitably be increased by the construction of this short line, owing to the large increase of traffic between Quebec and the maritime provinces ; and there is besides the retention to the Intercolonial of the trade which I have mentioned that pertains to it and that cannot be taken away from it. I will not dwell further upon the position taken by the hon. gentleman ; I will not criticise further his statements.

As I said last night, I have a line of argument to present with relation to this scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific which I propose to enter upon briefly at this stage of my remarks. As to the question whether we need another transcontinental railway, the question has been answered by the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair)) at Vancouver. I can quote him as an authority. According to him, we need the road and we need it quickly. It cannot be proceeded with too soon. He said on that occasion that men were standing in the audience who would live to see three or four transcontinental lines across the continent. I have no doubt he was right. At all events, the construction of this road is not premature. We must bear in mind the fact that we cannot get this road at once. We are taking the initiative steps now towards getting it. We have to proceed with surveys, we have to locate the line ; we have to proceed with the construction of a road 3,030 miles long in an air-line, and it cannot be done at once. It will take several years to do it. In the meantime, population is pouring into the North-west, new acreage is being brought into cultivation ; its prolific soil will furnish a large harvest every year, and at the time this road will be completed, it will be a crying necessity. We have undertaken its construction none too soon. I estimate that five years from to-day with a continuance of the conditions that exist now, the grain products of the Canadian North-west will have increasced at least three-fold. The present means of transportation will prove utterly inadequate and this road will be imperatively called for. The government, I repeat, are not acting with undue haste, or proceeding with an ill-matured scheme. They are not entering upon an enterprise which they are not warranted in entering upon ; but on the contrary, they are entering upon a scheme which is called for and called for now.

I pointed out last night that our situation, so far as our great wheat producing region is concerned, and the situation of the United States when it was a young country, are entirely different. The United States had an outlet by the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico. There were navigable rivers scattered along the Atlantic coast—the Hudson, the Savannah and other rivers. At an early date a canal was constructed from Albany to Lake Erie, tapping the waters of the Great Lakes. The country was able to get along largely without railways. In 1850, when the country had 23,000,000 inhabitants, railroads had hardly become a factor in the transportation situation at all. But we are situated differently. We have no Mississippi to convey the products of our western fields to the sea ; we have no Erie canal ; we have no natural outlet, not even by access by navigable rivers to the Hudsoy bay; if we were to have a route, it would have to be provided by artificial means. The whole country, to as far north as the isothermal lines make it possible to produce cereals, must depend on railroads exclusively. For this reason our situation is different from that of the United States. We have to provide our North-west with the means of communication which are absolutely essential to its success and its prosperity. Consequently delay in providing these facilities is inadvisable, and I dismiss the assertion as to the action of the government in proceeding with this railway being premature as totally without foundation, as betraying a lamentable ignorance of the conditions that exist and the probable wants of the near future.

The government proceeded carefully to the consideration of this question. The speech from the Throne contained an allusion to the necessity for a transcontinental line. The government were evidently considering the

propriety first of constituting a transportation commission to examine into this question and to report as to the proper course to pursue. But it became evident that there was not time to wait for the slow operation of an investigation by a commission. It became evident that the time for action was now, and that if we could secure such knowledge as would place us in possession of the facts that would warrant us in taking action, we should proceed. Well, what was done? The government proceeded to consider several propositions. They considered a proposition of building a government road, considered it carefully, as I am well aware, and rejected that proposition—the proposition which my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals pins his faith to, the proposition upon which he has gone out of office because the government did not accept it. I say the government rejected that proposition for what I suppose I may fairly concede were good and sufficient reasons, although I was enamoured of it. The government realized that to make a success of a government road across the continent required the total severance of that scheme from politics. Can that be done in Canada ?

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. The government thought not and so do I. It required, in the second place, honesty in construction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. That would require the possession of expert knowledge in supervising and carrying on that work, which perhaps no gentleman in this House possesses. It required in the third place, honesty of management, capacity for efficient management and an amount of expert railway knowledge which we do not find among men in public life. I doubt whether my hon. friend from East York would fill the bill. It would require a man like Sir Thomas Shaughnessy or Mr. Hay, at a salary of $50,000 or $75,000 per year, to manage efficiently such a scheme. Whether the government were right or wrong, whether their reasons for rejecting the proposition were sound or not, they did reject it.

Mr. MACLEAN. Canada does not grow that kind of man ?

Mr. CHARLTON. It does, but they are not in this House. We have not many railway experts in this House. The government proceeded next to consider a proposition for the construction of the road in the old fashioned way, that of granting subsidies. There was a proposition to build a road from North Bay to the west, which involved a land grant of 5,000 acres per mile and a money grant of $6,400 per mile. Well, the government have never adopted the system of making land grants to railways, and wisely concluded that this was not a good time to begin it. So that proposition was dropped. Then a compromise proposition was accepted, namely, the construction of a road, over which the government should have supervision. One division of that road, estimated at 1,835 miles in length, was to be constructed by the government, but the company was to lease the road and was thus interested in having the cost of the construction kept down. The company is to have the right of investigating whether the government was doing the work economically or not and is given sufficient control to enable it to do so. This is the scheme which was adopted for the construction by the government of the eastern section. Perhaps it would have suited my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Railways, better if he had had the disposal of the contracts for building that road, but I think it will be constructed fully as cheaply under the arrangement arrived at. Then we have the construction of a line from Winnipeg to Port Simpson by the company, the right being reserved to the government to audit the accounts and supervise the work and take any necessary steps to see that the work is done properly, and that the company is not stuffing its accounts so as to give a fictitious cost to the road, on which to secure the government guarantee of the bonds. By this scheme we are to have the eastern section owned by the government and leased to and operated by the company, and the western section owned by the company and operated under the supervision of the government, which is to have control of the rates. This scheme will serve the purposes of the country, I think, possibly better than the construction of a government road, even if a government road could have been constructed with all the conditions necessary for success which I have mentioned.

There were three schemes before the government, and taking everything into consideration, in my opinion they acted wisely and have adopted the scheme which is the safest and most likely to confer on the country great advantages.

The government were criticised for delay. My right hon. friend the leader of the opposition, every day or two, would inquire when this contract was to be brought down, what was the cause of delay, why we were kept dancing attendance while the government were shilly-shallying. They were asked : 'Why do you not bring your policy before the country ? What are you doing ? But yesterday we had my hon friend the ex-Minister of Railways telling us that they have shown undue and unseemingly haste.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will allow me, it had been announced in the government organs, over and over again, that a certain policy was to be brought down, and I protested against the House being kept from day to day and week to

week waiting for the government to announce its policy. I was not insisting on the government bringing down a policy, but insisting that, if they had any policy to bring down, they should bring it down at once.

Mr. CHARLTON. The government were probably in a position in which circumstances were arising that rendered them unable to say definitely how soon they would arrive at a decision. They had announced their intention of bringing down a railway policy, but they may have thought that they would be able to announce it earlier than they did. They took time however to consider and weigh carefully all the conditions before concluding finally an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That agreement will stand as a monument of their sagacity. And they brought down their policy with celerity and despatch, if we consider all the circumstances attendant upon the case. It was proper that they should take careful action. We were at the parting of the ways. We had, on the one hand, the policy recommended of building a government road. On the other hand, we had the policy recommended of assisting the construction of a road in the old fashioned way of granting subsidies. Between these two policies, the government had one which is better than either, but which required time and careful consideration because there were vast interests at stake; and if, owing to the absence of due care and thorough consideration, mistakes became developed in the future, through the adoption of the scheme recommended by the government, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition would not be slow to say that they had acted too quickly and brought down their policy too soon.

In adopting this policy, the primary consideration which the government had in view was the national interest—the building of a national road to connect our Atlantic with our Pacific ports, and which would pass all the way through Canadian territory. That object they have kept steadily in view. They desired to secure trade from the North-west for our own ocean ports or as large a share of that trade as possible. I do not say this all-rail route will be able to compete successfully with the water route; but I do say that it will not, unless it be made first-class in every respect. I notice that the 'Mail' newspaper has an editorial contrasting my position with that which I took on the transportation question in a speech I made on May the 26th last. I took the position then that water transportation was cheaper from the North-west to the seaboard than transportation by rail, under the then existing conditions. I take the same position to-day. If this road from Quebec to Winnipeg is to be a road with fifty feet or sixty feet grades, with light rails, and of inferior construction, if it is to be no better than the other railways with which it will have to compete, it will be distanced in the race; and to that extent I endorse the position which I took in my speech of May the 26th. I was then discussing water versus railway transportation in the then existing conditions.

As I said last night, this road from Winnipeg to Quebec, if it is to serve the purpose which it is intended to serve, must be a first class road. It must have not more than half per cent grades, and should have four-tenths per cent grades coming east, or twenty-one feet to the mile. It should be laid with 90-pound rails, should have bridges that would carry the heaviest rolling stock in use, with a margin to allow for an increase in the weight of rolling stock; it should have engines of 100 tons weight without the tender and cars of 50 tons capacity of cargo. The road must be built with bridges capable of sustaining the weight of cars with a carrying capacity 50 per cent greater than is now required and with corresponding increase in weight of engines. And with a road of that kind, considering prospective improvements in railway material, I feel hopeful that the route will be able to compete with the water route. There has been a constant, a regular increase in the efficiency of railway transportation. We have had the introduction of the fish-plate joint, making practically a continuous rail. We have had the introduction of the steel rail in place of the iron rail. We have had the increase in the weight of the rail. We have had the increase in the firmness of the road-bed. We have had a great increase in the weight and hauling capacity of engines, and an increase in the carrying capacity of cars from 10 tons to 50 tons. Trains are run on first-class roads with a capacity of hauling 2,000 tons of cargo to the train without requiring any greater force of engineers, firemen, brakemen and other attachés of the train than were required twenty years ago for trains that carried 250 or 300 tons. And this progress and improvement still goes on; the efficiency of railways will be still further increased. And with the kind of road that I foreshadow—not the kind of roads that exist now in competition with the water transportation—it is my belief that we can compete with the water route. I know of a road with a maximum grade of 19 feet to the mile running from Buffalo to Detroit through the province of Ontario. The only limit to the size of their trains on that road is the question of their management—whether they are too unwieldy to be managed or not; they do not like a train that is over half a mile long. They can haul upon that road sixty or seventy loaded freight cars with the utmost ease. Compare that with a road on which the engine is struggling up a grade of sixty or seventy feet to the mile with twelve or fifteen cars, and you can see the difference between a

first-class road and a second-class road. We want a road from Winnipeg to Quebec thoroughly first-class in its construction and equipment; a road that, in the ordinary way of business, can carry trains with 2,000 tons of freight. If we get that kind of a road, in my opinion we can transport wheat from Winnipeg to Quebec for less than 12 cents per bushel. Now, the rate to-day from Winnipeg to Port Arthur by the Canadian Pacific Railway is 7½ cents per bushel. And, at the rate I have given as a basis of transportation between Winnipeg and the lakes, the transportation on this line will be cheaper than the present transportation partly by water and partly by rail.

Mr. McCREARY. The rate from Winnipeg to Port Arthur is more than 7½ cents a bushel; it is 14 cents a hundred.

Mr. CHARLTON. They have lately reduced the rate. I was speaking with Sir Thomas Shaughnessy the other day, and he told me they had reduced the rate to 7½ cents per bushel. With the kind of road I am talking about, it is my opinion we can carry grain from Winnipeg to Quebec in competition with the partly water and the partly rail routes that pass to the south. And at this point I wish to impress upon the government the absolute necessity of securing the construction of a road of this kind. If because of difficulties of engineering, if because of enhanced cost of the road, we permit ourselves to construct a road with grades of 50 or 60 feet to the mile, we shall defeat our own purpose; we cannot do what we desire that this road should do —that is, compete with the other routes. But with a road of the kind I speak of, we can in all probability transport freight to Quebec successfully. And I say this in the face of the arguments I used on the 26th of May last, comparing water rates with the rates on the now existing roads from the west to the east.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Charlton's) argument is the exact reverse of what he said then.

Mr. CHARLTON. It will be evident that when I am dealing with new conditions, when I am dealing with a road entirely different from the class of road we have now, I am entitled to say that the results probably will be different. An argument based upon the old condition of things will not apply to the new conditions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Charlton's) estimate of the cost of a road of that character?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am coming to that, and——

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was arguing the abstract question of carriage by rail and carriage by water.

Mr. CHARLTON. It will be conducive, I think, to the object of this debate to allow me to proceed without interruption. If, when I get through, there is anything I have not touched upon, I shall be happy to deal with it. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the government comprehends the magnitude of this issue; for it is an issue of great magnitude; we have not been confronted with so great a one since the Canadian Pacific Railway debate. The government comprehends the magnitude of this issue and has conscientiously done its best. And I may be allowed to say to my hon. friends opposite that this is a question that affects the future of this great country, with its three millions of square miles of territory, with its enormous resources and potentialities and with its splendid future. We are considering the best means of subserving the interests of this country. This should not be a party question; there should not be objections raised for the mere purpose of making party capital; but we should get down to the consideration of this problem on business principles, and make up our minds on the basis of the evidence we have, and arrive, if we can, at a reasonable conclusion as to the probable outcome of this policy.

Now, the government has had in view in this matter a two-fold object, and it has not confined its attention to one or to the other. The first object is to provide an additional outlet for the grain of the North-west; the second object is to afford that outlet for the grain of the North-west in such a way as to direct the trade of that country to our own ports. These two objects the government have kept steadily in view in discussing, evolving and consummating the policy which it now places before the country. Now, we could have got over this question a great deal easier. There would have been no trouble about giving an outlet for the trade of the North-west with perhaps the expenditure of no money at all. We had only to allow these roads to reach Lake Superior. Perhaps we might have granted a little aid for that purpose. We had simply to allow the Jim Hill road and other American roads to come in without let or hindrance, without bonus or aid, and they would have furnished the North-west with an outlet and carried its grain to Duluth, Minneapolis, and Chicago, and so over American roads to the ocean. This would have been just as good an outlet as any other, so far as the mere interest of the farmer is concerned, but it would not have served a national purpose, it would have diverted the trade from our own ports and would have been a suicidal policy. The government have avoided such a policy. They have not counted a few millions as weighing against the fact that such a settlement of the transportation problem would have taken away from our own ports this great trade of to-

day, this trade which is to be so much greater in the future. So, due weight has been given to national considerations ; and when my hon. friends opposite belittle these considerations and make an effort to throw odium upon the government's policy and to show that what is claimed for this route cannot be accomplished. I do not think they are acting a patriotic part in the matter.

Now, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the physical features of the scheme. It designs to make Quebec the great seaport of the Dominion; that is the first great physical feature of this scheme. It will reach Quebec by a direct route from Winnipeg, it will reach the best harbour in the Dominion, or one of the best harbours; and the only drawback to it is that it is closed for some portion of the year. After having given Quebec a business that that port can transact during the season of open navigation, it is designed to carry that trade on during the winter to ports in the maritime provinces, to the port of Halifax, to the port of St. John. It proposes to give the very best conditions that are attainable for securing that object. It may be that it cannot be done, but we intend to attempt it, and to attempt it by using the best means in our power to accomplish the purpose. A first-class road from Winnipeg to Quebec and the maritime provinces for the purpose of securing the trade of the North-west for these ports—that is the object had in view by the government, that is the purpose they intend to attempt to attain ; and if our hon. friends on the opposite side wish to throw obstacles in the way of that purpose, why, I merely say that in that regard they are not patriotic.

Mr. BENNETT. From such a source.

Mr. CHARLTON. I remember, Mr. Speaker, some twenty-one years ago when the party that I belonged to at that time occupied very much the same attitude that my hon. friends opposite occupy to-day, belittling to some extent, casting aspersions upon, raising objections to, and magnifying the obstacles in the way of the construction of a transcontinental line. Well, some of our objections were well taken, but the general trend of our policy was not to our advantage. The country believed in a transcontinental line, and wanted it, and got it. We believe now that the country believes in another, and wants it, and is going to get it; and hon. gentlemen who stand in the way of consummation of that purpose will find that they have been poor politicians and still poorer statesmen.

The next physical feature of this road that I shall refer to is the fact that it opens up a vast unsettled area in Ontario and Quebec. It is a colonization road for 1,300 miles. It passes through our hinterland, opens it up, and while opening it up, goes over the best route for a direct line from Winnipeg to Quebec. This road passing through this hinterland, with a trunk branch running down the valley of the Nottawa river,—I presume some of my hearers have never heard of the Nottawa river, a stream about the size of the Ottawa, with what is supposed to be an extensive and fertile valley. This branch will go to a harbour upon James' bay, and will open up a vast section of country that will be tributary to this road. That is another physical feature. This road, through its connection with the extension of the Temiskaming road being built by the Ontario government will provide access to Ontario centres for all the country tributary to this Grand Trunk Pacific line. But this Temiskaming road will not serve as a line to divert traffic to other ports than the port of Quebec. The road will run from Winnipeg west largely through a new country, a vast unsettled region, a region supposed to contain the richest and most productive land in the North-west. It will open up a region from north of the Saskatchewan to Dunvegan on the Peace river ; and thence up the Peace River valley and through the Peace River pass to Port Simpson on the Pacific ocean. The road will cross the Rockies by easy grades. The summit of the Peace River pass, has an altitude about 1,800 feet above the sea. The construction of the mountain section, as it is termed, will be found to be much less expensive and much less difficult probably than is now anticipated. This western terminus will place the port that is its terminus much nearer to Asiatic ports in north China and Japan than any other port on the Pacific ocean. While the length of the road is somewhat greater than to Vancouver, the distance by the ocean to the ports named is very much less, and so this route will have important advantages in the overland and oriental trade over any other line. It will reach Quebec by easy grades, by a direct line, and in this respect will be superior to any other possible route from the west to that city. It will open up the great clay belt of this northern region, a clay belt that is supposed to contain sixteen million acres of arable land now lying unoccupied, not possible of being occupied, because it has no means of communication with the outer world. It will open up that clay belt, and it will open up all the timber resources, all the agricultural resources, and all the mineral resources of that great stretch of country, 1,400 miles in length from Quebec to Winnipeg.

Now, with regard to the route of this road, there were two propositions. The one proposition was to carry the road north of Lake Winnipeg. That was the route that would have been adopted by the Trans-Canada line. A good friend of mine in this House, whom I very highly esteem, thought that this line ought to have been adopted because it was 500 miles shorter than the other. Well, if there had been that differ-

ence in the distance it would have been a strong argument in favour of adopting that as the nearest route. To find the distances—but of course they are only approximative—I have calculated them by the map. I converted the geographical miles into statute miles, and made some allowance for deviation from the direct line in estimating the length, and the distances I obtained are as follows : By the Winnipeg route, from Quebec to Winnipeg, 1,380 miles; Winnipeg to Port Simpson, 1,650 miles; total, 3,030 miles. By the Nelson route, Quebec to River Nelson, 1,466 statute miles; from Nelson river to Port Simpson, 1,490 statute miles; total, from Quebec to Port Simpson, 2,956 miles. The difference of distance in favour of the northern route, north of Lake Winnipeg, is 75 miles. Now, I was surprised at this result myself. The two lines at their furthest points of divergence are three and a half degrees apart. But when you come to lay out, as I did, a sketch to ascertain the difference between the length of the hypothenuse and that of the base and the perpendicular of a triangle, it is less than one would naturally suppose. For instance, you lay out a line with a perpendicular of 400 miles and a base of 800 miles, and the hypothenuse is but a trifle more than one-fourth more than the length of the perpendicular line. So that showed this calculation was substantially correct.

Now, there is a reason why the Winnipeg route is preferable to the other. If there had been no such reason, the government would naturally have chosen the shorter line, even though the advantage to be gained was only 75 miles. But the Nelson route has less agricultural land upon it than the other. The distance is greater from Quebec to the River Nelson than it is from Quebec to Winnipeg, by about 70 miles. Then the unproductive country extends from the Nelson river west a long distance; while from Winnipeg, the productive country extends at least to the Peace River pass, and that is the reason for putting the road upon that line. Another reason is that at Quebec the road touches a point where all the business of the North-west converges, a great entrepot for the vast country west and north-west of it. It is so to-day, it will probably continue to be so, and a road reaching that point is in a position to compete for the business furnished by all these roads ramifying through the North-west in every direction, while if it had gone by the Nelson route it would have reached none of them, and could have competed for none of this business. For these reasons the choice of line by way of Winnipeg was a judicious choice.

I wish next, having dealt with physical aspects of this road, to call attention to its business prospects. We have dealt with the national question, with the necessity from a national standpoint of having a great transcontinental road upon our own soil, and it has been asserted by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and by others, that, leaving out this view of the case, this road has nothing to commend it to us from a commercial standpoint. Well, Sir, the business prospects of this road are, first, that it will furnish an outlet to the North Saskatchewan valley, an enormous extent of country and a fertile and rich region of the Canadian North-west. It will furnish an outlet to the Athabasca valley by means of the navigation of the river bringing its produces down to the point where the road crosses and up the river to that point. It will furnish an outlet to the Peace river valley. These regions are to be peopled in the near future by millions of people, these regions are to be the heart of the productive region of the Canadian North-west, these regions are to furnish an untold amount of business—business that this one line will be incapable of performing, and the building of this road, as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals very properly said at Vancouver, through this new and wilderness country is an act of statesmanship, of good policy, and it will open this region to settlement. When this road has been built to Fort Dunvegan on the Peace river, the natural corollary is to extend the line from that point to Dawson City, in the Yukon. The line would be perhaps a thousand miles long. I have not measured the exact distance ; it may be something less than that. It would cross the Hay river, it would follow the Liard river and traverse those fertile regions. Not 300 miles of the length of that road to Dawson would pass through a country incapable of settlement and cultivation, and if we had this road to Dawson we would have done away with this question of the bonding privilege from Skagway over the White Pass. We would have done away with this question of the trouble about the Alaskan boundary so far as reaching the Yukon from the Pacific is concerned. We would have reached through a direct route the very heart of that region, we would have its entire trade and we could afford to place little store upon the Alaskan boundary question when that point was reached. The road will open up, in addition, the regions I have named, to Northern British Columbia. Recent discoveries have been made upon the Skeena river of enormous deposits of coal, of hundreds of millions of tons of coal of superior quality. We are just scratching the surface of the country, we are just learning about its enormous resources. It is a country rich in minerals, rich in coal, rich in iron, rich in precious metals awaiting development, to be penetrated by a railway and to blossom into commercial life. The road will build up a great city at Port Simpson, a city that will command an enormous trade with the Orient, a city that will command, when the Panama canal is completed, an enormous trade with Europe in grain.

Grain from the Peace river valley, when the Panama canal is constructed, can be taken to Simpson by this road, can be shipped to Liverpool from Simpson and shipped at rates that will set at rest the transportation question for that rich country by affording them cheaper rates than can be obtained elsewhere. It will afford an outlet for the grain trade and for the flour trade which is sure to be developed from that great western country with China and Japan. This road will have a great lumber trade. That will be another item in its business prospects. It will have a lumber trade from the forests of British Columbia to the prairies of the West. It will have a lumber trade from the forests of the hinterland of Ontario and Quebec, which will be traversed for a length of 1,300 miles by this road. Wherever the road crosses a stream every tree standing upon that stream above the line of the railway will be tributary to the railway, and lumber from this section of the country, as I pointed out last night, can be transported to the prairies as cheaply as lumber is now transported from Vancouver, where there are two mountain ranges to climb, offering grades of from 120 feet to 200 feet to the mile. This road, when it is completed, will be called upon in all human probability to handle 100 million bushels of grain annually by its line west of Winnipeg. As I have said, it will be the exclusive outlet of the clay belt. By its branch down the Nottawa river, with a good harbour on James bay it will command the business of that great mare clausum of Canada, the Hudsons bay, thousands of square miles larger than the German ocean, a sea with untold resources in fish, with enormous resources in minerals upon its shores, and near whose shore Philadelphia companies have been locating iron mines for the last two years, and I would counsel the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to look closely into this question and see that these people do not obtain enormously valuable properties at a mere fraction of their value. This road would command the business of this great inland sea, with its valuable fisheries, and it would command the trade in minerals that are tributary to it and the Nottawa branch. It will bring back to Quebec—and I am sure this will interest you, Mr. Speaker—its palmy days. Once that was the seat of an empire in embryo. Its adventurous explorers reached the far west, planted fortifications and military and trading posts, in the rear of the English colonists, at Fort Duquesne, near Pittsburg, at Fort Kaskaskia, opposite St. Louis, at Mackinaw and various other points in the country, and projected an empire that was to be tributary to France, but by the struggle on the plains of Abraham that dream of empire was shattered. But, with this road Quebec will reach out to the future again, Quebec will reach out to the commerce of this vast region with its untold resources, and it will command the trade of that sea and become a queenly city.

This project will practically straighten the Intercolonial Railway. I have dwelt upon that subject already—a necessary step to be taken if we are to furnish the maritime ports in the winter with shipments of grain. I pointed out last night that vast expenditures that have been undertaken by all the principal American lines in betterments of their roads, in reduction of grades, in improvement of alignment, in laying with heavier rails, and in giving better equipment. These vast expenditures were absolutely necessary. The roads could not perform the functions that they were designed to do and desired to do without these expenditures. If one road made these expenditures every rival road had to follow suit, and the result is that the capacity of these roads has been quadrupled by the expenditure of money made in the way I have mentioned. The same necessity rests upon us in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. It was built upon a wrong route, and it is not first-class in the matter of its grades. The straightening of the road, and the improvement of its grades will vastly increase its efficiency and will render it possible to give to the maritime ports a trade which, without this improvement of the line, could not be secured. If we seek to divert trade to the maritime provinces we must have the best tools, the best appliances. We cannot do it with an antiquated system and with an inferior and second-class road. This road will develop an extensive and valuable section of the country in Quebec and New Brunswick.

Another consideration, and a consideration of no mean importance, is, that it will remove the dread of the abrogation of the bonding privilege. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals scouted the idea that there was any danger of such a thing being done. He told us: The Americans will never dream of adopting a course that would result to their own disadvantage; never would think of depriving themselves of the trade that now flows to their own seaports. Well, Sir, I do not know. The Americans have threatened to do this. Their President had power placed in his hands a few years ago to do it by his own proclamation without reference to congress, without being governed by anything except his own supreme will in the matter. It is a dangerous position for us to be in. We have had friction in our relations with the United States. They are pleasant and agreeable now because we are the spoiled child, and we stand spoiling all right. But the day may come, Sir, when friction may exist again. Our trade relations have got to be readjusted; we must have from the United States fairer trade conditions or we must apply to the United States the treatment that they apply to us. If we get fairer trade conditions it is all right, and there will be very little

danger of the abrogation of the bonding privilege; if we enter on the other line of policy, I would not guarantee that there would not be friction, I would not guarantee that there would not be talk of abrogating what the Americans call a privilege, and I would not be surprised if it were abrogated. And in any event, self respect, care for our own interests, respect for our standing as a country, imperatively demand that if we can place ourselves in a position where such a calamity cannot be visited on our heads, it is our duty to do so, and the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific line will do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to enter upon a consideration of the financial basis of this scheme. We have government construction from Moncton to Winnipeg. From Moncton to Chaudière Junction according to the best data that can be obtained, would be a distance by the new line of 378 miles, and by the present line it is 488 miles. The saving in the distance would be 110 miles. Estimates have been made of a saving of distance of from 120 to 140 miles, and I take this estimate of 110 miles saving, as being a moderate and reasonable one. Then we have from Chaudière to Winnipeg a distance by air line of 1,380 miles. I add to the air line distance, for deviations, slight deviations going north of Lake Nipigon and so forth, an increase of four per cent, which I believe is sufficient, and this would make the line from Quebec to Moncton 1,435 miles, and the line from Moncton to Winnipeg 1,823 miles. Now, these are approximate estimates. I arrive at them by careful measurement of the map, by ascertaining the number of geographical miles, by turning these into statute miles, by taking 69 miles and 900 feet and making that the width of each degree instead of 60 geographical miles. Now, the cost of this 1,823 miles—and we must bear in mind that this cost does not include the equipment—I estimate the cost of these 1,823 miles at $30,000 a mile. I think that estimate is not too high; I presume it is not too high for that section of the road, from Moncton to Chaudière Junction, but I believe it is too high for the stretch of road through that level country most of the way from Quebec to Winnipeg. But we will allow $30,000 a mile as the cost of a road 1,823 miles in length, or a total of $54,690,000.

Then we guarantee the mountain section and we are to pay interest upon that as well as upon the line from Moncton to Winnipeg. We guarantee the mountain section for not more than $30,000 per mile; the guarantee to be three-fourths of the cost of the line. That I believe is too high. I do not believe the line will cost $40,000 a mile through the Peace River pass and from that point to Fort Simpson, and I estimate the length of that mountain section at 450 miles. This would be a guarantee of $13,500,000. The total cost of the road, and guarantee of the mountain section which rests upon the same basis as the cost of the road so far as the payment of interest for seven years is concerned, would amount to $68,190,000. If we pay upon that sum three per cent interest for seven years that would amount to $14,319,000. Now, I have no doubt that the calculation of $13,000,000 by my right hon. friend the Premier is much nearer correct. I believe I have allowed sums in excess of what would be the actual cost of the mountain section and the actual cost of that stretch of 1,435 miles from Quebec to Winnipeg, but on the basis of this estimate we will pay $14,319,000. This will be equivalent to a bonus. Now, it was represented by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and no doubt it will be represented again, the total cost of the eastern section represents an actual increase of our debt, that the burden that the country assumes is measured by this amount, that that burden is $68,190,000. It is nothing of the kind. After the payment of $14,319,000 we lease this road to a responsible company, we lease this road under guarantees and conditions highly advantageous to ourselves, we lease this road with a reversion of title and ownership in 50 years. We lease this road upon conditions that pay the interest on this sum year after year, and we hold ample security for it. We hold the rolling stock, we hold on the western division their own investments in the road in addition to our guarantee. All these we hold, and to assert that this is in addition to our debt, an increase of the burdens that rest upon the country is absurd. It is not honest; it is not a truthful honest presentation of the case.

Now, with regard to the western division from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, 1,651 miles in the air line, I estimate an increase in length of five per cent. Perhaps that is somewhat too little, but it will make the line in statute miles 1,733 miles. The government guarantees the mountain section. I assume that that mountain section will not exceed 450 miles in length. I do not believe that road will cost $40,000 a mile judging by the character of the country, but the guarantee at $30,000 a mile amounts to $13,500,000. Then there will remain 1,283 miles upon which the guarantee will be $13,000 a mile. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals assumed that the road would cost the sum that this guarantee represents only. It is estimated that the road will cost between $17,000 and $18,000 a mile on the prairie section, and the government guarantee upon that will be $13,000 a mile. The mountain section will cost $40,000 per mile, and the government guarantee on that portion will be $30,000 per mile. This amounts to a guarantee of $13,500,000 for the mountain section and $16,679,000 for the

prairie section, a total of $30,179,000 of government guarantee applied to the entire line from Winnipeg to Port Simpson. If this estimate of cost is correct, the company's expenditure on this portion of the road will be $10,059,000, in addition to which they have to put on it $15,000,000 worth of rolling stock. So that the expenditure by the Grand Trunk Pacific of one-fourth the cost, and $15,000,000 on rolling stock, in addition to the guarantee by the government, will represent a value of $55,238,000 which we will hold as absolute security for our guarantee of $30,179,000. Is there anything reckless or prodigal or unbusinesslike in this arrangement? Why, the more I consider this agreement, the more I analyze its conditions, the better satisfied I am with the bargain. I would suggest that my hon. friends opposite also make a careful study of it, and see if that will not bring them to the same conclusion. The Grand Trunk Pacific leases this road from Moncton to Winnipeg for fifty years, and provides equipment for this eastern division to the value of $5,000,000. We hold the road, the equipment, and whatever betterments the company may place upon it as security under the lease; and at the expiration of fifty years the road comes back to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a bargain that could have been made, with any prospect of its being carried out, in no other way and with no other company in Canada than the one with which it has been made. No private company could take this agreement just as it stands to-day and finance this undertaking. No private company could raise on its second mortgage bonds the balance of the cost of the prairie section, over the amount guaranteed by the government. No private company could provide this road with $20,000,000 of rolling stock. It required the credit of the Grand Trunk Company of Canada, standing behind the Grand Trunk Pacific, to consummate this bargain. It could have been done, in no other way. We have the entire strength, resources and character of the Grand Trunk Company of Canada behind the Grand Trunk Pacific; the two are united together—a fortunate concurrence of circumstances, a rare opportunity which the government have had the wisdom to seize upon; and by seizing upon it they have secured the construction of a transcontinental line upon terms that are, to say the least, surprisingly favourable. The Grand Trunk Company has greater resources and appliances than any other company in Canada—perhaps greater than any other company in America. The Grand Trunk Company is associated with this new company, is in partnership with it, is interested in its success, and will carry it to a successful conclusion.

As I said before, the road reverts to the government at the expiration of fifty years. What will it probably be worth then? How many people will be in Canada fifty years from now? What amount of business will be done by this road then? There is a very carefully drawn provision here with regard to betterments and the keeping of the road up to a certain standard. The government have a right to compel this company to keep the road up to the highest standard that exists at any time. If improvements are made in railways, this road must be made to correspond with the character of those improvements. The keeping up of the road is an absolute condition of the contract. When this road reverts to the government at the expiration of fifty years, is it an extravagant calculation to suppose that it will be worth twice its original cost to the government? It is not. There is something marvellous about the increased value of railroads. Take the New York Central. It fell into the hands of Cornelius Vanderbilt about the year 1860. That road's stock was watered, and watered, and watered again, until every dollar of that stock to-day represents a cost of 25 cents; and yet the great volume of watered stock goes on paying dividends of 6 per cent per annum, due simply to increased value from increase of business. The same conditions apply to all the principal railroads. They will apply to this road. This road will inevitably increase in value. I think it is a very moderate calculation to suppose that this road, at the time it reverts to the government, will be worth twice its original cost. The agreement provides that if the government do not then choose to assume the road and run it themselves, the Grand Trunk Pacific Company shall have the right to lease it if it offers as good conditions as the government can secure elsewhere. Well, do you suppose that that road will be leased a second time at 3 per cent on its original cost—a road that will be worth twice what it cost? Is it unreasonable to suppose that the road will then become a great source of revenue to the government? It is a moderate calculation to suppose that while the government will continue to carry its bonds at 3 per cent, the company on the second lease will pay at least 6 per cent on the original cost. I do not know but that is a better arrangement than to rush into a scheme of government construction of railroads. At all events, it is an arrangement which will certainly enable the government to establish an efficient railroad from ocean to ocean, and leave that road under the absolute control of the government in every essential respect.

Now, I wish to refer to the matter of the management and practical basis of this scheme. The Canadian Pacific Railway distance from Montreal to Winnipeg, is 1,424 miles. The length of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Quebec to Winnipeg, if my calculations are correct, will be 1,435 miles, eleven miles longer from Quebec to Winnipeg than the distance on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Winnipeg; and I doubt if, when the surveys are

made, the difference will be as much in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The length of the entire road is considerably greater than that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that increased length is all but eleven miles of it west of Winnipeg, and it is a consideration that does not matter much, for every mile of it is developing a rich country, which will afford business to the line.

The government retains running powers on the road, or the right to give running powers over the entire line—over the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, and over the line from Winnipeg to Port Simpson or to Bute Inlet, whichever may be the terminus. The eastern division, from Winnipeg, is made a great artery as an outlet from the west, connecting with every road which comes from the west into Winnipeg; and, if it carries grain as cheaply to Quebec as it can be carried to Boston or Portland, it will divert to Quebec and the maritime ports all the traffic it can possibly handle. Was there any wisdom in the government retaining this right, and making these provisions for joint use and joint running powers? Certainly there was, and the question is, can this right be secured on reasonable terms for other companies? I answer, beyond question it can.

The criticisms made by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals with regard to this matter betrayed an utter ignorance on his part of the conditions surrounding this question. As I said last night, the gauges of the roads in the United States have been made uniform for the purpose of exchange of freight and avoiding the breaking of bulk when one road connects with another. No bulk is broken now. Cars go from where they were billed to their destination over one or two or a dozen roads, and arrangements are made for the division of freight on the basis of mileage. And if a railway does not return the cars it has borrowed promptly, it must pay a certain rate per day for the use of those cars. The whole business is carefully systematized; and even where there is no special arrangement, if one road runs its cars over another, there is no trouble in ascertaining what it should pay. Traffic is carefully exchanged and the flux and flow of business goes on from ocean to ocean over all railway lines on a well recognized system. If the Northern Central or the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other line wishes to send its cars through to Quebec to be hauled by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, it is the simplest thing in the world to make a division of the freight; and if there should be any disagreement, the government can step in as an arbitrator and decide the dispute on a fair and equitable basis. But if these roads desire to make use of this line practically as part of their own lines, there will be no difficulty. We know that by practice already. I pass over a road almost every week which is used by two lines a distance of 229 miles. There is one division from St. Thomas to Detroit 110 miles and another division from St. Thomas to Buffalo 119 miles long. Each of the lines which uses this road has its own roundhouses, its own appliances, its own engines, and runs its own trains, and there is no friction between them. Their system of train despatching is arranged in the easiest manner. Passenger trains take precedence over freight trains, and stock freight takes precedence of ordinary freight. The whole business is conducted with the utmost system and works with the utmost regularity and without friction. If you can run a road where there are two divisions, you can run a road where there are three or four or a dozen divisions. The same system applies to many as it does to a few. The running of pullman cars and passenger cars is reduced to a system on all roads. A pullman starts from New York or Boston and goes to San Francisco, and it makes no difference whether it goes over two roads or half a dozen. The system is perfectly adjusted to the satisfaction of all the roads, and everything goes on smoothly. The same system can be introduced here, and it is absurd to say that it cannot. We have this further assurance in our own case, that while in the United States all these matters are subject to mutual arrangement, so that any road may defeat the working of the system by being too grasping or exacting, here we will have an umpire, the government itself, which can compel the faithful and equitable carrying out of the provision laid down in section 24.

This company, as an assurance of good faith, deposits the sum of $5,000,000 with the government, and that money is to remain in the hands of the government until the company has fulfilled its obligations. But if the company are within $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 of the completion of the work, then the government may allow the company to use the $5,000,000 deposit to complete the work. But the government holds this $5,000,000 in hard cash or convertible securities in addition to all these other conditions. The government controls the rates on this road and it has the right to audit the accounts at any time. At any time it may send its accountant to see whether the accounts of the company are properly kept, whether there is any stuffing of accounts and pay-rolls. It can ascertain exactly what the road is doing, what its earnings are, what its dividends should be, whether its rates can be reduced without injustice with the company. Contrast that with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which we cannot interfere with at all until its dividends are 10 per cent. Then this company is liable to taxation and the Canadian Pacific Railway is not. This company has neither land grants nor cash subsidy, unless

you can call the seven years interest on the guarantee on the cost of the mountain section a subsidy. Contrast this with the first proposal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway itself. That company came down to the government with a proposition to build a line from North Bay. It wanted a subsidy of $6,400 and 5,000 acres of land a mile, equivalent in value to at least $15,000. Contrast the present bargain with that demand. I believe that the government have pressed the Grand Trunk Railway to the last point. I believe Mr. Hay was ready to throw up the sponge, if one single concession further had been demanded. I am, I think, in a position to know that the government got the very last concession possible from the managers of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; and that it has got a good bargain the future will prove, whether it be admitted now or not.

I give great credit to the government for having refused the land grant and still greater credit for having made that its uniform policy. The government deserves well of the country to a greater degree perhaps in this respect than in any other. Contrast this with the policy of the late government. That government made land grants to railways to the amount of 57,087,000 acres—an empire thrown away recklessly. It threw away our heritage recklessly, with no apparent idea of the ultimate value of that land. It gave away our lands as freely as you would stones from a brook, and of this amount of 57,087,000 acres, 29,986,000 have been earned and have passed out of the hands of the country. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have been able to make a $12,000,000 sale of land, I understand.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that include the Yukon River Railway ?

Mr. CHARLTON. No. The railway is somewhat south of the Yukon. Our hon. friends opposite may claim all the credit they can extract from that policy. It has been a most wasteful one and I trust that the Liberal government will add the brilliancy of its record in this respect by continuing to enforce the old principle, which we advocated when we were in opposition, of the land for the settler and the settler for the land.

With regard to the question of subsidies, I do not know that I would take the position taken by many persons in Ontario. Subsidies, reasonably granted, are a proper thing. Railroads may be subsidized and their construction secured that could not otherwise be had, railroads that would be of great benefit to the country. And here again with regard to their system of subsidizing railroads, the government has adopted a principle which redounds greatly to their credit. They have adopted the principle that a railroad which is subsidized must carry the mails free, and, I believe, they must provide a mail car and a mail clerk—the Postmaster General will correct me if I am wrong—they must carry military forces free, in fact, they must perform all government services free to the extent of three per cent interest upon the amount of subsidy granted. Under these conditions, and with these provisions, I believe that subsidies granted within the limit of reason, granted to meritorious enterprises, and in moderate amount may be reasonably granted, nowithstanding the outcry that has been raised.

Mr. MONK. Are there any of these conditions in this contract ?

Mr. CHARLTON. There is no subsidy in this contract. Now, Sir, I desire to refer to the wise provisions in the public interest contained in this agreement. Great care has been taken in this respect. We have not a Minister of Railways and Canals with carte blanche in the construction of a transcontinental line. This would be a very pleasant position, no doubt, for a public official to occupy ; but in the construction of the eastern section, we have a joint supervision provided for on the part of the company and on the part of the government. The company is interested in having the road constructed as cheaply as possible, as it has to pay three per cent interest on the cost. It has joint supervision with the government in the letting of contracts and the construction of the line. This provision will secure—perhaps such a provision would be unnecessary with a government like this—economy of construction to the utmost attainable extent. Then, we have a provision in the public interest that the standard of the road, west of Winnipeg shall be equal to the standard of the Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal. That is a much higher standard than that of any road that the west now possess.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. The Mackenzie & Mann road is laid with 60 pound rails. The Grand Trunk between Toronto and Montreal is laid with 80 pound rails, and in some sections 90 pound rails. It is a first-class road, with the best bridges and with low grades. And, if this provision in the contract is complied with and the Grand Trunk builds a road in the west that shall not be inferior to the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto, it will build a road thirty or forty per cent better than any road now in that western country. Compare these conditions with those that were imposed on the Canadian Pacific Railway when it was built. That company was under obligation to build a road equal to the standard of the Union Pacific when it was first constructed— a road whose rails were laid on cottonwood ties two feet apart, ballasted with frozen dirt in the winter, and with grades as high as 90, or even 100 feet

to the mile. There are other important conditions in this contract. We have a provision in section 16 that the government may improve the eastern section. So, if this road is not kept in condition to answer the purposes of the government, in a condition to secure the trade for the maritime ports and Quebec, the government may step in and put the road in condition necessary for this purpose, and charge the cost to the company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, no.

Mr. CLANCY. The interest.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, to the company. It is capitalized at the cost of the company. The government is adopting provisions with regard to the eastern section, stringent provisions, that insure against the deterioration of the line, that insure its maintenance at the same standard of efficiency as the rest of the road. Then there is the provision I have already referred to with regard to the hauling rights, made in the interest of the shipper of the west and of the whole country, that will be vastly beneficial to the transportation interest of Canada. The government has a mortgage that covers the road-bed and the rolling stock and is ample security for all its advances by way of guarantee. Then there is a clause providing for the purchase of Canadian material. My hon. friends on the other side may say that this does not amount to anything, because the company is not obliged to purchase Canadian materials, unless it can get them advantageously as other materials. But I think this clause secures to us an important advantage. The time will come, and come very soon, unless we get advantageous trade conditions from the United States, when we shall have duties high enough to assure the purchase of materials in Canada ; and this condition that the company shall purchase its materials in Canada will prove a great boon to the manufacturing interest of this country. Then, the government has control of rates, which I have already alluded to. It has provision for continuous and efficient operation of the road, and it has that condition secured by a provision in the agreement which says that when the lease is drawn the government shall have plenary powers and powers of imposing penalties in the event of this condition not being complied with. This agreement provides that the rates on export trade shall be no greater to Canadian ports than to American ports. The road must absolutely place Canadian seaports on the same basis with regard to advantage as it places other seaports. It was said last night that that company could evade this provision by sending its agents to the west to secure freight routed to American ports. If it did this, it would violate clause 43, which provides that there shall be no discrimination on the part of a railway company in favour of American routes. Then there is a condition that the company shall provide ample shipping accommodation at Port Simpson, Quebec, Halifax, St. John or any other ocean port that its business reaches. The attempt was made last night to convey the impression that of the $45,000,000 of stock which this company is to issue, $25,000,000 was to be treated in some way so that the manipulators of this contract could put it in their own pockets—confiscate it. Why, the $20,000,000 of preferred stock is to secure $20,000,000 of rolling stock for the road. That is the purpose to which it will be devoted. The $25,000,000 of common stock is to be laid aside and put upon the market for the purpose of constructing elevators and other shipping facilities at the end of the route that the government stipulates that it shall furnish and other such purposes. So that we have in this contract ample security for all the stipulations that the agreement contains.

Now, to sum up the matter : Under this arrangement we are about to secure a transcontinental line. We have granted no land for it. We pay interest for seven years on the cost of the eastern section, and upon the guaranteed portion of the mountain section not exceeding $14,500,000. And, at the expiration of fifty years, when the value of this property will be greatly enhanced, it comes back into our possession. That, broadly speaking is the outline of this arrangement. I wish to contrast this bargain with the first bargain for a transcontinental road made in this country. I think there will be food for reflection in this contrast; and while doing this, I wish distinctly to disclaim that I have any reflections to make upon the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I admire the courage, the grasp, the energy, the push that characterized that movement from the outset. I criticise, not the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate, but the government of the day. In 1886 I had a letter from the now Lord Mount Stephen, complimenting me, thanking me, for a speech I made in that year attacking the policy of the government and showing what vast franchises the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had obtained, what an enormous bargain they had from the government. This letter complimented me for having tried to act justly, and I was informed that it had been used quite efficiently in promoting the credit of the company. So I say now, that while I point out the recklessness of the government of that day, I utterly disclaim any intention of casting reflections upon the people that took the government in.

When that contract was made with the syndicate in 1881, it provided for the construction of a line from Calender to Port Moody. Of that line, certain portions were to be built by the government. The Lake Superior section from Lake Superior to Selkirk, 405 miles in length; the western section from Port Moody to Kamloops, up

through the canyons of the Thompson and the Fraser, 238 miles in length, a total of 643 miles that the government was to build and hand over free of cost or charge to the syndicate. The balance of the road was to be built by the syndicate. It was 1,906 miles long. Now, whatever subsidies, whatever grants of land, whatever gifts of completed railway the syndicate received were applicable to the construction of that 1,906 miles of road only. Let us see what they got. They got a cash bonus of $25,000,000; they got the 643 miles of completed road which cost, with the surveys, in round numbers, $35,000,000; they got 25,000,000 acres of land, worth at the least calculation $3 an acre, or $75,000,000. Their cash subsidy therefore for the 1,906 miles of road amounted to $13,100 a mile; their subsidy from the gift from the government of 643 miles, which had cost $35,000,000, amounted to $18,300 a mile; their subsidy from the 25,000,000 acres of land, worth $75,000,000 as the outcome proves, amounted to $38,300 a mile. So the syndicate, for the construction of 1,906 miles, the portion that was constructed by it between Calender and Port Moody, received in cash, in road completed and handed over, and in lands estimated to be worth $3 an acre, a total subsidy of $69,700 a mile. Now, I hope my hon. friends on the opposite side will make a note of that. That was a pretty reasonable subsidy—$13,100 a mile in cash, $18,500 a mile in the value of the road the government built for them, and handed over, and $38,300 in land worth $3 an acre.

Mr. McCREARY. What about the taxes ?

Mr. CHARLTON. We will come to that later on.

Mr. COWAN. Still there's more to follow.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, compare that with this scheme that our friends are denouncing to-day. Here is a scheme that will cost us, in interest in lieu of subsidy, $14,500,000, or $4,060 per mile for the entire line, against $69,700 per mile for 1,906 miles. Does not the contrast startle my friends ? And can they, in view of their own record, rise in this House and condemn this moderate, judicious scheme, conceived in the interest of the people, and to be carried forward to its consummation at such a slight cost ?

Now, let us have a summary of these subsidies : Cash bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway on 1,906 miles, $25,000,000; cost of road and surveys handed over to the company, $35,000,000; total value of 25,000,000 acres of land—and I may say here that part of that land was bought back at $1.50 an acre, $10,000,000 worth, but the average of the whole may be computed at least at $3 an acre—25,000,000 acres of land at $3 an acre, would be worth $75,000,000; total subsidies applicable to the 1,906 miles built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, $135,000,000. Contrast that with this scheme that is going to be denounced as extravagant and reckless. Aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific by way of interest, say $14,500,000; balance in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway, $120,500,000. The statement seems incredible, but it is a cold hard fact, and I thought perhaps it would be well just to remind our friends opposite of what they have done in the past as an incentive to them to denounce what we are doing in future, granting about one-seventeenth as much to this line per mile as the Canadian Pacific Railway received from them.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, at the hour of recess I had just completed a comparative statement of the aids granted by the government to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to the scheme at present under consideration. I had given the value of the investment of the government in the roads that were handed over to this company, the amount of the cash bonus, and the value of land grant of 25,000,000 acres. It may be argued in regard to the land grant that its value was created by the construction of the road, and that we are not entitled to count this as being in the shape of a bonus in regard to the aids rendered in this line. Leaving that question aside, I may say in this connection, at least, that we grant no land bonus to the present scheme and that the increase in the value of the land consequent upon the construction of the land will be ensured to ourselves as a government and to the country and not to a railway corporation.

I shall now enter into other conditions of contrast between these two schemes as relates to the government's position in the respective cases, and the first one I will refer to, Sir, will be the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway from taxation. That exemption is contained in section 16 of the agreement of the company, and is as follows :

> The Canadian Pacific Railway, and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein.

That exemption, of course, is perpetual. I need not point out that no such condition applies to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme. There is no exemption of its property in this case, and whatever conditions a railway corporation may be liable to under the authority of the Dominion, or of provinces that corporation will be liable to. Then, the next provision that I would refer to in this contrast of conditions is the exemption of the land grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway from taxation, which

exemption is also contained in section 16, and is as follows :

And the lands of the company, in the North-west Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

These lands were granted more than 20 years ago, no taxes have yet been paid, and the lands still are practically exempt from taxation.

The next condition and contrast that I would refer to is the transportation monopoly granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway covering the entire North-west Territories. The clause granting that monopoly is No. 15 of the agreement or contract, and is as follows :

For twenty years from the date hereof, no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from any point at or near the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such line as shall run south-west or to the westward and south-west ; nor to within fifteen miles of latitude 49. And in the establishment of any new province in the North-west Territories, provision shall be made for continuing such prohibition after such establishment until the expiration of the said period.

Here was a condition which gave the Canadian Pacific Railway an absolute monopoly of transportation in the entire North-west Territories. No line was to be built from the south of that road to within 15 miles of the American boundary line, no connection with any American road was possible under the provisions of this section. The Canadian Pacific Railway, by this provision of its agreement, enjoyed an absolute transportation monopoly in the North-west. Contrast that provision with the provision of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme and we find that no such monopoly is given, that no special privileges are given in regard to transportation, but that this road has to enter into full and free competition with all other lines without any intervention on the part of any government to aid it in any way in securing business.

The next point of difference is in regard to the admission of material for the construction of the road contained in section 10 of this Act. By this provision it was agreed that the government :

Shall also permit the admission free of duty, of all steel rails, fish plates and other fastenings, spikes, bolts and nuts, wire, timber and all material for bridges, to be used in the original construction of the railway, and of a telegraph line in connection therewith, and all telegraph apparatus required for the first equipment of such telegraph line ; and will convey to the company, at cost price, with interest, all rails and fastenings bought in or since the year 1879, and other materials for construction in the possession of or purchased by the government, at a valuation,—such rails, fastenings and materials not being required by it for the construction of the said Lake Superior and western sections.

Well, Sir, this exemption of material from duty was held later on to apply to the material used in the renewal of bridges years and years after the Canadian Pacific Railway had been constructed. The Grand Trunk Pacific has no such privileges, has no such exemption from the payment of duties ; it must pay duties upon all the materials it imports. That is another contrast between the conditions applicable to the roads.

Then the Canadian Pacific Railway was required to put up a deposit by way or security of $1,000,000. The Grand Trunk Pacific is required to put up a deposit by way of security of $5,000,000—five times as much as that required from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Then, the Canadian Pacific Railway could not be touched in reference to the adjustment or handling of its freight rates until it was paying a dividend of 10 per cent. No interference on the part of the government could be made with the affairs of the company until it was paying a dividend of 10 per cent. That was provided in section 18 of this Act. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is liable to the intervention of the government in the regulation of its rates at any time at the pleasure and upon the judgment of the government without any reference to the maximum rate of dividends it may be earning.

Then, the Canadian Pacific Railway had three-quarters of the cost of the rails that it imported advanced by the government. This provision is contained in subsection (c) of section 9 of this Act, and it is as follows :

If at any time the company shall cause to be delivered on or near the line of the said railway, at a place satisfactory to the government, steel rails and fastenings to be used in the construction of the railway, but in advance of the requirements for such construction, the government, on the requisition of the company, shall, upon such terms and conditions as shall be determined by the government, advance thereon three-fourths of the value thereof at the place of delivery.

There is no such condition in reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific. All these conditions were peculiar in their application to the Canadian Pacific Railway—exemption from taxation, monopoly of transportation, exemption from duties, advances on the cost of rails, all these are special conditions granted to this company in addition to the enormous subventions I have referred to were peculiar to its case, and not applicable to the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Then, we have another contrast of the conditions between the two roads. When the government had paid this $25,000,000 in money, when it had handed over roads costing $35,000,000, and when it had given these 25,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of aiding in the construction of 1,906 miles of road, the control of the government ceased. The road may at any time

pass beyond the control of the government altogether. It may pass into the hands of foreign owners. It may be gathered in by a Morgan syndicate. There is nothing to ensure to this country the possession of the road as a Canadian highway. It may be secured by foreign companies at any time and there is no guarantee to prevent such a consummation. Such is not the case with the Grand Trunk Pacific. The control of the government over the Grand Trunk Pacific is continuous. The Grand Trunk Pacific is bound to remain a Canadian road. It can never be made anything else. It must continue under Canadian control and we ensure to ourselves the control of one transcontinental line at least, which is our line, controlled by ourselves, and which can never pass from our possession. Then, the Canadian Pacific Railway gave no running rights to anybody over any portions of its line—the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway must share its line from ocean to ocean at the dictation of the government, and under the direction of the government with other lines.

I repeat that in all this, no odium attaches to the Canadian Pacific Railway officials. They simply made the best bargain with the government they could. They made a good bargain, they displayed their astuteness in doing it. They have created a property of enormous value; it is the grandest railway speculation that was ever entered into; it is the most brilliant of successes in the railway history of the world. The Canadian Pacific Railway magnates, if I may term them so, the Canadian Pacific Railway managers, were not to blame; the odium, if any, attaches to the government that granted these conditions and failed to safeguard the interests of the people in granting them.

Of course, at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate bargain went through, the conditions were different from what they are to-day. The North-west was then largely a wilderness; the success of a transcontinental road was problematical, and it was useless to suppose that we could then secure terms as favourable as we can to-day when that country is better known, and after the fact has been demonstrated that a transcontinental line can secure business, and business adequate to the payment of dividends upon the cost of construction. Still, it was quite evident at that time, and it was maintained by the then opposition, that the terms which were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway were extravagant. It was pointed out then that we were practically building a road for the Canadian Pacific Railway and handing it over to them, and more than that, in point of fact that we might as well build the road ourselves and own it, and then sell it if necessary. The Mackenzie scheme was to build a road from Lake Superior to Selkirk on the Red river. They had that road nearly completed when this contract was made. They were proceeding to extend that road to the Yellow Head pass and 100 miles were under construction; they were building a branch line from Selkirk to Pembina to connect with the American lines. We held, in discussing the terms of this contract, that if the Mackenzie road were pushed vigorously to Yellow Head pass we would then be in a position to secure the construction of the entire line, and be able to pass over to the company as a bonus the portion of the road constructed. No doubt this could have been done. If it had been done the cost to the country would not have been one-third what it proved to be under the scheme that was adopted by the Conservative government.

Now, these are contrasts between the policies of the two governments with reference to a transcontinental line, contrasts as to the difference that exists between the subvention granted in the one case and in the other. In the one case $135,000,000, counting the land at less than its market value to-day—in the other case, $14,500,000 in round numbers; the excess in favour of the promoters of the Canadian Pacific Railway being $120,500,000.

Now, it was not necessary to have granted these conditions to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was not necessary for the reason that we received a better offer. We received an offer at the time this contract was under consideration to build this road for 3,000,000 acres of land less, for $3,000,000 less subsidy, the road to be the standard of the Union Pacific as it then existed, instead of the standard of the Union Pacific as at first constructed, and the difference was very great. That offer asked no exemption from taxation; that offer asked no exemption from duty on materials; that offer left the road subject to the government control of its rates; that offer left the road subject to the purchase by the government on conditions favourable to the government. All these conditions in the second offer made it infinitely better for the country than the first offer.

Mr. CLANCY. That was a bluff offer made by the hon. gentleman's friends at the last moment.

Mr. CHARLTON. This bogus offer from a bogus syndicate was accompanied by a cash deposit of $1,395,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was $395,000 more than was required of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the best way to have demonstrated that this was a bogus offer was to have accepted it and swiped in the money if it was bogus.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who made this offer?—W. P. Howland, of Toronto; A. R.

McMaster, of Toronto ; H. H. Cook, of Toronto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, a gentleman of wealth and enterprise.

An hon. MEMBER. All Liberals.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, I am thankful to say they were—James McLaren, of Ottawa, a millionaire; William Hendrie, of Hamilton; John Stuart, of Hamilton; John Walker, of London; D. MacFie, of London; K. Chisholm, of Brampton; John Proctor, of Hamilton; P. S. Stevenson, of Montreal; A. T. Wood, of Hamilton; A. W. Ross, of Winnipeg; George A. Cox, of Peterborough.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. A gentleman of wealth, a gentleman able to subvent his undertakings to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars at any moment—P. Howland, Toronto; P. Larkin, St. Catharines; Allan Gilmour, of Ottawa, a millionaire lumberman; John Carruthers, of Kingston; W. D. Lovitt, of Yarmouth; Alexander Gibson, of Fredericton, a millionaire lumberman of New Brunswick; Barnet & McKay, of Renfrew. There were at least five names upon this list of gentlemen who were millionaires. This list of names could have furnished all the security and all the money that was necessary to carry through this project successfully with the aid they asked from the government. As an evidence of good faith they put up $500,000 in the Bank of Ottawa, $500,000 in the Bank of Commerce, and $395,000 in other banks. They put up that money as evidence of good faith, and they put up $395,000 more than the amount required by the government from the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate. And yet, some gentlemen tell us that this was a bogus offer. Well, there is no other way to exonerate themselves from the odium that ought to attach to them for having refused this offer, except to put in that threadbare plea.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the character of this second syndicate, how would it compare with that of the first syndicate. Let us see who were the signers of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway. There was Charles Tupper——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was he a very heavy millionaire at the time ? I suppose he could pay his debts; I do not know how much more he would have had then. There was George Stephen; George Stephen was probably a man of considerable means, connected with the Bank of Montreal. There was Duncan McIntyre; he was a millionaire afterwards, he was not a millionaire at this time; there was J. S. Kennedy, R. B. Angus, J. J. Hill (per pro George Stephen), Morton, Rose & Co., and Kohn, Reinach & Co. The second offer was made by a number of gentlemen all of whom were Canadians. Here we have in this first offer : Mr. Hill, an American.

Mr. HENDERSON. A Canadian.

Mr. CHARLTON. He lives at St. Paul—Morton, Rose & Co., English bankers; Kohn & Reinach, Paris bankers. This second offer was signed by men of greater weight, men of greater responsibility, men who were Canadians. In addition to the other things I have enumerated, that offer would have put this road under Canadian control, it stated that the directors should be British subjects, and it provided to secure the country in every respect with regard to the management of the road. Their offer was millions and millions of dollars better than the offer of the first syndicate. The stipulation that they should not be exempt from taxation would of itself have conferred enormous advantages on the settlers of the west. In every respect that offer was one that it would have been in the country's interest to accept. It would have left the company under supervision in the matter of rates, which were entirely beyond our control in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

But enough, Mr. Speaker, of comparisons. All of these serve to prove the superiority of the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme over any other scheme that has been put before the people of this country, and to place that superiority in the most striking light. Now, Sir, in their criticism upon the obligations that are to be incurred under this arrangement, I ask my hon. friends, in the first place, to remember that the money expended on a road which is to be leased by a responsible company at a rate of interest that will carry the cost of its construction, is not an addition in the proper sense to our obligations. I ask them to bear in mind hat the guarantee of the bonds on the mountain section of the western division and the cost of the division from Winnipeg to Moncton, are not properly speaking an increase to our debt ; because we have, in the first place, the obligation of a responsible company to pay the interest, and we have at the end of fifty years, when that property reverts to us, a property whose value will be vastly more than the cost of the road or the obligations which the road represents. I ask these gentlemen to bear in mind, in the second place, that this is a country that is to have great expansion of its interests, its property, its population, its resources, its tax paying power, in the near future. We are providing, not for the present, but for the future. We are entering now upon obligations which will culminate five years hence, when the road which these obligations create will be great-

ly needed—will be, in point of fact, imperatively necessary ; and when the period of fifty years terminates, what may we reasonably expect will be the population of Canada ? If it increases at the rate of 20 per cent each decade, it will in 1951 be 15,000,000. If it increases at the rate of 25 per cent in each decade it will be 18,000,000. I see no reason why our population should not increase more rapidly than at the rate of 25 per cent in each decade. During the first four decades of the United States their population increased at the rate of not less than 30 per cent, and yet up to the year 1825 the addition to their population was very small, amounting to 250,000 in a period of two or three decades. We shall have the natural increase of a vigorous population, and in addition an enormous immigration from the British isles, from Scandinavia and other parts of Europe, and a still greater immigration from the middle and western portions of the United States. So that we are building for the future, and we are looking forward to the time when the resources and the population of this country will be three or four times what they are at the present moment.

What may we expect will be the increase of our agricultural productions ? This year the area in wheat amounted to 2,500,000 acres in Manitoba and 750,000 acres in the Territories, and we expect to reap from this land a crop of over 60,000,000 bushels. How much more wheat land have we ? At a most moderate calculation, we have 250,000,000 acres of wheat-land west of Lake Superior. If we produce 60,000,000 bushels this year from 3,250,000 acres of land, how many millions of bushels are we likely to produce when that country is populated and the greater part of the soil is brought under cultivation, and when we increase the cultivable area to sixty or seventy or perhaps a hundred million acres ? Let hon. gentlemen sit down and figure that out. We are confronting great changes in our condition, great expansion in our business. We cannot realize how great that expansion will be, and we are making provision for it in the most moderate manner, instead of recklessly and with undue haste. As I have said, that country is absolutely dependent on railway communication. It has no natural outlet to the sea. For all the productions of that vast region of 250,000,000 acres of wheat-land, we must provide transportation by rail, and if we are going to keep up with the procession, we must provide it pretty fast. I think the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was right when he said that there were men in the audience which he addressed at Vancouver who would live to see three and possibly four transcontinental lines in Canada.

As to the question whether this railway will pay, I remember that question was debated when the Canadian Pacific Railway scheme was under consideration, and very grave doubts were expressed as to whether it would. Well, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made its annual statement a short time ago. Its total earnings last year were $43,957,000, its expenses $28,120,000, and its net earnings $15,836,000. It has just declared a dividend of 6 per cent. I can remember a few years ago when its stock was worth 40. The day before yesterday, when the 6 per cent dividend was declared, its stock was worth 126, and that at a period when the bottom has been knocked out of stocks, and the best paying stocks are at a lower point than they have been for many years.

Mr. HYMAN. What was it sold at originally ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think at 25 cents on the dollar, all but $5,000,000, which was sold at par. So I judge from this that the transcontinental line financially will have an assured success. It will secure the trade of the North-west to our ports, if that can be secured by any railway ; and if it is made essentially a first-class road, with a four-tenths per cent grade, heavy rails and perfect construction, it will be able to compete with the water routes in bringing down grain for shipment to Europe at our own seaports.

The contrast between the policies of the two governments, in relation to the first transcontinental line, and in relation to the transcontinental line now under consideration, is so marked, so striking, that I do not see how any man of dispassionate judgment can fail to approve of the scheme which we have under consideration. This scheme, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all that may be said in regard to it, has been thoroughly matured. It bears internal evidence of that fact. Let the ablest lawyer in this country scrutinize this agreement and seek to pick flaws in it, and they will be of the most infinitesimal character if he finds any at all. The interests of the government are safeguarded in the most perfect and complete manner. The only surprise to me is that a great railway corporation, with the resources which the Grand Trunk possesses, should have consented to be bound in the manner in which it is by the stipulations of this agreement. It is folly to contend that this is not a contract in the interest of the people of Canada. It is folly to contend that this is not a contract that reflects great credit on the gentlemen, whoever they are, who matured and perfected it. We are told that we should have waited for surveys, that we should not have been in a hurry, that we should have known more definitely where the road should go, and so forth. Sir, we have had surveys. We have a knowledge of the country in a general sense, and we know in a general way its character for railway construction. There was no time to lose in going forward. We

have to go on with surveys as it is, there is no doubt about that; but we have perfected an arrangement which we might not have been able to make twelve months hence.

We have got into this arrangement a great company, which perhaps might then see the matter in a different light, or possibly might not be in a position to take hold of the contract and enter into the stipulations it has done. When you have a good thing take it. Time and tide wait for no man, and if you neglect to take at its flood the tide which will lead you on to fortune, the opportunity may never again present itself. Do not be like the Irishman, who just after he landed in America, saw a dollar on the ground and passed it by with scorn because he was going to a section of the country where money grew on the bushes. I think that the perfection of this contract reflects unquestionably great credit on my right hon. friend the Premier of this Dominion. He may fairly claim, I apprehend, that this is his scheme. I apprehend that he may claim credit to a large extent for the consummation of this bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. If that be the case, I believe that this will be such a monument as any public man might desire to have to his memory when he passes from this stage of action. The right hon. gentleman considered all the suggestions of the various schemes presented. He considered them courteously, fully and fairly, and I think I may say that in meeting these various presentations of these various schemes or opinions, he has left those who presented them satisfied that he was right, and willing to accept his opinion. This I believe to be the case in every instance except one—the case of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways. The right hon. gentleman has shown throughout his firm belief in a national road. That has been with him the paramount consideration—a road which would serve national purposes, which would give an outlet on Canadian soil through Canadian ports for Canadian productions in the far west. It remains to be seen whether this road will do all that is predicted of it. If it be constructed in a thoroughly first class manner in every respect, I believe it will. And when both the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have to face the alternative that it be not so constructed, it will not accomplish what is expected, I believe they will see that it is built in such a way that it will be capable of producing the results we all hope for. No doubt there are many gentlemen who would throw cold water on our aspirations. We will perhaps have reason to compare these men with the late DeWitt Clinton, who, when in 1817, he was promoting the construction of the Erie canal, which revolutionized the commercial history of New York and made that city a great seaport, was ridiculed and assailed by lampoons and criticisms about Clinton's ditch from Albany to Buffalo. Well, Sir, Clinton's ditch was a nation maker. It affected the destinies of a great people in the west, just as the Laurier road will do for great districts of this country.

We are incurring, of course, heavy obligations, but they are moderate in view of what will be realized from the expenditure. In the abstract, however, they are heavy obligations, and we will become responsible for a large sum of money. But we will have an asset which will represent something. We will have an asset of great and ever increasing value in the transcontinental road. It will be money well expended. It will be a judicious investment which will not, after the first seven years, bear upon the resources of the country. The future will unquestionably justify this expenditure. We have in the past constantly underrated our potential sources of power. We have failed to realize that we have resources for the creation of a great nation. We have failed to realize that we have the room and the soil to produce food for 100,000,000 people. We have not allowed ourselves to rise to the level of the destiny that awaits us and the possibilities within our grasp. Today our conceptions of the future cease to be a dream, hazy, indistinct and, perhaps, fantastic. Conditions confront us, the outcome of which we can measure and determine—conditions as to the extent of our arable land, and mineral resources, and the certain influx of population from abroad. All these conditions we can measure and understand. We know that a judicious expenditure will be cheerfully borne by future generations, and that should we fail to do the work we are called on to perform, the future will blame us for our neglect to grasp the great possibilities of this immense country. Under all these circumstances, with a rosy future expanding before us—and we can look down the vista and see within a century fifty million or sixty million under our government—with this future expanding before us, are we not haggling in a penny-wise pound-foolish manner in standing here and criticising a policy which proposes to give this country a great national road from ocean to ocean—a road which will pass by a direct route from Quebec to the west, a road which will pass through 1,700 miles of rich and undeveloped territory, and from which branch lines will extend to the Yukon and in various directions for the development of this vast country. Shall we not be conscious of what is before us, shall we not realize our future and reach forth our hand to grasp our destiny by carrying out the sound policy now submitted to us?

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). My hon. friend who has just taken his seat introduced some time ago a resolution, the object of which was to diminish the length

of speeches and abolish discursive speeches, even on important subjects, and I was much pleased at the time by the attitude taken by my hon. friend, and expected him to practice what he had preached. But after hearing my hon. friend far into the night yesterday and during the whole of this morning and a part of this afternoon, I have come to the conclusion that upon this subject, as upon many others, strong as may be the opinions of my hon. friend, they are liable to change.

For my part, I feel impelled to offer a few observations upon this very important matter, as one coming from one of the older provinces much interested, from the very foundation of this great commonwealth, in its future, and particularly in the problem of transportation and the settlement of our immense regions. And also, Sir, because the putting into effect of that measure involves this country, and involves the older provinces particularly, in very large expenditure. There is no member of this House who will deny that this subject is presented for our consideration under exceptional circumstances, circumstances embarrassing for us who have to criticise it and, I think I may say, without precedents in this parliament. We have to pronounce upon the merits of a great railway scheme, yet we have no report before us as to the utility, the availability of that scheme to meet the problem which is tormenting us, the problem of transportation and settlement. We had been induced to believe, in fact, we had been told authoritatively that this important subject of transportation would be referred to a special commission. That commission has not even been created, much less have we a report from it. A great part of this railway project is intended to serve the objects of settlement. I believe that in the conception of my right hon. friend—and that idea is expressed in the Bill which he has placed before the House—side by side with the question of transportation is placed the question of settlement. And, in regard to these vast regions for the settlement of which we are called upon to spend such a large amount of money, we have no information whatever of a positive nature. There has been no location of the line. Not one single member of this House, from the Prime Minister to the most humble member, can tell us with any degree of certainty where this line of railway is going to pass. There has been no survey of this line. I shall advert in a moment to the discussion that my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) carried on for more than an hour upon the determination of a similar problem made over a quarter of a century ago. But I may say immediately that, before the government of that time entered upon the execution of that project, it had caused surveys to be made, and the members of the House in that respect were not placed in the vastly disadvantageous position in which we are placed to-day. Neither have we any estimate before us of the cost of this great construction. This may account, to a certain extent, for the fact that those who have spoken already upon this subject, whatever care they may have devoted to the calculation, have not given figures at all approaching each other as to the amount of this expenditure. And I for one say this, that under the circumstances which I have just referred to and with the disadvantages which I have enumerated, it is eminently unfair for this government to ask this House to pronounce upon the merits of this scheme, brought in as it is at the very end of a long and protracted session.

But, Sir, there are, perhaps, one or two redeeming features to one of which the country at any rate, if not the hon. members opposite, will attach a very considerable importance. That circumstance is that a member of the government, and he the one to whom the charge of railway matters was particularly confided and who should have been adviser in such a project as this, at the last sitting of this House, with the greatest cogency, and with admitted force of argument which my hon. friend from North Norfolk has in no way met, condemned this scheme in its entirety. The objections raised by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) were so obvious, so elementary that I am sure, I may say truthfully that the objections had presented themselves to the mind of each and every one of us upon examination of the contract and of the measure laid before the House. The hollowness of the cry of the danger of our bonding rights; the erroneousness of the right hon. Prime Minister's estimate of an expenditure of $13,000,000; the duplication of the Intercolonial; the immense cost, and the uncertain cost of the government section; the handing over of the road built by ourselves as soon as it is completed to a private company; and, let me say as a member from the province of Quebec, the impotency of that road as an agency in the settlement of our country; these objections had presented themselves to each one of us even before we had heard the able argument of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. And, after having heard that hon. gentleman, is there any member of this House who will coincide with the observation made by the right hon. Prime Minister that when the late Sir John A. Macdonald consented to the carrying through of the short line from Montreal to St. John through the state of Maine, he did unwisely in listening to the advice of his Minister of Railways and Canals. And will anybody say that in the conception of this scheme and the completion of its details the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself would not have done much better had he taken the advice of his Minister of Railways and Canals, his natural adviser in a matter of this kind.

Sir, it seems to me an admitted fact that the chief characteristic of the project submitted to us is haste. The right hon. gentleman himself has declared that this is not a time for us to deliberate. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has confided to the House the fact that this scheme was born scarcely two weeks before the opening of the present session, and that some of its most objectionable features have been added during the present session and even a few days before the introduction of this measure into this House. Is it necessary to go further in order to be satisfied that this project has been essentially marked by haste, and that that haste is, in itself, one of the great reasons why that project should be condemned. Under these circumstances, and after the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals had made to us the exposé which he made last night of the objections which he, in common with many members of this House, entertained as to this project, I ask hon. members if they think it was fair for the government not to have immediately replied to the vigorous invective of that hon. gentleman and set aside, if it was possible to do so, the very strong objections which he had urged against that scheme. Instead of that these hon. gentlemen have put up to answer—with the weakness which we have seen this morning and this afternoon—the objections of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, a gentleman, Sir, who, fifty years hence, will be heard of in this country if for no other reason than for the extraordinarily lofty example he has set us in the public life of this country.

Sir, it is almost incredible to have heard this afternoon the hon. member for Norfolk enter into a very elaborate argument to show the possible superiority of railway carriage of grain over water carriage, in face of his own recent utterances. Allow me to quote the language used not very long ago by the hon. gentleman himself upon this most important question. He has told us to-day that we have all the data necessary for the purpose of deciding this question ; and yet, Mr. Speaker, not very long ago that hon. gentleman stated the exact contrary of that proposition, when he used these words :

> Whether the building of the St. Lawrence canal was a mistake or not, and whether or not a heavy expenditure at Port Colborne is necessary, I think we have gone far enough in that direction until we have more reliable data as to the effect of the improvements in railways and the reduction in cost of transportation by railways in Canada and the United States.

But still more pointed was the statement of the hon. gentleman in regard to the incomparable superiority of water-borne traffic as regards cheapness of freight compared with railway traffic. This is what the hon. gentleman stated :

> That trade will seek the waters of the great chain of lakes. Inevitably, during the season of navigation, that trade will be carried to Lake Superior, and improvements have been made in the construction of lake vessels and the deepening of channels between the head of Lake Superior and Buffalo, which enables forwarders to secure the shipment of wheat from Duluth, or from Port Arthur to Buffalo at a ridiculously low rate, as compared with rates prevalent a few years ago. For a cent and a quarter or a cent and a half per bushel, you can transport your wheat from Duluth or Port Arthur, and put it in an elevator at Buffalo.

Then the hon. gentleman added :

> So you have the possibility of carrying wheat from Port Arthur to New York for three cents a bushel, or at most four cents a bushel. Now these are conditions which render it, in my opinion, impossible at present to compete with that route. It is uselesss to think of hauling wheat from a point as far west as Port Arthur by an all-rail route to Quebec or to Halifax at prices such as these I quoted with regard to the American lines.

And further still :

> If, after having given to our seaports connections in the form of a railway to Quebec, right through the country, and a railway from Quebec for winter communication with Halifax and St. John, we attempt, in addition to affording facilities, and the best facilities that can be given—roads with low grades and great capacity for hauling heavy loads, such as the loads that can be hauled over the New York Central and Lake Shore of 2,000 tons to a train —to force trade over these roads we will make a mistake, because we have to allow this trade to find a natural outlet. We must simply make with care, and make efficiently, provision for securing this trade in our own seaports under circumstances which are possible, having regard to our natural facilities and natural advantages.

The conclusion at which the hon. member arrived is this :

> I do not believe that we are in a condition to-day, even if we decided to improve the Ottawa River Valley route, to decide what are the proper conditions upon which to proceed. For this reason I think the appointment of a commission to take this whole question under consideration is in the highest degree desirable—is not only desirable but necessary. We are now confronting conditions that require careful consideration. We are called upon to inaugurate a policy and to proceed in a direction that has for its purpose the affording to the great North-west of transportation facilities. It is beyond all things necessary that we should make no false step, and that we should proceed upon no false hypothesis or basis, and for that reason it is a wise thing to appoint a commission composed of men who are capable of examining this question and arriving at correct conclusions.

No doubt one of these commissioners was to be the hon. gentleman himself.

> We cannot do it here in an expert and scientific manner ; we must rely upon the service of men of the character of those who are to be appointed upon this commission. Let us wait until we have the decision of these men as to the proper course to pursue.

These are some of the contradictions to which my hon. friend, who holds strong opinions as he says, is nevertheless subject. The hon. gentleman has told us himself

that before this scheme was brought to the notice of this parliament he entertained strong opinions, opinions upon which I for one would congratulate him, because these opinions are in consonance with the modern ideas of the twentieth century. He entertained strong opinions as to government ownership, but those opinions, strong as they were, have been contradicted by the explanations which he has given to this House. Mr. Speaker, let us hope that in many other matters my hon. friend will not so easily change his opinion. However, I for one, as a representative from the province of Quebec, am prepared to congratulate him most heartily on the great change of opinion he has undergone within the last few years in regard to the present and the future of that great province. Members of this House are aware that not more that three years ago my hon. friend urged strongly, in a public speech, the necessity of placing a garrison in the city of Quebec in order to prevent the people of that province from rushing into rebellion. To-day it is pleasant for us to hear that hon. gentleman take such a warm interest in that province, and praise as highly as he has done to-day the character, the loyalty and the many laudable qualities of the people of that province.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will give Quebec wheat instead of a garrison.

Mr. MONK. Or perhaps soldiers brought down from the west to the city of Quebec, passing through sub-Arctic regions where this railway is contemplated. But, if my hon. friend was put up to answer the, in many respects, unanswerable arraignment of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the public must not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite were absolutely idle. Whether they were able to answer on the spur of the moment that arraignment, or whether they deemed it necessary to concert together before that answer was given, it is certain that hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches sharpened their pencils, and we saw them taking copious notes during the argument of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals—except my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I will admit that the hon. Minister of Finance whom the public credits with having combated this scheme from the beginning took no notes and judging from the expression on the hon. gentleman's face during the argument of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, I assume that it was his skilful hand which inserted in the Bill now before the House the extraordinary provision, contained, I believe in section 20, which states that at any time the construction of the eastern section of this extraordinary and phantom railway may be stopped by the government. That is the life preserver upon which the hon. Minister of Finance rests, and I believe, after having seen the hon. gentleman yesterday during the long argument of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals wearing the expression upon his face which Macduff had when they came to tell him that his family had been assassinated, that the hope that the hon. gentleman entertains is that it will be possible for him at any time with that saving clause to stop the construction of the railway once it has passed east of Lake Superior.

I wish to be as brief as possible, and I will certainly not take up any considerable time of the House at this stage by refuting the fallacious argument of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in regard to the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company more than a quarter of a century ago. The conditions at that time were totally different. Everybody knows what price we paid after confederation for the immense extent of land and all the rights accompanying it which we purchased from the Hudson Bay Company. Everybody knows that the conditions made at that time and under circumstances entirely different from those of the present day with the Canadian Pacific Railway were not unreasonable. I will ask my hon. friend and hon. gentlemen opposite how they reconcile the statement which they have repeatedly made that it was by opposing the conclusion of that bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway that they deferred the time of their coming into office so many years with the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk to-day that that bargain was one which should have been condemned. But, to be short upon this subject, I think it is merely necessary for me to quote to the members of this House the offer made in the year 1874, by the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie himself and those who in that year were ready to enter upon the immense work of constructing that railway and which they announced to the country. The offer is found authentically set down in our own statute which was passed under the direction of the then Liberal government, and supported, I am informed, by the hon. member for North Norfolk himself. That offer, generous as it was, was never accepted. It is to be found in chapter 14 of the statutes of 1874, 37 Vic. The House, I am sure will arrive at the conclusion on reading that offer that there is absolutely nothing in the contention which at so great length the hon. gentleman has developed to-day. The hon. gentleman stated that what was then contemplated was a railway from Lake Superior to the west. That is not correct. What was intended and what the offer was given for was a railway from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean, and further, there were to be two branches laid out and constructed under the same generous conditions as those contained in the offer. The first was :

A branch from the point indicated as the proposed eastern terminus of the railway to some point on the Georgian bay, both the said points to be determined by the Governor in Council.

And the second was :

A branch from the main line near Fort Garry, in the province of Manitoba, to some point near Pembina, on the southern boundary thereof.

But, this is the offer. It is to be found in section 8 of the Act :

That the total sum to be paid to the contractors shall be stipulated in the contract, and shall be ten thousand dollars for each mile of the section or subsection contracted for, and that such sum shall be paid to the contractors as the work progresses by monthly payments in proportion to the value of the work then actually performed (according to the estimates of the engineers designated for the purpose by the Minister of Public Works), as compared with the value of the whole work contracted for, including rolling stock and all things to be done or furnished by the contractors ; and except money arising from the sale of lands, as hereinafter provided, no further sum of money shall be payable to the contractors as principal, but interest at the rate of four per cent per annum for twenty-five years upon the completion of the work, on a sum (to be stated in the contract) for each mile of the section or subsection contracted for shall be payable to the contractors, and guarantees for the payment thereof shall be given from time to time to the contractors in like manner and proportion, and on like conditions, as payments are to be made on the principal sum above mentioned ; and the tenders for the work shall be required to state the lowest sum per mile on which such interest and guarantees will be required.

And this was the subsidy in land :

That a quantity of land, not exceeding twenty thousand acres for each mile of the section or subsection contracted for, shall be appropriated in alternate sections of twenty square miles each along the line of the said railway or at a convenient distance therefrom, each section having a frontage of not less than three miles nor more than six miles on the line of the said railway, and that two-thirds of the quantity of land so appropriated shall be sold by the government at such prices as may be from time to time agreed upon between the Governor in Council and the contractors, and the proceeds thereof accounted for and paid half-yearly to the contractors free from any charge of administration or management,—the remaining third to be conveyed to the contractors. The said lands to be of fair average quality, and not to include any land already granted or occupied under any patent, license of occupation or pre-emption right ; and when a sufficient quantity cannot be found in the immediate vicinity of the railway, then the same quantity, or as much as may be required to complete such quantity, shall be appropriated at such other places as may be determined by the Governor in Council.

There could be no doubt that at that time land in the North-west Territories was of really no value. The value was given to it by the railway which entered that region and the conditions which I have just mentioned—which were tendered at that time—by the government supported by the hon. member for North Norfolk himself is proof conclusive that the criticism which he has offered at such length is clearly not well founded. I, for my own part am not prepared to say that with the changes which have taken place and which I must say exercise a very potent influence upon my mind it would not have been preferable at that time for the government to have constructed the road itself. I have not been a very long time in this House but when I entered it in 1896, knowing the way in which the question of government ownership and management of railways was treated, and considering the immense progress during the last six or seven years that idea has gained not only in the minds of the people of this country but throughout the whole world, I, to-day, am of the opinion that as far as possible and particularly in this country where there is a question of transportation, where there is a question or a transcontinental line there can be no doubt that it is better for us ourselves as a nation not to delegate the carrying out of any such great works to private corporations or to individuals whatever may be their respectability, but to keep for ourselves and under our absolute control everything in connection either with the transportation or settlement of the country.

I am prepared to admit, Sir, that other members in this House are in a better position than I am to criticise the conditions with regard to the prairie section of this proposed line. I heard the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) whom every one will admit is a competent man to treat of a subject of this kind, whom every one will admit is clothed with experience acquired during his term of office in the past seven years ; I heard that hon. gentleman state in very strong terms, that there was no necessity at the present time for a third line of railway in the prairie country. He mentioned that we had just afforded aid in the shape of a guarantee to a line which extends into a still unsettled region, and that the two lines that now exist in that country, are, according to the testimony that has been afforded him, sufficient to supply the wants of a population of over 5,000,000. However, Sir, I for one am prepared to be enthusiastic about that western country. I am prepared to take the optimistic and even poetic view of the Prime Minister with regard to it. I will proceed upon the assumption that this contemplated line will open up a great and fertile country which at the present time is being invaded by settlers as never before. I will admit with hon. members from the west, on both sides of the House, that an additional line is required to move the ever increasing grain crops of the west. I will admit that that new line will pay its way at once, and I will even admit, although I am not so sure on that point, that the new line will cause rivalry between railways which may result

in a reduction of rates. But assuming all that to be true, I wish to hear from some member of the government the reason why we do not apply to that prairie section of the line the principle which we apply to the eastern section. I wish to know why we do not construct that line ourselves, and why we confide the construction of it to a private company ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. If the prairie section is going to be a paying concern, if it will regulate rates, if it is the very best portion of the transcontinental line, why do we not build it ourselves ? It must be evident to every member of this House, it must be evident to even a novice in railway matters, that if we wish to control rates effectively, if we wish to resist the almost overpowering influence of great corporations which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals described ; the only way to do so is for us to step in and supply a railway upon which we establish rates which will be beneficial to the people of the North-west Territories. What is our experience in the North-west ? Each and every one of the branch lines which we have constructed there has been absorbed by the main line, and it has been the experience of many countries that the construction of a number of railways does not of itself tend to reduce the rates. New railways will facilitate settlement and open the country, but when it comes to freight rates, these rival lines bind themselves together, and it is impossible to obtain the reduction in rates desired, except where the government intervenes with the object of benefiting the people and fixes a rate which will control the rates charged by existing lines through the same territory. In view of the large extent of line which the government is undertaking to build and the grave doubt as to the paying character of that line, it would have been far better for the government to have undertaken the building of this whole railway, and thus afford to the people of the North-west the undoubted benefits which low freight rates would confer upon them. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that the theory is rapidly gaining in the American republic, that the time has arrived for governments to cease giving aid to railways, and in the constitution of a great majority of the states there is a provision against granting state aid to any railway. In Canada, where great reasons do not exist as in the present case, for the government intervening, we should refrain entirely from aiding railways in any shape or form.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has laid great stress upon the advantages of an all rail route for carrying grain. My information is that the vast bulk of the grain of the North-west is carried out of that country during the season of navigation, and it is an axiom in transportation that grain can be carried by water at a far cheaper rate than it can be carried on railways. It is a known fact that to-day grain is carried from the western part of Lake Superior to Depot Harbour, to Midland, in fact to the eastern side of the great lakes, a distance of over 600 miles, for 1½ cents, or, as I am informed, 1 cent a bushel ; whereas the cost of carrying grain from Winnipeg to the shores of Lake Superior, a distance of 400 miles, amounts to over 12 cents per hundred weight, although I believe it is to be reduced to 10 cents on the 1st of October next, under the arrangements made by the Roblin government, or six times the cost per bushel of what it is over the waterway. The bulk of the grain being carried out during the season of navigation, and the rates being as they are, it seems to me that it is impossible for any railway, even constructed under the most favourable circumstances, to rival the navigation route; and as a result of that state of things, we find that scarcely 6 per cent of the grain which comes from the North-west is carried by rail. As a matter of fact, almost the whole of that grain avails itself of the water route ; and therefore it is evident to me that the government, in the hasty course they have pursued in connection with this scheme, have failed to consider sufficiently the immense importance of the natural route which we have for the conveyance of that grain the moment it reaches the shores of Lake Superior down to the ocean ports within our own territory, whence it may be shipped abroad. I am informed that last year the amount of grain received by water in the city of Buffalo from the city of Chicago, a distance which could easily have been covered by rail, exceeded 74,000,000 bushels ; which is proof once more, if any proof were required, that the navigation method of carrying grain will for a very long period in the future be superior to the rail-carrying method. Under these circumstances, after having spent such large sums as we have spent in improving our water routes from the lakes down the St. Lawrence to the city of Montreal, after having spent millions in the construction of canals, with the great question still unsolved—but I hope not entirely abandoned, of a canal along the Ottawa river, that canal known as the Georgian Bay canal—it seems to me that the government have been very hasty in arriving at the conclusion involved in the scheme proposed by the right hon. leader of the House. When we reflect on the large amount we have spent on the Intercolonial Railway, when we recollect what the attitude of this government was in 1897, when that road was extended from Lévis to Montreal, the reasons advanced at that time by this government, and the hope entertained by the country generally that that step was only the first towards

carrying out the larger scheme of extending the Intercolonial Railway to the shores of the great lakes, it seems to me that in this project we are launching upon far too great an expenditure, an expenditure which the data at our command and under our observation does not in any sense justify.

Let us for a moment consider what is the cost to which we shall be put by the carrying of the railway through the mountain section. In this connection it is worthy of note—it has been stated already in this House—that there has been no demand in the province of British Columbia for the construction of this transcontinental railway. In regard to that province we have fulfilled every pledge to which we were bound when it entered confederation. We have never heard in this House any demand from that province for anything further in the way of a transcontinental railway; but we have heard many demands for railways within the province, and any one who knows anything about the condition of affairs there knows that in order to utilize the large mineral wealth which that province possesses, it is necessary to build within the limits of the province railways to which possibly aid may be expected from this government. But taking the project itself, I think we may fairly assume that in connection with the mountain section we shall be obliged to furnish the full extent of the guarantee which is contemplated by the contract, and that section will cover a distance of about 600 miles. Those who have taken the trouble to refer to the very able report made by Sir Sanford Fleming in 1877, will find in that report a reference at length to the pass which it is contemplated that this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will cross when entering the province of British Columbia through the Rocky mountains. He will find that Sir Sanford Fleming estimated the cost of the construction of that line at over $50,000 a mile; and we may safely assume that under the present conditions of labour and the increased cost of materials, that estimate can be in no way reduced. We have, therefore, to furnish a guarantee of $30,000 a mile for a distance of 600 miles, amounting in the aggregate to $18,000,000. The interest upon that sum at 3 per cent for ten years, which is the time limit during which we may be expected to pay the interest, amounts to $540,000 a year, or, for the whole ten years, $5,400,000. That is the extent of our liabilities in regard to the mountain section, and I think the House will easily come to the conclusion by the time this discussion has advanced a little, that the estimate of $13,000,000 as being the total amount of cash payments which this government will have to make in connection with this contract, is far below the true mark. Five million four hundred thousand therefore is the amount which we will have to pay in connection with the regular mountain section, a section of railway for which no cry has been heard from the distant province of British Columbia.

Leaving the section of railway which traverses the prairie and the Rocky mountains and coming to that portion which the government is to build, what do we find? My right hon. friend has given us a most attractive picture of the region which that railway is to traverse on its way from Winnipeg to Quebec. Where did he get his information? Where does he find his proof that this region is rich in agricultural lands, mineral resources, water powers and forests? I have examined the report of Sir Sanford Fleming, and I do not find in that report anything to corroborate the glowing description given by my right hon. friend. The surveyors and engineers found here and there settlers who had grown vegetables. They found in places some rich agricultural soil, and they found trees in abundance, but we have no evidence whatever that the land is so adapted for settlement and that the climatic conditions are such as will justify our spending over $50,000,000 in the construction of a railway across that country. Nothing in that region, as far as I have been able to find, justifies in any sense the description given by my right hon. friend. And if we turn to later reports, there is one to which I may invite attention. I refer to the report of the survey and exploration of Northern Ontario in the year 1900. Although there is a rather flattering general summing up of the reports of the surveyors, who were deputed by the Ontario government to visit that region north of Lake Superior, it is impossible to go through these reports one by one and come to any other conclusion than that the greatest doubt exists as to the utility of that region as a place of settlement, which will justify the expenditure contemplated. I have no desire to belittle that region any more than I would the corresponding region in my own province, but we have not yet sufficient information to justify us in saying that it is one which should claim our attention at present in lieu of other regions which we know something about. The same remark will apply to that portion of my own province intended to be traversed by this railway. A very interesting movement has been in progress in the province of Quebec since several years. The exodus of the people of that province to the United States has not diminished in a noticeable degree, but within the past few years a group of patriotic men in the province of Quebec, irrespective of party, men who have no private interest to serve, who have only one object in view, the keeping of our own population within our province, have been at work obtaining the moral assistance and help of the citizens of the province of Quebec. And what have these men achieved? They have found back of the city of Montreal, in the great region

watered by the Saguenay river and Lake St. John and the rivers flowing into that lake, millions of acres which are unoccupied at present. But that region, to which we should at present devote all our attention, is not the region to be traversed by this railway. The region which this railway will cross is one unknown to us and unknown also to the right hon. gentleman. It is impossible for him or any member of the government to give us any precise information regarding the country where this railway is to pass, far beyond the height of land in the province of Quebec, over 200 miles from Montreal and 80 miles from the most distant settlements, such as St. Gerard de Montarville and St. Michel des Saints. This road will run fifty miles away from that region, and therefore will be of no help whatever to these men who are ready to lay before the government clear and precise information regarding this vast and unsettled region in the province of Quebec, to which they are seeking to attract our compatriots and prevent them from going to the States. That is the position with regard to the province of Quebec. There is not a man in the province of Quebec who has taken any interest in that great and noble movement inaugurated there some years ago for the purpose of settling the northern portion of that province and that portion from the shores of Lake Témiscamingue down to the centre of the peninsula of Gaspé, who would not stand dumfounded if you proposed to him, as a help towards the carrying out of that patriotic scheme, a line of railway passing over one hundred miles from any known region in that province. And upon that score, if upon no other, I, for my part, do condemn that part of the railway which it is alleged is intended to help us towards these settlements of the province of Quebec, but which can be of no help whatever. Mr. Speaker, that movement to which I have referred, which perhaps exists in some degree in the province of Ontario, but I think not in the same degree as it exists in our province, for the same conditions do not present themselves —that scheme of settlement of our province covers the whole valley of the Ottawa, it extends throughout the entire valley of the St. Lawrence, north and south, and, as I stated a moment ago, it extends down to the county of my hon. friend from Gaspé, where, as I was informed when I visited that region, a few miles from the coast in the interior of that great peninsula, there is a fertile plateau in which there is room for over fifty parishes of settlers. This being so, what are the present needs of the province of Quebec if we wish to stem that tide of emigration to the United States which has been flowing so long? What we need in our province is colonization roads to afford easy access to those regions which are known to us, and the only obstacle to the settlement of which is the want of proper means of communication. And I venture to say here that we do not need great expenditure. Let the government take this scheme to heart, not only in the province of Quebec, but in all the older provinces, which have done a great deal, and are ready to do still more, to help the settlement of the regions of the west. Help the west, but do not forget that something must be done for ourselves also. Let the government consider that by aiding roads in the province of Quebec, not to the extent of giving money, but by guaranteeing bonds for from thirty to forty years upon the many branch lines which are necessary if we wish to utilize our country, the country would incur less expense and would do a more patriotic and more legitimate work for the province than they are doing by spending over $50,000,000 in running a trunk line through a region with regard to which we know nothing, and which we are not ready to penetrate, because we must first cover the intervening ground. If I am right in my judgment that, as long as we have our natural facilities, as long as we have these splendid waterways which help to convey the products of the west to the sea and the merchandise of the east to the settlement of the west, we cannot compete by rail. 'Opposuit natura'—we cannot do it. We are driven to the conclusion then that it is the second part of this which is applicable in these regions, it is for the purpose of settling that we are opening them. Is it not the part of wisdom, then, before we spend—speaking more particularly for the province of Quebec—over $50,000,000 (over $65,000,000, I say) to build this line from Winnipeg to Quebec, to consider, if it is the settlement of the province that we want, whether it would not be better for us to incur a far smaller liability and a liability which we shall never be called upon to pay any more than we shall be called upon to pay our guarantee upon the prairie section, to afford facilities for this legitimate policy of colonization which has been inaugurated in our province, and which must be carried out if we wish immediately to contend against the flow of emigration to the United States. Holding as I do—I frankly declare it—that it would have been far better for us to take our own valuable property, the Intercolonial, and extend it immediately to the great lakes, believing that that could be done at a cost of less than $15,000,000, at a cost far less than will be necessary to construct the eastern section under this scheme, I must say I view with regret the determination of the government to spend such a large sum as $50,000,000 in constructing a line where, as I said before, looking at it as a member from the province of Quebec, it will not be half as useful as would have been the construction of branch lines within the limits of that province. Take up a map of

the province of Quebec, and you will find that on the south shore of the province the counties extending south are settled in the northern parts. Means of communication are required to reach fertile regions in the extreme portions of those counties. Take the northern shore, and the same condition is found. At the present moment, in the vicinity of Montreal, we have counties the northern parts of which are fertile, are known to be fertile, which have a few struggling settlements, but which require merely railway communication in order to become as productive, as rich and as prosperous as other parts of those counties. It would have been wise, it seems to me, to turn our attention in that direction rather than do what the government has done. And I have no doubt that, when we come before the electors of that province, and particularly those of regions that have a just right to ask at the present moment that something should be done to put them on the same footing as other citizens of this great country, that consideration will have some weight with these people, even if it has not the weight it deserves to have before this House.

Now, as regards the cost of that road, the eastern section from Winnipeg to Quebec, my hon. friend from North Norfolk has laid down the condition that it should be a perfect road, a road that should be able to haul something like forty or fifty cars, in fact it should be a road comparing favourably with the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto. Well, if that is to be the standard of construction, I venture to say that the cost of that road from Winnipeg to Quebec will far exceed any of the calculations so far offered to this House. I venture to say that after you have given the necessary allowance for curvature—and there is a good deal of curvature, not only in this projected road but in the policy itself—after you have given the proper allowance of curvature, and all we know of that region is that it is filled with lakes, mountains and waterways, you will find that the distance covered by that line over which trains will run from Winnipeg to Quebec, will be no less than 1,600 miles. Now, if we are to make that road of the character that is to be required for it by my hon. friend, would it be possible to build it for less than $35,000 a mile ? The Intercolonial itself cost us more than that, and if it is to cost us $35,000 a mile for 1,600 miles, then the amount we will have to pay as regards interest upon expenditure will amount to $16,800,000. That is the amount which we will have to pay in interest during those ten years, if I am correct in the statement that the road covers 1,600 miles and that it will cost $35,000 a mile to construct it. If we add that interest to the amount we will be called upon to pay in connection with the mountain section, $5,400,000, we arrive at a total expenditure from which we cannot escape of $22,200,000, instead of the sum of $13,000,000 which was mentioned as the utmost expenditure to which we were liable according to the right hon. gentleman when he introduced this measure.

Now, Sir, no mention has been made of the expenditure which would meet us as soon as we arrive at the city of Quebec ; no mention has been made of the way in which we are to cross the river St. Lawrence. Poetic as was the flight of my right hon. friend, he did not go so far as to say that these trains of 50 cars would be able to cross the St. Lawrence with the help of the wind. We will require a bridge, and no mention has been made of that bridge so far, yet I think it has been thought of by those who projected this great scheme. What are we to do in regard to that bridge, Mr. Speaker ? What will it cost us ? So far that bridge has cost about $1,000,000. The city of Quebec has given, if I mistake not, $500,000, the province of Quebec has given, I think, a similar sum, or perhaps more. Are we going to buy that bridge the construction of which has been begun but has ceased, if I mistake not, through want of funds, I believe the bonds of the Bridge Company, the president of which is the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec and the friend of my right hon. friend—the bonds, if I mistake not, have been handed over at 60 to the contractor of the bridge in order to satisfy him to a certain extent for the amount of work done.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does my hon. friend know that this bridge at Quebec was promised several years ago by Sir Charles Tupper ?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend seems to assume that I am opposed to that bridge. He forgets that I took quite a different position when the question of voting money for a bridge at Quebec came up. I am very glad to see a bridge there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Thank you.

Mr. MONK. At the same time, I think my hon. friend will admit that we have some claim for a bridge at Montreal also. He will not deny that, and I am sure he would be favourable to any project by which we could get a bridge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. You have one already, but I would object to any Armstrong scheme.

Mr. MONK. We have no bridge, but I hope we shall get one. Now, Sir, in my opinion, before we cross the St. Lawrence and touch the Moncton section, we will have to spend a very large amount of money upon the bridge at Quebec, and that item of expenditure has not been considered. I will not be rash, I think, when I say that before we have communication from the north to the south shore of the St. Lawrence at Que-

bec, we will be about $5,000,000 out of the treasury. If I am exaggerating, I will be be glad to admit it when that part of the transaction is carried through which regards the bridge at Quebec. I am not opposed to the bridge, I will be glad to see it finished, because at the present moment it is not being finished. But it will cost a good deal to finish it, and when we are considering a scheme of this kind, though we may neglect the consideration of hundreds of thousands of dollars, we cannot afford to neglect the consideration of millions.

Well, Sir, we cross the St. Lawrence and we come to the Moncton section. That part of the scheme has been fully treated by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and therefore I shall not take up much time with it. But let me give to the House the distances that I find over that very expensive section of road which the government contemplates constructing. I have not found out these distances myself, but they are furnished to me by men who are not only conversant with that section of the country, but are railway men of experience. At present, as has been said, the distance from Lévis to Moncton is 488 miles. Now I assert, subject to contradiction by members of this House, that the distance from Lévis to Edmundston via the Temiscouata district, is 196 miles; and from Edmundston to Moncton via Chipman, it is no less than 204 miles. Therefore it is apparent that we are building this branch, which at no portion of its line is more than 50 miles distant from the Intercolonial, over the whole 400 miles—we are building it to save 88 miles. By the projected line of my hon. friend the distance is 400 miles, and by the Intercolonial at present it is 488 miles. Now I am informed that by building what is called a cut-off, or an air line from Rivière du Loup to Matapedia, we would save 65 miles, and from Matapedia to Moncton the line is not very straight, and can be shortened a good deal. Therefore, in building from Rivière du Loup via Matapedia we have a total distance from Lévis to Moncton, with the cut-off, of 423 miles; the distance from Rivière du Loup to Matapedia being 110 miles as against 177 by the existing line from Rivière du Loup to Matapedia. We have therefore a distance with this cut-off of 110 miles, passing through a country which is most desirable for settlement, a country through which my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) obtained a charter to construct a railway from the legislature of Quebec during the last session and here also at Ottawa. So necessary did my hon. friend think that line to be that he obtained two charters, one at Quebec and one at Ottawa, to reach that fertile region and where the construction is easy the line covering a distance of 110 miles, from which I am led to the conclusion that in order to save these 23 miles, because that is what it means by the cut-off, we are building a railway which is going to cost us at the very least $37,500 a mile for over four hundred miles of territory and we are going to do incalculable injury to our own property, the Intercolonial Railway. Whatever may be the expenditure of the government upon the new line, whether that expenditure amounts to $15,000,000 or not it would be better to grant a sufficient sum to improve the grades and the construction of the road by which we will be able to save these 23 miles in time. In other words we are expending $15,000,000 perfectly uselessly on the construction of a line and the effect of that construction, view it as you may, cannot but be a cause of injury to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is under a misapprehension as to the charter obtained for a railway in the county of Gaspé. The line for which a charter was obtained will run from Causapscal to Gaspé Basin, but I think he refers to another charter which was obtained from the Quebec legislature during last session for a line running from Fraserville to Paspebiac. If he refers to that charter I can tell him that I am not interested in it.

Mr. MONK. I did not say my hon. friend was interested in it, but I am strongly of the impression that there are special charters given for a line running from Rivière du Loup or Fraserville—these places are very close to one another—and covering this country, because this is an admirable country for settlement and it requires a railway. By building that cut-off of 110 miles the distance will be shortened by 60 miles even if we left in Moncton. But we are building 400 miles of railway at a cost of $15,000,000 just to save 23 miles. Our own road is a good road. The road from Lévis to Matapedia and even to Moncton is a very much improved road as compared with former days and can carry very great loads of freight. I fail to see what can possibly justify us in rushing hurriedly into the construction of a line as to which we have no information. It is not located, we have no survey, we have no estimate, but we are safe in saying that line cannot cost less than $37,500 per mile. It crosses, I believe, three watersheds, a great number of hills, a range of mountains and it passes through a country where construction is very difficult; in fact, even with this expenditure, I question very much if it will be possible to give to that line the easy grades and solid road-bed that our own Intercolonial Railway has for 423 miles between Lévis and Moncton with the cut-off at Rivière du Loup. Now, I have promised to be short and I wish to conform to the precepts so well laid down and so ill-observed by the hon. member for North Norfolk, but I wish to say that it seems to me under these circumstances to be an immense expenditure. It seems to me that with an expenditure of $65,000,000 on the eastern

section of the road from Winnipeg to Quebec, say what you like as to our receiving interest upon that amount, we are borrowing the amount, we are increasing the public debt, and although we own the property—property as to the value of which I have grave doubts—still, we owe that amount and therefore I think it is right to continuously bring the attention of the House and of the country generally to this enormous expenditure.

I cannot refrain from expressing my regret that since the expenditure is to be incurred we have not reserved unto ourselves not only the ownership but the management of the whole line from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The ideas which my hon friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) expressed so often when I was first in this House, have gained ground to an extraordinary degree. They are occupying the public mind throughout the world and I have no doubt that before many years we will regret this transaction by which we have alienated from our control this transcontinental line for at least fifty years. I therefore view with regret that part of the contract. And, Sir, corporations have no souls. This road is passing under the control of a company whose capital is not in this country; it is English capital and that capital as employed in this country is entirely under the control of American management. I make no imputation whatever against the men who are leading in the management of the Grand Trunk Railway, but there is no doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway will control this corporation and certain it is that ultimately the control of this line will be in the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway and that management is American. They have vast interests in lines in the United States. They own lines in the United States and they have spent millions in improving their terminals at Portland and it would be very difficult for people who know something of that company to believe that they are ready to abandon these terminals. I believe myself that with the facility of outlet that they have they will find means of escape from the elastic clause in the contract in regard to Canadian commerce, Canadian ports and a Canadian highway, and under these circumstances and knowing with the limited experience at my command how difficult it is to control the operations of these great railway corporations I say it is a matter of regret for me that the control has been given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and I believe that before long a very strong conviction will exist throughout this country, at any rate in my own province, that we would have done better if we had determined to take up our Intercolonial Railway where it is and to bring it at a cost of less than fifteen million dollars to the shores of Lake Superior, to improve our waterways, to improve our ports, to improve the St. Lawrence route, and spend the rest of the money which I claim we are going to waste in an unknown country, there instead of spending it in a region as to which we have insufficient data.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker. There is one ground upon which this great project may be opposed with some appearance of reason, and I congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) on having discovered it. We are submitting to parliament a proposal for the construction of a great transcontinental railway stretching from ocean to ocean through British territory, and about 3,500 miles in length. A portion of that line will run through the prairie lands of Manitoba and the North-west; a country which nobody questions is in need of railways. These prairie lands are fertile and fruitful, and we all recognize that they will supply traffic to a railway. But after all, that is only a small part of the scheme. This line starting from the very heart of the settled districts of the lower provinces, after leaving the city of Moncton will plunge into the unsettled interior of New Brunswick; thence, turning the corner of American territory, it passes through the settled lands of the province of Quebec, reaches the St. Lawrence at Lévis, and crossing the new bridge will pass through the historic ancient capital of Canada, and thence once more plunge into new and undeveloped territory. Again in the far west, it will touch Winnipeg, and once more plunge into new territory, and so on and on, always touching far as practicable at the large centres on the way, but always striking out again into new and yet undeveloped Canadian lands.

Now, Sir, if we were to believe that this vast area of Canadian territory is a miserable, worthless and God forsaken country; if we were to believe that such are the conditions prevailing in 3,500 miles across this Canada of ours, then hon. gentlemen opposite are right in opposing this measure. But, if on the other hand, we believe that this line will open up new districts valuable for agriculture, if we believe that it will open up valuable tracts of timber—more valuable to-day than ever before when we consider the fast diminishing forest areas of this continent—if we believe that it will open up rich mineral districts in Ontario, and Quebec, and through the mountains of British Columbia which are known to teem with mineral wealth; if we believe that it will bring into industrial use the vast water-powers of this Dominion which become more and more valuable every day as science advances; if we believe that throughout this 3,500 miles of country we have a territory worth owning, then we must believe that this is a good scheme, and, Sir, we are proud to proclaim ourselves as supporters of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we are approaching this project without information, and we are asked if there are any surveys. Let me ask these gentlemen: Did they require surveys when in the year 1871 the Conservative party accepted the responsibility of building the Canadian Pacific Railway, and of making it a part of the treaty with British Columbia? We have more information concerning this proposal to-day than Canada had in 1871 when she accepted the responsibility of that treaty. If there be any difficulty to be met with in this case, it is not because of lack of information, for there is abundance of information. The greatest difficulty which gentlemen opposite will experience will be in digesting the great mass of matter bearing on this question which can be found in the archives of the public library.

The eastern part of the line was surveyed many years ago; the country between Winnipeg and Quebec has been examined and reported upon to a very large extent by competent explorers. The prairies are no longer an unknown land. The mountain passes of British Columbia have been examined and their character is well known and understood. Though we may have no located line to assist us, yet as the Prime Minister said, there are mountains of information available to those who will take the trouble to seek it. To state that we have no information on this subject is absolutely unjustified by the facts.

I suppose, Sir, that if there is one part of this scheme which is being more strongly opposed than another, it is that part of the railway which it is proposed shall run from Moncton to Quebec. I have no doubt that in the western part of the Dominion we shall hear that talked of more frequently than any other section, but at the same time I have no doubt that down in the eastern provinces we shall hear a great deal about this worthless country in Ontario which we are going to build a railway through. And, notwithstanding the speech of my honourable friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, I do not think we shall hear much in the maritime provinces against this project of a railway from Moncton to Quebec. However, I fully expect that when the time comes when we have to meet our opponents on the platform in the lower provinces, we shall hear a great deal about the wild country in Ontario in which we are to squander money. Be that as it may, we have to ask our friends in the east and in the west to give and take in this matter, and to believe that in both cases the country is not so worthless as it is represented to be, but that it is a country worth owning and worth developing. One would think from what has been said about this Moncton-Quebec section that it was absolutely new and unheard of, a mad and a crazy scheme. We are asked, who shall be so mad as to ask that another railway should be built from the waters of the St. Lawrence down to the lower provinces? Well, Sir, so far as this part of the scheme is concerned, the line upon which it is proposed to build this road to-day, is practically one of the three main lines that were examined, and reported upon, and recommended by the surveyors for the Intercolonial Railway as far back as 1864. And yet, gentlemen opposite seem to treat this project to-day as something new and unheard of. We have some information about it in the report of Sir Sanford Fleming, made nearly forty years ago. We are told to-day that this road will be of no value. At that time Sir Sanford Fleming pointed out that the shortest line and the most direct line for through-freight that can be obtained from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the lower provinces, is by what was called the frontier line running close to the state of Maine, and then he said, that next to that there was the 'central line,' and the 'central line' of Sir Sanford Fleming's report is substantially and practically the line on which it is now proposed to build the railway. These are Sir Sanford Fleming's words:

> The central route would, next to the frontier line, be the best for the transportation of through-freight, and as a means of colonizing the country and developing its natural resources it would stand in the first position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And, Sir Sanford Fleming also reported:

> The settlement of the province has naturally enough followed its navigable waters; on the south by the Bay of Fundy and its inlets; on the east by the coast and bays of the Gulf of St. Lawrence; on the west by the river St. John which extends and to some extent is navigable almost to the extreme north-westerly angle of the province. In consequence, New Brunswick may be said to be populated as yet only along its outskirts. There is a vast area in the interior unoccupied, not because the soil is so much more uncultivable than elsewhere, but because it has hitherto been, and is still, inaccessible.

That condition of affairs to a very large extent prevails to-day, although a great many years have passed since that report was prepared. In the lower part of the province the Canada Eastern line stretches from the River St. John across to the gulf, and there are here and there one or two small branch lines; but practically the great part of the interior of the province of New Brunswick described in Sir Sanford Fleming's report of that day is still inaccessible and not open to settlement; and the reason why it has not been settled has been, to use Sir Sanford Fleming's own words, 'not because the soil is so much uncultivable than elsewhere, but because it has hitherto been and still is inaccessible.'

Mr. CLANCY. That does not mean that the soil is not inferior by comparison.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. By comparison with what ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has just read that it is not by reason of it being so much more uncultivable, but by being inaccessible, which, of course, means that it is not as cultivable as other land.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, Mr. Speaker, all the lands of Canada are not equally fertile or valuable to the farmer; but even if they are not all equal to the lands of the prairies, there are millions of acres in Canada which we expect to be occupied by settlers, millions which are to-day occupied by settlers, even though they may not be what the hon. gentleman would call the superior lands. I will quote further from Sir Sanford Fleming's report of 1864. I may say that there are three routes described—the frontier route near the state of Maine, the central route, which is the subject of the present discussion, and the route along the Baie des Chaleurs, which was afterwards adopted for the Intercolonial Railway. Sir Sanford Fleming says :

> The central route will have the least population to accommodate immediately along the line. Indeed, between the Miramichi and St. Lawrence there is only one settlement, which consists of a few families on the Tobique river. By opening roads, however, to the east and west, the county of Restigouche and the valley of the St. John would be easily reached and a considerable portion of the trade of these sections brought within the influence of the railway. A line through the centre of New Brunswick would take the supplies for the lumber trade and would rapidly settle up the large tracts of cultivable land in this district.

You see, he considered it quite cultivable.

> A railway so situated would, as a line of communication, have similar effects on the trade and progress of New Brunswick as the River St. John has had, with this additional advantage, it would be open all the year instead of half of it.
>
> In much less time, it is believed, than has been occupied in settling and improving the lands which nature made accessible by the river, would the artificial means of communication result in populating the interior of the country through the greater part of its length, and thus develop and foster a traffic which does not now exist.

Such was the view held by Sir Sanford Fleming as far back as the year to which I have referred.

The cry has been raised that this line should be objected to because it parallels the Intercolonial Railway. We claim that it does not parallel the Intercolonial Railway; but for the sake of argument, we will assume that it does. Is that a conclusive argument against its construction ? Do we refuse to parallel lines in this country ? Have we not granted parallel charters and parallel subsidies all over Canada? Have we not, during this very session, laid down the policy in the Railway Committee that charters may be granted for parallel railways so long as they are thirty miles from other railways ? Where has this parliament laid down the principle that we shall not grant charters or subsidies or assistance of any kind to parallel lines ? If we are prepared to grant parallel charters and subsidies in other cases, why not in the case of the Intercolonial Railway ? What reason is there for treating the Intercolonial Railway in a different way from other railways in that respect ? Am I to be told that it is a good thing to parallel company roads, but a bad thing to parallel the Intercolonial Railway ? Am I to be told that because this is a government road we must nurse and protect it, and give it freedom from competition which private capital has to submit to ? Are we to tell investors in the railways of this country that they shall have their capital imperilled by charters and subsidies to other railways, but that we shall take care that our own road shall not be subjected to any such competition ? Surely we are not prepared to take that ground. Surely, if we grant charters and subsidies for parallel lines in which private capital is invested, there is no reason why the Intercolonial Railway, because it happens to be a government road, should be free from the competition which other roads have to submit to.

Suppose that instead of having built the Intercolonial Railway around the north shore, this favourable report of Sir Sanford Fleming had been adopted, and the Intercolonial Railway had been built by this central route, what would have been the position to-day ? Undoubtedly the towns on the north shore would always be of some consequence, on account of their accessibility to the ocean; but without railway communication they would not be in the flourishing condition that they are in to-day. Some of the prosperity that has come to them by reason of the railway communication they enjoy would have come to the people who would have settled along the central route, and that country would have been opened up and developed in the manner suggested in Sir Sanford Fleming's report. What then ? If the people of the north shore were coming to this House to-day and asking for a government grant of subsidy, or for government construction, or for some other means of giving them the benefit of railway communication, would we be able to meet them with the statement: 'Oh, no, we cannot give you a railway, because it will parallel the Intercolonial' ? Surely we would have been bound to extend to that section of country in the course of time the benefits of railway construction. And as in the beginning we built the Intercolonial Railway by the north shore and gave the people there the benefit of railway construction, surely the time has come, whether it will parallel the Intercolonial Railway or not—and I want to

deal with the worst view of the case—when we would be justified in building a railway through that unsettled country which has been described so well in the report of Sir Sanford Fleming.

Well, Sir, does the proposed railway parallel the Intercolonial Railway ? That question has been dealt with by my right hon. friend the premier, and there is no need of my dwelling upon it. From the way in which this expression, paralleling the Intercolonial Railway, has been used, one would think that because two roads start from a common point and end at a common point, they may be said to parallel each other, even though they go around the opposite sides of a circle. There is no paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway by this road. After it leaves Lévis it is out of the way of the Intercolonial Railway at once. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that it never gets farther away from the Intercolonial Railway than fifty miles. I am advised by competent authorities that there are places where it will be 88 miles from the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. SPROULE. Will it not take a large share of the trade which now goes over the Intercolonial Railway to Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am prepared to say that even if it does, that is no argument against the construction of the railway. When the Canada Atlantic Railway was the only line running directly from Montreal to Ottawa, and we were asked to aid the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct a line between these two cities, we did not consider whether the two roads paralleled each other or not ; and after the Canadian Pacific Railway line was built, the company proceeded to parallel their own line with another one. To-day you have four railways between Ottawa and Montreal, if I may include the road running to Prescott, all aided by the government of Canada, and nobody seems to be very much aggrieved over the question of any of them being paralleled. Whether the Intercolonial Railway is paralleled or not, and whether this new road will take traffic from it or not, affords no argument against building the new line, opening up a new section of country, and doing something towards settling the unoccupied lands of the province of New Brunswick. If a road starts from Montreal or Quebec and runs to a point in the maritime provinces, and another railway which it is proposed to construct between those points is to be regarded as a case of paralleling, what happened when the Intercolonial Railway was paralleled in that sense by the construction of the short line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? Did the hon. gentleman stop to see whether it took any traffic away from the Intercolonial Railway ? No, that question did not count for anything then. There was no question then about paralleling the Intercolonial Railway, or about competition with the Intercolonial Railway. Nobody cared anything then about the rights of the Intercolonial Railway, and our hon. friends in opposition were prepared to spend money liberally in building another line, which was not even a line completely on British territory.

There was another phase to that scheme. When it was adopted by the Conservative government, it included a branch which was to run from Harvey to Salisbury. Salisbury is a station close to Moncton, so that the Harvey and Salisbury line was of the same character as the one we are proposing to build now. The only difference is that ours is to start in Quebec and go direct to Moncton, and the other was to start at a point further down on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and cross from Harvey to Salisbury. Why ? To serve the very purpose for which our projected road is intended to-day, namely, give another short line to the maritime provinces. There was no talk then about paralleling the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. CLANCY. Was that a trunk line ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not see that that makes any difference. It was a line which was going to carry freight, and might have taken freight from the Intercolonial Railway, but that never worried the souls of the hon. gentlemen who sat behind the government of that day. There is another view of the case. This so-called Harvey-Salisbury line was deemed to be of so much importance to the maritime provinces that I believe I am justified in saying that but for the putting of that section into the scheme the Bill would have never been carried through parliament. I am assured of that by people who were familiar with the facts at the time, and I do not believe that you would have had a member from the eastern part of New Brunswick or from the province of Nova Scotia, on either side of politics, who would have voted for that scheme at that time had they not the assurance that that line was to be built. Well, as in many other cases, the expectations created by hon. gentlemen opposite were not realized. The Harvey-Salisbury line was not built by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Then the maritime province members began to complain to the government of that day that faith had not been kept with them, that they had been misled, humbugged and deceived ; and in the efforts to conciliate, the government of that day brought forward a Bill to construct the Harvey-Salisbury line as a government work. That line was to reach the very point we are now reaching, because Salisbury is a station but a short distance from Moncton. Although the starting point was not the same the object was the same, namely, to get a short line to Moncton. What followed ? The Bill passed this House, but by some misfortune

it failed to pass the Senate, and there the matter ended. The good people of the maritime provinces were humbugged. They were humbugged first by putting the building of this line into the Canadian Pacific Railway arrangement, and afterwards by putting it into a special Bill, which was quietly so managed that the Senate threw it out. Is it surprising that from that day to this there has been, in a large portion of the maritime provinces, deep discontent on this question of the short line ? The maritime provinces have not been content with the short line which runs through the state of Maine. We have no objection to that line. We have no quarrel with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But we say that it would have been a wise policy to have had a short line on British territory. That which the government of the party opposite intended to give but failed to give, a short line on British territory, this government, after the lapse of these years, has undertaken to provide as a part of a great national scheme and to make amends for the wrong done to the maritime provinces in the manner I have described.

If we were to judge from what was said yesterday by hon. gentlemen opposite and repeated to-day, this is a very mad scheme, and one that was never thought of before. No engineer would ever contemplate such a line. No sensible person would ever dream of it. But I have already shown that it was recommended as a good line by Sir Sanford Fleming in the early days, and that the government of Sir John Macdonald deemed a short line to Moncton so important that they incorporated it first in their arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and afterwards made it the object of a special Bill. But that is not the whole history of this matter. Later on there were other negotiations respecting this road. After the government arrangement fell through, the Grand Trunk Railway came forward, in association with the people connected with the Témiscouata road. They asked for a subsidy for the building of a line from Edmundston, which is on the Témiscouata road, down to this very place, the city of Moncton. Yet we are told that the scheme was a mad one. One would imagine, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite, that no sane man would ever dream of such a thing. Well, the Grand Trunk Railway, under the management of Sir Joseph Hickson, believed so much in that scheme that they entered into negotiation with the government, in association with the Témiscouata Railway Company, to construct it over the very route we propose to-day, only they proposed to begin at Edmundston instead of at Lévis. They came here and sought a subsidy. I have information, on which I can rely, that Sir John Macdonald personally approved of that scheme and was willing to grant a subsidy of $10,000 per mile to the company to build that road. I have reason to believe that my statement is well founded, and the men to whom the promise was made can be found, if it be disputed. I do not say the government as a whole made the promise, because in the final settlement influences were brought to bear which led to the scheme being abandoned. But why was it abandoned ? Was it because it would parallel the Intercolonial Railway ? Not a bit of it. It was abandoned, not because it would parallel the Intercolonial Railway, but because it would compete with the new Canadian Pacific Railway short line. That was why the government of that day refused to grant the desired aid. I am not making any accusation against the government of that day, nor am I finding fault with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That company had recently built a short line to the maritime provinces, and thought it a little too much that it should be met immediately by an opposing line. We can make some allowance for the stand then taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but many things have passed since then, and I think the Canadian Pacific Railway have no reason to-day to view this scheme with disfavour. Any anxiety which they had in the beginning of the enterprise no longer exists, and we have no reason to suppose that they are hostile to this scheme. We are told that it is a mad scheme, one which nobody has ever thought of. Well, the board of trade of the city of Quebec passed unanimously resolutions in favour of that scheme and calling upon the government to aid it. The board of trade of Halifax also passed resolutions calling on the government to support that scheme with the public money. The board of trade of Truro passed similar resolutions. Were all these people mad ? I happen to have under my hand the resolutions of the board of trade of Truro, which I may quote as a sample of the public opinion which existed in the maritime provinces then in favour of the very enterprise which the government propose to-day. On the 14th of February, 1890, the board of Truro passed the following resolution :

Mr. FRASER. On what day ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the 14th of February, 1890, St. Valentine's day. They passed this valentine and sent it to their representative at Ottawa :

> Resolved, That the Truro Board of Trade learns with interest of the proposed extension of the Grand Trunk Railway system to the maritime provinces connecting with the Intercolonial Railway at or near Moncton, thus giving a competing line to the west as well as a short line and one on all British territory, and hereby requests the Dominion government to afford all possible aid to promote the success of the undertaking ; and further
>
> Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our Dominion representative at Ottawa for presentation to the government.
>
> G. CLISH, President.
> G. A. HALL, Secretary.

No wonder my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley), whenever he stands up here, sounds a loyal note. He comes from a loyal town and this is a loyal resolution. As I had the pleasure of knowing both gentlemen, I desire to say in fairness to them that they are both good, staunch Conservatives of the town of Truro.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt, that will add materially to the scheme that was outlined by the Tories first.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was outlined by the government of Sir John Macdonald, but like too many outlines these outlines faded away as time passed on. The lines were obliterated. They lasted long enough for the scheme to serve in one or two elections in the maritime provinces, but the promises made were never realized. What I wished to call your attention to, Mr. Speaker, is that in all these negotiations to which I have referred, the same thing is seen. In the negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway in the beginning they were to have a line which was to include a line from Harvey to Salisbury, which is near Moncton, and the Bill was carried through this House to build the line from Harvey to Salisbury, near Moncton. And the Grand Trunk scheme that I have referred to was to build from Edmundston to Moncton. In all these negotiations Moncton was the objective point, as it is to-day. Why is Moncton the objective point? Some hon. gentlemen talk as if the great object, and the only object was to build the shortest and most direct line to the ocean. And my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) asked yesterday if this government were going to build this Eastern line, why did they not build it by the shortest line to St. John. There was applause on the other side of the House. There are a number of reasons why Moncton is the right point. One of the reasons is that if you want to get the shortest line from the waters of the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic ocean, you will not go to St. John, because that is not the shortest line. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) will endorse this, because the shortest line from the waters of the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic is to the port of St. Andrews. Therefore, the idea that you must go to St. John because it is the shortest line is an entire delusion. I know that some hon. gentlemen have been influenced by that. The shortest line to the ocean is an important consideration, but it is not the only question involved. Other interests are entitled to receive consideration, and they did receive consideration in making this arrangement. There are various reasons why we should go to Moncton. In the first place, it is the centre of the maritime provinces, as near as we can get it. The actual centre of population is further east, probably in the county of my hon. friend from Cumberland, possibly further east in the county represented by my hon. friend from Colchester. But, to reach that centre you would have to parallel the Intercolonial; it would be an actual parallelling, and we do not propose to do that. Moncton is the most convenient centre of connection for the million of people in the maritime provinces. Now, important as the grain traffic is, and we all recognize its importance, it is only one object to be considered in the making of a national transcontinental railway. We may believe, we are bound to believe, that this million of people in the maritime provinces will have something to send back to the west, and besides, there is the passenger traffic which must be considered. We do not think it wise to single out one port and give it a monopoly. Moncton is the most convenient point, and from it all the ports in the maritime provinces are most easily accessible. It is convenient to St. John. It is nearer to St. John than it is to Halifax. So far as the ocean port is concerned, St. John is placed on at least equal terms; as I say, it is nearer to Moncton than Halifax is. We must leave the two harbours to argue the question as to their respective merits; but Moncton is chosen because it is the central point of all the maritime provinces. There are other harbours besides Halifax and St. John that are entitled to consideration. Those who had the pleasure and advantage of hearing the discussion of the Grand Trunk Bill in the Railway Committee will remember that Mr. Hays, the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, when asked about the use of the harbours of the maritime provinces, said that if the western country developed at its present rate, as we have no doubt it will, the time is close at hand when we should need, not one, but three or four harbours to serve the traffic coming from the west. We are not building for to-day, we are building for the future as well as for to-day; and it was sound policy on the part of the government to take as their objective point a point on the Intercolonial Railway in the very heart of the maritime provinces, which gives easy access to St. John on the one hand and Halifax on the other, as well as to Sydney and Louisburg, both of which are on the line of railway communication, and to Country Harbour, which is the objective point of a line of railway now under charter, and to Whitehaven, one of the harbours in the lower provinces which will take its place some day as one of our prominent Eastern harbours. The policy of the government is not to select one port, but to select a central point from which access may be had to all the harbours in the lower provinces. I think our friends in St. John have no reason to regret this; I am sure that St. John will profit largely by the construction of this line. As I have said, it is nearer to Moncton than Halifax is, and when the trains come down

from the west they are as likely, if they want to go to St. John, to go over this road as they would be to go over the Intercolonial, which is much longer. The people of St. John have shown great enterprise in the past. They have invested their own money in providing harbour facilities for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I rejoice to know that they are reaping the reward of their enterprise. But they are dependent wholly upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. They have connection with the Intercolonial, but we know that the Intercolonial and its connection, the present Grand Trunk, have no connection with the great west, and therefore the Intercolonial is not in a position to deliver at St. John the traffic of the western country. With this road built, instead of being dependent on the Canadian Pacific Railway only, St. John will have two strings to its bow. Not a pound of traffic that goes to St. John now will be taken away, and St. John will stand its chance of getting a fair share of the new traffic to be created by this road. Halifax, with its peerless harbour, will have advantages which it has not hitherto enjoyed. Surely, Sir, the time has come, after years of deception, humbugging and trickery about the lines to the maritime provinces, that faith should be kept with these people, and they should have a through line running on Canadian territory from ocean to ocean.

I have given you so much with regard to the history of the past. Perhaps, before six o'clock I may have time to say a word with regard to what is going on at present. We are told that this is a mad scheme, a wild scheme, that nobody would place faith in it, that no business man would believe in it. Let me read a resolution passed on the 23rd day of July last, relating to this scheme :—

Whereas, objection having been taken to that part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme which provides for the building of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton, N.B., this board desires most emphatically to reaffirm its previous declaration (appended hereto) that no scheme of government transcontinental transportation will be either adequate or equitable to each province of the Dominion which does not ensure the carriage of Canadian products through Canadian ports in winter as well as in summer, and regards it as imperative that stringent guarantees to carry out that policy should be exacted by the government.

We further maintain that the construction of the road west of Quebec without ensuring its continuance east through Canadian territory would be manifestly unjust to the maritime provinces.

This board is also of the opinion that the building of the shortest possible line through Canadian territory from Quebec to Moncton, N.B., would be of immense advantage to the maritime provinces, as well as to the rest of Canada, and would secure for the road a large share of through freight and passenger business, which at present is done through United States ports.

(Sgd.) JAMES HALL, Vice President.
CHARLES M. CREED, Secretary,

This resolution was passed unanimously a few days ago by the Halifax Board of Trade.

I noticed that when my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways was referring yesterday to the danger of this scheme dismantling the Intercolonial Railway, doing harm to the Intercolonial Railway, his words were received with wild applause on the other side of the House. They were pained, I suppose, to hear that there was any danger of the Intercolonial Railway being starved or interfered with. My hon. friend the ex-minister must have experienced a new sensation when he received these cheers from the other side, for he must have remembered that session after session, and year after year, the efforts that he made to benefit the Intercolonial Railway, the efforts which this government authorized him to make and supported him in making, for building up the Intercolonial Railway, were opposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. the ex-Minister of Railways said that we had better spend this money in equipping our harbours with elevators and terminal facilities ; and again the applause came from the other side. I think, Sir, if we could have read the mind of the ex-Minister of Railways at that moment we would have seen that he recollected the fact that when this government made a moderate provision for terminal facilities in his own city of St. John, when they put up a modest elevator in St. John, and another modest elevator in Halifax, instead of hon. gentlemen opposite supporting us and asking us to give further terminal facilities and equipment in the way of elevators, they declared that the money was wasted. Then my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways was very much disturbed by the fear that the workshops at Moncton were going to suffer, that the workmen were not going to be employed, that there was not going to be money enough spent down there. Again, Sir, the applause came from hon. gentlemen opposite, and the ex-minister must have thought to himself, why did I not have these cheers when I was providing the money for these workshops ? Why was it that for seven long years when this government was pouring out money liberally, and as hon. gentlemen opposite said, lavishly, for the upbuilding of the Intercolonial Railway, why was it that we had nothing but flouts, and jeers and sneers from the men who were cheering him yesterday ? Sir, I can assure the ex-Minister of Railways that he need not worry about the Intercolonial Railway, for it is safe in the hands of its friends, the present gov-

ernment; and may Heaven preserve it if the time ever comes when it has to depend upon the tender mercies of the hon. gentlemen who cheered him yesterday, and who for seven years have done everything they could to tie his hands and to prevent the development of the Intercolonial Railway.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 244) respecting the Western Assurance Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ratify the agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for the construction of a national transcontinental railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, when the House suspended its sitting at six o'clock I was making some reference to what is called the Moncton section of this proposed road—the road from Moncton to the city of Quebec. I endeavoured to point out that this road would serve a good purpose in opening up a country, the development of which is desirable and necessary. I endeavoured to point out that there were no particular difficulties in the way of construction and that while opening up a country which is capable of development we would at the same time obtain a shorter line through the province of New Brunswick which certainly is not a disadvantage, but in regard to which we may all agree in saying, I think, so much the better. I pointed out that Moncton had been chosen as the objective point because of its central position, because it affords by means of the Intercolonial Railway easy access to all of the important harbours of the maritime provinces. Moncton is in the eastern portion of the province of New Brunswick within a short distance, comparatively speaking, of the Nova Scotia boundary. It is very close to the point of communication with Prince Edward Island. There are two principal channels of communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. One is from Pictou in the province of Nova Scotia to Charlottetown and the other is from Point de Chêne in the province of New Brunswick across to Summerside. The crossing from Point de Chêne to Summerside is at a point quite near to Moncton. The traveller going down there and desiring to cross to Prince Edward Island would leave the Intercolonial Railway at a point a very short distance from Moncton. So, in locating Moncton as the central point we have a point in the eastern portion of New Brunswick, near the Nova Scotia boundary, in close touch with the communication with Prince Edward Island. In that way in so far as any one point can serve the purpose, Moncton seems to fill the bill better than any other place we could have named. I do not say in this connection that I agree with all that has been said with regard to the original location of the Intercolonial Railway. It is sometimes spoken of as a political location. I suppose that term may be used in a good sense or in a sense of reproach. I am inclined to think though that there were high political reasons which could be and were urged in favour of that location. For myself I do not hesitate to say that if to-day we could have only one line of communication between the upper and lower provinces, I should prefer to have the line of the Intercolonial Railway around the north shore. If you could have only one line then that line should be chosen not purely for commercial reasons but for larger national reasons, and I may say even for imperial reasons. The selection of the north shore route for the Intercolonial Railway at the time of confederation was to some extent based upon national reasons and to some extent based upon imperial reasons. It was deemed desirable that the line should afford a channel of communication between the east and the west and that it should be a sufficient distance away from the American boundary to make it what we sometimes call a military line. I think that is a reason which the whole country will sympathize with. Then, there was an imperial reason in connection with finance. Owing to Canada's splendid position to-day her credit is of such high standing that we need not look for a guarantor or endorser when we go into any transaction; our position is so good that we need not seek for an imperial guarantee or attach much importance to it. But, while that is the condition to-day with the magnificent prosperity which our country has enjoyed for a number of years, that was not the condition at the time of the union, and the imperial guarantee was then deemed of sufficient importance to play an important part in the transaction. It was deemed desirable that the imperial government should give a guarantee to assist the Intercolonial Railway. While I do not go so far as to say that they would have refused to give the guarantee if another location had been adopted, it is probably not too much to say that when the government did determine to locate that road around the north shore they knew it was agreeable to the imperial authorities who for imperial reasons favoured it. However, I take the position that if we could have only one line to the maritime provinces that one line should be practically the location near the north shore

of New Brunswick, and I do not join in the opinion of those who think now that a mistake was made.

My right hon. friend the leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in his reference to this Moncton line, dwelt for some time on what he regarded as an important feature in connection with the bonding privilege. He said that this line would make us more independent of our American neighbours. That view has been scoffed at by some hon. gentlemen who point out that we are not really dependent on our American neighbours because we have access to our own seaports by our Intercolonial Railway, and that there is also another line by which we can get down to the sea. Though we may be independent in a limited degree of our American friends, I think we ought to make it plain to them that we are determined to be even more independent than we are. There was no part of the eloquent speech of my hon. friend that I admired more than his statement to the effect that the best possible way to live on friendly terms with our brothers to the south of us is to have them understand that we are determined to be absolutely independent of them. It is true that in some respects that we have been more independent of them as respects the bonding privilege than perhaps they were aware of. But we have been told that, because the bonding privilege is a mutual one and because it is of advantage to American railways as well as to the railways of Canada, we need not be alarmed that any change will take place. I believe that the fact that a thing is of advantage to one set of people in the United States is not always conclusive evidence that that condition of affairs will continue. I have no doubt the high tariff of the United States is a burden to many people living in certain sections of the country, but, while the tariff operates with particular severity upon the people of this section, it is regarded with favour by the people of other sections and I have no doubt by the majority at large. So the people of any particular section are obliged to bear the burden for the common good, and I have no doubt that if it suited the policy of our American friends to carry out the threats they have repeatedly made of the abolition of the bonding privilege, the fact that such action would be injurious to one particular set of men or to certain railway companies would not prevent them from carrying out that policy. Therefore, I say it is desirable that we should give our American brethren to understand that Canada is resolved to work out her independence in these things, that the present proposal will promote this object, and that even if still another railway should be necessary we shall be prepared to construct it. The attitude that the government has taken upon this subject and the speech which my right hon. friend has addressed to the House on the subject has already attracted much attention across the border, and there is a much keener appreciation of Canada's independence than ever before. I read to-day in one of the great journals of the United States, the 'New York Journal of Commerce,' not a political journal, but a commercial journal:

> What more particularly interests and concerns us now is the determination of Canada, at whatever cost, to be independent of the United States for the means of reaching the eastern and western seas with the products of her territory. . . . . Our policy has been anything but liberal, though a liberal policy would have been as much to our advantage as to that of Canada. If we exclude or restrict her trade, keeping it from passing freely into and over our territory, we must expect her to provide for it elsewhere and ought to admire the spirit and determination with which she does it.

That, Sir, is a specimen of what is being said in the journals of the United States to-day. I agree with the hon. gentlemen opposite when they say that we have not been wholly dependent upon the United States for the bonding privileges. I believe we had some levers, but I am strongly convinced that these levers would not be powerful in the event of a great movement arising in the United States which might take the form of hostility to our country. Therefore in the interest of Canada to-day, as well as in the future, it is well that we should let our friends across the border understand, that whatever measure of independence of them we have now we shall maintain, and that we shall increase that measure of independence by the line that we are now proposing, and should the necessity arise, we shall not shrink from providing another.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no idea, Sir, that I shall be able to settle the dispute as to the saving in mileage between Quebec and Moncton. Whenever a line is not absolutely laid down there is always room for discussion on that point, but I shall assume for the present that the mileage between Quebec and Moncton is somewhat longer than it has been supposed to be by some hon. gentlemen. I am advised on good authority that an air-line from Moncton to Quebec—that is, if I may use the expression air-line, where you have to go down to the point where you turn the American territory, and then take another air-line to Moncton—taking the shortest air-line you have from Quebec, or rather from Chaudière, to Moncton, would be 351 miles, and to this you have to add for curvature 10 per cent, making it 386 miles. I do not fail to remember that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) said there was a great deal of curvature in this road, and a great deal of curvature in the policy. I accept the compliment which my hon. friend of course

did not intend, because no doubt he forgot the fact that from the point of view of the artist and designer, the curve is the line of beauty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Taking an air-line and allowing 35 miles for curvature, we would have 386 miles as against 496, which is the mileage from the Chaudière to Moncton by way of the Intercolonial Railway. That would give a saving of 110 miles. That is a little less than the saving claimed by some hon. gentlemen on this side, and a good deal more than the saving claimed by hon. gentlemen opposite. But while I give these figures upon competent authority, I am not disposed to stand strictly by them, and for the purpose of the calculation that I shall make later, I propose to treat the mileage of that road as being in round figures, 400 miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Having regard to the natural obstacles, what does the hon. gentleman say the saving is?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am advised that a line of about 400 miles will probably accomplish the distance. Taking an air-line and adding 10 per cent, as engineers do in an ordinary country, it would give 386 miles, but I am going to treat it for the purpose of my financial calculation as a mileage of 400, because I wish to be absolutely fair in any argument I shall make.

The section from Quebec to Winnipeg has also been the subject of much discussion, and efforts have been made to show that the country through which this road is to run, is a country unworthy of our consideration. I stated this afternoon that the only ground on which I think hon. gentlemen opposite could fairly oppose this road with some show of reason, would be upon the assumption that this vast territory is absolutely worthless. We differ from that opinion, and we think that the territory is deserving of development. We think also that the representations that have been made, as to the very expensive character of this section for railway building, are entirely mistaken. We believe that the information which is available justifies us in saying that that portion of the country, speaking generally of it, is not one of great difficulty for railway building, but is one through which a railway may be built at a very moderate expense, and that it has resources which we ought to develop in order that we may build up the Dominion at large.

In the course of the surveys that were made for the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was found that a railway north of Lake Nipigon could be built at a very moderate cost, but it served the purposes of the company to go along the shore of the lake, where the construction was very expensive. I believe that the records will show that the Canadian Pacific Railway could have been built at a much less expense if it had been built on the elevated plateau which lies behind Lake Superior and Lake Huron. The information we have on that subject is very clear. There is no difficulty whatever so far as we can learn, in obtaining a good location there, and the only reason that location was not adopted by the Canadian Pacific Railway was, that they wanted to avoid building a long branch down to Lake Superior. The reports all go to show that while on the lake shore the country is rough, rugged, and unsuitable for railway construction, when you go back a short distance into the country the conditions are much more favourable. In Sir Sanford Fleming's report of 1874, he says:

> Although the general aspect of the country east of Lake Nipigon as seen from Lakes Superior and Huron, is precipitous and rugged, to the rear of this wild and rugged frontier the surface descends northerly in easy slopes. So much is this found to be the case that in passing from Lake Nipissing to Lake Nipigon through the entire country the ascent to the summit level will actually be less than that which is experienced in passing through Toronto across the peninsula of western Ontario, by either the Great Western, the Grand Trunk, the Grey and Bruce, or the Northern railways.

That region was surveyed by Mr. James H. Rowan, in connection with the government survey of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and this is what he says of the condition of that country:

> The principal physical difficulties to be contended with in the construction of a railway throughout the whole section of country under consideration, are the great extent of water encountered on the route, its rocky character and inaccessibility It is nevertheless believed that a very direct line could be obtained with quantities of excavation and embankment not exceeding the average of railways already constructed in other parts of the Dominon. The last difficulty could be overcome to a considerable extent by means of the knowledge of the country already obtained. There are not many large rivers to be crossed on the line proposed, and of these not more than three or four will require bridges of 200 feet span. Timber of good quality and in sufficient quantity for the various purposes of a railway can be obtained either upon the line or in its neighbourhood. The gradients will be favourable too, in no case exceeding one foot per hundred, or 52·80 per mile. Of these maximum gradients the percentage will be small.

That is not so good a line as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) hopes we will get, but it is as good as a number of the lines we have in Canada to-day. Again Mr. Rowan says:

> It is not a mountain range but merely an elevated plateau, and one remarkable peculiarity connected with it is in the numbers of lakes which occupy its summit, whose waters can easily be diverted and made to flow either the one side or the other.

Further on Mr. Rowan says :

The character of the country is very similar in the neighbourhood of either side of this elevated plateau, but outside that margin the difference as regards its adaptability for railway construction is very marked ; for while to the south it is broken up by hills of considerable altitude, with lakes intervening, of all shapes, sizes, and some of great depth, to the north it is comparatively level and swampy.

The greater portion of the country explored is covered with a dense growth of moderate sized timber, consisting of balsam, spruce, poplar, white birch, some tamarack, and occasional groves of white, but principally red pine, while at many points there are indications of valuable mineral deposits.

And in a foot note concerning mineral deposits, the report says :

Iron, copper, lead and gypsum in large quantities ; silver also has been found ; and the Indians say there is coal or lignite, which statement is borne out to some extent by a remark of Mr. Bell's in a geological report on the Albany river.

Now, if I wish to dwell a little further on the condition of the country between Winnipeg and Quebec, I do so because I am satisfied that by and by, in certain sections of the Dominion, we shall hear not so much about the Moncton section, but we shall be told, as we were virtually told today by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that that country is a sub-Arctic country, that it is not fit for settlement, and that we should not attempt to build a railway through it.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that my hon. friend is quite fair. I said that we knew nothing about the country, and that there was nothing in the reports to confirm the statements of the Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is mistaken. We know a lot about the country. I have been giving him information from the reports of the explorers and surveyors, who tell us what they know about it; and I am going to give him some more. The hon. gentleman says we know nothing about the country. Why, the whole country has been explored and surveyed for several years by parties sent out by the Ontario government, and here we have their published report. I shall not inflict a great deal of it on the House, but in order that those who have not access to it may know what they say about the country, I shall read some extracts from it :

The results of these extensive explorations, as detailed in the elaborate reports sent in by the surveyors, the land and timber estimators and the geologists, have fully justified the most sanguine expectations in regard to the natural wealth and fertility of northern Ontario and demonstrated the wisdom of the action taken, whereby some accurate knowledge of the character and extent of its enormous undeveloped resources has been acquired. It has been established beyond controversy that in the eastern part of the territory north of the height of land there is an immense area of excellent agriculture land, apparently equal in fertility to any in older Ontario, with an equable and temperate climate and an abundance of wood and water, which render the inducements it presents to those in search of homesteads as good as those offered anywhere else on the continent. The apprehension entertained by some that our forest resources were very limited has been contradicted by the exploration and estimation of extensive pine areas on the southern slope, as well as the location of great forests of spruce and other varieties of pulpwood north of the height of land, which will enable this province to take a leading position in the commercial world as regards the growing and remunerative pulp and paper-making industry. While the geological examinations have not resulted in any new discoveries of economic minerals (and it was scarcely expected they would), they have been of material service in identifying and establishing the character of the different rock formations and locating promising indications as a guide to closer investigations in the future. Analyses of the peat taken from the extensive deposits in Nipissing have conclusively shown its high qualities and economic utility, and established the value of this great natural store of fuel, which will probably make it useful in the industrial development of the country.

Then, under the head of Agricultural Lands, the report says :

The great clay belt running from the Quebec boundary west through Nipissing and Algoma districts and into the district of Thunder bay comprises an area of at least 24,500 square miles, or 15,680,000 acres, nearly all of which is well adapted for cultivation. This almost unbroken stretch of good farming land is nearly three-quarters as great in extent as the whole settled portion of the province south of Lake Nipissing and the French and Mattawa rivers. It is larger that the states of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey and Delaware combined, and one-half besides of the state of New York. The region is watered by the Moose river, flowing into James bay, and its tributaries, the Abbittibbi. Mattagami and Missinabie, and by the Albany and its tributaries, the Kenogami and Ogoke. Each of these rivers is over 300 miles in length, and they range in width from 300 or 400 yards to a mile. They are fed by numerous smaller streams, and these in turn drain numberless lakes of larger or smaller size, so that the whole country is one net-work of waterways, affording easy means of communications with long stretches fit for navigation. The great area of water surface also assures the country against the protracted droughts so often experienced in other countries. The southern boundary of this great tract of fertile land is less than forty miles from Missinabie station on the Canadian Pacific Railway ; and the country north of the height of land being one immense level plateau sloping off towards James bay, the construction of railways and wagon roads through every part of it would be a comparatively easy matter.

Under the head of Climate the report says :

Another important fact established by the explorations is that the climate in this northern district presents no obstacle to successful agricultural settlement. The information obtained completely dispels the erroneous impression that its winters are of Arctic severity

and its summers too short to enable crops to mature. The absence of summer frosts noted by the explorers and the growth of all the common vegetables at the Hudson bay posts must disabuse the public mind of this erroneous impression. The 50th parallel of latitude passes through the centre of the agricultural belt, and the climate is not much different from that of the province of Manitoba, lying along the same parallel, with this exception, of course, that the winter is tempered by the great spruce forests and the presence of so large a proportion of water surface. The country, too, has an abundance of wood for fuel, building and commercial purposes, and plenty of pure water every where.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend allow me ? I specially referred to that introduction to the reports, and I said that I had read the ten reports, and that it seemed to me that the very fine impression made by the introduction was not borne out by the reports themselves.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to leave my hearers and readers to judge what is borne out by that which I have read from the official report issued by the government of Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say who that is signed by ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is published by the government of Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will find that there is no signature to it. It is a mere comment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not expect that criticism. This is a document issued by the printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty for the province of Ontario.

Mr. NORTHRUP. From Mr. Stratton's department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not a blue book, but it is what is called a blue book, though in colour it is somewhat different from our blue books, and it is headed : 'Report of the Survey and Exploration of Northern Ontario, 1900; printed by order of the legislative assembly of Ontario.'

Mr. BROCK. Absolutely cooked.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We can stand the condemnation of that country from my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, but we do not expect it from the member for Centre Toronto.

Mr. BROCK. I did not condemn that country. I condemned the report which the hon. gentleman was palming off on this House as a report from either the government or an individual. It is not a report. It is merely cooked up for political purposes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, well, well. This report is three years of age. It was issued in the year 1900, and, although I have not followed the affairs of the province of Ontario perhaps as closely as my hon. friend has, I have never before heard any question raised as to the good faith of this report. It would be a marvel to me if an official document——

Mr. HEYD. Was there any objection made to this report by the opposition in the legislative assembly ?

Mr. BROCK. The whole thing is a humbug.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot answer my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Heyd), but I am bound to say that when I find this report issued as an official report of the government of Ontario I give it the same faith and credence that I would give an official report issued by the government of any British colony. I hold in my hand a volume of the Geological Survey Reports for 1877-8. This particular report is by Dr. Robert Bell. It is headed 'The soil of the country between Lake Superior and James Bay.' :

> In my report for 1875, I gave a general account of the soil, &c., in the region between the great lakes and James' bay. Following the canoe route from Michipicoten to Moose factory, the country is more or less rocky as far as Missinabie lake, yet even in this section the proportion of rock-surface to the whole area may be comparatively small. But after passing the 'Swampy Grounds' north of Missinabie lake, the traveller cannot fail to be struck by the abundance and the general fertility of the soil exposed in the banks of the Missinabie and Moose rivers all the way to Moose factory. It consists mostly of a brownish, somewhat gravelly loam or earth, resting upon 'till' and sometimes upon stratified clays or the solid rock, which, however, is seldom seen, except at the principal rapids and falls. But in the central third of the section between Lake Superior and James' bay, or from the Brunswick to the Long Portage, a light-coloured clay usually forms the surface. I examined the country for a mile or two back from the river in several places for the special purpose of ascertaining the nature of the soil, and found it excellent in all cases, but tending to become more swampy in receding from the river in the Devonian region below the Long Portage. Samples of the soil were collected in a few places for subsequent examination. In traversing such a great extent of almost unbroken wilderness, one is apt to forget the possible value of this vast region for agricultural purposes. But the examples of the farms at New Brunswick house and Moose factory show, upon a small scale, what might be extended over a great part of the country. I have no doubt that at some future time this territory will support a large population.

It is a quarter of a century and more since that report was issued, and we think the time has come when that territory, capable of supporting a large population, might well be opened up by the construction through it of a transcontinental line.

As to the method whereby this road is to be constructed, although it may be a repetition, let me state what the plan of the government is. We propose that a railway

shall be built from Moncton to Winnipeg by way of the city of Quebec as a government work, and be leased for a term of fifty years to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. We propose that the western portion, from Winnipeg to the Pacific, shall be built by the company itself. We propose that guarantees be given to the extent of $30,000 per mile for the mountain section and $13,000 per mile for the prairie section. With respect to the construction of the eastern division, we propose that that shall be brought about by the government through the agency of a commission, and that this commission be composed of three members, who will have full charge of the construction. These commissioners will have large and ample powers, but there will be proper supervision by the government and parliament, as should be the case wherever public money is to be expended. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) called attention to what he calls an extraordinary clause in this arrangement. He said that there is a clause which enables the government to suspend operations on the eastern division. If that be an objection, he might as well have called attention to the clause which says that no money shall be spent until voted by parliament. Such an objection would be just as reasonable as the one he did make. It is the policy of the government to have the work done by the commissioners, but also to have the operations of this commission subject to reasonable parliamentary control. We provide that not a dollar shall be expended until the appropriations are voted by parliament from year to year. We provide further that in case anything unforeseen shall happen—which we do not anticipate—in case the operations of the commission be not carried on to the satisfaction of the government and parliament, the government shall have power to suspend operations until parliament meets and determines what further action will be taken. Yet this is the clause which my hon. friend says is a remarkable one, put in for the purpose of preventing the construction of the road.

What we regard as a very strong feature of the project is that it is to be carried out by practically the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. In an editorial published recently in a Conservative paper, allusion was made to the old Grand Trunk Railway, with its $150,000,000 of assets. I have not stopped to ascertain whether the figures are correct, and am willing to accept the statement that the old Grand Trunk Railway is one of the solid institutions of this Dominion, with its assets of $150,000,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the solidity, strength and power of the Grand Trunk, we have it all in the undertaking we are now submitting to parliament. Hon. gentlemen who have attended the meetings of the Railway Committee may remember that when Sir Rivers Wilson addressed that committee he made the remark that the old Grand Trunk Railway would stand behind this enterprise. We have not been content that they shall stand behind it. We have required, and they have readily consented, that they shall be in it and of it and form the whole thing. We think it is to the advantage of this country to have the Grand Trunk Railway extended both east and west, and we think it is far better that this enterprise should be in the hands of the old Grand Trunk Railway than of promoters who could be characterized as irresponsibles. It is only within the last few days that we have had the views of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, but we have been led to believe by criticisms in the opposition press that the ground upon which they expected to attack this scheme was that some promoters would make a great deal of money out of it. Well, if there be any means by which a promoter can make money out of this enterprise, I have yet to discern it in the Bill. Never was there a railway contract submitted to this parliament behind which there were men in a better position to undertake the work, and who gave better guarantees of their good faith and ability to carry it out.

We have required that the Grand Trunk Railway shall not only be behind this undertaking, but in it and of it. Every joint stock corporation is controlled by those who hold the common stock. So long as the interest on the bonds is paid, no one can take that control from them. We have provided that practically the common stock of this company to the full extent of $25,000,000, shall be held, not by promoters, not even by the old Grand Trunk Railway officials individually, but by the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada itself. There are 250,000 shares of commons stock, of which 249,000 will be held by the Grand Trunk Railway, in its corporate capacity, and 1,000 only are available for distribution among those who may be qualified as directors. I want to know where there is a chance for promoters when they can only hold 1,000 shares against 249,000?

We are not much concerned as to what price the Grand Trunk Railway pays for the stock. That has been a subject of discussion, but I do not attach great importance to it. If the Grand Trunk Railway acquired that stock at a comparatively small sum and afterwards floated it on the market at a higher sum, that would be a proceeding which might be open to objection. But the Grand Trunk Company must not only take this stock, but hold it for all time; they cannot put a dollar of it in the market. It is absolutely impossible to buy a share of that stock; it must be held by the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself and no person can buy or sell a share. Where, then, comes in the chance of speculation? We are not so much concerned, I say, as to what the Grand Trunk pays for it. They have to make some arrangements, and this stock will be one of the elements of the

transaction, one of the elements by which they must make some arrangements to raise a large sum of money. Be it noted that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company must pay at least one-quarter of the cost of the road from Winnipeg to the Pacific. We do not guarantee the cost of that road. We do not pay for that road, as some seem to imply; we do not guarantee the cost of that road. We do not even guarantee a portion without limit. With respect to the western division, we guarantee three-quarters of the cost, not exceeding a certain sum. Our guarantee—not the cost of the road, but our guarantee—is limited to $13,000 per mile on the prairie section and $30,000 per mile on the mountain section. If the road costs less than the figures on which these guarantees are based, we only guarantee three-quarters of that cost, but if the road costs more—and some hon. gentlemen argue that it will be very expensive—we do not increase our proportion, but the company must provide the increased cost without limit so that the road may be finished. The Grand Trunk Pacific agrees to do these things. The next point to be considered, is how are they going to do this? The old company—Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is to obligate itself, it is to guarantee the bonds of the new company in order to accomplish these purposes—the old Grand Trunk with its $150,000,000 of assets, quoting again from the opposition paper, guarantees the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific for whatever is necessary to make up one-quarter of the cost of construction. They afford this assurance for the new undertaking. It is a new company nominally, but the more you look into it, the more you see that it is one company. I do not object to the statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals when he said that these two companies were all 'the same red-headed boy.' We are rejoicing in the fact that these two companies are practically one, and that when we submit this project to the people of Canada, we are not submitting a project of irresponsible promoters, but a project endorsed not only by the good will and pious resolve of the Grand Trunk, but the Grand Trunk put their guarantee and all their resources at the back of the undertaking of the Grand Trunk Pacific. And every dollar they put into the enterprise in that way becomes mortgaged to the government as its own security; and every man who puts a dollar into it in that way does it upon a second mortgage and with the full knowledge that the government holds the first mortgage. When you have a man proposing to invest some money in an enterprise on a first mortgage and when he is hesitating to do it another comes along and says: If you put in $15,000 on the first mortgage. I will put in $5,000 more on a second mortgage, that is a pretty good guarantee that the property is solid and reliable. Everybody connected with the Grand Trunk fully realizes that the government has the first mortgage on the whole undertaking, and every dollar put into the enterprise in the way of guarantee by the Grand Trunk in any way, is subject to the first mortgage of the government. Not only must the Grand Trunk, through this stock or by the issue of guarantee bonds, or in some other way—not only must this company, with the co-operation of the old company, provide one-quarter of the cost of the western division of the road from Winnipeg to the ocean, but it must provide $20,000,000 worth of rolling stock at its own cost. Not a penny of the guarantee of the government goes into this. The Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific by their association must not only provide the money for one-quarter of the cost of the western road, or more if the cost of the road is higher, but they must provide at their own cost, raising the money as they may, $20,000,000 for rolling stock. We have heard a question raised with regard to the position of the rolling stock. When the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) spoke of it the other day and referred to this $20,000,000 of rolling stock, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) said it was a remarkable thing that only $5,000,000 of this was assigned to the eastern division, which would have the greater length, while $15,000,000 went to the other portion of the road. I think the hon. member rather missed the purpose of the assignment. It is not an assignment for operation; it is not that only $5,000,000 of stock will be operated on the eastern division. The eastern division is in close touch with the existing Grand Trunk Railway, and, no doubt, the rolling stock of the two will move freely to and fro; the rolling stock of the old Grand Trunk will be used on the new line more freely on the eastern than on the western portion. There is no limitation to the use of the whole $20,000,000 of the rolling stock—it may be used over the whole road. But this $5,000,000 of rolling stock is ear-marked for the eastern division, as special security for the rental and operation of the eastern division. It becomes liable with the other $15,000,000 worth as security to the country for the guarantee given, but beyond that this $5,000,000 becomes a special security for the operation of the eastern portion of the road. That is, we especially assigned this $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock to the eastern section, not because there is expectation that it will be used only there, but because, whether it is used on that section or goes elsewhere, it will be ear-marked practically as the property of the government of Canada, mortgaged to the government not only for the general obligation of the company under this contract, but particularly for the operation of the eastern division. I think, Sir, that in these transactions the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the old Grand Trunk Company have given us

ample evidence of their good faith. And when I add that, in addition to all this, the government will have one director on the board during the time that this arrangement continues, I think it will be seen that all reasonable precautions have been taken to protect the government's interests.

I come now to the question of the standard of the road. As to the eastern division, no special standard is made, because that is practically under the control of the government. They have to build the road and they can make it any standard they please, if they agree with the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk and the government will have a common object. The government will desire to build as cheaply as possible in order to save money, and the Grand Trunk will want to build cheaply, because they have to pay the interest. But the Grand Trunk will desire it to be built substantially and there is no reason to doubt that the government and the company will come to an understanding as to the standard of the eastern division. As to the western division, the standard is to be remarkably high. It is to be that of the old Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto. Now, I regard that, upon the information I have received, as one of the very highest standards of railway construction on the continent of America. I do not think we could have selected in the Dominion a better standard than this. In a railway contract there are two ways of dealing with the character of the road. One is to make out elaborate specifications providing exactly how it is to be constructed. That may be conveniently done in the case of a short line. But, in the case of a long line, like this, it is better to have a standard accepted, and let the construction be tried by that. When the Prime Minister read from the contract that the standard was to be that of the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Toronto so far as that was practicable in the case of a new road, hon. gentlemen opposite laughed as if the qualifying words materially altered the condition. I am sure that on reflection those of the hon. gentlemen who have special knowledge of railroads will see that those qualifying words are absolutely necessary. It would be quite impossible by the expenditure of any money to produce a railroad equal to the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto within the space of five years. There are some things that can come only with the maturity of time, and a fully completed railroad is one of them. All you can do is to create a standard to which you will move up all the time; you seek to get a railway which, on final completion will conform to the standard. It is in the case of a landlord renting his house. The house is finished and the tenant occupies it. In a year or two the house becomes seasoned, and the landlord can do things that he could not do in the beginning.

Now, we know that in the construction of a road, in the anxiety to get a railroad built, some things are done which may be regarded almost of a temporary character. In one place you put in a trestle which, five or six years later you will fill up and make a permanent road. In another place you put in a small wooden bridge; in time when it commences to weaken you put in a steel structure, and so on. The road is not finished when its nominal completion takes place, but it may be finished as time progresses. The qualification which is put in in that respect does not differ from the condition made in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We had a standard there which was the standard of the Union Pacific Railway of the United States, but not of the Union Pacific Railway as it stood at that time. It was the standard of the Union Pacific as it was first constructed. I understand that the standard maintained between Montreal and Toronto is a higher standard than that which was required in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway. At all events, any railroad man will recognize that you cannot, in the construction of a new road, provide that it shall come up to the condition of an old and matured railroad; but you can lay out your plans and do all that it is possible to do to that end, and as time goes on you gradually bring the road up to that standard.

Well, we hear some hon. gentlemen opposite say that the government would have to maintain the eastern section—coming back to that for a moment. Sir, that is not correct at all. The government provide that the company shall not only maintain the western division which they are to build, but they shall maintain the road which we lease to them in the east. We will give them a completed road so far as any new road can be made so; but as years roll on, if the government, being in the same position as the landlord to whom I referred, desired to make improvements on that road, if they desired, having regard to the permanency of the road, to take out a wooden bridge and put in a steel structure, if they desired to fill up a trestle, or do one of the many things which hon. gentlemen opposite who are familiar with railways will understand better than I do, then the government will have the right to do that in the way of betterment; but it is entirely a matter of discretion for the government, and if they do that the cost of it is added to the capital of the road, and the Grand Trunk Company have to pay interest on that capital.

A point of some importance will be the dividing line between these several sections. The point of division between the eastern and western portions of this road is of course clearly defined. The government will build from the city of Moncton to the city of Quebec and then on to Winnipeg. From Winnipeg the western division of the

road to be built by the company begins, and runs out to the Pacific ocean. But there is to be a susdivision of the line, because the guarantee is only to be $13,000 per mile on what is called the prairie section, while on the mountain section the guarantee is to be $30,000 per mile. Now, the point at which the prairie section ends and the mountain section begins is not determined in this contract. It did not seem possible to determine it, but the contract sets forth the principle upon which it is to be determined in the event of any dispute. The point of division will depend to some extent upon the location of the road. We think, and I am going to assume for the purpose of the remainder of my speech, that that road will enter the mountains through the Pine River pass. If it should enter by any other pass the effect would be a difference or variation in the distance as respects the mountain section and the prairie section. The point becomes of some importance, as I have said, because we only guarantee $13,000 a mile on the prairie section, and the $30,000 a mile begins with the mountain section. The provision is made that engineers should determine the point at which the facilities of easy construction incident to the prairie road should end and those of the more difficult section of the mountain section shall begin. That is to be determined by the engineers, and in the event of a dispute, it will be a matter of arbitration. But it is purely an engineering question, and therefore we do not think we can do more than refer it to the engineers.

Much has been said in the discussion regarding the running powers that are given to the government, as respects the Intercolonial, and to other companies. I think we may fairly claim that by this proposal we practically extend the Intercolonial Railway from the city of Quebec to the city of Winnipeg. We provide that the government, as the owners of the Intercolonial, shall have the right to run its trains over this road which shall be leased to the Grand Trunk Company, and we may, if we wish, run our trains out to Winnipeg. We may even run them further than that, because even over the company's western line there are running powers. But inasmuch as the company will be our lessee as respects the road from Quebec to Winnipeg, we can provide for the running of Intercolonial trains, if we so desire, from the city of Halifax or the city of St. John out to the city of Winnipeg. Now, it has been said by some that there can be no such running powers as are there described; other gentlemen have said there can be. To my mind it becomes largely a question of economy. I do not think there is any difficulty in doing it, it is a question of whether it will pay to do it. The Intercolonial will have a perfect right to apply to the controllers of the Grand Trunk Pacific and say: We want to run a train daily from Halifax or from St. John, or a joint train as they do now; but instead of stopping at Quebec, we propose to run over this leased line out to the city of Winnipeg, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company would be obliged to give us the privilege of running that train over the road upon fair and reasonable terms.

Now, it has been shown in this discussion that running powers are exercised over lines of some considerable length. If you can exercise running powers over a line 100 miles long, then, if you duplicate your force, you can run over one 200 miles long, and so on, just as often as you duplicate your force. It might not be economical to do so, unless the amount of traffic which you expected to do was large. But you might have, as in the case of the Intercolonial, to establish all along the line coaling stations, water stations, and all the other facilities and necessary attendants. It might pay you to do that as is done to-day, I understand, by some short lines. Unless the volume of business is very large I do not think it would pay the government to do that. But the knowledge you have of the right to do it and the power to do it, gives you a leverage in dealing with the Grand Trunk Company to make fair and reasonable terms for the interchange of traffic, and that we regard as the strong feature of this agreement. There is a running power and there is something which is not exactly a running power but which is described in this contract as haulage rights. That is to say, that if the Intercolonial should bring its train up to Quebec, and if it did not think it was economical to exercise its running powers by sending that train out to Winnipeg, it would turn over the train to the Grand Trunk people at Quebec, deliver the train to them in a perfect condition, and provide that that train, without breaking bulk, should be hauled out to the city of Winnipeg. You might not send the same locomotive, you might not send the same officials, you might deliver only the train over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company; but the knowledge you have of the power to demand that right, gives you a leverage whereby you can make satisfactory arrangements with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to carry your train over with their own locomotives and with their own staff, if, in your judgment, that would be a more economical proceeding than the other. I believe that is practically the way the thing will work out. I do not think, though, it would be economical to do that, but we have the power to do it, and the possession of that power will enable us to make fair and reasonable terms for the exchange of traffic.

We have been dealing with the main line, and reference has been made here by several hon. gentlemen to the question of branches. One hon. gentleman says: Why haven't you a branch to this point? Why haven't you a branch to another point? Why

haven't you a branch to this city ? That, Sir, is an appeal that is made from a sectional point of view. A city along the line within reach of this road, or within the possibility of reaching it, might easily be disturbed by being told that it is being sidetracked and shut off without any branch. You must first build your main line before you build branches. You first build your trunk line, and when that is built your branches will go out in all directions. Branches will undoubtedly be constructed out in the far west. Branches will be constructed to reach settled communities which are not on the main line. A branch will undoubtedly be constructed to reach Lake Superior. A branch will in all likelihood be constructed to connect with the Ontario government road at Temiscamingue, giving connection with North Bay and the whole Ontario system of the Grand Trunk Railway. A branch will undoubtedly be constructed as we come further east to reach the city of Montreal. A branch will undoubtedly be constructed, or may be constructed, if the Grand Trunk Railway recognize the need, to the city of St. John. I think if it is their desire to reach St. John by a quicker line than by way of Moncton, they can have a branch from Chipman to St. John, either by constructing a new road or by acquiring the road now there. The air-line of this road from Quebec to Moncton line will pass within measureable distance of Chipman, and engineering conditions may oblige the line to go to the village of Chipman. Even if it should not go to Chipman, connection between the main line and Chipman will be very easy, and there is no doubt that if the argument that has been advanced in favour of a quicker line to St. John by way of Chipman is found to be strong enough, the branch will be built to St. John by that route. While all these questions are important, no doubt, to the communities to be served in the different sections of the country, they can wait for the present. We can build the main line and then take up the question of branches as different communities call attention to them.

There is another view of the question, and that is the truly national character of this line. The old Grand Trunk Railway has never been, in the best sense of the word, a national line. I find no fault with the company for that. The old Grand Trunk Railway was built before confederation, and at a time when Portland seemed to be the most convenient port for the connection between old Canada and the ocean, and the Grand Trunk Company invested large sums of money in this connection at Portland. They would naturally be inclined to utilize these terminal facilities at Portland. I do not blame them for that. But the Grand Trunk Railway has had to recognize the fact that the Canada of that day is not the Canada of the present time. I recall the fact that when the Intercolonial Railway was completed and when it was proposed that we should have a measure of independence of the United States by having steamers take our mails from Halifax instead of from Portland, there was quite an agitation before it was brought about. I remember that many good people of the upper provinces said: You cannot take the mails in that way, you cannot get there in time, you cannot rely on your connections. These were some of the reasons which were urged why, notwithstanding the union of the provinces, notwithstanding that we had built the Intercolonial Railway and had put the road into operation, we should still send our mails through the American port of Portland. It seems to us a simple idea to go to a Canadian port for our mails, but that idea was regarded as a very grave and serious one at that time, and there were many men in the upper provinces who shook their heads gravely at the idea that we should take our mails through Halifax. But the mails came through Halifax, and they have continued to come through Halifax throughout the winter season. I have from time to time had conversations with gentlemen connected with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and I have tried to point out to them that the time had come when the Grand Trunk Railway should take a more truly national position. I have tried to point out that the changes brought about in the condition of Canada were such that even if they had to sacrifice some interests at Portland, if they expected to receive the sympathy and co-operation of the Canadian people in large transactions, they must respond to the national aspirations of the Canadian people, and recognize the wishes of the Canadian people. Again and again, as opportunity has occurred, I have humbly ventured to point out these things to gentlemen connected with the Grand Trunk Railway. Well, I rejoice to know that not by virtue of anything I have said to them, but by virtue of this scheme which we are now presenting to parliament, the Grand Trunk Railway has recognized its national obligation, and has declared its intention to be a truly Canadian road. We cannot ask it to give up its Portland connection. It has its investment there. Still, part of its trade will undoubtedly go there. We must be reasonable. But we have said to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company : If you come forward and ask for aid for a great enterprise, if you ask us to pledge the money or the credit of the government of Canada to assist you in this enterprise, you must put it upon a ground which will enable us to go before the people in any province of this Dominion and say that the scheme we are proposing to them is not a sectional or local scheme, but a scheme which appeals to the people of Canada from ocean to ocean as a truly national one. This we have obtained in the contract which is now before us. The Grand Trunk Pa-

cific Railway Company in one of these sections, has stipulated that all the traffic that occurs on that road and on its branches shall be, when not specifically routed elsewhere, carried through Canadian territory or by Canadian inland ports or to a Canadian port on the ocean. My hon. friends on the other side of the House have rather scoffed at this. They have asked what guarantee we have that they will do this. Well, I grant you that it is somewhat difficult at times to bind a railway company. I have not more confidence than most people in corporations; still, I do not believe that gentlemen connected with corporations generally are pirates, and I do not believe that the people connected with this company have deliberately entered into this obligation with any intention of evading it or deceiving the government. I believe that the obligation they have given to us was given to us in good faith, that they have accepted the national responsibility which this condition involves, and that they mean to live up to the contract, and I am satisfied that we can find means if necessary to make them live up to it. We may be told that we have not provided enough. Fortunately, we have a good test. We have the pleasure of knowing what hon. gentlemen opposite consider is a sufficient provision to make of that kind. While this matter was still occupying the attention of the government, while we were working out the details of this measure, there was before the Railway Committee a Bill respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific charter, and when it came from the committee to this House we had the pleasure of listening to a resolution moved by an hon. gentlemen opposite setting forth what kind of guarantee would be necessary to secure the national character of this road, what kind of a guarantee would be necessary to secure the shipment of this trade through a Canadian outlet. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler) moved a resolution in this House and it was voted upon. This is what hon. gentlemen opposite have declared is a proper way to obtain this safeguard. They say: Put this clause, not in the government contract, but put it in the Grand Trunk Pacific charter, and all will be well. Here is the clause:

That the order for the third reading of Bill No. 64 be cancelled, and the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, in order that the following section may be added to the said Bill—'All freight originating in Canada, and received along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, intended for export across the Atlantic, shall be shipped through Canadian ports, when the route is not otherwise specially indicated by the shipper; and that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway shall carry all such freight to the eastern Canadian seaboard as cheaply as to any American port on the Atlantic seaboard.'

That is what hon. gentlemen opposite said should be done. Well, at the very time that these hon. gentlemen were preparing this as the embodiment of what was necessary to secure that purpose, we were placing not in the charter, but in the contract itself a clause to serve the same purpose, and there is not a line, or a sentiment, or a word in it that is not expressed, and better expressed, in the contract we have made. I have read the proposal of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), and I have no doubt the House has carefully taken in its purpose. Permit me to quote the provision in section 42 of the contract and the section following:

42. It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

Here is an absolute undertaking on the part of this company that they will do everything that any reasonable man would ask in this connection. Ah, but we are told, they may dodge and evade this, you will allow them to ship traffic through American ports which is specifically routed; you don't prevent that. Neither does the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler). He recognized that the shipper can route his traffic as he pleases. The suggestion is thrown out that this company will humbug us and deceive us, and will take care that the freight is specifically routed so that it will not come to Canadian ports. That is the suggestion which has been made by some hon. gentlemen, but what does section 43 say?:

43. The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely,—the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

In this we have the fullest possible guarantee that can be given, we have every guarantee that was included in the resolution that hon. gentlemen opposite voted for, but expressed more fully, more thoroughly, and more effectively. In the first place, the company guarantee in good faith to do this thing; in the second place they guarantee that they will not evade it in the way suggested, and in the third place, they put away temptation to divert

the traffic by providing that the rates via Canadian ports shall be as low as the rates by any American port. I admit, Sir, that if the rates were not to be the same there might be a temptation, for in this export business I have no doubt that men will shape their actons on business principles; but here we distinctly provide that no temptation shall arise for diverting this traffic, and we say that the rates via Quebec or Montreal, or St. John, or Halifax, shall not be greater than the rates which are charged at the same time by that company for export by way of the United States. I venture to say that in no contract that has ever been submitted to parliament have there been such guarantees given in respect to the handling of this export traffic.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked: What penalty was there provided? Well, there are all the penalties that there were in the opposition clause. These gentlemen opposite had thought this thing out, and they did not think penalties were necessary. But in this agreement there are penalties, and my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) who is a lawyer, knows perfectly well that where the company have agreed to do this thing, if they deliberately violated their agreement, or if they evaded it in the way that has been suggested, there would be methods found to compel them to carry it out. My hon. friend could find these methods very readily, and I am sure that he could bring the company to justice. I say that they could be so worried and harassed by legal proceedings for the evasion of that agreement, that it would not pay them to do it, even if we could believe that they were deliberately resolving to break faith with the country. I would like to have my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) employed to punish the company, for I am quite sure that he would find a way to do it.

Now, some comparisons have been made between this contract and the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I certainly shall not refer to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract with the intention of casting any reproach upon the policy of the previous government, but by way of illustration, I may make some comparisons in order that the public may more clearly understand the nature of the contract we have made. In the first place, it is worth remembering that the contract that was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was not a contract for a transcontinental railway at all. It was a contract for a railway which began about 850 miles from the Atlantic tide water. This is a contract from ocean to ocean; this is a contract which begins at the ocean at Moncton—because, although Moncton is not a deep water port it is an Atlantic port, and the men who start from Moncton on the trains will hear the murmurs of the ocean as the Bore comes in from the Bay of Fundy. This, Sir, is an ocean to ocean contract; a contract for a truly transcontinental railway, and the other was only a contract for part of a transcontinental railway. Let us remember that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is a pro-Boer contract.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no. My hon. friend must not cast any reflection upon that Bore of Moncton. It is one of the things which recommend it, and under this contract we will take thousands of people there to see the marvellous waters of the Bay of Fundy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINSTER OF FINANCE. Under this contract, let us bear in mind that we are giving nothing like the grants and exemptions that were given in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. In the Canadian Pacific Railway contract you gave 25,000,000 acres of land, the value of which I shall not enter into now. You gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in cash or by way of completed railways $62,000,000. It is worth while remembering, and it is a very important point, that we are giving no exemptions whatever from taxation to this company. We are not giving them an acre of land except for the purposes of the railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company not only got the land necessary for railway purposes, but great tracts of land were donated to them besides. I am not arguing whether that was wise or unwise, but I am pointing out that under this contract we do not give an acre of land to this company except that we give them the right of way through any government lands, and also whatever lands that may be necessary for railway purposes. Then the Conservative government gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway exemption of taxation in the way of customs for a large portion of the things they needed for the construction of the road. For many years after the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed, under the term of 'original construction,' the Canadian Pacific Railway received either free admission of goods at the customs, or they received what was still more, bonuses to compensate them for the goods that were made in Canada. We give no exemption of any sort in this contract. In the case of the Eastern road, the government will build it themselves and it will stand in that respect exactly like any other government work. If the government imports materials for the Intercolonial Railway to-day the government do not go through the form of paying money into the customs house. If the government find it necessary to import any materials for the construction of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton, they would, in accordance with

the practice, not go through the form of entering the goods at the customs house. But, Sir, as this road is to be built by contractors, and the contractors will have to tender for the work, they will receive no exemption whatever. Therefore any man who has anything to do with the construction of that road, if he imports materials, he will have to pay the duty, and if he buys the goods in Canada the Canadian manufacturer will have the benefit of the duty in so far as that is of any advantage to him. If you could imagine such a thing as the government bulding this road themselves, and if the government were importing materials, they would, as in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, not enter these goods at the customs house. They would be for the government service. But I say that even there we do not, as respects the eastern division, take any advantage of that, because we provide that it shall be built by tender and contract, and the contractors will not have any exemption, but will have to buy the goods in Canada or else pay the duties if they see fit to import them. When we come to the western division, we deal with the company. They will build the road, and will not have any exemption in any shape or form. They will not be at liberty to import a penny's worth of goods without paying the same duty that is paid by any private individual. The grant in the way of exemption from customs duties in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was a vast privilege. I do not attempt to compute it in money, but I am sure that it would run into a vast sum. We do not give any exemptions of any sort.

Now, I come to the financial side of this question. We propose to build, by the government, through the intervention of a commission, from Moncton to Quebec, a distance which I have estimated at 400 miles. You will remember that I showed that an air-line, with an ordinary allowance for curvatures, would make a distance 368 miles; but in order to be on the safe side, I have put it at 400 miles. I am advised by competent authorities that, from the general knowledge possessed of that country, that road can be built at a very moderate cost. From Quebec or Lévis to near the point where the railway will leave the province of Quebec it can be built at a comparatively low cost. There is some expensive work in passing from the province of Quebec into the province of New Brunswick, and as you get into the province of New Brunswick, there are some portions which are moderately expensive. But I am informed that you can build a line through that country with maximum grades no less favourable than those on the Intercolonial Railway—though that is not as good a road as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wants—for $25,000 per mile. On 400 miles that would be $10,000,000.

From Quebec to Winnipeg I estimate the distance to be 1,475 miles. That is a larger mileage than some of my hon. friends have given. I am not trying in these cases to make the mileage small. I am advised by an engineer who has measured the distance, that in putting it at 1,475 miles, I am making a liberal allowance. I put that down at $28,000 per mile, which I am advised is a fair estimate. Remember that in both cases we are speaking of the road only, without equipment. That would make the cost of that section $41,300,000. Taking these two together, we have the estimated cost of the eastern division at $51,300,000.

Now, according to the principle which is laid down in the Railway Act, the interest paid during construction is a part of the capital. Every railway company constructs its road in that way. Therefore any money that we may pay during the course of construction is of course chargeable to the capital account, and the interest thereon is also added to capital. So that when the road is completed, it will represent in capital, not only the actual money which we have put into it, but also the interest which has accumulated in the meantime.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have not got the interest during construction separate?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The difficulty there, as my hon. friend will see, is that you can hardly tell what amount will be expended in each year. I have had a rough estimate of that made, and it can only be a rough estimate. In the first year, we would spend only a very small sum. After that the expense would increase very rapidly. We would spend $12,000,000 or $13,000,000 a year. Distributing the amounts over the period of construction in that way, I estimate that at the end of the period, instead of the capital of the road standing at $51,300,000, it would stand at $54,609,676. The annual interest on that sum would be $1,638,290.30. We would be out of pocket that interest for seven years. There is another period of three years to be considered during which the company has to pay us interest if the road earns the interest. If the road does not earn the interest, then any deficiency that may arise is an addition to capital account. Although we lose our interest on that portion for the time being, in the ultimate adjustment we get it back in the shape of addition to the capital account on which the company would pay interest. Therefore what we are out of pocket is just seven years' interest on the amount of the capital as it would stand on the completion of the road.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister in the course of his speech said that we could meet the responsibilities of this contract by setting aside the present year's surplus which is roundly stated at $13,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite have thought that was a rash statement. I am convinced that the figures I shall be able to give to the House

will show that my hon. friend's statement is substantially correct. If at the close of the year, when we are making up the accounts, we lay aside the surplus which will have accrued as stated in the budget speech, and subject to the improvement which we hope will take place in the final adjustment of the accounts, and if, instead of using that surplus to build railways elsewhere, to reduce our debt, or in the many other ways in which we could use it, we place that $13,000,000 in the hands of financial managers, I hope to show the House that that money would meet every financial responsibility which the government of Canada have assumed under this contract. How is this brought about? We have to consider not the mere multiplication of interest for seven years. What we have to consider is what use we could make of that $13,000,000. You have to consider the present value, as ascertained by actuarial calculation, of seven years' interest on the money we invest or the guarantee we give. In the case of this sum of $54,609,676, which will represent the capital account of the eastern division at the time of its completion, the annual interest is $1,638,290, and we will be out of pocket that interest for seven years. Now, if you apply to any actuary of repute in the Dominion and ask him what sum of money it will be necessary to provide to-day to meet the seven years' interest as it shall accrue, he will tell you that for the sum of $8,853,502 you can provide for those seven years of interest. That is to say, if, instead of managing our money ourselves, we turned it over to an insurance company or a trust company, or any other company which deals in annuities, and it invested the money on the basis of three per cent interest half-yearly, it would provide for that seven years' interest if we would give them now the sum of $8,853,504. Whether the calculation be right or not, hon. gentlemen can have it submitted to the test of any actuary. What I state is—talking of what we might do with our surplus of to-day—that we might out of that surplus take $8,853,000, and managed in the way I have described, pay our seven years' interest, as it shall accrue from time to time on the construction of the eastern division of this road.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are leaving out the Quebec bridge.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am coming to that. I am speaking of things which are more definite. There is an indefiniteness about the Quebec bridge, but I propose referring to that later on.

The western division is divided into two sections—the prairie section and the mountain section. As respects the prairie section, we assume no obligation whatever, except the guaranteeing of the bonds, but my arguments are based upon the assumption that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will carry out its undertaking, and I think that it has given a sufficient guarantee of its ability and good faith in the large sums it is putting into the enterprise. Assuming that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company fulfils its obligations under the contract, and that we shall only be called upon to do exactly what we have agreed to, we assume no obligation in respect of the prairie section, because the Grand Trunk Pacific Company agree that, from beginning to the end, they will pay the interest on that section. Then, Sir, we come to the question of the mountain section. Here we meet the difficulty of determining precisely where the mountain section begins. It is necessarily an indefinite point. It is a point where the easy methods of the prairie construction end and the difficult methods of the mountain section begin. That can be only determined later on by the engineer, but from the best information we can receive, it is probable that the easy facilities of construction which are afforded by the Pine River pass will lead to the railway being constructed through that pass. Assuming that the road will go through that pass, we are able to form a correct estimate as to what will be the particular point where the prairie construction would end and the mountain section begin. I am advised that should the road be constructed through the Pine River pass, the mileage on the mountain section will be 480 miles, on which we will provide a guarantee to the extent of 75 per cent on the cost of its construction, but no matter what the road may cost, our guarantee is not to exceed $30,000 per mile. We only guarantee our three-fourth, which may be less than $30,000 per mile; but if it costs more the company must pay the difference. We do not guarantee at the outside more than $30,000 a mile, and, estimating the length at 480 miles, our guarantee cannot exceed $14,400,000. On that sum the interest during seven years is to be paid by the government, and during another period of three years it is dealt with in the way I have already described. All we are under obligation to pay is seven years of that interest. At the expiration of the seven years, the company will pay its own interest, so that we will be out of pocket seven years' interest on the mountain section, or interest on a total of $14,400,000, being 480 miles at $30,000 per mile. We have now to ascertain, by the same process as I applied in the other case, how much money we would need to provide out of our surplus to meet this seven years' interest on the mountain section. I find, by actuarial calculation, obtained from an actuary, that the present value of that is $2,334,575.90. That is to say, if we take $2,334,575.90 and lay it aside now out of our surplus, under the same process as I explained before, that will provide for the payment of seven years' interest on the mountain

section, as that interest shall accrue from year to year.

My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has referred to the Quebec bridge. At present that bridge is in the hands of a corporation which intends to constitute a bridge and terminal company. They expect that the traffic over it will enable it to pay a fair interest on the capital invested. We have already assisted it to the extent of $1,000,000, and I assume we will have to grant further aid. Whether the Grand Trunk Pacific Company had made a contract or not, whether we ever should build a transcontinental railway or not, the Quebec bridge has become a national undertaking, and in one form or other this government has to see it through. As to what the government may do later, I am not in a position to say. Whether it would be wise to buy the bridge outright and make it part of the government system, or let the bridge company continue to manage it, will have to be arranged later on. But some part of the cost of that bridge is properly chargeable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Five or six companies will use it—the Intercolonial Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway, the Quebec Central, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Quebec and Lake St. John, and there are other railways the crossings and approaches, will cost it. I understand that the bridge proper, the crossings and approaches, will cost about $4,500,000. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) makes the cost $5,000,000, so that we are not very far apart. But his estimate would probably include some of the terminal facilities in the city of Quebec, which may be important as part of the general scheme, but are not essential as part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme. What proportion of that would be fairly chargeable to this enterprise ? I am going to assume that out of what it may cost we may fairly charge the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway $2,000,000. I think that is a liberal allowance—too liberal in fact. I would not like the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to come and say that we have pledged ourselves to this figure ; but for the purposes of my present argument, we may assume that to be a fair amount. That is to say, that we will be obliged to give to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, if they demand it, a crossing on that bridge, and that in connection with the general arrangement to provide a crossing $2,000,000 will be the outside obligation which we should charge to this scheme. Our $2,000,000 will stand as part of the cost of the railway upon which the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will ultimately pay interest in the same manner as on any other portion of the railway. For seven years we would be out of pocket the interest on that $2,000,000. Applying the same principle of actuarial calculation, we could provide seven years' interest on that bridge by the sum of $324,246. We have not exhausted our surplus yet. We have only provided some $8,000,000 for one portion and $2,000,000 for another, and there is plenty still left. If we provide further out of our surplus the sum of $324,246, we can make provision for the payment of interest on that $2,000,000 for seven years.

I add these items together. The present value, by actuarial calculation, of the cost of the seven years' interest on the eastern division is $8,853,502.47. Seven years' interest on the Quebec bridge represented by the present value, $324,246.65. Seven years' interest guaranteed bonds, mountain section, represented by $2,334,575.90. These sums making a total of $11,512,325.02. Why, we have some millions of a surplus left yet. Well, it was stated to-day in the argument that the eastern road that the government are obliged to build will be very costly. Of course, regarding the mountain section there is no possibility of increase, for our limit of $30,000 per mile is fixed and definite—but as regards the eastern section, whatever it costs we have to pay, there is no question about that. I have made an estimate of $25,000 per mile for one part, and $28,000 a mile for the other part, which estimate is backed by the reputation of an engineer of standing. But, if we are to have the high grade—perhaps I should say the low grade—road called for by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) perhaps these estimates are not high enough. I am prepared that the millions of a balance should be devoted to the improvement of that road. I propose to add 25 per cent to the first estimate of the cost of construction of the eastern division, and so add 25 per cent to the present value of the seven years' interest of that portion of the road. That is an equivalent to an advance on the cost of from $25,000 per mile to $31,250 per mile for one part, and from $28,000 to $35,000 for the other part. That is a pretty liberal estimate, and ought to build even the fine road called for by my hon. friend from Norfolk.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) allow me a word ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLANCY. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought to have a little civility and good manners. I merely wished to ask the hon. gentleman a question. He has spoken of estimates. Has he made the estimates out of his own mind, or from some data which he is prepared to lay before the House ?

Mr. COWAN. A pretty good mind to make them out of.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, with all my presumption, I would not venture to make these estimates without proper information from reputable quarters. I did

not make these estimates out of my own mind. They are worth more than if they had been made in that way. Now, I submit these figures for discussion. I think there is no mistake in them. Of course, there is a possibility of mistake, but I can say with perfect certainty that they are made in good faith, and made by capable people. Adding all the various sums together—the present value of seven years' interest on the eastern section, first on the basis of $25,000 and $28,000 per mile, which is the way the figures are made up; seven years' interest on the Quebec bridge represented by its present value; seven years interest on the guaranteed bonds in the mountain section represented by its present value; and then 25 per cent addition for the cost of the eastern section to meet the views of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, and I reach this conclusion, so far as figures can prove anything: If we had a surplus of $13,725,706—and we have it and more—and if, instead of investing that in the various purposes of government, if, instead of doing the various things which the House has authorized, if, instead of reducing the debt of the Dominion as we shall do during the present year—though I do not make any great boast of that—if, instead of applying this money in any of these ways, you take that sum and give it to a trust company or insurance company accustomed to dealing with annuities, to invest it at three per cent per annum payable half-yearly, I undertake to say, on the authority of an actuary, that they could pay every cent of obligation we assume under that contract.

Mr. HEYD. Except the redemption of the bonds at the end of the fifty years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Of course at the end of fifty years if we pay the bonds we take over the road. But I am dealing with the interest. What we pay is seven years' interest, and that is provided for as I have described. And as a pledge of their good faith in this matter, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company agree, within thirty days of the passing of this Act, to place in the treasury of Canada $5,000,000. When was such a sum ever before offered to the government of Canada as a pledge of good faith? When the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was made, the company provided $1,000,000, and it was thought to be a large sum. And so it was. Sir, the Grand Trunk Railway Company multiplies the pledge of the Canadian Pacific Railway by five, and the amount so pledged will be in the treasury of Canada within a month of the passing of this Act.

Mr. BRODER. Will that be in actual cash or in bonds?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be in actual cash, or government bonds, as good as cash. And, while the government holds the money, we will pay the company 3 per cent interest if it is in cash, and if they deposit bonds—they must be government bonds approved by this government, bonds of some recognized government, and not of private corporations—whatever rate of interest they may bear will be paid to the company so long as that deposit remains. That money will remain until the completion of the western division—save and except $5,000,000 worth of final work on the western portion of the road—and also the full equipment of the whole road to the amount of $20,000,000. When they have so far advanced their road that $5,000,000 more will finish it, and when they make a satisfactory arrangement with the government of Canada, then this $5,000,000 that is in the hands of the government will be paid over, from time to time, as satisfactory evidence is given that the money is being put into the road for the completion of the contract. How could we ask for a better guarantee for the carrying out of a contract of this sort? I believe the announcement of this contract has been a surprise to the country. I believe it has been a surprise, above all, to hon. gentlemen opposite. They are surprised indeed that the government of to-day is able to make a contract with a great railway company like practically the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada with its $150,000,000 of assets, to quote again the Conservative paper. Hon. gentlemen opposite are surprised, and no wonder they are surprised when they compare what is being accomplished by this contract with anything ever accomplished before in the history of Canada. The very mention of a transcontinental road is calculated to give persons an idea of a work of great magnitude, and well it may. Even if we had had no experience in the responsibilities involved in such an undertaking, the mere mention of the work brings to our minds the thought of large responsibilities. When we think of the great sums of money paid out before to get part of a transcontinental road compared with what we are paying to-day to get a real transcontinental road from ocean to ocean, it is no wonder that there is surprise in the country. But, Sir, we give them this contract, made in good faith, not with empty promoters, not with people who are irresponsible, but with men who are the most capable railway men in Canada, with men who have given every guarantee of good faith, with men who are prepared to back their undertaking in a manner no company ever did before.

And how is it received by hon. gentlemen opposite? I am afraid the tables are to be turned. I am afraid that in the clear light of 1909 these gentlemen are going to make some of the mistakes which may have been excused in the

early dawn of twenty years ago. We have made some comparisons with the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I do not do that with a view of casting reproach upon anybody. No doubt some things occurred in the early history of that great enterprise, before the contract was made with the syndicate, which we all desire to remember, if at all, only with regret, for they were not creditable to the government, to the parliament, or to the people of Canada. But let that pass. When we come to the actual contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I think it will be admitted even to-day that perhaps some mistakes were made. Perhaps there were some mistakes of location, perhaps some mistakes in the land policy, and in the clearer light of to-day we may be able to see that things were done then which had better been left undone. I am disposed to think that perhaps those things may after all have been only incidental to the difficulties of the time and to rapid construction. I for one do not hesitate to say, in the light of experience, that the Liberal party did entertain alarm and anxiety, which have been proved in the end not to have been fully justified. I for one have no disposition unfairly to criticise to-day. I frankly admit, as one who was then a young man, that I was led to entertain alarm and anxiety. To-day I say that the policy of the Conservative party, subject to these qualifications which I have mentioned, has been justified, and in that respect the Conservative party has made a record which they can look back to with pride.

But while there was some excuse for doubt and hesitation in 1871 and 1887 there is none to-day. Are these gentlemen to learn nothing? We Liberals have learned something by experience. Are these gentlemen to be as the Bourbons, who learn nothing and forget nothing? Are they to take up the role of carping criticism which they complain the Liberals took up in 1881? No, they should not do that. They should go on with us in this great movement, they should remember that the Canada of to-day is different from the Canada even of 1871 or 1881. In 1871, when the Conservative party made the treaty with British Columbia and accepted the responsibility of building the Canadian Pacific Railway, what was the condition of Canada? In 1871 the population of Canada was 3,547,000; in 1881, when the contract with the syndicate was made, the population was 4,324,000. To-day the population of Canada is put down at 5,500,000. Things which we should hesitate to do in 1871 we can undertake with confidence with the larger resources and in the clearer light we have to-day. In 1871, when they assumed the responsibility of building a railway to British Columbia, the revenue of the country stood at $19,250,000; in 1881, when they made the contract with the syndicate, the revenue stood at $29,500,000. This year the revenue will be $66,500,000. In 1871, when the contract with British Columbia was made, the total trade of Canada was $170,000,000; in 1881, when the contract with the syndicate was made, the total trade was $203,000,000; in this present year, the year just closed, the total trade of Canada was $467,000,000. In 1871, the bank deposits, including the savings banks of Canada, stood at $62,250,000; in 1881, when the contract was made with the syndicate, they stood at $99,500,000. In 1903, the bank deposits, including the savings banks, stand at $439,000,000. With these statistics, showing the growth and progress of the country, why should we fear? Why should not hon. gentlemen opposite feel as confident as we feel in this matter? I am glad to know that all the Conservatives are not going to take that narrow view which I am afraid some of my hon. friends are being tempted to take. I am glad to know that this policy is going to be supported by the great mass of the Liberal party, and I believe by many Conservatives as well. I have in my hands a public letter from one of the most respected Conservative merchants of the city of Montreal, Mr. Robert Reford, which I ask permission to read. Mr. Reford, a citizen and merchant of Montreal, does not propose to be drawn away by the cry that Montreal is to be side-tracked and not have a branch. He knows that all these branches will come as a natural consequence of the construction of this road. Mr. Reford writes as follows:—

As a Canadian, hopeful that the Dominion of Canada will one day be the peer of the United States in population, prosperity and power, I highly approve of the action of the Dominion government in introducing the Railway Act, whereby the Grand Trunk will be enabled to extend its great system through the unopened portion of our great west, now without a railway, and badly in need of one, opening up fertile farming and rich mineral districts, a new port on the Pacific for promotion of trade with Asia and Australia, and a short and much needed new route to the Atlantic and the important ports of Halifax and St. John, which should greatly benefit them, and give them a summer as well as a winter trade. The Grand Trunk has in the past done much for Canada, and that at a time when Canada badly needed it, and was not in a position to do much in the way of railway building for herself. It has not been a bonanza for its shareholders; the bulk of the original ones, I think, died without seeing a turn of a penny for their investment, consequently I think that the Grand Trunk is well entitled to liberal terms in the present contract. Why the Act should be opposed I am at a loss to understand, seeing that the opening up of such new territories and the investment of so much capital must be for the benefit of the country. It is possible that disappointment may arise in the working, building or earning power of parts of the road, but that is to be expected in such a gigantic enterprise, and should not for a moment be allowed to discourage its projection. Nothing could have been more dis-

couraging than the prospects of the Canadian Pacific at its inception, many well-informed railway people saying that it would never pay for the grease used on the axles of its cars ; and yet that railway now stands almost at the head of the earning railways of the world. From all reports the Grand Trunk projected railway runs through a much more easily built and possibly richer section of country, and there is little reason to doubt that it will prove as good a paying railway as the Canadian Pacific is, and do much in the development of Canada. Had the Laurier government ignored the claims which the Grand Trunk has upon the country, refused to listen to them, or unduly delayed the building of this great transcontinental railway, future generations would, I feel sure, have branded them as men unworthy their position as rulers of Canada, and rightly so.

I am sure that that opinion of one of the merchant princes of the city of Montreal, a life-long Conservative, is likely to be only a specimen of the opinions which many of the most broad-minded and enlightened members of the Conservative party will have when they come to study this contract and learn all that is provided in it. I feel sure that we have reason to submit this contract to the country with the fullest confidence that it will meet with public approval. Some one has said, Let the country make the railways and the railways will make the country. That is the doctrine we are proposing to carry out now. I regret that we cannot have in a larger degree the co-operation of hon. gentlemen opposite in it. I regret we have had again to-day, from an acknowledged leader of the Conservative party, a declaration that they will not support any form of subsidies. We have had that from the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Osler) two or three years ago in his reply to the budget speech. We have it renewed to-day. Sir, we take issue with those hon. gentlemen. There are times when subsidies are proper, there are times when guarantees are proper. In this instance, we have no subsidies to propose, we propose a guarantee. There are other parts of the country in which the Grand Trunk is not prepared to come forward with its great resources and take up railway construction; those sections of the country have claims upon us, and we must be prepared from time to time to deal with every one of those sections on their merits, and even to grant subsidies in proper cases. However that may be, we recognize the position the hon. gentlemen take. We say we are prepared to go before the people to-day with this policy in the fullest confidence that it is a policy which has been wisely considered, that its provisions will stand investigation, that the cost to the country is very moderate, and that we firmly believe we will be able to give to the Dominion of Canada one of the greatest achievements in its history.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made his speech, but, I understand that he made some reference to running powers and sought to refute the statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) yesterday on that subject. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has alluded to the same matter this evening, and I desire to say that I think the hon. member for North Norfolk has hardly been candid with the House in the reference he made to certain railways which are exercising running powers in Ontario. The hon. gentleman alluded particularly to the Wabash, a railway exercising running powers for a couple of hundred miles over the Grand Trunk Railway, but the hon. gentleman neglected to tell the House that while the Wabash is exercising running powers it does not do and it is not allowed to do local traffic. All that the company has power to do is to carry through traffic from the Detroit river to the Niagara river and if the hon. gentleman in his county wanted to send a ton of traffic to any point in Canada he could not send it by the Wabash although this road is exercising running powers.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to correct the statement which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) has made that the Wabash is not allowed to do any local business while running between Detroit and Buffalo. It does local business. I have shipped by that line myself local freight and it is perfectly untrammelled in picking up business upon this line and thus competing with the Grand Trunk Railway and all other lines for local business.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to differ from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton). I know that what he says is not a fact.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I also know it is not a fact.

Mr. COWAN. I do know that Wabash tickets are for sale in every ticket office on the line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. A Grand Trunk Railway ticket is not good on a Wabash train.

Mr. COWAN. Nor is a Michigan Central ticket good on a Wabash train.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. You can buy a Wabash ticket but you cannot use it on any train.

Mr. BARKER. I referred to freight. I said that the hon. member for North Norfolk could not send a ton of freight in any direction by the Wabash.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have done it. I have shipped lumber by the Wabash road to Buffalo.

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking of what can be done generally by people along the

line. If the hon. gentleman has on some exceptional occasion or under exceptional influences obtained the privilege of doing that he knows that the public cannot do it. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway running between Hamilton and Toronto, they must run through trains and they cannot do local business, and the line over which they have running powers is only 40 miles long. Take for instance the Canadian Pacific Railway running to North Bay; they cannot do local business. I would ask the hon. gentleman what earthly good running powers over the 1,400 miles between Quebec and Winnipeg would be, if the various companies alluded to by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals which were attempting to use this railway as a common highway, as it was put in the contract, could do nothing but through business. What advantage would it be to say that a railway using this common highway could pick up a passenger anywhere ?

Mr. COWAN. The Wabash can pick up passengers.

Mr. BARKER. They have a special arrangement, but has been stopped at times owing to quarrelling about it.

Mr. COWAN. Wabash tickets are on sale in every Grand Trunk Railway ticket office on the road over which the Wabash runs.

Mr. BARKER. I am perfectly aware of that and when it does not work well the arrangement is stopped. They do it by the favour of the owning line. I would ask what value that would be over the 1,400 miles which is to be subjected to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. This is a freight line that we are talking about. Passengers are not going away north of the height of land when we have routes through more settled portions of the country for passengers. We are now talking about freight.

Mr. COWAN. Is that not a question of agreement ?

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) will be addressing us presently and if he will reserve his arguments until we get through, I think the debate would proceed more satisfactorily. I am simply referring to the question which was raised by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals yesterday. There is not a railway man in the whole of America who would contradict his statement that it would be utterly impracticable to exercise running powers over a long line such as this. The Minister of Finance to-day has tried to put it in a different light by saying that there may be haulage, that practically one company will haul the whole of the traffic but that is a different thing from making a common highway free to all companies and I have simply referred to the matter, because it was made a point of, that this railway could serve every company in the land. The hon. Minister of Finance dwelt at some length on the western portion, or what is called the mountain section of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The hon. gentleman did what his leader did the other day; he dwelt very fully upon all the characteristics of that portion of the line. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary for us to criticise anything that has been said or that may be said about that section. That section will not be constructed by the government but by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and judging by the successful manner in which its representatives negotiated this contract with the government I think we may safely entrust them with looking after their own interests in building that part of the road. What we are anxious to know now is what information the government has as to what is called the eastern division which they have undertaken to build. We want some information about that, and I noticed to-day that the hon. Minister of Finance, like his leader the other day, in dwelling upon the portion of the road between Winnipeg and Quebec passed very lightly over many hundreds of miles, using general words and expressions and giving as little information as is possible. The hon. Minister of Finance to-day alluded to some surveys in the Nepigon district; and as to the section from Abbittibbi to Quebec we had from him some vague reference to explorations which have been going on for the last two hundred years, the result of which seems to be very meagre because a few years ago the province of Quebec caused further explorations to be made. It is quite clear that none of them have any information that would justify defining where a track could be put. The hon. gentleman dealt with the Moncton end of the line, with which, of course, he is more familiar, and he tells us that that line was practically surveyed in 1864 by Sir Sanford Fleming. He says there was a survey made in these days of the frontier line; the centre line—which he says is practically the one they are adopting to-day—and the north line. Now, it is quite true that Sir Sanford Fleming in 1864 did survey that central line, but is there a gentleman in this House or in this country who supposes for one moment, that any company proposing to build a railway would contract to lay it in a particular line based entirely upon a survey thirty-nine years old. Why, Sir, the information that was obtained by surveyors in these days was for an entirely different purpose than for the construction of the railway that is necessary to-day. Who, in 1864, supposed that the railway they were contemplating would ever be carrying the grain of the great North-west to Halifax or St. John. No such thing was ever thought of then. That cheap kind of traffic, the necessities of it, that were comtemplated at that

time, and a line that might have been considered satisfactory then would not be accepted for a moment to-day.

The hon. gentleman refers to Sir Sanford Fleming's reports. I have had the advantage of talking to Sir Sanford Fleming within a week, and that gentleman assured me, that it is not possible to obtain a line suitable for old grain traffic where the Minister of Finance says this line is to be put.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. Sir Sanford Fleming at that time reported that the best line was near to the frontier, and that the next best line in view of matters as they stood in 1864, was over the heights through the centre of New Brunswick. Sir Sanford Fleming told me that that line through the centre of New Brunswick would perhaps shorten the distance seventy miles, or perhaps a little less, as against the present line of the Intercolonial Railway, but he added that the high gradients and the curves would more than compensate for the shortening. It would be far better, he said, to continue the traffic over the present line than to attempt to send it through the centre of New Brunswick over the height of land. He said also, that if you want another line ; utilize the existing lines from Edmundson to Fredericton, or to some point in that section, and thence on east and south. These lines, he said, will give you as good a road, practically as short a road as the government is proposing to build, and it will be the best line obtainable. Why then undertake to build railways when we have them in existence to-day ? Why do we want to duplicate our railway line simply in order to run a track, as the Minister of Finance says, in an air-line to Moncton. He takes the map I suppose and runs a pencil across it and enters into a contract to build a railway. That is practically what the government is doing in this case. And yet, the Minister of Finance is astonished that any criticism should be made of such a line. He even says it is extraordinary that any objection should be made to building a line competing with the present Intercolonial Railway. Surely, if the duplicating line is not going to be an improvement on the existing line, we are more than justified in our criticism, and so far as we know and so far as the minister knows the present line is better than the one which he proposes. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Fielding) told us that it is a common thing, and that we every day see a company building a railway to compete with the railway of another company. Yes, but you never heard of a company building a line to compete with its own line, and that is what the government is doing in this case. They have an excellent line now, but they want to build another one to compete with it. If they want to go south to St. John, and east by Chipman, they have roads in existence, and surely they don't want to build new roads where ample railway accommodation already exists. The hon. gentleman cites as an instance supporting his contention, that the Canadian Pacific Railway some years ago proposed to build a line from Harvey to Salisbury near Moncton, and he thinks that because they proposed thus to get to Moncton it is an excellent reason why the government should get to Moncton. But when the Canadian Pacific Railway proposed to get from Harvey to Moncton it was because they had no connection with Moncton. The government have got a line to Moncton, but they are not content with one, they want another, and they tell us that the two cases are analogous, and that it is an excellent argument for the building of two lines by the government where one is necessary. Then the Finance Minister jumps off into what he calls the objection of the opposition to the improvement of the Intercolonial Railway, as if that, even if it were true, would have any bearing upon the question we are debating. Suppose that we most unjustly and most unfairly oppose improvements on the Intercolonial Railway, what on earth has that got to do with the question whether they are going to build another line or not ? We are treated to a long dissertation on that subject, as if the country were to be affected by such an argument. I deny that there has been any criticism or any such objection on the part of the opposition. I have been in this House three years, and I have heard all the criticisms relating to the Intercolonial Railway, and I have never heard a gentleman on this side say one word in opposition to any improvements that could properly be made on the Intercolonial Railway. No gentleman on this side of the House has ever objected to the strengthening of bridges, to the increased weight of rails, or to works of that character. But the Finance Minister thinks that because we have not swallowed everything that has been done we were objecting to improvements on the line. The truth is that the objection we were making was to the way in which the hon. gentleman was adding to his surpluses by creating pretended profits that never existed. The government instead of maintaining their line in the ordinary manner were putting down new rails and charging them to capital, when maintenance should have borne nearly all the charge. By that means the Minister was showing what a lot of money he was making and how prosperous the country was under the management of this government. Surely we had a right to point out that the hon. gentleman was not making the surpluses he was claiming. That had nothing to do with the legitimate improvement of the Intercolonial Railway. We are all glad to see the Intercolonial Railway improved and we never raised a question about it. The Finance Minister speaks of our criticism of

$1,000,000 being expended at St. John in connection with elevators and other things in order that the grain traffic should be carried to that port. But our criticism was this, that although they had spent $1,000,000 on that work, they had never carried a bushel of grain there, although the money had been expended for the very purpose of promoting the grain traffic in that direction. That is the nature of the criticism, and that is what the hon. gentleman thinks indicates a desire on our part to crush the Intercolonial Railway. I think the Intercolonial, if it could speak, would say, save me from my friends.

Then, the hon. gentleman took up that awful bugbear, the bonding privilege, which his leader dwelt upon so eloquently the other day. The hon. gentleman must know that the question of the bonding privilege has been hammered this way and that way for years, and we are just where we always were in that respect. The bonding privilege does not stay for our good. It does not exist to-day, any more than it has existed at any time, for our convenience. It does not exist because the United States are afraid of us or are friendly to us. It remains there because the New England states insist upon it, and the United States government cannot remove it without hurting their own people far more than they would hurt Canada. That is the truth of it, and the hon. gentleman knows it. What do people who understand the question show by their conduct? Take the Grand Trunk Railway Company of which we hear so much. The Grand Trunk Railway Company owns a railway in the States from Port Huron to Chicago. It owns besides several hundred miles in Michigan. It owns a long railway in the state of Maine. In Vermont it controls, practically owns, the Central Vermont from the boundary line to Long Island Sound. Some of these lines it has acquired recently. Would the Grand Trunk Company risk all that if they thought there was any danger of the bonding privilege being taken away? Are they afraid? Are they shutting off business or building other lines through fear of it? Not at all. Within two or three years they have actually taken the ownership of the Chicago and Grand Trunk into their own hands, and it is now the Grand Trunk Western. They are not afraid, and why should the hon. gentleman be afraid? Suppose the bonding privilege were stopped to-morrow, what would be the result? Would the grain traffic that is now going by Portland go that way, or would it go over the Intercolonial? Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not consider that. If the bonding privilege were stopped to-morrow, it might hurt the Grand Trunk, the Canada Southern and some other lines; but what hon. gentlemen opposite have been seeking, that the grain traffic of the country should go over the Canadian route, would be the inevitable result. It would have to go to Halifax and St. John by the Intercolonial Railway. And yet the hon. gentlemen are going to build another line through fear that that would happen. That is the argument of the hon. gentlemen. They are actually going to spend millions now; they will not wait an hour or a minute. Now is the time—we cannot wait, because this bonding privilege may be stopped at any moment, and we must be independent of the United States. If the bonding privilege were stopped to-morrow morning, would it prejudice the Dominion of Canada as regards the ports of Halifax and St. John? Not one iota. It would send the traffic that way. It is an argument against what the hon. gentlemen propose; and yet it has been bravely put forward by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance, as if it supported their view of the question. Now, I beg to say, that even if there was anything in that, it would be far better for us to stand as we are, and take the chance of having to haul the grain for a few years over that sixty or seventy or one hundred extra miles, whatever it may be, around the Intercolonial and for the country to pay the extra expense of that, and so cheapen the rates to the public, rather than go into enormous expenditures now, and pay interest in anticipation of a trouble that will perhaps never come. The hon. gentleman wants to spend this money now lest some day or other the bonding privilege will be stopped. Why not wait, if that is the point? We can afford for a time to carry the traffic over those sixty or seventy miles without charging for it much more easily than we can pay interest on the railway from Quebec to Moncton. Surely there cannot be any question about that, and I think the hon. gentleman must know it. I have never met anybody who seriously looked on that bonding privilege question as a factor in the matter.

The hon. Finance Minister tells us, with a great deal of satisfaction to himself, that the Grand Trunk, with all its assets, is behind this scheme. I do not wish to say one word against the Grand Trunk. I do not think it is in the interest of the country to say anything against any corporation such as the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway in the country. I believe in backing them up and saying a good word for them at all times. But when the Finance Minister uses the arguments we heard him use to-day about the Grand Trunk being behind this project, all I can say is that the Grand Trunk is behind it by getting $25,000,000 of common stock for nothing. That is the only way it is behind it that I can see. The Grand Trunk will guarantee something on the prairie section. That section I think it would be very easy to get anybody to guarantee.

There is a peculiarity about the argument of the Finance Minister contrasted with the argument advanced by the First Min-

ister the other day. The Finance Minister told us this evening that the Grand Trunk are paying one-fourth of the cost of the western section. Well, the Grand Trunk, as I understand it, are guaranteeing twenty-five per cent of the cost, and the country is guaranteeing seventy-five per cent. The other day the First Minister told us that the country was not paying one cent. If the country, in guaranteeing the seventy-five per cent, is not paying one cent for the road, how can the Grand Trunk be paying one-fourth of the whole cost ? I leave the hon. gentleman to explain that. Then, as to the eastern section, the First Minister told us that we are not paying anything for that. I have always been under the impression that if I borrowed say $10,000 to buy a piece of property and build a house on it, I incurred a debt of $10,000, and added that to my obligations even if I was going to rent the house. And when this country expends $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 or more on that eastern section, and gives its own securities for fifty years for it, and contracts with the public to pay both the principal and the interest, it does seem to me that we shall be paying something for that road. If not, I shall like to pay my debts and obligations in a similar way.

Let me say further that the Grand Trunk Railway guarantee comes after its bonds and debentures. These amount to $100,000,000, and they are all ahead of this guarantee. Within four or five years, as the hon. gentleman knows, the Grand Trunk Railway came to this House for a Bill authorizing it to charge up to capital a portion of the interest on its securities which it had been unable to pay. That was only five years ago. I do not mean to say that it has not improved since then. It has improved, and will go on improving, but it is idle to talk of a company like the Grand Trunk Railway as being of such material value as a guarantor. Whether the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be able to sell its bonds on the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway at par, and at three per cent interest, I do not know, but I very much doubt it. I think it will have to submit to considerable discount, which will add to its obligations, and which the public will have to pay interest on, just as they will have to pay sooner or later dividends on that $25,000,000 of common stock to be held by the Grand Trunk Railway, though the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway may never have received a cent for it.

As regards the rolling stock, section 22 provides that the company shall equip both divisions with modern and complete rolling stock and that the first equipment shall be of the value of at least $20,000,000, of which not less than $5,000,000 shall be supplied for the operation of the eastern division of the said railway, and the said $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock, together with all renewals thereof and additions thereto, shall be marked as assigned to the said eastern division. I take it that that covenant will be sufficiently complied with by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway hiring the rolling stock. I am quite aware that there is another section concerning the purchase of supplies and equipment in Canada, but that section will be sufficiently complied with if they hire the rolling stock in Canada. Let me refer to section 14 :

> For the purposes of this agreement, the expression 'working expenditure,' as applied to the eastern division of the railway shall mean and include all expenses of maintenance and all such tolls, rents or annual sums as are paid in respect of the hire of rolling stock let to the company as part of the equipment of the said eastern division.

There are two aspects of that. One is how careful the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is to have everything charged to maintenance, so that the government will not have much chance in the ten years of getting any profit. There will not be any profits on that line when all these charges are so carefully heaped up against the gross receipts. And I think you will find that probably all the rolling stock that will go on that line will be old rolling stock of the Grand Trunk Railway, made in Canada, of course, but sent up there on terms profitable to the Grand Trunk Railway, and that the company will make quite sure that the government will not get interest in the three years, any more than they will in the first seven.

Then the hon. gentleman made out his $13,000,000 as the actual cost to the country in respect of interest, &c., during construction. It is quite true that the ex-Minister of Railways yesterday made up to some $19,000,000 or $20,000,000 ; but the Minister of Finance cuts it down to $13,000,000. He works it out, with the help of an actuary, thus : He takes the items spread over seven years. These he says represent a present cash value, being discounted, of only $13,000,000, which he therefore claims to be the whole cost to us. But if we should advance that $13,000,000 in cash now, and receive nothing in return for seven years, we would have to take into account interest for the seven years. And if you take other items into account, as well, I fancy that the ex-Minister of Railways was not far out in his little computation of $19,000,000, as the sum we are paying in the way of interest.

When I was referring to the Moncton end of the road, I omitted to remind the House how cocksure my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was about this line. It was practically an air-line, right from somewhere near a point where they turned down along the Maine frontier, to Moncton. He knew all about it. He had been reading in the archives, and he had plans and reports, and it was all right. However, he was less cautious than his leader, who in his speech, said :

> From the town of Edmundston the railway will proceed eastward to the town of Moncton;

it is impossible to say at this moment by what route, perhaps by Chipman, or in the vicinity of Chipman. At all events, from this point it is impossible to exactly locate any precise line, or to say where it will be ultimately. Suffice it to say that we desire to have the best and shortest line between Lévis and Moncton.

That was all the First Minister could say.

An hon. MEMBER. That was three or four days ago.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, they get light very quickly on the treasury benches, and I am not astonished that my hon. friend the Finance Minister should now know exactly where the road is to be.

But I think it is perhaps desirable that we should have a little inquiry as to how it has come to pass that this government has glided into this tremendous natioal and transcontinental railway scheme. Now, Sir, it appears fairly certain that up to the opening of the session the government had no thought of anything of this kind. That appears very clear, if you take the speech that the government deliberately put into the mouth of His Excellency at the opening of the session :

The great influx of population into our Northwestern Territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels.

This is the very subject we are discussing. And this is how the government proceeded, in March last, to deal with it :

The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

This was exactly five months ago—this subject was continuing to occupy attention, and the government were immediately to appoint experienced men to report. What followed ? On the 6th of April the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) brought in a very carefully prepared report —another department you see; they had two of them at it. And that report—after careful consideration by the cabinet, of course—was approved by the Governor General on the 19th of May last, less than three months ago. And what did that report say? It is a very important report, and I will take the liberty of reading it, because it conveys a great deal to the public :

On a report dated April 6, 1903, from the Minister of Public Works, stating that he has under consideration questions affecting the transportation of Canadian products to the markets of the world through and by Canadian ports with a view of placing the Canadian producer in a position to compete, and compete successfully, through all Canadian channels with the producers and exporters of other countries.

The minister submits that it may be assumed that grain and other products will naturally seek their markets by the cheapest routes, and therefore the method of attaining the object desired should be to make the Canadian routes cheaper and more convenient than competing routes.

That the development of North-western Canada has manifested the inability of existing Canadian transportation agencies to take care of Canadian products.

That our agricultural exports can only command the prices over seas to which their natural excellence entitles them when they cease to be confounded and confused with the inferior and often adulterated articles produced elsewhere; and to preserve their separate identity they must go through Canadian channels.

The minister further states that the questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.

This involves the consideration of their transportation :—

From place of production to Canadian seaports.

From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.

From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.

From Canadian seaports to Europe.

From place of production through Canadian ports on the Pacific.

As it affects the products of the eastern provinces of Canada it involves their movement :—

To the seaports.

From the seaports to Europe.

It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding :—

The conditions of original shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding such shipments.

The storage requirements of lake, river and ocean ports.

The harbour facilities of the inland lakes, rivers and Atlantic and Pacific ports.

The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally, any improvement, enlargements, or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.

The minister further states that in making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

The forces operating against the attainment of all Canadian transport, namely:—

Competition by United States railways ;

Competition by United States vessels from Lake Superior ports ;

Diversion of Canadian products through eastern outlets to Boston, Portland and other United States ports, should be investigated, and the best and most economical methods used by our competitors should be carefully studied and reported upon.

The minister apprehends that in these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its

own products, and it is thought that the most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts who may be appointed and authorized under the provisions of chapter 114 of the Rivised Statutes of Canada.

Then the Order in Council goes on and names the commissioners. Now, this is all within three months of the present time. Yet, what a change! This commission has been sidetracked; it has gone no one knows whither; and instead, these hon. gentlemen opposite have constituted themselves the experts. They have even set aside the Railway Department; the Prime Minister has become the 'competent expert,' and they have decided upon the expenditure of something like seventy millions of money without a moment's hesitation and with the absolute confidence which was attributed to Lord John Russell, who, it was said, would, at a moment's notice, take command of the channel fleet. Surely the government, when they made that report and put it in His Excellency's hands, could not have had under consideration any such project as this. If they had had such a scheme under consideration, the Order in Council appointing a commission would have been an absolute farce. What possible use could there be in such a commission when the government had determined not merely to send out surveyors and survey a line, but actually to enter into a contract with a number of gentlemen and bind the country as to where the line shall be? And this we are asked to confirm. The country is asked to commit itself to this, although we are told that the 'inquiry must be thorough and comprehensive' into the 'complicated and involved question,' and that 'it should be made by competent and experienced experts.'

I think I may call attention here to the way in which, as it appears to me, the government tumbled in to this affair. It would not be accurate to say they drifted into it, they seem to have tumbled into it headlong. In January last, several railway officials and other gentlemen intimately connected with the Grand Trunk Railway published a notice in the 'Canada Gazette' that they were about to apply for a charter authorizing them to construct a railway from the Pacific ocean either to North Bay or Gravenhurst. At that time they proposed to build a branch from their main line to Winnipeg, but shortly afterwards they altered that to make the main line run through Winnipeg. To appreciate the significance of that notice, which seems to be the very beginning of this contract, it must be borne in mind that the Grand Trunk Railway to-day connects all the more important centres of Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces with Gravenhurst and North Bay. That company has also two ports on the Georgian bay, Collingwood and Midland; and the project for which notice was given was to bring the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from the Pacific ocean to connect at those points and ports with the Grand Trunk's eastern system. Now, there we had a project devised by experienced railroad men, men thoroughly competent, none more so in this country. Those gentlemen, understanding thoroughly the requirements of the country, and how the best line of railway could be constructed to afford transportation facilities, determined that the point where the eastern and western divisions should meet was at Gravenhurst or North Bay, coupled with their own ports of Collingwood and Midland. Gravenhust is a point from which they would be able to run their railway south of Lake Nipissing across the French river, and thereby make some saving of mileage as against the route by North Bay. The importance of that point is shown by the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has already made several surveys between Gravenhurst and Sudbury, for the purpose of getting the very best line. I may say that the Canadian Pacific Railway, instead of moving as rapidly and rashly as hon. gentlemen opposite have done, have, I believe, surveyed that line at least six times in order to get the best route, and that has been going on for two or three years.

Now these are very significant indications, as they strike my mind, showing what competent and experienced men regard as the real points for the connection between the western system and the east.

Well, these Grand Trunk gentlemen went on with their application for a charter, and unfortunately for themselves they soon found that there was an agitation at Quebec for a trans-Canada line, and to meet that they apparently were obliged to say they would extend their line to Quebec. I do not believe they ever intended to build it, but they put that in their Bill, and their line was to go on from Gravenhurst or North Bay to Quebec. Then, as the Bill got into committee, some hon. gentlemen, seeing how easily Quebec got a line to the city of Quebec, said to themselves, we must have one to Moncton. And so they pressed, and they fought, in those sultry days, and Mr. Hays, in the blandest manner, said, Oh, yes, we will go to Moncton. Why, he would have promised to go to Newfoundland and build a tunnel to get there, provided he could get his charter. That is what he was after, and he promised them whatever they wanted. Well, while this was going on, and while the members in the Railway Committee were fighting day after day, and week after week, over the clauses of that Bill, what was going on in the closet? What was going on between the First Minister and Mr. Hays? All the morning the Railway Committee and Mr. Hays were fighting over the Bill, and at night those two gentlemen were down below, closeted together,

tearing the Bill to pieces. The Railway Committee supposed they were going to get the Grand Trunk to Moncton, for Mr. Hays agreed to put it in the Bill. The Bill was kept before the Railway Committee, while the First Minister, throwing aside his Minister of Railways, behind that gentleman's back, took upon himself, as he says, to conduct negotiations with Mr. Hays. And lo and behold it turned out that the government were undertaking everything, not merely between Gravenhurst and North Bay and Moncton, but all the way from Winnipeg. So Mr. Hays is left with the cream of the whole thing ; the government has got a bone without any meat on it, so far as we see. That is the way this thing seems to have come about. It may not be so, but I cannot see any other explanation. What was the meaning of the farce that was going on in the Railway Committee ? Mr. Hays promised everything, he was the most obliging gentleman any Railway Committee ever had before them. But he knew all the time that he would meet the First Minister downstairs, and the harder the committee made it for Mr. Hays, the better terms he seems to have got from the First Minister. Now, Sir, I think that, having regard to the circumstances, we ought to assume that the project as it came before the Railway Committee was never a serious one, it was all a piece of by-play. I am sure we must absolve the members of the Railway Committee of any suspicion that they were not perfectly square in their action. Why, they fought so strenuously that we thought that Bill would never get out of committee at all. They were sincere, they thought the Grand Trunk Railway was going to do all this work. There was a gentle hint that the Grand Trunk Railway might expect something from the government in the way of guarantee or favours, but that the company was not going to build to Moncton never entered any man's mind.

Now, at this time the House was startled by the resignation of the Minister of Railways. It came upon us like a clap of thunder, and then we had explanations. The ex-Minister of Railways refused to hold his position. He gave up an honourable position in the government, one that he must have been proud of. He had worked seven years in that department. While he was responsible to the country for that department, was the minister responsible for matters connected with all railway operations, he found that his leader had thrown him aside in these negotiations. The First Minister, utterly inexperienced in railway matters, had undertaken to fight alone and unassisted against the wiliest and most expert railway man in Canada, and we have the outcome in this contract. That is the position. No wonder that the Minister of Railways resigned. The right hon. gentleman thinks that the objection to the immediate construction of a railway negotiated under such circumstances requires but a single observation. I am surprised at the right hon. gentleman's moderation.

There were rumours in the press of these meetings, but nobody knew what was being done. The secret seems to have been well kept. The ex-Minister of Railways was apparently as much in the dark, at first at all events, as the rest of us. Then, the right hon. gentleman endeavours to rush this thing through. He makes a speech in this House and scornfully speaks of the policy of tomorrow, of those who say consider, calculate, inquire. You must not consider, you must not calculate, you must even inquire. No, he says, this is not the time for deliberation ; yet, less than two months before he had made up his mind to enter into this negotiation he was a party to an Order in Council which says that the subject requires the utmost consideration, information, and even experts to report and advise. Yet, the right hon. gentleman expects this country to adopt his scheme simply, apparently, because the government have committed themselves to this arrangement. I repeat the words that appeared in that report :

> That the questions to be considered are complicated and involved.

Yet, we must not pause ; we must not hesitate.

> It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough comprehensive inquiry should be made.

And :

> If necessary, surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

Surely that is common sense. Surely there cannot be any more reason now for haste than there was then ; yet, the right hon. gentleman has cast aside the Order in Council and the commission, and instead we have this scheme in which the fine hand of Mr. Hays appears. Mr. Hays has the prairie country, he has the mountain section and the right hon. gentleman has the district which produces poplar, jack pine, and spruce. The government do not show the grade it is going to get through that country of jack pine, poplar and spruce. In so far as the hon. Minister of Finance has referred to surveys, I gather that the grades would be 52 feet to the mile. Does not the hon. gentleman know that this will not be a satisfactory grade for grain traffic ? Does he not know that the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot haul, as against the water route, on the north shore of Lake Superior ; yet, he is going away up north of the height of land to carry grain 1,800 miles to the sea by an all-rail route, competing with a line which has 550 miles of water route, competing with a line which runs through a country with large commercial and manufac-

turing interests and millions of people to furnish the road with business and to fill up the trains. Furthermore he is going to have a line without return traffic. What traffic does he expect to carry back over this line from the sea to the prairies ?

An hon. MEMBER. Lumber.

Mr. BARKER. Lumber ! Does he know that he will find a tree bigger than a man's leg in that country for 1,400 miles of the route. He may get pulpwood, but there is enough pulpwood below the height of land to supply the wants of the country for fifty years. We do not need to spend $80,000,000 to get into the pulpwood north of the height of land.

The line that is proposed would have to compete with railways further south which enjoy traffic both ways, both freight and passengers and which have the great advantage of a water-route. It is impossible for a line to be successful unless it has the very best grades and the most satisfactory curves, and can hon. gentlemen say that there is any evidence that it is possible between Quebec and Winnipeg to get such a line ? I admit that it is possible to make any grade you like if you only spend millions enough but you will not get it even with such an expenditure as the hon. Minister of Finance has spoken of to-night. There is not the slightest shadow of evidence that it is possible to get that line with grades of 21 feet or thereabouts per mile. Without that, what use is the line ? The fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway unloads all its traffic at Port Arthur leaving it to vessels to carry it by the water route to the ports of Georgian bay is the strongest evidence you could get that the all rail route must have favourable grades before the traffic can be profitably carried. The line to the north must have favourable grades or it cannot hope, even with all other conditions equal, to compete. I have taken some notes from the speech of the right hon. leader of the government as it appeared in ' Hansard ' and I will quote them here. I do not give his exact words, but the substance of what he said. He says as to the district west of Lake Abbittibbi that twelve or thirteen years ago the Ontario government sent a party of gentlemen into that district. Their report is the one that the hon. Minister of Finance read from to-night. They were a few members of the local legislature and some others. One of them was Mr. Charlton, a brother of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and, I think it is understood that that gentleman had a good deal to do with the writing of the report. These were the explorers of that unknown land. They said in the report, as quoted by the hon. Minister of Finance, that they were not expected to make a thorough exploration. In a modest way they reported that there were 24,500 square miles of good fertile land. They were up there for a few weeks. What travellers they must have been, and what travellers' tales were told ! The wonder is that these gentlemen who wrote that nice report did not get up a syndicate on their return to Toronto and buy the whole thing, but I can assure hon. members of the House that every acre of it is still open to purchase. Pine timber is commercially valuable but that pine will be floated down to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it lies to the south of the height of land. Really all that the hon. gentleman has beyond the height of land is spruce, jack pine and poplar. That is what these gentlemen reported, and the hard facts about the timber are of more use to us than their very general remarks which were read by the Finance Minister. Such general observations are no doubt eminently satisfactory to the first minister, but that a great railway line should be forced upon the country upon such evidence is simply astounding. I can hardly believe that the government is seriously intending to build that line. I think there must be more in that clause 21 than the Finance Minister would lead us to believe. The government have put that in as a safety-valve. They have thought perhaps that after all they are a little premature about this thing, and although they have entered into this contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, they put in the Act a clause to enable them to suspend operations.

There is another feature of this line that I would call attention to. Suppose the line is constructed through this section, where does the government hope to get its supplies, say of fuel. The First Minister is not going to burn spruce or poplar on his engines. He must haul coal a very long way into that country, over 1,000 miles, to get fuel for his locomotives. I do not suppose the right hon. gentleman is going to turn the muskegs into coke or peat. He will find authority for that in some of his reports perhaps, but I do not think that any practical railway man would recommend the adoption of that system. The line is going to run through stunted woods; there will be a little black birch or white birch and much poplar and spruce, but that would be a sad sort of fuel to run a railway with. So the hon. gentleman must take coal up there to run a line from Winnipeg to Quebec, a distance of 1,400 miles. It is a pretty serious undertaking, and the right hon. gentleman should have asked some of these experts to consider that feature before he committed himself to a contract binding him to build a railway through such a district.

And there is another feature that I wish to call attention to, it strikes me as a very important one. The Grand Trunk Pacific will be able to construct and complete hundreds of miles of the prairie section long before, perhaps years before, the government can complete

the 1,800 miles of the eastern section. It must be apparent to everybody that before that 1,800 miles is fully completed from end to end, there will be hundreds of miles of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in operation on the prairie section. The hon. gentleman cannot compel the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to take over one mile of the 1,800 miles until every inch of it is completed? What is he going to do with the portions that are completed from time to time. Is he going to work them? If so, there will be a handsome loss. There will be no through traffic and certainly no local traffic. If he does not work them, he will have to spend large sums of money in maintaining the portions built, because nothing goes to pieces so quickly as an unused railway. There will be an enormous amount of money, which the Finance Minister has not taken into his calculation with his actuary, to spend year after year in that way, while the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in the west is enjoying the fat of the land, and the government is struggling to finish its 1,800 miles through the muskegs. That is the position. But what then? What is the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway going to do with all this grain at Winnipeg that will come over the prairie section that it has in operation? What does the Prime Minister suppose the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will do? Does he know that the Grand Trunk has a line from Chicago, running to Buffalo, and running also to Portland, Maine. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the Grand Trunk will not send its grain down to Chicago, and over its Chicago line and its line in Ontario to Buffalo for the grain that is going that way, and to Portland for the grain that is going in that direction. The government can hardly insist that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway must send its grain by this great continental line until they have completed their 1,800 miles. Therefore, by these ill-digested arrangements the country will assist the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in making a route for traffic by way of Chicago. That will be the result of this contract, the inevitable result of it. The right hon. gentleman may remember that last summer there were rumours that the Grand Trunk Railway was negotiating for a line from Chicago up to the boundary. But whether that be true or not, there are plenty of American lines who would be delighted to carry that traffic down to Chicago, and the Grand Trunk Railway will probably make more money on its traffic going that way than it will in any other. The west-bound traffic, merchandise and manufactures will go back through Chicago up to the North-west, and you will establish a trade there that it may take years to reverse. That is the result of the government's undertaking. But the Grand Trunk Railway will have another opening, and if they choose they can send their traffic from Winnipeg to Port Arthur That will be the way to do it, probably in the interest of Canada. They can send it thence by water to their port at Midland, anl carry it from Midland to Niagara and Buffalo, or Portland. There is nothing in the contract that can prevent them until the government has completed the 1,800 miles, and even after that, as I think I will show presently, they cannot be prevented from sending the grain by what route they please, even to American ports. And yet the right hon. gentleman cannot wait a day or an hour, because he is afraid that traffic will go to the United States.

At this point I wish to say a few words upon clause 42 of the contract. This is the wonderful clause that the Finance Minister referred to, by which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway agrees to forward its traffic through Canadian ports. Mr. Hays was perfectly frank when he was asked by the Railway Committee if he would bind himself absolutely to do that. He said: 'No; would you have me ignore the wishes of the shipper?' That was a frank and proper thing for him to say, and the committee understood perfectly what it meant. What is the clause here? Let us see what it is: It is limited to 'all freight originating on the line of the railway or its branches.' In the course of ten or fifteen years from now, I presume there will be a great many railways in that country, if it fills up as we expect it to do, and there will perhaps be Grand Trunk branches or branches bought up by it, quite apart from the Grand Trunk Pacific. It can by such means get plenty of traffic that will not originate on this Grand Trunk Pacific line, and the clause is limited in that respect. But it agrees 'that all freight originating on the line of railway or its branches not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper shall when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports—and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.'

Now I do not pretend that there is any deliberate intention to evade that clause or to act in bad faith. But does the hon. gentleman seriously suppose that on a railway, either the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk or any other, a station agent is going to wait for orders, or that he does not know what the interests of the company are? Why, the youngest billing clerk on a railway knows perfectly to what destination traffic should go so that the company he serves shall make the most money. If he does not know that, he had better seek some other vocation, because he will not remain long in that service. They do not want a boy or a man who does not thoroughly understand the interests of his company. And let the president or the vice-president of the Grand Trunk send printed orders out once a week

to every station master and billing clerk on the line that they must send freight through Canadian ports, that they must not send it to Portland, and the agent will send it to Portland just the same. He will understand. If he were to begin shipping say to Halifax for money which the Grand Trunk could get for carrying the shorter distance to Portland, that young fellow would know he was not acting in the best interests of his company ; and does any hon. gentleman in the House, who is accustomed to shipping goods or grain, believe that one man in a hundred who ships goods cares what is written on the bill ? If the billing clerk says : 'This can go most quickly, I think, on such a road,' the shipper would say, 'send it that way.' If he is shipping to an ocean port, and he wants to send his goods to Halifax, the billing clerk may perhaps say : 'Certainly, sir, we will send them to Halifax. There is not a steamer there this week, but there will be one at Portland, and you can take your choice.' The man says : 'Then my choice is Portland.' There is not a person in the country who does not know that. Mr. Hays could not prevent it. The boys would take the risk of being discharged for acting in the true interest of the company.

This is a very good clause, and very nicely drawn. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said, in complimenting the legal gentlemen, the contract is drawn in a manner to do them credit. I am sure they would be extremely gratified with the commendation of the hon. gentleman. He is a good judge of legal work and I hope the hon. Minister of Justice will convey to them the approbation of the hon. member for North Norfolk in that respect. It would be very much more satisfactory to the House and the country, however, if the hon. member for North Norfolk could point to the work of some surveyors on this line. The mode in which the legal gentlemen do their work is not the important thing. It is not that we are discussing. The objections we are raising are that the government have not the information that is necessary before we determine the location of the railway ; and as to this routing clause, however drawn up, that it will be of no practical benefit—that it will not be of the slightest advantage to the government or the country. Take a practical case. I am not sure whether the right hon. gentleman understands it ; but in any train that goes into Winnipeg, or Brandon, or any of the towns in the west, there will perhaps be cars of ten different companies. The cars lie empty at a station. A man comes along and wants five or six of them. The station agent says: 'All these cars have come from Chicago, and they have to go back that way ; the companies that own them do not wish them to go to Halifax. If you wait till next week, we will have cars that will be going to Halifax.' The man will say : 'No, let them go as you please.' They will send them where the interest of the company requires, the grain will be routed that way and by the order of the shipper. There is no question about that, and you need not inpute any dishonesty to Mr. Hays, Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson or anybody else. It will be inevitable, and it cannot be helped. That is all I have to say on that.

Clause 44 is a significant clause. It provides that through rates shall be apportioned in percentages between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Pacific—a very proper provision. But what about the percentage division of through rates to be taken by the Grand Trunk ? The Grand Trunk can make arrangements to take the lion's share of the rates, leaving the lean share to be divided between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial.

Then it must be obvious to the hon. gentleman that while he has clauses in this Bill enabling the government to see all the books and papers of the Grand Trunk Pacific in order to ascertain the net earnings, charges, tolls and rates, it would have been far more serviceable to have a provision entitling the government to inspect the books, papers, and rate bills of the Grand Trunk itself. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not be heard of a month after the whole thing will be completed. It will be the Grand Trunk, so far as business is concerned. No one hears of anything but the Grand Trunk on the Atlantic and the St. Lawrence, which runs to Portland. It is the Grand Trunk that gives the orders from Montreal to Chicago, and so will it be with traffic for our North-west. It is impossible to make any thorough investigation or to find out anything that is going wrong in these matters unless the government have power and authority to examine not only the books of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the books of the Grand Trunk Company. The whole thing will be conducted in the name of the Grand Trunk Company from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

In conclusion I can only say had the government taken time to deliberate instead of acting in this impulsive way, had it submitted this question to a commission of experts, it would have been able to devise a scheme far more serviceable to the country and more beneficial to the Grand Trunk. It could have arranged to carry the traffic from the North-west by the water route in summer and by a land route in the winter, when the lake harbours are not open. It could have done all that and besides have provided for every need in the way of development. Had the government taken this course, it would have saved millions which it proposes to spend and I think waste now. It would have done more good to the North-west, it would have done more for our undeveloped territories and the whole Dominion than can be done by this wild and reckless scheme. I say that advisedly. I do not wish to use rash language, but I

firmly believe that this scheme will never be practicable. It is an experiment on which millions are to be spent. The government has no information, it has not attempted to get any information that would justify what it is doing. I would impress on hon. gentlemen opposite, but I am afraid they have committed themselves too deeply, the necessity of withdrawing from this scheme. My hon. friend the Finance Minister spoke of the murmurs heard at Moncton from the sea, but he will hear more murmurs throughout the Dominion than he imagines if he attempts to carry out this project. The right hon. the First Minister has lost, I consider, the finest opportunity of his life, in not having proceeded with that commission which he advised His Excellency to appoint and submitted to it this whole question of transportation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I hoped that I would be able to make the remarks which I have to make on this Bill this evening, but in view of the fact that it is now twenty minutes to twelve, and that we have been listening to a continuous flow of oratory since eleven this morning, I think the House will appreciate the suggestion that we should adjourn. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, August 13, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

LECTURES ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. LEMIEUX (Gaspé) asked :

1. What are the names of the lecturers on agriculture for the Department of Agriculture ?

2. In which counties of the province of Quebec were these lecturers employed during last year

3. What salary is paid to these lecturers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. The following officers of the department, in addition to their other duties, deliver lectures on agriculture :

Experimental Farm branch—Dr. Wm. Saunders, LL.D., director ; Dr. Jas. Fletcher, LL.D., entomologist and botanist ; Mr. F. T. Shutt, M.A., chemist ; Mr. Wm. T. Macoun, horticulturist ; Mr. J. H. Grisdale, B. Agr., agriculturist ; Mr. A. G. Gilbert, poultry manager ; Mr. A. T. Charron, assistant chemist ; Mr. J. L. A. McMurray, Mr. John Fixter.

Branch of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying—Dr. Jas. W. Robertson, LL.D., commissioner ; J. C. Chapais, assistant dairy commissioner ; F. W. Hodson, live stock commissioner ; J. A. Ruddick, chief of the dairy division ; W. A. Mackinnon, chief of the fruit division ; George H. Clark, chief of the seed division ; Frank Hare, chief of the poultry division ; A. W. Woodward, official referee for butter and cheese ; Alex. McNeil, fruit inspector ; Elmer Lick, fruit inspector ; P. J. Carey, fruit inspector; J. F. Scriver, fruit inspector ; E. H. Wartman, fruit inspector ; Richard Burke, fruit inspector ; Geo. H. Vroom, fruit inspector ; F. L. Déry, fruit inspector ; J. J. Philp, fruit inspector ; Barton Gandy, fruit inspector ; Freeman Fitch, fruit inspector ; Maxwell Smith, fruit inspector.

In addition to the foregoing, the following persons have been specially engaged at various times to deliver lectures : T. G. Raynor, Daniel Drummond, Henry Glendenning, J. E. Orr. Mrs. I. E. Tilson, Prof. H. H. Dean, Robert Thompson, Duncan Anderson, John Jackson, Jas. Shepphard, G. C. Cottrelle, J. M. Gardhouse, Gus Boyer, C. W. Nash. R. F. Holtermann, Robert Ness, G. W. Clemons.

2. Brome, Beauce, Compton, Drummond, Megantic, Richmond, Wolfe, St. John, Iberville, Rouville, Missisquoi, Shefford, Sherbrooke, Stanstead, Arthabaska, Terrebonne, Montcalm, L'Assomption, Joliette, Berthier, St. Maurice, Champlain, Argenteuil, Chambly, Chioutimi, Jacques Cartier, La Praire, Laval, Lotbinière, Maskinonge, Nicolet, Richelieu, St. Hyacinthe, Two Mountains, Vaudreuil, Verchères and Yamaska, Portneuf, Quebec, Quebec (city), Montmorency, Dorchester, Huntingdon, Bagot, Bellechasse, Chateauguay, Kamouraska, L'Islet, Montmagny, Rimouski, Temiscouata, Charlevoix, Lac St. Jean, Matane, Montreal, St. John, Wright.

3. The officers of the department are not paid anything for lecturing in addition to their regular salaries. Other persons engaged by the department are paid at the rate of three dollars per day.

MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL AT ST. JOHN D'IBERVILLE.

Mr. MORIN—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government had a military riding school built at St. John d'Iberville ?

2 If so, to whom was the contract awarded, and at what price ?

3. Were tenders previously called for by public notice ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir F. W. Borden). There is no riding school at St. John.

TRADE WITH JAPAN.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Are goods and merchandise of the same classes and values, manufactured in Canada and the United States, respectively, subjected to the same customs duties upon being entered for consumption in Japan ?

2. Are exports from the United States to Japan admitted into the latter country on more favourable terms than exports of a similar character from Canada ? If so, why is the discrimination made ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright):

1. As regards some classes of goods they are. As regards others they are not.

2. Certain specified articles exported from the United States to Japan are admitted into that country on more favourable terms than exports of a similar character from Canada, the reason being that there exists a special preferential treaty between Japan and the United States, which also contains the 'most favoured nation clause,' while no such treaty exists under which Canada could claim preferential or minimum tariff.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into Committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a national trancontinental railway.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Mr. Speaker, the debate in which we are engaged at the present time has now reached such a stage that we may fairly say that the House is seized in a general way of the views put forward by the government in favour of the proposition which we are discussing, and that it is seized in a general way of the objections which are put forward by our friends on the opposition side. We have, therefore, made some progress, and if the debate at later stages is to be illuminated upon the subject it will be necessary for us to confine ourselves more to the points which prove to be at issue between the parties, instead of discussing the general features of the scheme, which are now well before the country as well as the House. We have had exhaustive statements from both sides. We had an eloquent and able speech from the right hon. leader of the government, in which, with that ability which on both sides of the House, I think I can fairly say, we all admire, he placed before the House and the country his views respecting this great project. He was followed by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. That hon. gentleman did not, it is true, have the printed contract before him sufficiently long to enable him to give a mature and detailed criticism of its contents, and therefore he may fairly ask that this House and the country shall hear him again. But, in so far as the general features of the scheme were concerned, they had been reported in the press without dispute ; they had been brought before the members of the government following in caucus, and, with that enterprise which characterizes our friends of the press, had been fully and completely reported to the readers of the newspapers. Therefore, I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, probably knew as well, when he came to listen to the Prime Minister's deliverance, the general features of the scheme which he should be called upon to criticise, as he knows at the present time. He did not shrink from the task which was imposed upon him, but he spoke vigorously and at length on behalf of himself and his party, and placed himself on record respecting this proposition. Then we had an address from my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who, by reason of his length of service in this House, his service in the late government, and the position which he occupies in the public life of the country, is well qualified to speak for the Conservative party of the province of Ontario in this House; and I think I do not misstate my hon. friend's position when I say that it was one of uncompromising hostility to the proposition of the government. Then we had from my hon. friend the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) a lengthy and exhaustive discussion from the standpoint of an opponent. My hon. friend and late colleague spoke with all the knowledge of a gentleman who had been a member of the subcommittee who were instructed to prepare the details of this scheme. Therefore, he could not claim that his information was not full and complete or that he had not sufficient time to go into the subject with great fullness since the speech of the right hon. the Prime Minister. So that we may take it that what he has said is the worst that can be said, so far as he is concerned, with respect to the scheme before us.

Then we heard yesterday from the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk, and I think I am safe in saying that his attitude was one of uncomproming opposition. We heard also from the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) last night, and his attitude was equally one of uncompromising opposition. So that we have this fact thoroughly well settled, that from every portion of the Dominion represented by our hon. friends on the opposition benches, except from the west—we have not yet heard from our friends from the west—we have uncompromising opposition to the plan of the government in connection with this transcontinental proposition. From our side we have had a very able and convincing speech from my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and last evening we had from the Finance Minister a speech characterized by that ability and eloquence which

causes us all on this side to be so proud of him. Leaving aside for the moment the presentation originally made by my right hon. leader, the different phases of the subject were dealt with by the hon. member for North Norfolk and the Finance Minister in such a convincing, exhaustive and conclusive manner that would be mere impertinence for any one at this stage to undertake to amplify the argument and reasons which they gave. But if I may be permitted, I will devote a few moments to a consideration of a few of the objections which have been raised by our hon. friends on the other side to this contract.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier spoke to us yesterday afternoon at considerable length, and the chief ground he took for opposing the Bill was that we had no information about the country through which we proposed to run the line from Winnipeg to Quebec. I understood him to take the position that it was unwise and imprudent to undertake to build a railway without first having had an actual survey made of the route. But it has been pointed out that the position taken by the hon. gentleman, and which has been reiterated on that side, is contrary to all business experience and practice. When people undertake a railway enterprise, they usually come to parliament for authority to go on, before making an actual survey of the route. They get first a general knowledge of the country, such a knowlelge as justifies them in the conviction that a railway of the character they intend to build, can be built, and then proceed to get the requisite authority to make a survey and decide on the exact location. That is what was done—in fact I do not know that quite as much was done when the Dominion undertook to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Information was at the disposal of the government which enabled it to say that the railway could be built and they undertook to build it and they did build it.

And after the government entered into a contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that railway did not follow the line of the survey which had been made at all, but went hundreds of miles away from where, according to the survey, it was intended the road should go. It will not be found, in all the practice regarding the initiation of great railway enterprises, that complete surveys are required before a decision is arrived at to go on with the work.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier raised another objection. He said the province of Quebec required colonization railways, and he made that statement in such a way as to indicate that the argument or proposition he was advancing was an argument against the scheme we were discussing. Well, I am wholly unable to see what it has to do with the proposition we are discussing. If the province of Quebec requires colonizataion railways, if there are districts in that province through which the building of colonization railways can be justified, then this parliament is prepared to deal liberally with any proposition for development of that kind when it is brought before us. My hon. friend has been a member of this House for six years, during two of which he has occupied the position of lieutenant of the leader of the opposition, and up to this moment he has not brougt before us a single scheme looking to the building of a colonization railway in his province. I do not see therefore how he can say how there has been any lack of disposition on the part of this House to deal liberally with his province in that respect. There is absolutely no connection between the two propositions. We stand in the same position with regard to the province of Quebec upon that subject as we do with regard to the other provinces of the Dominion. As a member of a government I have never had any sympathy whatever with the agitation which has arisen and been fomented in certain parts of the older provinces against the bonusing and encouraging of railways.

I take the position that it would be an act of folly, that it would be disastrous for the parliament of Canada to lay down any principle contrary to the encouraging of railway construction in this country. I have suffered politically somewhat for my faith, because in certain parts in the western country which are fairly well served with railway facilities, the people have been persuaded that the policy of bonusing railways should cease. But I am convinced that the view which I entertain is sound and will appeal to the solid business judgment of the people in the long run. We are prepared to give effect to the policy of encouraging railway construction in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and the other provinces of the Dominion, including the old province of New Brunswick, where additional facilities are required.

The hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has addressed some criticisms to this contract. I am sorry he is not in his place, because he has been placed by our hon. friends opposite in the position of a railway critic and as being in some sort, after the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), the railway expert of the opposition ; and we are therefore to pay some considerable degree of attention to what he says. My hon. friend criticised the provision of this contract regarding running powers. I regard that provision as most essential and important, as a fundamental provision, without which this contract never could have been made. That is the importance which the government attaches to that provision of the contract, and therefore when it is attacked we find it necessary to meet the attack. And when this debate is over, I do not think that hon. gentlemen on that side will be able to say that any attack was made on this particular phase of

the question which has not been thoroughly met. My hon. friend from North Norfolk dealt with that question fully.

The allegation is made that the provisions respecting running powers are not practical. In broad, general terms, that is the proposition that is laid before the House. It is said: Your idea about a railway highway, your idea about running powers is a good enough idea, but it won't work. What did my hon. friend from North Norfolk say? He showed that it is actually working. He said: It is of no use for you to say it won't work; here is a road where it is actually working now. And what is the answer to that? I am free to say that I do not know. It was said that the arrangement could not work where the road was more than one division long, say more than 75 or 100 miles, for you would have to have engines, shops and changes of crews. And my late colleague, the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), excited the mirth of our hon. friends on the other side by the humorous description he gave of the difficulties that would arise in endeavouring to carry into effect what he represented as a ridiculous and impracticable idea. Now, humour is a very good thing, and a very entertaining thing—but it is not argument. And when, after my hon. friend's humorous address, the hon. member for North Norfolk said: Your argument is very well for a lawyer, but here are the facts, here are two railway companies doing this very thing which you say is ridiculous and impracticable; what have you to say to that? And we ask hon. gentlemen on the other side what they have to say at this present stage of the discussion? My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has an answer to it, and to that answer I desire to draw attention. Let the House observe that the hon. member for North Norfolk spoke in the morning, and the hon. member for Hamilton, who is a railway man—I understand he has been a railway manager—a man with expert knowledge of railroads and familiar with the road to which my hon. friend from North Norfolk referred, and the country through which it runs, spoke in the evening. And what was the only argument he could bring against the facts stated to this House by the hon. member for North Norfolk? Why, the only thing he could allege, after a whole day's consideration of this most important phase of the question, which goes to the root of the whole contract, was that the dominant railway, the Canada Southern, did not permit the junior railway to compete with it for local traffic. That was all he could think of saying. It turns out then that even that is not correct. My hon. friend from North Norfolk says that, so far as freight business is concerned, the dominant railway does permit competition for local traffic, for he says he has shipped the freight. There can't be very much mistake about that. And my hon. friend from South Essex (Mr. Cowan) says that, so far as passenger business is concerned, they do permit competition, because he has bought the tickets. There cannot be very much mistake about that. So the alleged facts put forward by my hon. friend from Hamilton do not appear, so far as the testimony at our disposal is concerned, to be very conclusively established. But, supposing they were established, supposing that what my hon. friend says were perfectly true, and the railway company which owns the fee of the Canada Southern did not permit, and was not permitting, the junior road, the leasing road, the road co-operating with them in the use of the line, to compete for local business; will my hon. friend from Hamilton, or will the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), when he follows me, say how this affects the provision of the contract that we have now before us? The arrangement in the case of the Canada Southern is a voluntary arrangement; the dominant railway can allow competition for local traffic if it likes, or it can refuse to allow it if it likes. Is that the case in this contract? This contract provides that the government shall decide the terms and the running powers. It is not a voluntary question; the Grand Trunk has nothing whatever to do with the subject; but the government, or the railway commission, or whatever authority the government may provide, will decide the terms on which these running powers shall be used. Therefore, let the House understand and mark well, that this futile, absurd and ridiculous objection is the only answer that can be made to the conclusive argument of my hon. friend from North Norfolk upon this question.

Now, my hon. friend from Hamilton undertook to lecture the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) as being a very innocent and easily gulled person, because, forsooth, that hon. gentleman relied to some extent upon the survey of Sir Sanford Fleming, made about thirty years ago. I would have gathered from the remarks of my hon. friend from Hamilton that there was great danger that the physical features of the province of New Brunswick had changed within the last thirty years. He did indeed make the suggestion that the surveyors of thirty years ago were not as careful and particular in gaining information as are the surveyors of the present time. Well, Sir Sanford Fleming, be it remembered, was the chief engineer of the Canadian government. He was instructed to procure the necessary information for the purpose of locating the Intercolonial Railway line. As was pointed out by the Finance Minister, he made three surveys for the purpose of locating three practicable and reasonably good commercial lines, any one of which might have been adopted by the government of Canada for the location of the Intercolonial Railway. And what

the hon. member for Hamilton, in his answer to the Finance Minister, asks us to believe is that, because that was done thirty years ago, and the report is an old report, and because the government ultimately decided that for political, military and imperial reasons, they would decline to take the better route, which Sir Sanford Fleming, though he did not recommend it, evidently thought was the better route, we are not justified in believing that that route is there at the present time just as much as it was thirty years ago. Well, it would be painting the lily to answer an argument of that kind. My hon. friend from Hamilton then proceeded, being somewhat restless under the remarks of the Finance Minister respecting the attitude of the opposition towards the Intercolonial, to rebut, with some degree of warmth, the suggestion that the opposition were not friendly to that road. There is an old line asking a question which seems appropriate here :

> Perhaps it was right to dissemble your love.
> But why did you kick me downstairs ?

Our hon. friends on the other side have dissembled their love for the Intercolonial very successfully for the last five or six years. They have been kicking the Intercolonial downstairs and the late Minister of Railways and Canals with it, on every occasion that they got a chance. They say they have not been hostile to the Intercolonial. Well, when we came into power we found, as has been very truly said, the Intercolonial Railway ending in a ploughed field. We brought it into the city of Montreal and made a modern and businesslike railway out of it. We have spent millions of dollars to bring the Intercolonial up to date and make it a modern railway, and give the people of the maritime provinces a railway service that they have a right to be proud of and to be satisfied with. This government, and the united force of the members of parliament behind this government, enabled the Minister of Railways and Canals to come down to this House and make this proposition for the purpose of carrying out what we believed to be a sound and businesslike policy in regard to that railway. But where were the gentlemen on the other side ? Why, Sir, year after year they have fought that proposition, every proposition, that we brought forward, inch by inch, tooth and nail, every day and every hour of the day, to the greatest extent of their ability. And not only that, but while this has been going on, year after year they have denounced the late Minister of Railways and Canals ; they have attacked the late Minister of Railways and Canals, they have hounded the late Minister of Railways and Canals all over Canada, in their press and upon the platform. And, Sir, we have the astounding spectacle within the last two or three weeks, after the culmination of their attacks, of the whole Conservative party joining in enthusiastic applause while the late Minister of Railways and Canals addressed the House from his desk ; and we find them endeavouring to show to the country that this gentleman whom they have been hounding year after year, whom they declared to be incompetent, and corrupt and incapable, is the greatest railway authority in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker)—and I am devoting some attention to the hon. member for Hamilton, because he has been put forward early in the debate, he has been put forward before the late Minister of Railways and Canals in the Conservative government, my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), he has been put forward even ahead of the leader of the opposition, to declare the railway policy of the Conservative party in connection with this contract. My hon. friend from Hamilton took violent exception to what has come from this side of the House in advancing the argument that this railway is required in view of the possible withdrawal of the bonding privilege. I am not going to discuss that question, because in my judgment it has been discussed sufficiently. The Prime Minister, the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the Minister of Finance have given very fully the views of this side of the House on that question, and I do not propose to repeat the discussion. I propose to devote a moment or two to the criticism of the hon. member for Hamilton. If I understood him aright, his answer to the suggestion that another railway was necessary and would be a convenient safety valve in case of the withdrawal of the bonding privileges, was this: That if the bonding privileges were withdrawn it would simply have the effect of driving the traffic to Canadian ports over the Intercolonial, and that we ought to feel gratified that such should take place ; and we should devote ourselves to building up the Intercolonial instead of building another line of railway through New Brunswick for the purpose of helping to take care of that business. I do not think I misstate the position of the hon. member for Hamilton. Let us examine his proposition for a moment or two. At the present time the Intercolonial Railway has certain equipment, certain switches, certain station yards, certain engine houses, certain terminal facilities. My late colleague, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, says the facilities are not sufficient for the purpose of doing the business that we have to do at the present time. We have large appropriations before parliament at this session for the purpose of improving those facilities. We have been improving them by spending millions of money every year since we came into power. We are told by our late colleague that the facilities are not sufficient as yet, and that some millions more will be

required to enable that road to cope with the business which it has to meet under present conditions. Well, I do not know whether that be correct or not; I do not know enough about the Intercolonial to say; but I think perhaps we may all agree over that which we do know, which is a matter of common knowledge, that the Intercolonial has had all the business within the last year or two that it could do, and that its facilities are not more than sufficient to enable it to do the business which it has at the present time. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a short line to the city of St. John, it has large facilities for doing business there and along that line. The Grand Trunk Railway has a line from the city of Montreal to the city of Portland. It is a magnificent line of railway, well equipped in the best modern style, and it has terminal facilities which I am credibly told have cost from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000. We are told by the Grand Trunk people that the facilities which they have for doing business between Montreal and Portland are not sufficient now to cope with it.

Now, what is the proposition of the member for Hamilton? It is that the Intercolonial, with its barely sufficient equipment to do the business which it has now, shall take three or four times as great business of the Grand Trunk, that it shall take the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the business of these railways shall be suddenly precipitated upon the Intercolonial Railway, and that that railway shall be expected, with its insufficient facilities, to do the business of the whole three. And my hon. friend says that that is a consummation to be desired. He says we should not be alarmed at a prospect of that kind, that it is something which will help the Intercolonial and which does not at all call for any action upon the part of this government for the purpose of preventing the consequences which might flow from it. Why, Mr. Speaker, has he considered for half a moment what would happen in such a case as that? Why, we would have in the traffic of Canada confusion worse confounded, we would have a blockade which would throw into the shade the wheat blockade which took place during the last couple of years in the North-west; we would have the business of the country disorganized, because the business of Canada depends upon its export trade, and we should have millions upon millions of money of the people of Canada annually wasted on account of our inability to do the business which ought to be done over these railways. That, Mr. Speaker, is the contribution to the discussion of the railway question which is made by the railway expert of the Conservative party.

There is another contribution which my hon. friend from Hamilton made. He pointed out with some detail and with great accuracy that the prairie section of the railway was easier to build than the eastern section; and that inasmuch as the Grand Trunk Company would probably start up first to build, and would complete it as rapidly as they could, they would have that line of railway in the western portion of Canada, or a considerable portion of it, hundreds of miles of it, I think he said, constructed and graded to do business before the government would have built the eastern section between Quebec and Winnipeg. My hon. friend then proceeded to show that the result would be that the Grand Trunk Railway, long before the government line to Winnipeg was built, would be hauling out wheat from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and bringing it down to the lakes and sending it to the markets of the world. I may be excused if I do not regard that as a very alarming proposition. If the proposition is that before we get the line built to Winnipeg the Grand Trunk Railway Company will be relieving the congestion and raising the blockage in the west by taking the grain out by way of the lakes, the way our hon. friends say it ought to go, that is not a very alarming criticism of the proposition before us. We trust that that will be the case. We trust that the prognostications of my hon. friend from Hamilton will come true that at an early date the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will to a considerable extent be able to relieve the congestion in the west. As to this argument against the immediate construction of the Winnipeg-Quebec line, I would say that if it proves anything it proves that we should have started to build the line to Winnipeg two or three years ago so as to be there in time. It certainly does not prove that we should not start now. I just note in passing that my hon. friend from Hamilton, like some other members on the other side of the House, argues in favour of the construction of another line by way of North Bay instead of going to Quebec or to the eastern provinces. I note also that my hon. friend from Hamilton, who perhaps thinks it is necessary for him to do something to bring about better relations with the late ex-Minister of Railways and Canals than he has been having during the last few years, entered into an argument for the purpose of justifying my late colleague for leaving the government and I think that my hon. friend was rather unfortunate because he justified my late colleague for leaving the government on the ground that he was not sufficiently consulted by the right hon. Prime Minister, but he forgets that that is not the statement of the late minister himself. My late colleague says that that is not the reason at all. He says that his resignation only had relation to the question of the policy of the government. So that, if my hon. friend from Hamilton thinks to pay court to my late colleague I am afraid he will find that this effort has not been successful. I

note also that almost every hon. member on the other side of the House who has spoken has suggested that this line of railway will not have any return traffic and that the amount of business it will do is extremely problematical. I hope to say a few words upon the subject of traffic before I finish my remarks. I just note now for the purpose of marking the objections that have been made that this is one of the objections which has been raised very generally by our friends on the other side of the House. Then, Mr. Speaker, I note also that our friends on the opposite side of the House, particularly my hon. friend from Hamilton and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), took strong objection to the accuracy of the Ontario government reports in regard to the country which we have to deal with and through which we are going to build this railway. I have had some experience in connection with the sending out of exploration parties and the organization of parties and I have made an examination of the reports of these parties to which reference has been made. I have taken the trouble to look into the organization and constitution of these parties. I have read the instructions which were given to the various members of these parties and I make the statement without any hesitation and without any fear that it will be successfully contradicted that these parties were organized in a most comprehensive and in a most businesslike way. If there is any reason why these reports are not reliable that reason has not been made evident to this House and that reason is not open to the ordinary observer or to the person who ordinarily examines these papers. We have every reason, I submit, Sir, to entertain the belief that these reports are in every respect completely accurate, and completely reliable in so far as they have gone. But, if our hon. friends on the other side of the House are not satisfied to take the reports of the Ontario government, if they are not satisfied to take the reports prepared when the party with which it does not agree politically, was in power, I think we can furnish them with a large amount of information prepared and procured by the government of Canada when their own party was in power which deals very fully and very comprehensively with the questions which are at issue in regard to the quality and the nature of this country, and I shall take occasion before the conclusion of my remarks to indicate briefly the nature of these reports and the method by which that information has been procured.

Just now I desire to call attention to what I regard as a somewhat important criticism of the contract which is before us. When the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) addressed the House in reply to the right hon. Prime Minister, one of the important points which he made, one of the points upon which he laid great stress was the allegation, since supported and amplified by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that the contract was an abrogation and an abandonment of the policy that the government inaugurated and carried into effect when it brought the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal. That statement has been made, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has attached great importance to it, has put it in an important place in his remarks upon this important subject when he was addressing the House and the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has amplified it at considerable length. Let us for a moment or two examine the question as to whether that suggestion or statement is justified or not. It is an important point, it is a point that ought to be settled, and today, therefore, some consideration may properly be devoted to it. We have spent a large amount of money in bringing the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal. We inaugurated an important line of policy when we did it and we say that we are not abandoning that policy. We say we were successful in carrying that policy into effect, that it has brought about the results which were anticipated that we are not abandoning that policy at the present time and that in no possible respect does this proposition affect that policy. The hon. leader of the opposition said that if this policy meant anything its logical conclusion was that we were going on with the Intercolonial Railway to the great lakes. I make the statement that the hon. gentleman has not made out the truth of that proposition. That is an assertion which an examination of the facts does not warrant. The Intercolonial Railway, as a matter of railroading was brought into the city of Montreal for the purpose of bringing it into the commercial metropolis of the country in order that it might be able to do business in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway upon equal terms. It was not brought there for the purpose of enabling it to do the grain traffic of the west. It may be a proper thing some time to do it, but the two propositions are entirely distinct. There is no connection between the two. The hon. leader of the opposition suggested further—I think his words were—that if that policy meant anything it meant that the Grand Trunk Railway was to hand over at Montreal to the Intercolonial Railway its proportion—I took note of the word used—its proportion of the traffic for the seaboard. It depends upon what my hon. friend meant by the word 'proportion.' If he meant a rateable proportion, if he made a half, or a third, or a quarter, or any fixed proportion then he was entirely wrong, because there is nothing of that kind in the contract. The traffic contract obligates the Grand Trunk Railway to hand over to the Intercolonial Railway

the traffic which is routed by shippers over the Intercolonial Railway. That is what it requires it to do, and if the contract which we are now discussing is carried into effect the position of the Intercolonial Railway will not be altered in the slightest possible degree in any way, shape or form. Since that contract went into effect what has been the position ? The condition has been, that the Intercolonial Railway is competing for through-traffic between Montreal and St. John with the Canadian Pacific Railway short line, and with the Grand Trunk Railway still shorter line to Portland. It was able to do during the last year, 1903, $1,739,545 worth of through business. That was the through business of the Intercolonial Railway done in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway short line and the Canadian Pacific Railway short line. The local business of the Intercolonial Railway was $4,327,626 or a total of $6,067,000. What does that prove ? It proves, first of all, that the predictions of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, that the policy of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal was an absurd policy, and that their assertion that the railway would do no business was absolutely foundationless.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. And, Sir, I venture to assert that the criticism which they are making now, that the railroad which we propose to build will not do any business, will prove to be equally foundationless when the facts are known. The figures that I have given prove that the Intercolonial Railway was able to do a substantial amount of business, and that the Intercolonial Railway was able to do it in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway; both lines much shorter than the Intercolonial Railway ; both lines—and this is the point I wish to emphasize—both lines shorter than the new Grand Trunk Pacific Railway line will be. Then, Mr. Speaker, if the Intercolonial Railway under its traffic agreement can compete with the short line to Portland and with the short line to St. John, why in the name of common sense cannot it compete with the new line by way of the Chaudière Junction ? When you come to sift the arguments presented, when you come to look into the actual facts, there is absolutely nothing in the business position presented in connection with the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, which even suggests the idea that this transcontinental railroad is going to do any harm to the Intercolonial Railway, so far as the through business is concerned.

It is said that the Quebec and Moncton branch of this railway will injure the Intercolonial Railway, by taking business away from it in a local way. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in that connection, that members of the House should direct their mind to the illustration which is in their own experience in matters of this kind. I believe, Sir, that if they do address their minds to this experience which they can recall, they will come to this conclusion—a conclusion which I venture to say is justified by all railway experience on this continent—that the building of additional lines of railway where there are any considerable natural resources does not have the effect of injuring the business of the first line. Experience will show all over Canada and the United States that the railways that are doing the worst business, the railways that are the poorest, the railways that are prospering the least, are the railways that are alone. That is the experience all over this continent, and that always will be the experience, mark you, in a country where there are any considerable natural resources and which has any capacity to develop trade. Of course, if you run a railway through the desert, or if you run it through a region of rocks where no traffic can be got, that would not be the case. But where you run a railway through a country that is capable of development and capable of sustaining a population, a new road, according to all experience, builds up its own business, and in addition to building up its own business, by its drawing power and general effect in building up the country, it promotes the general business so that the old road will do more business than it did before the new road was built.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Why, Sir, the Canada Atlantic Railway has not done any worse since the short line from Montreal was built by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am told they are doing better. If you take the position of the Grand Trunk Railway in Canada, everybody knows that the Grand Trunk Railway Company never began to prosper until the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, and came down to the province of Ontario, and invaded the city of Montreal, and put new life into the business. The Grand Trunk Railway has prospered in a greater degree ever since. And what is going to happen in the province of New Brunswick and in the province of Nova Scotia when this railway is built, and when through business is carried to a large extent—to I believe an enormous extent—through these provinces ? In the first place we are going to have, even while the railway is being constructed, an enormous demand for the products of the industries of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are going to have business done in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick upon a scale and upon lines that have never been attempted before. And, Sir, what is going to be the first institution that is going to

prosper by the increase of business, and by the increase of general prosperity in these provinces? Why, Sir, the railway is the very first institution that will prosper, and I venture to say that the first effect of this prosperity and this increased business in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will be to benefit the Intercolonial Railway. I am not in the habit of making predictions, and I am not generally very sanguine in matters of this kind, but I venture the statement—and time will show whether my statement is correct or not—I venture the statement that the inauguration and carrying out of this enterprise will be the first step which will go towards placing the Intercolonial Railway on a paying basis and making it a good and a revenue-producing property. I have never been able to comprehend the position of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Blair). I have never been able to follow his argument; I have never been able to see that there was any argument of any kind whatever in a business way, in the contention which he advanced with respect to the Quebec-Moncton line.

I want to say upon that point just another word, and if I speak at such length on this question of the Quebec and Moncton line, it is because of the fact that it has been made the point of resistance, the point upon which the attack of our friends of the opposition, and their press all through Canada—with the exception of the press of Nova Scotia and possibly a part of New Brunswick—it is the point upon which they have centred their attacks. I would not say anything further were it not for the fact that as a representative of a far distant portion of the country, I wish to express my view on the proposition to construct that line. I entertain the view in the first place, that it is very surprising to me that the people who are going to be served by this new line should have stood being treated as they have been treated, so long. I express the opinion very emphatically, that if these people were animated by the same spirit as the people that I have the honour to represent in this House, and that my hon. friends from the west have the honour to represent, they would have had that railway before now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They would have had the promises which have been repeatedly made to them and repeatedly broken, carried out. They would have had these promises implemented and carried out, or somebody would be made to suffer very severely in consequence. Therefore, I am surprised, I am extremely surprised that this railway which upon every possible ground of reason and common sense the people that are going to be served by it are entitled to get, I am surprised that it should be the one part of this proposition that is attacked with the utmost venom, and that it is held up as being wholly indefensible and wholly absurd. If we were being asked in this House at the present time to build a branch line of the Intercolonial Railway into that part of the country; if we were being asked to subsidize another railway there, who would raise his voice in objection? There is not a man on this side of the House, and there is not a man on the other side of the House, who would raise the least objection to the construction of that line; and if a single man did raise an objection, the railway history of the Dominion of Canada would be the answer to that objection.

References have been made in the press—I need not multiply them now—to cases in the province from which I come, in my own county, where there are railway lines ten, twelve, thirteen and fourteen miles apart. Nobody talks about the infamy of paralleling railway lines there; and we are getting on pretty well, and the railways are getting on pretty well too. Take the position in the province of Ontario, with the Canada Atlantic and the Grand Trunk running on the average not further apart than this line.

Mr. COWAN. The Canadian Pacific from London to Windsor, for 110 miles, does not run more than two miles from the Grand Trunk, and we subsidized it to do that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We subsidized a portion of that line in this House, and was there a man who took the responsibility of dividing the House on the question or of saying that we were wrong?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What part of it did you subsidize?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A part that runs not more than five miles from the Grand Trunk. I know that, because I scaled it on the map.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When was it subsidized?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Three or four years ago; I cannot give the exact date. I remember it being discussed in council, and I remember the subsidy being passed in this House. I cannot remember the local name of the line. Now, Mr. Speaker, consider a few more cases. It may seem that we are wasting time on this point; but we are not wasting time when we are showing that the principal objection which has been raised to an important part of this scheme is an objection that is perfectly absurd, and has not a particle of foundation. The Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway parallel each other from Montreal to Toronto. How far are they apart? I looked at the map the other day and scaled the distance, and I do not think they are more than forty miles apart anywhere.

They are not as far apart on the average as 62 miles. The Canada Atlantic and the Grand Trunk, running down from the Georgian bay are no further apart on the average than these two lines that we are speaking of. Why, when Mr. Booth built the Canada Atlantic Railway he was hailed as having achieved something which entitled him to be ranked as one of the great men of Canada, and I think that is right. I admire Mr. Booth because of his achievements, and I think he is entitled to respect and credit at the hands of the people of Canada for what he has done. But if Mr. Booth is entitled to credit for having built a railway to the Georgian bay paralleling the Grand Trunk to get a share of the same business, how is it that when you propose to build another railway in another part of the province you are infamous, and too much cannot be said against your proposition? I venture the statement that the longer that particular objection to this proposition is discussed, the more our hon. friends on the opposition side will wish they had never raised it.

I do not know whether we are safe in saying that the leader of the opposition party is against this contract or not. I have listened with some degree of care to the addressses which have been delivered, and I have not heard anything from the other side of the House in favour of the Quebec-Moncton line. I have heard a very great deal against it from the different gentlemen who have spoken, including the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not suggest that he undertakes yet to speak for our hon. friends on the other side. From the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), from the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), from the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), we have received word of what I take to be uncompromising opposition to the Quebec-Moncton line. Our hon. friend the leader of the opposition has not yet spoken clearly on that question. We invite him to speak.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You will hear him all right.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We invite him to say whether he, speaking as the responsible leader of the Conservative party, is prepared to endorse what the gentlemen sitting behind him have said, and what they are saying in the country with regard to this proposition. The people whom my hon. friend represents have a right to know where he stands. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, there are difficulties and responsibilities in connection with the position of a leader of a great party which are very embarrassing; but my hon. friend will have to face the embarrassment, and he will have to tell us whether he elects to stand with the people of New Brunswick, the people of Nova Scotia and with the people, so far as the rest of Canada is concerned, who are supporting this government, or whether he elects to stand with those members of his party and a small remnant of the people of Canada who have undertaken to block a meritorious proposition. We shall listen with interest to what my hon. friend has to say on that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You will hear it all right; do not be alarmed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I desire to refer to one criticism which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition made, and which requires to be mentioned and cleared up at some stage of the debate. My hon. friend referred with fine sarcasm to a provision in this contract which relates to the question of security. He read the clause with reference to the deposit of $5,000,000, and spoke somewhat sarcastically of this clause as a statesmanlike provision. I will quote his own words:

> In other words, the company guarantees to build a railway as to which it receives a guarantee of $13,000 per mile for one portion of it and $30,000 per mile for the rest; and it deposits with the government $5,000,000 as security that it will use the bonds guaranteed by this government.

If the company were depositing $5,000,000 as security that it was going to use the government guaranteed bonds, the sarcasm of my hon. friend would be perfectly justified. That would be not a statesmanlike provision, but a most absurd, a most futile, a most ridiculous proposition; and I wonder that it did not occur to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in the hasty examination which he made of this contract, that it would be safer, in his preliminary criticism, to give the lawyers of this government, including my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, credit for a little common sense and a little brains in drafting the document which they submitted to the consideration of parliament. If the hon. gentleman would give us credit for a little common sense and intelligence he would not put that construction upon this document. The hon. gentleman read the clause and therefore could hardly claim that he was not aware of its contents. By reading the clause, he made this perfectly clear, that the $5,000,000 are put up for the purpose of securing that the company shall build and equip the railway in accordance with the terms of the contract. What does that mean? It means that the company shall use the bonds guaranteed by the government and the bonds guaranteed by second mortgage in order to procure money for the construction of the railway and also for its equipment to the extent of $20,000,000, and we shall have a mortgage on the whole. I leave my hon. friend to explain this discrepancy between his version of what the contract provides and the actual facts. An off-hand statement as to what a clause

in a contract means must be made with some degree of caution or serious mistakes will occur. It is not, I presume, a thing that can be lightly passed over, that when a contract of this description is made, when the utmost care is taken in the drafting of its provisions, when legal counsel are employed to draft, with the utmost care, security clauses, and when a large and substantial security is being put up, a gentleman occupying the responsible position of the leader of the opposition should wholly distort and misconstrue the effect of this important provision. My hon. friend must remember that the great Conservative party throughout this country will look with respect to what he says on this question, and therefore he cannot afford to entirely mislead them in regard to one of its important phases.

I have tried, in the remarks I have made up to the present, to advert more particularly to what I consider the important feature of the contract. I spoke of the question of running powers, and I said that that was so important a feature of the contract that in all probability, if that provision had not been there, the contract would not have been concluded. There is another provision of equal importance. It is one to which reference has been repeatedly made. I refer to the provision which relates to the question of routing traffic by Canadian ports. Certain criticisms have been addressed to that particular part of the contract. I may say that I agree largely in the view expressed by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, when he said that inasmuch as we were making a clear, distinct and unambiguous contract with a responsible company, with a respectable institution which might reasonably be expected to implement its obligations, we should have a good deal of confidence that every reasonable effort would be made by them to carry out the contract. There is much more to be said on the question, and I desire to call attention to the nature of the criticisms on this point. I think that the criticism of my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, was perhaps the most reasonable. He said that this is a provision which you can evade and he left it there, except that he suggested that there was no penalty provided in case the Grand Trunk Railway failed to meet its obligations in this respect. Upon that I shall speak in a moment or two. Then my hon. friend and former colleague, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) suggested a most elaborate method of getting around the contract. He suggested that while the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would not know that the contract was being violated, the Grand Trunk Railway would send up agents over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway stations to induce people to route their traffic by the Grand Trunk Railway to Portland instead of to Quebec and St. John. That was the suggestion given by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals as a reason why he does not think this is a good or effective proposition. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has another reason. He says that the Grand Trunk Railway would issue instructions to its officials not to interfere with the routing of the traffic but to let people route traffic at the same rates by St. John and Halifax, if they wanted to, but the Grand Trunk Railway would take care not to promote any official who would permit that to be done. Are the opponents of this measure driven to such absurd reasons as these against a provision of this kind in a solemn contract made between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway? I would like to see my hon. friend the leader of the opposition or the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals sitting upon a bench, as the sole arbitrator between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway to adjudicate on a complaint that the contract was being violated under such circumstances. If evidence were given on behalf of the government that the agents of the Grand Trunk Railway went through the stations, communicated with the people, and induced them to send their traffic down to Portland, I would like to see the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific getting up and declaring that they knew nothing at all about such proceedings. How long would a judge, with any common sense, listen to such an absurd, ridiculous plea. If it were a criminal case, there is not a court or a jury in Canada who would not convict the accused of guilty knowledge. We cannot put upon the interpretation of the contract any such ridiculous reasoning. How great a penalty would the hon. gentleman want? Would it do if we fine the company $1,000? Would it do if we fine them $10,000? Or would it do if we fine them $1,000,000? If hon. members will look at section 35, they will find the follwing words:

> For the purposes hereinafter in this paragraph respectively defined the company may and shall create mortgages to trustees as follows:—

Then, in subsection (c):—

> A mortgage which shall be a charge upon the rolling stock constituting the equipment of the eastern division next after the charge mentioned in paragraph 35 (a)——

That is, our own mortgage, not another——

> —to secure to the government the rental payable in respect of the eastern division, the efficient maintenance and continuous operation of the said eastern division, and the observance and performance by the company of the terms of this agreement.

Upon that line of railway there is to be $5,000,000 of rolling stock under a mortgage to the government to secure the performance of the terms of the agreement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sifton) a question? I suppose he is very familiar with this con-

tract and could give me in a moment the information I want. Is there any provision in the contract which requires the Grand Trunk Company to own the rolling stock on the eastern division? Would it not be possible for it to merely lease it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will deal with that in a moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should be glad if the hon. gentleman would do so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The point referred to was one passing through my own mind, because it was adverted to, I believe, by my hon. friend from Hamilton though I did not hear him very distinctly. It is an important point to be considered. But just now I was calling attention to the fact that upon $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock the government of Canada has a mortgage expressly provided not only to secure the operation of the eastern division, but to secure the performance of the terms of this agreement. And one of the terms of this agreement is that this clause shall be fully and completely carried out. If it is a fine our hon. friends want, there is a fine provided, amounting to the respectable sum of $5,000,000. But I go further, I would not consider it at all advisable to put in this contract a penal clause, a clause that would provide, for instance, that a fine in the ordinary sense should be levied against the Grand Trunk Railway for the violation of the clause. It would not, in my judgment, be an appropriate or proper way of arriving at the end we desire to reach. In drawing this contract, we are not making an amendment to the criminal law, we are making a contract between parties. If the contract were between two private parties there would be no penal clause. Any lawyer will agree that while sometimes such a clause as a liquidated damage clause is inserted in a contract, yet, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, contracts between private parties simply state what the parties agree to and they are left to their ordinary remedies in the courts. In this case, the contract is being made between a great railway corporation and, in effect, the parliament of Canada. The parliament of Canada has plenary jurisdiction over the other party to the contract. There is no body that has jurisdiction over the parliament and over the railway company too, and we cannot place ourselves in exactly the same position as that in which private parties stand. The company trusts in our good faith that we will deal reasonably and properly with them, and they are perfectly safe in so doing. If there is any doubt about the meaning of any clause in this contract, they may fairly say to us: Do not pass an Act of parliament to decide what this means, but submit the matter in some way to a judicial and impartial tribunal, in order that it may be decided. In such case, we should not have the right to legislate upon a question that was fairly and reasonably a subject of dispute between us. But if we come to a clause which is absolutely clear, about the meaning of which there is no possible dispute, and a state of fact arises in which it is clear beyond doubt that the company is wilfully, deliberately violating the terms of this agreement, will the leader of the opposition, or will the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, tell this House that the parliament of Canada has no remedy in the circumstances? Sir, the proposition is the most absurd that could be brought before a deliberative body. It would be the duty of parliament, in case of such a state of facts arising, to apply every remedy within its power; and it cannot be doubted that its power is ample and complete with regard not only to the Grand Trunk, but with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. I can see no possible ground for argument that, in case of a wilful violation of this clause, parliament would not have power, properly and without the violation of good faith, or proper practice in the premises, to take any steps necessary, in the exercise of its supreme legislative jurisdiction, to enforce the carrying out of the terms of the contract.

Now, I have dealt with what seemed to me to be the main criticisms which have been addressed to this contract by our hon. friends on the other side. Looking over the trend of what has been said up to the present moment, I gather that hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to this proposition, they are opposed to it with unanimity and, apparently, they oppose it with vigour. They have certain grounds upon which they base their opposition. First, they say that this railway is not a pressing necessity at this time. Second, they are opposed to the Quebec-Moncton branch—except my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and we shall hear from him later on. Third, they are opposed—and this is a point to which I wish to direct a little attention later on—to our construction of the Quebec-Winnipeg line. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) tells us that the proper method of developing the outlying districts of the province of Quebec is by colonization railways running out from the older parts of the province, and my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) expressly takes the position, so far as Ontario is concerned, that that province, he believed, would favour the development of the newer portion of the province, not by a through line, as we suggest, but colonization lines running out from lines already in existence. You will see, Sir, that I am trying to define the issue. As I understand, these hon. gentlemen take issue as to the necessity of this work, and as to the method, and say that their method would be better and more in accordance with the necessities of the case. These are the issues between us. They say that

the road will not have enough business to justify its existence or its construction. And lastly—I think these three or four points that I mentioned would cover the main ground upon which they object to our proposition—lastly, they apparently decline to accept the reasoning which we have presented to them from this side of the House upon the financial phases of this scheme.

Our hon. friends opposite view apparently with some degree of amusement the reasoning which has been presented to them, and the statements which have been made in respect to the financial effects of this contract, and the amount of money which it will take to implement our obligations in regard to carrying it out. My hon. friend the Finance Minister—and I may perhaps ask that particular attention be given to this phase of the question, because I think it is the most important in the whole discussion—my hon. friend the Finance Minister took the provisions of this contract in so far as they relate to the financial features, and he went over it from end to end. He made a close, and a careful, and an exact calculation as to the amount of money which we should have to pay if the Grand Trunk Pacific carries out its contract. That was the nature of the calculation which was made by the Finance Minister. If the Grand Trunk Company carries out its contract, then there is no escape from the conclusion which was placed before this House by my hon. friend. You cannot get over it by laughing, you cannot meet the argument by jeering at it. There is only one way of meeting the argument that he presented to this House, and that is by showing that the Grand Trunk will not be able to carry out this contract. That is the only way you can meet it. If the Grand Trunk Company carries out its contract, then we will pay just what the Finance Minister said, not one dollar more not one dollar less. We have therefore to discuss the question upon that basis. I intend later to say a few words in regard to the question of traffic, but in the meantime I desire to point out one important consideration having reference to the question whether the government are taking sufficient guarantees that the company will carry out its obligations. In the first place, we have to consider what was well suggested by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd), who asked what would happen when the railway bonds mature. Upon that point I am not going to enter into a lengthy argument, because I do not think it is necessary. I will, however, say this, which I think will meet with the immediate assent of every member on this side of the House at least, and I hope of every member on the other side, that so far as the payment of the bonds at maturity is concerned, either upon the eastern section or upon the western section, we are perfectly satisfied that fifty years of development in Canada will make that railway worth a great deal more than the face value of the bonds. Therefore we may dismiss from consideration, we need not bother our heads about the payment of the bonds. The railway will be able to do much more than take care of the principal and the bonds when it is called upon to do so.

As to the payment of interest in the meantime, what you have to consider is the immediate security the government has for the obligations which are incurred. The security which the government has for the fulfillment of these obligations is this: In the first place, the Grand Trunk Railway Company have to find the additional quarter of the money for the construction of the western section; they find $20,000,000 for rolling stock, and they put that $20,000,000 under our mortgage; they put under our mortgage $30,000,000 of their money which they provide as an additional security for the general purpose of carrying out this contract. I think, as my hon. friend the Finance Minister well said last night, when he so fully, so clearly, and so ably discussed the financial phases of this question, that no parliament, certainly not the parliament of Canada, was ever asked to assent to an important financial proposition which was so buttressed with security, so impregnably fortified by all the securities that were required, as this proposition which we are dealing with at the present time. And yet, we are asked to believe that after a little while the Grand Trunk will fail to carry out its contract, and it won't go on. What does that argument amount to? What is the Grand Trunk going into this scheme for? It is because it has a magnificent system of railways in the eastern portion of Canada, because there is an enormous and growing traffic in the west, and the Grand Trunk wants to get in there, and by means of this railway it is going to get in. Moreover, its thousands of miles of railway all over Canada are going to be connected with the growing trade in western Canada, and they are going to do a large and profitable business in consequence. Yet, Sir, the suggestion is made that after a little while, after they have got that trade built up, after they are making millions of dollars out of it, they are going to stop operations on this transcontinental road, throw it all up, and withdraw altogether from the business, as they will do, if they do not carry out the terms of this contract, and it is only by carrying out the terms of this contract that they can get any business from the west, or over the western line. So I think it must be clear that we may feel ourselves reasonably safe and reasonably well protected.

A word upon another point, and I would like my hon. friend from Lanark to direct particular attention to it; I would like him to give his view as to what is likely to happen as a result of this enterprise. I

would like my hon. friend, with his knowledge of this country, to say if he does not himself know, and believe in his heart, that this is going to be a great and a successful enterprise. My hon. friend once had faith in the country, I do not know whether he has lost it or not. He told us some time ago, in fact, that he used to have faith in the Intercolonial and in its management, but that the management of the Intercolonial under the late minister had destroyed any prospects which might have once existed of advancement in the policy of government ownership of railways. Now, the real question on which we are at issue with our friends opposite is the necessity of this railway, the immediate necessity of it. My late colleague, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, entertained the House at some length in discussing this question of the immediate necessity of the railway. He said that if there had been any demands made for that road he would have heard them. Well, I thought if what my hon. friend said was true that he had not heard any demands made, that he must have been suffering from deafness even worse than I am myself. I thought he must have been emulating the example of that celebrated character Rip Van Winkle, he must have been asleep, and he must have been sleeping very soundly, or he would have heard the many and insistent demands, a very few of which I shall refer to, for the construction of a new railway to afford greater transportation facilities to the country in general.

But what I desire to advert to is not so much the attitude of the late minister, which was fairly well dealt with by the member for North Norfolk, but the attitude of our friends upon the other side, because, when the late Minister of Railways and Canals said there was no immediate necessity for this railway, his remarks were received with the greatest of applause by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. We are, therefore, justified in assuming that they approve of the position taken by the late Minister of Railways and Canals, when he stated that there was not sufficient necessity for this road and that he had heard no insistent and strong demand for its construction. It is necessary that we should make our position upon that point clear. This is not a thing that can be passed over with a wave of the hand. It is a serious and important matter of business, and if the allegation is that twelve or thirteen members of the government have gone into the council chamber, locked the door, discussed this matter, and have, after a little talk with the railway managers, brought out a scheme for building a transcontinental railway involving an enormous expenditure of money, when the people do not want the road, and when there is no demand for it, it is a pretty serious allegation and it is an allegation that we have to meet. What are the facts in regard to that point? I think the testimony will be found to be absolutely conclusive.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter from His Excellency the Governor General's secretary:

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Thursday the 13th instant at four o'clock p.m., for the purpose of giving assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

F. S. MAUDE, Major,
Governor General's Secretary.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a national transcontinental railway.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I desire, Mr. Speaker, in passing, to call attention again to the fact to which I made reference this morning respecting the bonusing of a certain line of railway in Ontario which was a very short distance from another line of railway. I made the statement that this line was four or five miles distant from the other, and I think that is admitted. As to the question whether we bonused the line or not, I refer hon. gentlemen to the Subsidy Act of 1899, in which it will be found that this country gave a bonus to a railway to parallel the Lake Erie and Detroit Railway, and that these two lines are not more than five miles apart, as my hon. friends from that part of the country will know. There we have a striking example of the bonusing of parallel lines of railway, lines coming closely into competition with each other and going through almost the same territory. That, therefore, is a matter which depends on the necessities of the trade of the district in a particular case, and it is not to be settled by any general proposition that no parallel line should be constructed. That principle is so well recognized in this House that no one will undertake to dispute it.

I want to call attention to some other points on which there has been some misunderstanding. If we are to proceed with this debate upon intelligent lines, then there should not be so much discussion about matters in respect to which there can be no dispute. In the Conservative press and in the addresses made by some of our hon.

friends—my hon. friend from South Lanark amongst others, but I do not blame him, because when he spoke he had not time to read the contract—in considering the cost of this enterprise the government is charged with the interest upon the cost of construction, and which, if it should not be charged with, would mean a very substantial difference in the total amount of the liability. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) will by this time have discovered his mistake and may correct it, but in the speech that was made by the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), who certainly had every opportunity of reading the contract with care and deliberation, he also charged us with interest upon the cost of construction in his calculation. Now, if you read the contract, you will find that the interest on the cost of construction shall be part of the cost of the road, and is provided for as capital in the ordinary way. Any person of ordinary intelligence will see that in the contract, so that there need be no dispute about it. Therefore, when we guarantee interest upon a maximum of $30,000 per mile in the mountian section of this railway, the interest on the cost of construction, as it goes on for the five years, is included in that $30,000 per mile, and that is the maximum of our liability. We have no charge for additional interest, to the interest upon that $30,000. That is covered by the capital account when the capital account is closed, and it is the same way with regard to the cost of construction of the eastern division. I call attention to that, because in the opposition press calculations are made which should be lessened to the extent of some millions of dollars on account of this manifest error into which they have fallen.

I want to say a word on the question of running powers ; not for the purpose of demonstrating the practicability of carrying out this provision in the contract, but for the purpose of showing my hon. friends from the eastern portion of the country how important we who represent western Canada believe this clause with regard to running powers, is. Gentlemen who live in the eastern provinces, and who do not know what it is to be cut off by thousands of miles from the seaboard, have no idea how helpless such a community is to alter the conditions of transportation without assistance of a very important and of a very extensive character. The prairie community west of Red river is in the position that they may develop their population and their trade to a very large extent, that there may be abundance of trade for independent lines of railway, in addition to these already constructed in the prairie country, but you cannot get anybody to consider the advisability of constructing lines of railway, simply by reason of the fact that they cannot get out of the country for want of an outlet. In the other provinces you can get people to engage in a railway enterprise, but the opportunity to do that does not exist in the west, for the simple reason that a railway of 50, or 60, or 200 miles, is liable to be confiscated at any minute by the conditions which a through line of railway may impose upon it. Therefore, it is that we who come from the west feel that this clause in the Bill which provides for running powers is very important to us. That clause can be so worked out that other lines of railway can make use of it, and it means that it will place the people of the west in a position of independence that no other scheme possibly could.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I want to say a few words on the much discussed question as to how these running powers can be carried out. It was discussed by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and later on by the Minister of Finance. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance touched a point which causes me to make another remark. He suggested that there was very little doubt about the possibility of carrying out this clause with regard to running powers, and that it would be simply a matter as to whether it could be economically done, and whether in the matter of business it would pay to have it done. It will suggest itself at once to the members of the House that when the country develops, as it will develop, when the time comes that the Intercolonial Railway, for instance, may desire to make use of that eastern section, and when the Canadian Northern Railway, or other lines which may be built in the western country, desire to make use of that eastern section main line, there is nothing to prevent the forming of an operating company, just as a terminal company is formed in the city of Chicago, or any other place, and have that operating company put its staff along the line of railway, as is done in the case of the Canada Southern ; and that operating company will act for the benefit of all the railway companies that may desire to participate in the advantages afforded by that main line. That is a simple matter which requires only to be stated in order that it may be perfectly clear that the bugaboo that has been raised in regard to this clause about operation is absolutely unfounded in fact, upon the question being examined.

My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) indulged in criticism of some provisions of this contract, and I am bound to say that if the hon. gentleman were not a man of age and discretion, I should not have been disposed to take him seriously; I should have thought that instead of addressing an argument to the House he was making a joke. My hon. friend's argument, as I understand it, was based on section 14 of the contract. I suggest to my hon. friend from Hamilton that in reading this contract, it would be better for him to enter-

tain the idea that it is a serious business contract, intended to govern transactions in a business like way, and not specially drawn for the purpose of concealing some nefarious plot to be palmed off on the public. If I understood my hon. friend's argument aright it was that section 14, which defines working expenses, as including in respect to the eastern division, money paid in respect of the hire of rolling stock, was put in the contract in order to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to borrow or rent the $20,000,000 of rolling stock, instead of purchasing it and putting it on the railway according to the terms of the contract. That is my hon. friend's suggestion. If you read this clause, you will find in it a definition of the expression 'working expenses,' and the obvious purpose of that provision, in respect of the hire of rolling stock, is this, that if the company—as it will, as every company does, from time to time—has the use of rolling stock belonging to other companies, the rent which is paid for the use of that rolling stock goes into the working expenses as part of the cost of running the road; and I am not aware of any other provision that could be made to cover the case.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Does he not find in the 14th clause that the rent is to be charged on the cars furnished for the equipment of the eastern division?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend's argument, if I understand it aright, is that that clause is intended to let the company put rolling stock on the eastern division without owning it. They are going to borrow or rent that rolling stock, and what are they going to do with it when they get it there? Under the provisions of this contract, they are going to put a mortgage on it. That is my hon. friend's argument. Now, I do not know whether my hon. friend's attention has been much given to criminal law or not; but if it has, he will know that to mortgage property which does not belong to you is considered a serious offence, and I do not think it probable that this company will do that under this contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is it a criminal offence for a lessee of property to mortgage his interest in it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If his mortgage of the property is under such circumstances as to be an unlawful conversion of the property, it might be; and I think my hon. friend as a professional man will be able to recall numbers of instances in which that point has been under consideration. But, as I said, if my hon. friend had not addressed that argument to the House with the elaboration and care which he did, I would not have thought that he meant it seriously.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has asked me to devote some attention to the question of the ownership of this rolling stock, and I intend for a moment or two to refer to it. Section 22 of the contract provides:

> The company shall equip both divisions of the said line of railway with modern and complete rolling stock suitable and amply sufficient for efficient operation and the handling of all classes of traffic to the satisfaction of the government, and the first equipment for the completed road shall be of the value of, at least, twenty million dollars, of which not less than five million dollars worth shall be supplied for the operation of the eastern division of the said railway, and the said five million dollars worth of rolling stock, together with all renewals thereof and additions thereto, shall be marked as assigned to the said eastern division and shall be held to be and form part of the equipment of the eastern division of the railway during the said period of fifty years and shall be used as the equipment appertaining thereto, according to the ordinary practice of railways during the said period of fifty years.

The first reflection that occurs to any one after reading that section is that if the company borrowed the rolling stock, they would have to borrow it for fifty years, and a loan of that kind would be somewhat extensive in its period. But, apart from that feature of the case, I may say that, while it is not my business to advise the government on questions of law, that being the duty of the hon. Minister of Justice, and while the counsel who were associated with the Minister of Justice in the revision and examination of this contract were clear in their opinions as to the meaning of it, those of us who are lawyers may nevertheless express an opinion as to the meaning of that section; and I venture to give the opinion, without any doubt at all as to its correctness—and lawyers know that we cannot always give an opinion without doubt as to its correctness—that no court in Canada would hold that the company complied with the terms of that clause if they did not own the rolling stock and put it on the road as the property of the company. If there is any doubt about that, look at section 35, which says:

> For the purposes hereinafter in this paragraph respectively defined, the company may and shall create mortgages to trustees, as follows:
> (a.) A mortgage which shall be a first charge upon the railway, undertaking equipment, and property.

The company is declared by this Act to have the power to put a mortgage which shall be a first charge upon the property; and subsection (c) of the same section says:

> A mortgage which shall be a charge upon the rolling stock constituting the equipment of the eastern division next after the charge mentioned in paragraph 35 (a) to secure to the government the rental payable in respect of the eastern division, the efficient maintenance and continuous operation of the said eastern division, and the observance and performance by the company of the terms of this agreement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need apprehend that any court that is called on to construe this agreement could by any possible construction of this provision, hold that the company could borrow their rolling stock and send it there for the purpose of complying with the terms of this contract. I was speaking at one o'clock of the fact that our hon. friends opposite take issue with us upon an important phase of this question. They take issue with us as to the necessity for the railway, and I adverted to the fact that they loudly applauded my former colleague when he expressed himself as having been wholly oblivious of any demand for the construction of an additional transcontinental line. I, therefore, think it is wise to advert briefly to the evidence of such a demand and to the evidence of the fact that the government, in coming to the conclusion to which it did, is not submitting a proposition which is without public support and unwarranted by public sentiment. Well, I venture to express the doubt as to whether any member of this House can recollect any important proposition ever brought before the parliament of Canada which was received with such unanimous approval from all quarters as the proposition that the Grand Trunk Railway should build to the Pacific. Whether the people would approve of the method proposed, is matter for discussion, but there can be no doubt as to the opinion of the people of Canada regarding the necessity for a new railway across the continent. We find the evidence in all shapes and forms. In the fall of last year, the board of trade of Winnipeg—that city which is the entrepot of the trade of the great west and which, in my judgment, will remain so and achieve great growth as the result of the development of that country—passed a resolution, most unqualified in its terms, as to the necessity for additional transportation facilities. In this resolution the board of trade said that the railway service had become so unreliable on account of being overtaxed that relief was absolutely needed. The passenger service had become so irregular, unreliable and apparently demoralized, that much loss was inflicted on business men. Then they spoke of the congestion with regard to freight traffic and other difficulties affecting transportation, and wound up by saying :

> Therefore this board respectfully urges the Dominion government to take such immediate action as shall remove the grevious disabilities under which the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories labour, and to take such further measures as shall effectually prevent a recurrence of the conditions herein described.

I find that the North-west territorial assembly, in the fall of 1902, passed a very strong resolution, in which they recited the many difficulties under which the people of the west were labouring in the matter of transportation, and wound up by saying that :

> The prospective increase in the volume of traffic, which largely increased cultivation and settlement of lands in these territories will certainly create, will further tend to congest traffic between these territories and the provinces of the east, and unless it is held desirable to divert part of such traffic through foreign channels, adequate facilities for transportation must be immediately provided. That this assembly does therefore humbly pray that Your Excellency may be pleased to take such action as may be necessary or expedient to insure that the people of these territories are provided with an efficient transportation system as contemplated by the contract made between the people of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

It will be remembered that this is an address or memorial, passed by the representatives of the people of the North-west Territories, coming from all portions of the territories, and fully aware of the facts and circumstances as they existed at that time. I find that last winter the Grain Growers' Association of the North-west Territories passed a strong resolution, in which they say that the country is not only being retarded, but the residents are suffering much deprivation on account of the scarcity of fuel and building material, owing to the lack of transportation facilities.

I see in the 'Regina Leader'—not an editorial item—but a news item, stating that :

> For many weeks past, first one merchant and then another has in vigorous language drawn the attention of the 'Leader' to the fact that the condition of railway traffic in the west is continually getting worse. The situation last year was bad enough, when for days and sometimes weeks, merchants were completely out of certain lines of goods, because the railway could not get them in. This year it is infinitively worse, for many business houses have been completely sold out of certain lines for weeks and months, notwithstanding the fact that their orders were placed in plenty of time and the goods promptly shipped by wholesalers in the east.

I find in last December an opinion given by a gentleman, with whom I have had long personal acquaintance, and who is better qualified to speak of the railway situation in western Canada than any man living. I refer to Mr. William Whyte, a prominent officer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for many years general superintendent of that western division. Last December he said :

> There is lots of room for the Grand Trunk Railway in the North-west. I'm glad to hear they are coming. You must remember that the Grand Trunk Railway is a national road, and it is far better to have it than an American road. If the people of the east had any idea of the rapidity with which the country is settling out there, they would not be surprised to hear me say : 'There is room for the Grand Trunk Railway and others as well.' The condition of affairs has completely changed even since a year ago. The traffic is not only abnormal east-bound but also west-bound. It is this fact which has simply rendered it impossible to handle the crop with the despatch which was necessary.

Again he said :

In 1895 we had a large crop, as you remember, which was handled satisfactorily, simply because we could rush the cars back, and reload. To-day all is changed, and I don't suppose we are getting within 35 per cent of the use of our cars for grain haulage we did last year, simply because they are used in other ways. The people are rich, they are purchasing in the east, and what we call our lake trade has increased 95 per cent over last year. Then the fuel situation has changed ; they are consuming more fuel as they become richer, buying more groceries, provisions, &c., in the east, so that the abnormal increase has been in both east and west-bound, and in local trade.

My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) made a remark last May. He said :

Still, as I have said, there is no denying the fact that they have not met the requirements of that country——

That is, the railway companies have not——

——and that, if they are going to remain in the country and if the country is going to make the progress we all feel it ought to make, either the company must voluntarily do more than it has done, or else this government or whoever is responsible in the premises, must take steps to meet the emergency which now arises.

And my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said this year :

Now with the influx of population to that country which has taken place lately, what will it be two or three years hence when you have 400 million bushels of grain ? Why, even twelve or fifteen railroads could not handle it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has not completed the quotation. My remembrance is that the rest of the sentence is something like this : 'in the short time the farmers expect it to be handled in the fall of the year.' Let the hon. gentleman give it all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. House of Commons 'Hansard,' May 5th 1903—that is where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will find what he said. I have here a resolution from the council of the Toronto board of trade. As you go along and pick up just here and there a little of the evidence on this point as to the demand for this railway, the assertion of some hon. gentlemen that they never heard anything about it is slightly humorous. However, we have the resolution of the Toronto board of trade, passed on June 23rd of this year :

Whereas, the board realize the necessity of an outlet by the shortest and cheapest route for the fast increasing productions of the Northwest country and the advisability of competition without the extravagance of the duplication of lines.

Be it therefore resolved that this board urges strongly upon the government of Canada the construction by the Dominion of a line from Quebec to Winnipeg traversing the clay belt of northern Ontario and passing north of Lake Nipigon to Winnipeg, the use of such railway being permitted to all railroads under proper regulation.

Has the Toronto board of trade gone mad? Are these business men all fools?

Mr. KEMP. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Will he make it clear that that was not a resolution of the Toronto board of trade, but of the council of the board of trade ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall not attempt any answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp). He desires this House to take knowledge of the fact that there is a distinction between the most prominent men of the city of Toronto, selected by the business men of Toronto to be the council of the board of trade and their constituents.

Mr. KEMP. If the hon. gentleman will allow me——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Well, now, perhaps my hon. friend will permit me to proceed——

Mr. KEMP. I will not interrupt the hon. gentleman if he does not allow me to.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am referring to a question of fact about which there is a dispute. It has been alleged in this House that nobody ever heard of the demand for this railway before. It is alleged that the government go into the council chamber, discuss this matter by themselves, then come out here and launch upon this parliament a mad, stupid, crazy scheme not worthy the support of any man of sense or reason. What do we find? We find that the council of the Toronto board of trade, the selected representatives of the business men of Toronto, next to Montreal the commercial metropolis of Canada, have solemnly put themselves on record as advising this very thing. If my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) had been desirous of accentuating this bit of evidence, he could not have done it more effectively than by calling attention to the fact that it was not a big mass meeting, perhaps acting without any very great deliberation, but a meeting of the council of the board, prominent men, responsible to their constituents, and giving their advice upon this question deliberately. Well, I find the Winnipeg 'Tribune,' my old friend, says that it is a good thing to have the Grand Trunk go west. The Winnipeg 'Telegram,' equally friendly to myself, says :

The same confidence in the west we still have, and we have no more doubt that the west can support a third system of railway than we had in 1901 that it could support a second system.

This was on the 27th of November. Two days before they had a long article in which they said that if the Dominion government make satisfactory arrangement the railway should be a good thing for the country, and the country could sustain the road. The 'Mail and Empire' had something to say on the subject on November 25th last. My hon.

friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was good enough to point out that, of course, when it is known that the government has made up its mind to do a particular thing, the party press throughout the country naturally falls into line and is disposed to advocate the idea of doing this thing which the government has already determined to do. The suggestion of my hon. friend was that the knowledge that the government was going to take a certain course had considerable effect upon the mental attitude of the members of the press. I may be excused for doubting that the knowledge on the part of the managers of the 'Mail and Empire' that the government was likely to take up this project would very much influence them in its favour. Therefore, I quote the 'Mail and Empire' as one of the few newspapers not likely to be subject to government influence in the way suggested by my late colleague. The 'Mail and Empire' said :

Last year the crop was more than the Canadian Pacific Railway, exerting all its great resources, could handle before the close of navigation. This year, the crop is still larger, and though the hauling power of the road has been very greatly increased, milions of bushels will remain to be carried after Fort William is closed by ice. Yet the traffic of our North-west is but in its beginning: Instead of 70,000,000 bushels of wheat grown this year, five times that quantity may have to be looked after before the Grand Trunk Pacific is ready for business. Production will greatly thicken in the zone traversed by the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern. But the wheat belt has been proved to be much wider than that zone. Far north of the country served by existing lines, the finest hard wheat can be produced. There is plenty of room for another railroad in the prairie country. The completion of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific will not prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway continuing by leaps and bounds along its career of prosperity.

And I find that on the 24th of November last the Montreal 'Star' said :

That the great North-west needs additional railway connections with Eastern Canada is obvious.

Mr. Thomas Crawford, Conservative member of the Ontario legislature for a Toronto division, a large cattle dealer, an experienced and capable business man, said, as reported in an interview in the Toronto News, on November 27th :

That to his mind, as a cattle man, it would be a good thing for Canada which would be a boon to the country and give us an assurance of good times for twenty years. 'The time has come,' said he, 'for such a line, and to-day if it were in operation it would do well. To-day there is such a traffic in our trade in North-west cattle that some of them have now to be shipped in by Chicago.'

Then a leading official of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. H. P. Timmerman, general superintendent, according to the Toronto 'News' of November 25th, said this :

I believe the Grand Trunk Pacific will be of great advantage to the west. It will certainly not injure the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the output of produce is so vast that the question of competition will not be considered for many years hence.

I find that Mr. J. R. Booth, an able and experienced railway man, whose opinion has great influence in this House and throughout the country, in an interview accorded to the Ottawa 'Journal,' is reported to have said :

There is room enough for all in the trade which is to develop in western Canada. I certainly think it is a good thing for the country, and in fact I don't see how they have got along without a transcontinental line so long. They certainly need it to feed their large capacity at the shipping ports of Montreal and Portland.

That is what Mr. Booth said when he had before him the original project, when the Grand Trunk intended to apply for a charter, and announced that they were going to build to North Bay and make their business tributary to their present outlet. But as the House will have seen, we have changed all that. I find in the 'Globe' newspaper of November 25, an opinion of Mr. E. F. Clarke, M.P., who is quoted as saying :

He thought that the proposed extension was second only in importance to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway some twenty odd years ago. He believed that the development in Manitoba and the Territories would go on so rapidly that even this third transcontinental railroad would find abundance of traffic awaiting its completion. The fact that it was to pass through the Peace River district gave some idea of the immensity of our country, for this district was fully 800 miles north of Toronto. He believed the project to be of the greatest importance, not only to Toronto and Ontario, but to the whole Dominion.

In the 'Mail and Empire' of November 24, Mr. J. R. Booth is again interviewed, and expressed himself in favour of the project. In the 'Globe' newspaper of November 25, I find the opinion of Mr. W. R. Brock, M.P. This paper, I believe, is on fairly good terms with my hon. friend, except politically. This is what he is reported to have said :

The new road will be the grandest possible thing for Canada. The Peace River district, through which the railway is to run, will be our future granary. The engineer who first surveyed for the Canadian Pacific Railway desired to go the route now proposed by the Grand Trunk Railway. There can be no question about the proposed route, being a succees in every sense, and an inestimable boon to Canada. It is better to have such a road as the Grand Trunk build the new lines, because it will ensure competition.

Now, I do not wish to misrepresent my hon. friend, or anybody else. This opinion of his was expressed on November 25th, before it was decided and announced that the line was to be built from Quebec to Winnipeg. These gentlemen were then in favour of the project. I wish them joy of

it, I want them to take the responsibility of it, and I ask them to put themselves on record again. These gentlemen must therefore be taken to approve of the project of a transcontinental line, and of the route of the Grand Trunk Railway from North Bay westward to the prairies to bring its business down to Portland.

Mr. BROCK. Does the hon. gentleman contend that great quantities of wheat from the North-west will go over the route they are now proposing, instead of over the route that I approved of ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will discuss that with my hon. friend later on. I have not the slightest hesitation in discussing that ; we expected to discuss it when we brought in this Bill, and we are going to discuss it. I have here a whole list of important men of business, speaking on November 24, who expressed favourable opinions with regard to the construction of this railway, and to the necessity of its construction. I need not give them more in detail. I find in going over this symposium of testimony, the views of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, not only in the Victoria papers to which reference has been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, but in the 'Toronto Globe' after he got back from his trip, after he had seen the west and had breathed the invigorating air of the prairies. The 'Globe' represents, and no doubt truly, my late colleague as saying :

> There is room for several railways in the west. With the business that will be created by the rapid settlement of the country, I venture to say there will be room for railways within twenty-five or thirty miles of each other. He said the extension of the Grand Trunk would be a good thing for the country.

Generally his views were favourable to the project. Later on my hon. friend the ex-minister was represented by the Montreal 'Star,' I do not know whether correctly or not, as saying :

> I am free to confess that in my judgment the development of the Canadian North-west and British Columbia will be so rapid the next few years as to afford ample traffic for three transcontinental lines, and I am glad to know that the Grand Trunk Railway Company seeks to share in that development.

I simply mention that to show that the view which my late colleague entertained at Victoria, when he was in favour of three transcontinental lines, did not evaporate on the way across the continent, and that he still entertained it when he got here. Mr. Alexander McFee, president of the Board of Trade in Montreal, an important business man, doing a large business in that city, said on November 24 :

> The building of a transcontinental route by the Grand Trunk Railway means a good deal to the Dominion of Canada, east and west. The announcement means that one of our great needs is to be supplied. It assures the development of the Canadian North-west along Canadian national lines. The new railway is required. The North-west is ready for it. The country is in a state of rapid development.

The 'Montreal Herald' of November 24, reports Mr. J. G. Garneau, member of the council of the board of trade, as expressing a favourable opinion. In the 'Montreal Herald' of the same date, Mr. W. I. Gear, president of the Montreal Corn Exchange, when interviewed, expressed himself as follows :

> In the projected line of the Grand Trunk, competition cuts no figure. The country can support a new line and more than one. Besides, a little competition is a good thing for all parties, and a very good thing for the country. There is a lot of the North-west that has not been opened to settlement. The proposal of the Grand Trunk, I believe, is to open new country, and aid in filling the North-west. The benefit to the country of such a line as the proposed one cannot be estimated at the present time, but it is bound to be very great. The east and the west will alike share in the benefit.

Hon. Richard Turner, member of the legislative council of Quebec, Mayor White, of St. John, Mr. Jas. Carruthers, a prominent grain man of Montreal, commenced the building of a new railway. Mr. H. D. Metcalfe, ex-president of the Corn Exchange, and a prominent grain dealer in Montreal—expressed a strong opinion in favour of the proposition for the building of a railway to the west by the Grand Trunk. Although these statements, of which these are a few picked out at random without any special care, were published broadcast through the press, the position is taken in this House and before the country that no necessity exists for the construction of this railway.

I have a word to say on my own behalf as to the question of the future. We gave last year 31,000 homesteads. That means 31,000 farms taken up, and we expect to give the same number or a larger number next year. If hon. members will take the trouble to stop and think what it means to have 30,000 or 40,000 fertile farms taken up every year they will have some idea, though only a small idea, of what is going on in the west and what it is necessary to provide for. I think we can safely say that if we continue our present efforts in the way of immigration we will probably be able to keep the movement of population up to somewhere in the neighbourhood in which it is now, for a considerable number of years and if we do that we shall inevitably increase tremendously the production and not only that, but as I have pointed out and as the testimony which I have read points out conclusively, there will be an enormous amount of grain from the west and there will be an enormous amount of general merchandise to go back to the west and which this proposed line of railway may

be absolutely unable to handle. The Montreal 'Gazette' of August 13—that is to-day—practically admits the necessity of a further outlet. In attacking the provisions of the government proposition, it says :

A line from North Bay to the Pacific, with such branches as the company thought it commercially wise to construct, would have been defensible and commendable and no one could have successfully attacked it.

ROYAL ASSENT.

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

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General desires and awaits the attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate chamber.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :

An Act to incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the encouragement of the construction of Dry Docks.

An Act for the relief of Florence Lee Gray.

An Act respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.

An Act to incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company, Limited.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Naturalization and Aliens.

An Act respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.

An Act respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.

An Act to incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England of Canada.

An Act respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Brandon and Southwestern Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.

Hon. Mr. SIFTON.

An Act respecting Government and Post Office Savings Banks.

An Act respecting Dominion Notes.

An Act to amend the Act of 1899 respecting the City of Ottawa.

An Act to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.

An Act to incorporate the Citizen's Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Rathbun Company.

An Act respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate the Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Company.

An Act respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.

An Act to prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated Butter, Oleomargarine, Butterine, or other substitute of Butter, and to prevent the improper marking of Butter.

An Act to amend the Fisheries Act.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certains powers for the relief of George M. Depew.

An Act to incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Lake Huron Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.

An Act to amend the Patent Act.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ended the 30th June, 1903.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have one other authority, just one as to the necessity for a transcontinental railway. It would be undesirable that I should omit to mention that the leader of the opposition on the 26th May last, brought this subject to the attention of the House, and pressed upon the attention of the government a resolution of the Halifax Board of Trade which is sufficiently important to be again referred to in this debate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) placed before the House and the government particularly, the resolution in which it was stated as follows :

Whereas, application has been made to the federal government for a charter to build a line of railway known as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, from Quebec to Port Simpson, or Bute Inlet on the Pacific coast (said line to run south of Lake Winnipeg), and no provision has been made in application for the shipment of the traffic originating on said line through the maritime province ports in the winter season.

And whereas, members of parliament representing maritime province constituencies at Ottawa, have urged that the charter be granted only on the condition that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company agrees to build the line from the Pacific coast to the town of Moncton, N.B.

Therefore resolved, that this board approves of the stand taken by the representatives from the maritime provinces.

The resolution then goes on to deal with the necessity for an arrangement by which the railway shall be built entirely through Canadian territory, that the rates of freight should be controlled and placed upon an equality; that the railway company shall be compelled to proceed with the construction of the eastern section simultaneously with the western section, and they recommend that the railway be built north of Lake Winnipeg, which is not quite so wise as the other provisions of the resolution, but which is no doubt due to the fact that the Halifax gentlemen are not as familiar with the country up there as some of the rest of us. Then they go on to say that the government be urged to adopt this route for a new transcontinental railway seeking government assistance, and the board also desires to express its opinion that the interests of Canada demand that the Intercolonial Railway be extended to the grain producing centres of the west. There is further on a telegram somewhat on the same lines which was sent by the Halifax Board of Trade to the late Minister of Railways and Canals. The leader of the opposition having knowledge of the fact that this resolution had been passed by the Board of Trade of the city of Halifax in his own constituency, very properly brought it before this House and proceeded to ask if the government were then in a position to say to the House and to the country in what way they proposed to deal with this transportation problem, and

Was the government able to disclose to the House and to the country any really comprehensive national policy by means of which it may be able to deal with this question of transportation in the west and in the east also.

I recommend these words of the leader of the opposition to my hon. friend from Lanark :

We know that not only in the west of Canada, but in the east of Canada as well, it is of the utmost possible importance to the people, it is vital to the interests of the people that they should have means of transporting their products to the foreign market equally as cheap and equally as available as those which are enjoyed by their competitors to the south of us, and we know that it is otherwise impossible for our people in the east or in the west to compete on fair conditions with their chief competitors, the people of the United States of America.

Now, has the government any policy upon this matter which it is prepared to disclose to the people of this country, and if it has not any policy at the present time, when may we expect that its policy shall be announced to the country.

Why, Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister had been forcasting the policy which we have laid before parliament he could not have done it in more explicit terms than those announced by the leader of the opposition in this House on the 26th May last.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would my hon. friend permit me to call his attention to one paragraph which he has omitted :

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that on a question of this kind which touches the whole future history of the transportation question of this country, the government ought not to take any leap in the dark, it ought not to take any step at hap-hazard. If the government proposes to appoint a commission it should have appointed that commission long ago, and that commission should have been at work dealing with and studying the very problems of transportation which are now confronting the government in regard to this matter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that anybody will dispute that the government ought not to take a leap in the dark. We are not taking a leap in the dark. We are taking a leap exactly on the line and over the route suggested by the Halifax Board of Trade, by the business men that my hon. friend represents, on the exact route which they suggested, and which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) not knowing and not supposing that the government did purpose to bring this policy down at this present session of parliament, brought to our attention, and practically endorsed some months ago. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) gave an intimation in another way that he had not a very decided opinion that the government was likely to adopt such a policy as it has adopted, and that he had in his mind the idea that possibly the government would adopt the policy of encouraging the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway from North Bay. Therefore, my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) in addressing the Conservatives of Ward 2, in the city of Toronto on March 25th, 1903, as reported in the 'Mail and Empire,' spoke as follows :

While this great question of transcontinental railway extension——

I stop for a moment to refer to that in connection with the suggestion of my late colleague (Hon. Mr. Blair) who never heard anything about the necessity of a transcontinental railway. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition heard about it and heard about it so often that he was making it a subject of discussion before his party friends who were assembled to hear him in the city of Toronto.

While this great question of transcontinental railway extension is before parliament and before the country, we must see to it that the public rights are guarded. The Postmaster General in his address of last evening expressed views which were sane and sensible.

Flattering to my hon. colleague the Postmaster General.

At last he has realized that this country is a great one and can only be developed by a strong railway policy. In the past Mr. Mulock and his friends said that the Canadian Pacific Railway would never pay——

We have heard something about railways not paying, for the last day or two :

—and that British Columbia was merely a waste of mountains, but their views are changed, for which he should be thankful. I am glad to hear of Sir William Mulock's noble and patriotic words. I am glad to hear of his conversion, but we as Canadians must ask some questions Shall we take care to so guard any franchise we give that it must be exercised alone in the public interest. Shall we see that any railway receiving public assistance forms part of an all-Canadian route ? But gentlemen, the record of the government is not such as to lead us to believe that these questions will be regarded with the importance they deserve. If assistance is given to any transcontinental railway it must be an all-Canadian line, which will take Canadian products to Canadian ports, where they will be shipped abroad.

That is the testimony of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think you will get much consolation out of that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) succeeded in making his meaning very clear. Now, there is some testimony since this project was launched, I find that Sir Sanford Fleming—a gentleman of great experience in connection with railway matters, formerly chief engineer of the government and chief engineer when the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial Railway surveys were made, a man who has taken a great interest in the development of Canada ever since—I find he is reported in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of August 3rd as having given to the correspondent of that paper in Ottawa an interview heartily endorsing the general scheme which is before parliament at the present time. In the 'Globe' of August 6th Mr. James H. Ashdown of Winnipeg is reported as having given the correspondent of the 'Globe' an unqualified endorsement of the government scheme. I attach a very considerable degree of importance to the opinion given by Mr. James H. Ashdown. Mr. Ashdown is perhaps the ablest business man that we have ever had in Manitoba or the North-west Territories. He occupies the position of being recognized as an especialy able, keen, capable business man, and probably the wealthiest citizen and most successful business man of the west. Mr. Ashdown has been a member of both political parties. He was formerly a Conservative; later he became identified with the Liberal party; but he is not a man of strong party feelings, and has never had any very strong affiliations with either party. But he is a man who knows more respecting the trade conditions of the North-west, its importations and exportations, than any other business man in the west; and he gives his opinion in a most unqualified way in endorsement of this proposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude with the testimony in favour of this proposition ; and I think I may venture to remark that the testimony in favour of the immediate construction of a transcontinental railway may be regarded as tolerably conclusive. Sir, the congestion of traffic in the west has not been the congestion of wheat traffic only. Reading the discussions in the newspapers, and hearing what has been said upon the subject, persons not familiar with the local situation would naturally be led to the conclusion that it was a congestion which arose altogether by reason of the rush of wheat during a few months in the fall. That would be an entire mistake. The congestion during the last year or two has occurred not only during the months when wheat was pressing upon the railways, but during other months when the railways have been choked with cars loaded with general merchandise; and when the wheat season has come on they have been caught with their yards full of cars loaded with general merchandise which even then, before the wheat began to move, they have been unable to handle. Let it be understood that every carload of freight that goes to the North-west, wherever it may have originated, has to be taken care of by the railroads there, and the congestion has naturally arisen from the lack of complete facilities to handle the accumulation of traffic from various agencies. While that congestion was not serious in the early stages of the development of the country, it has now, according to the testimony of competent observers, reached a stage when it is absolutely necessary that effective relief should be given. I wish to point out to this House, in connection with the situation there, a most important circumstance. You have a large and important part of Canada so situated that it is a thousand miles away from the other portion of the country with which it has political and business affiliations; and you have immediately south of our western territory a well-developed, well-peopled district, with vigorous and capable railway systems. Immediately to the south of the boundary line between Manitoba and the states of Minnesota and Dakota there are four or five of the finest railway systems in the world—the Burlington, the Chicago and North-western, the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul —strong, well-equipped, vigorous systems, thoroughly versed in everything that pertains to the management of the railway business on the prairies. They are only a few miles away from Manitoba and our prairie district in the North-west Territories ; and do you expect that you are going to allow the traffic to be congested year after year,

the grain to be held up, and the merchants to be left with their shelves empty, for lack of transportation facilities, and that these railway systems are not going to go in there and take this business to the south? It is contrary to experience and common sense. I am bringing this aspect of the case to the attention of the House because it is naturally my duty to do it. Hon. gentlemen from eastern Canada have not had their attention directed to this particular phase of the situation, and you would properly say to me that I had failed in my duty to the House and to my colleagues if I had not brought it strongly and seriously to the attention of the House. No person who has any knowledge of the situation will for an instant throw any doubt on this statement, that if arrangements are not made for relieving the congestion of traffic, not only in wheat, but in cattle and produce of all kinds for shipment outwards, and in general merchandise for shipment inwards, and if those arrangements are not made soon, as surely as the sun shines, the greater portion of that trade will go south to the United States. It is going now. Mr. J. T. Gordon, of the firm of Gordon & Ironsides, the largest cattle exporters, I believe, in Canada, states that that firm sent last year 3,000 head of cattle by an American line because they could not get shipping facilities over the Canadian line. That is what is going on now. In the agricultural implement business, the makers of eastern Canada are handicapped for the same reason. A few hundred miles to the south there are implement makers with first-class shipping facilities, and the means of filling orders promptly when they come; and even if there is a slight difference in price, or if the difference is equal in amount to the duty, you will find that the inability of the Canadian dealer to fill orders, largely due to lack of shipping facilities, is going to result in the business being taken away from him by his competitors to the south. So our duty is to relieve this congestion of traffic, and provide for the future, not only for the purpose of enabling the great products of the country to be exported, but for the purpose of enabling the manufacturing towns and villages and the industrial centres of eastern Canada to be put in communication with our fellow-citizens upon the prairies, so that mutual benfit may bring mutual profits to all concerned.

Now, having decided—and I think the reasons given are conclusive in favour of our so deciding—that we should build this railway, we had to decide whether we should own and operate it ourselves, or whether we should deal with a company, and allow that company to undertake the task. I do not propose to discuss at any very great length the question of government ownership of railways. I have never been an advocate of that principle. I have never seen anything in the experience of the government of Canada to induce me to become an advocate of it. What has been our experience of the Intercolonial Railway? We have a length of line of 1,510 miles; the total expenditure of capital to June, 1902, was $68,310,619; it is over $70,000,000 now; all the surpluses since 1876 to the 1st of July last added together amount to $445,647; and the deficits since that time, if you subtract the surpluses, amount to $5,281,000. That is the position of affairs, financially, resulting from the operation of the government railway in Canada.

Now, Sir, let me not be misunderstood. I entertain no feeling of hostility to the Intercolonial Railway. I recognize, as I said this morning—and I believe every man on this side of the House, and I have no doubt every member on the other side recognizes—the fact that the building of the Intercolonial Railway was a part of the terms of confederation, that Canada owes it to the people who accepted the terms of confederation that that railway shall be maintained and operated properly, and not only that, but that it shall be kept up to date, and that the people of the maritime provinces shall have a good, liberal, up-to-date service, a service which they will have reason to be satisfied with and proud of. I believe that it is true. I am in favour of doing that which is necessary for the purpose of giving effect to that proposition, but I see no reason why the fact that we are prepared to implement our obligations honourably should oblige us to enter into other obligations of a similar character and which we believed to be totally unnecessary under the circumstances. So far as we know anything about the operation of government railways, there is nothing in what has happened to induce us to place upon this country at present the burden of operating a line of railway across the continent. A moment's consideration with regard to the railway management of railway properties, must show us that there are good reasons—apart altogether from the question of honesty or dishonesty, or corruption or political influences, which we all know are serious enough in matters of that kind—why it is difficult, if not impossible to have a railway managed by a government as effectively and economically as by a private individual.

If you will consult railway men, they will tell you that the interference even of boards of directors is detrimental to the proper running of a railway. American railway managers have found that they cannot effectively conduct their railways with a board of directors which will interfere with the men who are running the road. The same experience has been felt by Canadian railway companies. The result has been that the system has now become general of giving the president practically undivided power and control. It has been found that divided power and divided authority make

it impossible for a road to be effectively administered. Under our system what have we? We have a Minister of Railways who has to submit to parliamentary criticism every time he wants to spend $5 or $10 on anything connected with the whole railway system. He can never conduct the enterprise with the same confidence, energy and vigour, when he knows that every item of his administration has to be dealt with and discussed as a matter of politics, as he would if he were serving a private corporation, confident that he would be backed up by the board of directors. That is one of the main reasons why it is wise for us, in a case of this kind, where we desire that the country should be opened up by an active, aggressive policy, not to load ourselves with that task, but to commit it to a private corporation.

We are not committing it to a company that we know nothing about. So far as the sentiment in favour of government ownership is concerned, I believe it is largely due to the fact that Canada has been behind the period in the matter of railway legislation. But we are remedying that every year. We are providing legislation which will have the effect of removing the grievances of which our people complain.

We have passed a railway Bill which is the first effort of a Canadian parliament to provide an effective means by which the public may get redress from railway companies. I am satisfied that the effect of that railway legislation, if administered, as I have no doubt it will be, in the spirit in which it is intended, will be to remove the feeling of distrust against railway companies due to the fact that the people have had unredressed grievances from year to year, and also the sentiment in favour of government ownership due to their belief that if they had to deal with a government their grievances would be more easily redressed. Having decided that we were not going to operate this railway line as a government system, the question arose which company we should deal with. I have not heard any attack made on the decision of the government to deal with the Grand Trunk Railway; and inasmuch as that proposition is not attacked, I need not defend it. If we come then to the terms upon which the railway is to be constructed, what criticism can be offered? My hon. colleague the Finance Minister discussed it in detail last week and so did my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). Both showed that the terms upon which the western division is to be constructed practically amounted to this, that we guarantee the bonds, and as security for our guarantee we obtain a first mortgage on a property which is going to cost from $55,000,000 to $60,000,000. We shall have a railway which with its rolling stock will have a value of $55,000,000 at least and inasmuch as our guarantee will not exceed $30,000,000, we will have that guarantee secured by a mortgage on a property of about double the value. That is surely as good a bargain as was possible, and certainly no attempt at detailed criticism has been attempted on the other side.

As to the eastern section we have two alternatives, and I come now to a point where there seems to be a line of cleavage between some hon. members opposite and ourselves. Whether that cleavage exists all the way across the opposition, I am not yet in a position to say. We had in the beginning one proposition and to that proposition there was an alternative. The suggestion was made that we should assist the construction of a line from the end of the North Bay branch of the Grand Trunk Railway northward and around to the city of Winnipeg and further westward to Fort Simpson. If we had carried through that scheme, we should have, if they went by the route originally contemplated, about 600 miles of railway on a route practically alongside the Canadian Pacific Railway, or very near to it, which would have been, to all intents and purposes, absolutely useless except for the purpose of making connections. That, however, was not a necessary incident of the scheme, because they might have gone north to the clay belt and around to the city of Winnipeg without very much increasing the distance. We had, therefore, the project of a railway from North Bay west to Fort Simpson, but without eastern connection except that which exists by the Grand Trunk Railway at present. We declined to agree to a proposition of that kind. We declined to assist the Grand Trunk Railway to go westward and build up its business in such a way that, in so far as the winter business is concerned over this line, it would necessarily go to Portland. We declined to assist the Grand Trunk Railway upon those terms, and I would like our hon. friends opposite to say, before this debate is through, whether they support that proposition or not. If they are in favour of it the country has a right to know it. The country has a right to know whether they support the position we took in that respect or are opposed to it.

We decided on the other plan. We said that we could not agree to that proposition, but would insist on a line being built from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to a central point in the maritime provinces, with the result that we will get a road which will open up, for the first 400 miles east of Winnipeg a territory where there is some fertile land and a good deal of timber readily available; a road which then goes through the clay belt of the province of Ontario, which is somewhere in the neighbourhood of 500 or 600 miles long, a road which would furnish the shortest available line to the Canadian seaboard and furnish us, at the same time—and this is a point which,

I think, ought to be marked—with just as short and just as good a road through the provinces of Ontario and Quebec by the communication which will be opened up when the road is built. We have the Quebec to Winnipeg line north of Lake Temiscamingue; and with the connecting line to North Bay and down to Toronto, as short a route from Winnipeg to Toronto as exists at the present time by the Canadian Pacific Railway, or within a few miles of it. Practically, the distance will be the same; according to some scaling the distance is rather in favour of the new line. So, while we have the advantage of the through line, and of a line going through territory that requires settlement, yet, at the same time we have the advantage of just as good and short a route to every town and village in Ontario and Quebec by the old Grand Trunk system. So, we give what our hon. friends say we were going to give in the first instance, the line from North Bay, and we give the other line under conditions which will assure the carrying out the stipulations with regard to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question in that connection? He has referred to the through line to Quebec and a branch to North Bay. Has he made any approximate estimate of how much grain is likely to go by the all-rail route, and how much by the North Bay branch?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am about to deal with that in a few minutes. We are being asked—and that point was referred to by my late colleague (Hon Mr. Blair) in one of the letters he wrote to the Prime Minister—why we build the expensive section of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg ourselves, that is, the government furnish the money to build the line, but we hand over the western section, the profitable part of the line, to a company to operate. The stating of the argument in that form is an intimation that we are keeping the unprofitable part and losing money on it, and handing over the profitable part to a company to make money out of it. But a cursory examination of the proposition before parliament must show any person that that is the exact opposite of what we really do. It is true we furnish the money to build the eastern section, under financial conditions which I shall not further discuss. But we make it a condition, mark you, with the Grand Trunk Railway, that if we assist them in the construction of the line of railway westward over the prairies and to the Pacific ocean, they agree to take from us the eastern section and pay three per cent interest on its cost, and that is one of the conditions of the whole enterprise. So, the scheme we place before parliament is a completed scheme, a scheme under which we place the profitable and unprofitable parts under one management, and make it an enterprise which will not place a burden upon anybody. In no other way could we have so arranged it that the business of the line would be managed in such fashion as to prevent any burden falling upon us. It is not a case of handing over to the company the profitable part of the line and keeping the unprofitable; but we bind the two together and make the profit of the whole line pay for the cost of construction of the whole line, so that no loss will rest upon anybody. I have no doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would have preferred to get a good liberal bonus, pretty nearly enough to build the line from North Bay to Winnipeg, without any harassing or embarrassing stipulations as to what they shall do with their traffic, but under conditions, such as railway companies like, leaving them free to do just as they please. That might have suited the Grand Trunk, but it would not suit the government, and it would not suit the Canadian people—and we are well within the judgment of the people in that respect.

I desire to say a few words in regard to the character of the country through which this Quebec to Winnipeg division is to pass. I shall try to make my remarks on that subject as short and as little tiresome as possible. It has been said with a good deal of insistence that we do not know much about that country, that the explorations have been few and vague. A good deal of discredit has been thrown upon the official reports of the Ontario government on that country. I never heard before that those reports were unreliable. The reports were brought down to the legislative assembly of Ontario, the Toronto newspapers published excerpts from them and referred in glowing terms to the great domain shown to be owned by the province of Ontario, and congratulated the people of that province upon their possession. Nobody ever heard that these reports were not reliable until this debate opened, and it was found that this government was going to build a railway through that country. Then, suddenly, our friends of the opposition become very sceptical as to the value of these reports. Well, we have some reports which they got themselves, or which the Dominion government at various times have got. I wish to ask hon. members to look at a map which I have here which represents the territory through which the railway will run. The green lines, which hon. members will see are pretty numerous, represent the routes of exploring parties of this government which have from time to time passed through that territory. These lines have been traversed by exploring parties of the Geological Survey, to say nothing of the provincial examinations which have been made, and of the surveys and other explorations made from time to time. These lines show that the country has been traversed from end to end, so that we practically know all about

that country. Thinking this an important point, I have had some definite information collected upon the subject from the reports which are available, and I have here a memorandum prepared under my instructions. I told these officers : Divide the line into twelve sections and tell me the character of the country through which each section passes, from the reports which are available. Sir, we have reports in regard to every one of the twelve sections, showing with a fair and reasonable degree of accuracy what the nature of that country is. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), when he was discussing this question the other night, made use of the following statement with regard to the road north of Lake Superior :

No. It will be built—it must be built—in that section north of the height of land reaching to the plateau which borders Hudson's bay and which, at the verge of the plateau, drops to the extent of three or four hundred feet. Between that drop and the height of land, the land is totally unfit for any purpose known to civilization, a land of low scrubs and unfathomable muskegs crossed by granite ridges.

Let me read to my hon. friend from an official report some facts regarding the character of that country.

In a northwesterly direction from the city of Quebec it is not difficult to reach the St. Maurice. The Lake St. John Railway runs in that direction quite a distance, and from the point near Rivière à Pierre a northwesterly direction towards La Tongue and Iroquois Chute. Thence to the height of land there are no obstacles of any account, a general level plateau is struck which can be followed in a westerly direction for 800 miles not varying 200 feet in that distance.

That is on the question of grades. The St. Maurice division comes next :

Country less hilly as we proceed towards head waters of St. Maurice and Rouge rivers. Good agricultural land in numerous areas, 3,000,000 acres fit for settlement.

This is the part of the country which my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier said was no good, and would not enable us to do any colonization work.

Farming by Hamilton Bros., ten miles up the Range river, successful. Well timbered country. Red and white and jack pines, spruce, tamarack and birch. Climate is not any more severe than that of Quebec. Hills disappear at the height of land. At 380 miles from its mouth, the St. Maurice is still a large river. Above Grand Piles station, last station up the St. Maurice valley, navigation is good for seventy miles. Numerous surveys by Richardson, Ingall, Bouchette and other surveyors and explorers and geologists, have been made.

That is about the worst part of the country, or nearly so.

Division No. 3, the Upper Gatineau.

Above 100 miles from mouth of Gatineau, country is generally level, rocky hills occasionally seen. Soil, sandy loam. Oats, barley, pease, spring and fall wheat under cultivation. Excellent reports from all sources. Timber abundant. Spruce, balsam, fir, white birch, black birch, white and brown ash, also maple, besides white and red pine. Minerals, nickel, copper, iron, limestone, &c. Water power, excellent. Character of crops grown indicate nature of the climate.

Surveyed by James Richardson, 1870, from Desert river to height of land, head waters of the Gatineau. Head waters of the St. Maurice on to Lake Mistassini, revealed a flat undulating plain, with good flats of farming land throughout the country.

Upper Ottawa division, No. 4.

This division comprises a good portion of the unorganized country of the county of Pontiac. Country generally flat or undulating plain, part of Hudson bay basin. The southern portion hilly and rocky. Middle portion, through which the line traverses, is flat and easy grade. Soil —large areas of dry clay soil extend around the height of land. Although the district as a whole in its southern portion cannot be said to be suitable for agricultural purposes, still in many places considerable areas of good land are known to exist.

I may say that from the northern slope of the height of land the southern part of the clay belt is well timbered, the waters running down to the northward. The railway must run along the northern part of the clay belt if we are to put it in such a position that the timber can be got out. Every man who is familiar with lumbering knows what I mean when I say that the timber can only follow the flow of the river, and the railway must cross the lower region, otherwise the timber cannot be driven down and reach the railway. A branch railway must go on the northern side of the clay belt so as to take in the lower region of the river and enable the timber to be driven down, so that the large timber resources of the province of Ontario lying along the northern slope of the height of land may be rendered available for commerce.

Timber on the lowlands mostly spruce, tamarack and fir. On the high land, birch, poplar spruce and red pine. The country has been many times surveyed, and traversed by explorers since the early part of last century. Gold, gypsum, lignite, have been discovered.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman say what page of the report he is reading from ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am reading an abstract from information in the Geological Survey, which has been made at my request and by my instructions, by Dr. H. M. Ami, a member of the Geological Survey, who will be responsible for the correctness of the information which he has taken from the official survey.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The suggestion was that if he would give us the pages of the reference as he goes along, it would be convenient to this side of the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot do that for the reason that this is collected from a large number of reports in different places ; but I will leave upon the Table of the House what I am reading

from, so that it can be consulted from time to time. I will leave also further references which will give an indication as to where they can be obtained.

Surveys by the geological surveys of Canada, by the Crown Land Commissioners of Ontario and Quebec, as well as by the officers of the Ontario Bureau of Mines, afford valuable information on the resources of this division, who all state favourably.

Division No. 5. Abbittibbi division.

Minerals—Iron, copper, magnetic iron pyrites and steatite are reported, and inasmuch as the great Huronian belt of metalliferous rocks traverses this region further discoveries are anticipated.

Timber—White and red pine found over the whole region. On the north side of the height of land pine trees measure from eight to nine feet in circumference.

I heard a statement made, I think by the hon. member for Hamilton, last night, that there was not any timber up in that country any larger than a man's thigh. We have here an official report which states that there is timber there ranging from eight to nine feet in circumference. Our hon. friends have a very contracted idea of the resources of their own provinces.

Soil and climate—The whole country northward from the mouth of the Montreal river is pretty correctly described as a level clay plain with rocky hills protruding here and there through it. Mark the distinction between this region and the country south. Clay appears to be uniform throughout the whole region. Several acres of this clay soil are cultivated at the Hudson Bay Company's post at Abbittibbi. All the ordinary cereals cultivated on the St. Lawrence can be cultivated at Abbittibbi.

I may here mention that in 1896 or 1897 seed which had been sent to a point called Lake Wawanisipi 80 or 90 miles north of Lake Abbittibbi by Dr. Robert Bell, of the Geological Survey, was planted and successfully ripened.

Division No. 6, Upper Moose or Mattagami division.

Character of country—Fine agricultural land, clay and sandy loam forms part of great clay basin of Moose river and its numerous tributaries which take their rise near the Canadian Pacific Railway line north of Lakes Huron and Superior, and even south of the line. The head waters of the rivers in this division are well timbered, and the country is well described as an undulating, rolling plain, gently sloping towards James' bay.

Soil is good for farming throughout the greater portion of the country.

Division No. 7, Kabinakagami river division.

Character of country—Generally level plain, slightly inclined to the west, very easy grade, practically level. Soil, clay for the most part. Land low and swampy in places, needs drainage. Rolling land, heavily timbered.

Timber—Good spruce, tamarack, banksin pine, poplar, red pine, cedar, reported throughout this division, besides white birch, balm of Gilead.

Then we come to division No. 8, the 8th division out of the twelve into which the line was divided.

Division No. 8, Long Lake division.

Character of the country—Fine agricultural land. Level and rolling country. Partially dissected plane. Rocky in the southern portion. Flat and generally level along the projected line. Soil—Very productive. Abundant vegetation everywhere. Good timber.

Division No. 9, Nepigon division (in Thunder bay district of Ontario).

Character of country—In part level and undulating and part rocky. The Nepigon region constitutes a dissected plane. Good agricultural land, clay soil and clay loam and sandy loam. Timber—A little north of Lake Nepigon the country is heavily timbered with spruce, banksin pine, poplar and balsam, with occasional birch, also tamarack.

Then we have sections 10, 11 and 12 at the other end of the line, which do not constitute a country which we can call an agricultural country. The last 300 miles, or probably 400 miles, of the line is in a country which it cannot be successfully asserted is likely to be a country which will amount to very much as an agricultural country. There are occasional patches of good land along the water-courses, but they are not large in extent. This is a country which is largely timbered, which will produce a very considerable amount of business for many years to come by reason of the fact that the railway, if it is constructed as suggested, will go along on the lower reaches of the river and will in that respect be in an exactly converse position to that occupied by the Canadian Pacific Railway now. The Canadian Pacific Railway, unfortunately for it, in being built from Port Arthur to the Red river, was built in such a way that it runs along just at the southern end of the rivers which run northward and the timber which is situated near the head waters of these rivers cannot be driven to the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because the flow of the water takes it the other way. The result is that the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Arthur and Winnipeg practically has no lumber business at all except what comes to it from the south by way of the Lake of the Woods. The fact that it touches the Lake of the Woods so that American timber that comes from the Rainy river and across the Lake of the Woods can be shipped by it is the only thing that enables it to do any timber business at all. This line that we are proposing to build will go further north and the timber will be driven down the streams and a large business will be created in that way. I do not know that I need say anything more upon that phase of the subject. I have taken the trouble to have this report prepared, because I thought that the House was entitled to something more than mere fragmentary statements in regard to this matter, and that it was entitled to a systematically prepared statement by a responsible officer of the government which would

give us that information and would give it to us in a form that could be relied upon.

We are at issue with our hon. friends on the other side of the House upon an important question of policy in regard to colonization. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for Lanark have taken the position in this House that in regard to the great and important question of opening up the unsettled portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec the sound and statesmanlike policy to follow is to run colonization railways from the older parts of the provinces and they put the position against the position we take when we say that the sound and statesmanlike method of opening up these unsettled portions of the country is to put a through line of railway through those territories so that we shall be enabled by means of that railway to make it at least probable that settlement will take place. Let us understand each other. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier and the hon. member for Lanark, one representing the province of Quebec and the other representing the province of Ontario, the two provinces that are most concerned in regard to this proposition, say that it is wrong because we propose to put a through line through the northern part of Quebec and through the northern part of Ontario, instead of building colonization railways up from the older portions—and stopping there. Stopping in the woods, stopping nowhere. The policy which is advocated by these hon. gentlemen, if pursued, would, in our judgment, not result in the settlement of that country for many years. I ask the House to compare these two lines of policy. If you cannot do any better in opening up the northern parts of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, build a colonization railway up there. It will help. The Temiscamingue Railway is a meritorious enterprise. It will develop the country, slowly, it is true; it will help towards the development of the country, but I ask hon. members of this House to contrast the development that is likely to take place from two lines of railway, one running from Quebec and the other from Ontario in these respective provinces, to contrast the development that is likely to take place under the policy advocated by my hon. friends with what is likely to take place if we send a transcontinental railway longitudinally through that district, and if we place that district not upon a back street, not away in the woods where nobody can see it, but on the main artery of travel, upon the transcontinental line. When the trade of this line is developed the staff of men who will be required to operate this important railway will be of itself an important nucleus of settlement within that district and the supplies which would be required of one kind or another and the work which gathers around the operation of a great railway will be the very best nucleus of settlement, the very best stimulus, and it is certain that settlement will take place rapidly. I think when the matter is placed before the House there will hardly be any difference of opinion that we will see these northern territories of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec settled much more quickly under the policy which we propose than under the policy which our hon. friends opposite have adovcated. Then, my hon. friend from Lanark—I was rather surprised at him criticising this scheme—asked: What is to become of my province, the province of Ontario? I do not know what my hon. friend considers to be a grievance. We have in Ontario a great undeveloped territory, almot an empire, a territory as long as from Windsor to Montreal and as wide as the fertile portion of the old province of Ontario. We have in the St. Maurice valley in Quebec one million acres of land open for settlement. Ontario is confronted with the task of developing the great territory to the north, she is confronted with an enormous task, a task by which the resources of a provincial government will be taxed in order to carry it out successfully and this government, without asking for a dollar from Ontario, except such as is her share of the general contribution, inaugurates a scheme to put a transcontinental line of railway right through the heart of that territory; yet, my hon. friend from Lanark has nothing to say in regard to that proposition except that there is a grievance on the part of the province of Ontario. If my hon. friend thinks that is a grievance on the part of the province of Ontario—he is generally a man of pretty good sense—I think he will find he has made a mistake this time and I think he will find that the people of Ontario, when he goes out amongst them, will not agree with him in regard to that proposition.

It has been suggested to me at various times that I should make a remark or two about the question of the wheat traffic on this line. Manifestly, Mr. Speaker, no man is called upon to make any definite or specific predictions in regard to the wheat traffic. When the hon. leader of the opposition made the statement the other day that the Canadian Pacific Railway had handled last year forty million bushels of wheat and that only two and a half million bushels went all rail, I queried the statement and I made up my mind that my hon. friend had not been properly informed. I took the trouble to telegraph to the grain commissioner to get the figures, and I find that during the last year the total amount of grain from Manitoba and the North-west of all kinds that came east was 45,087,413 bushels, and that the amount that came all rail was 5,823,000 bushels, so that the percentage of the total that went all rail was

12·9 or practically 13 per cent, instead of 2½ per cent, as the leader of the opposition has been informed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not say two and a half per cent; I said six per cent, and these figures I believe are reliable.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The figures given by the commissioner officially to me, show that the amount that went out by rail was 13 per cent. It is difficult to get correct figures in matters of this kind, and I suppose when my hon. friend made the statement that the return which he had got was in some sense a partial statement and that he had been misled in that way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether the whole of the 5,500,000 bushels he refers to went north of Lake Superior by the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not stated. I have simply the returns of what came to the east by rail.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend will remember, because he wants to be perfectly fair, that what I was speaking of was the quantity that went by the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior. What is the name of the commissioner who made this statement ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Castle. The statement I have is a statement of the amount of grain that went from the west by rail as compared with the amount that went by water, and that is the point with which we are concerned and with which we have to deal in connection with this argument. Now, the figures I have given do not include the shipment of flour, and the advantage which wheat has in shipment by water is not applicable to flour in the same degree. I find in the Inter-State Commerce Commission report for 1901 (page 13) that the subject is fully discussed, and it is pointed out that when it comes to the shipment of flour, the water route has not the same advantage over the rail route that it has in the shipment of wheat. It is well known by those who ship these commodities, that the water route cannot compete in the same degree with the all rail route in the shipment of flour. I do not think there is a difference of opinion as to that. Now, a very large quantity of flour will be shipped from the North-west Territories and Manitoba as time goes on. I do not think that it ever can be said that any large percentage of the crop will be shipped in the shape of flour, but no doubt an enormous quantity of flour will be shipped, a quantity which will furnish an appreciable traffic for a railway. I find further in connection with these shipments, that there is a very substantial amount of wheat that goes from different points by rail as opposed to the water route. I will give these figures, not with the object of showing that the facts will be paralleled in connection with the railway we are speaking of, but I will give the information because it bears upon this discussion, and as I think, because it will lead to a certain conclusion in connection with it. From the city of Chicago in the year 1901, 31,523,000 bushels of wheat went by lake and rail, and 13,969,000 bushels went by all rail. In 1902, from the city of Chicago 22,000,000 bushels went by lake and rail, and 8,190,000 bushels went all rail. This will show that the lake and rail route even when most advantageously situated has not by any means yet a monopoly of the business. Now, let us take the shipments of flour. In the year 1902, 1,086,000 barrels of flour went from Chicago by rail and lake, and 4,752,-000 barrels went all rail, showing that when it comes to the shipment of flour the railway has a great advantage.

We have some times very indefinite ideas as to what rates could be made by railways when they want to make a good rate, and when they get down to a competition basis and find they cannot get any more. I shall give two or three rates as an illustration of what railways can do. I am not going to say that this new railway will open with a rate of this kind, I am not going to say that this railway will carry all its business on a rate of this kind; but the railway we are going to build is going to be a good railway; it is going to be just for the express purpose of carrying heavy loads and giving low rates, and being able to compete with a low rate. Therefore it is proper for us to consider what low rates have been given and can be given on similar commodities as those which we shall haul, in other parts of the continent. I find that the average distance from Kansas city to Chicago by the three roads: The Santa Fe, the Burlington, and the Rock Island is 488 miles. By the report of the Inter-State Commerce Commission for 1901 (page 15) there was in the previous year a rate of five cents per hundred pounds between Kansas city and Chicago. If you take the distance from Winnipeg to St. John via the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway you will find that the equivalent rate from Winnipeg to St. John would be 11½ cents per bushel, and if they can haul wheat for 11½ cents a bushel they can get plenty of it to haul. The Inter-State Commerce Commission report for 1900 (page 22) points out that there had been previously a rate from Buffalo to New York of two and a half cents per bushel. That is not the average rate upon which the wheat is carried, but that was a rate which obtained and under which immense quantities of wheat were carried, and which the railway companies were prepared to maintain if circumstances did not alter. The average distance from Buffalo to New

York by six routes is 443·12 miles, and on this basis the rate from Winnipeg to St. John would be 10·56 cents. Now, to come nearer home, during the past four years the Canada Atlantic Railway has hauled grain from Depot Harbour to Montreal as follows: highest rate four and a half cents; lowest rate two and a quarter cents. There is a break in the route from Depot Harbour to Montreal. It is all rail to Coteau and then there is from 42 to 45 miles of water carriage to Montreal. This rate is what the Canada Atlantic Company charged to haul it over the all rail route and then transhipped it and take it down the 45 miles and deliver it at Montreal. The transhipment and the handling and the carrying for the 43 or 45 miles was certainly as expensive to them as it would have been if they had their own line into Montreal and had taken it through by rail. I fancy there is no doubt that if they had their own line into Montreal they would prefer to carry it in, rather than tranship it and take it 45 miles by water. The comparison therefore is a fair comparison. The distance from Depot Harbour to Montreal is 388 miles, and as I have said, the Canada Atlantic Railway during the past four years has hauled grain from Depot Harbour to Montreal; highest, four and a half cents a bushel; lowest, two and a quarter cents per bushel. If you take the lowest rate of two and a quarter cents, then on that basis the rate from Winnipeg to St. John via the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would be 10·85 per bushel. Now, I want to compare that. I talked with a prominent member of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange the day before yesterday, and I asked him, how that 10·85 cent rate would compare with the rates which he is now paying from Winnipeg to New York by lake and rail. He tells me that, taking into account the rate by lake and the rate by rail, and a small additional charge for extra insurance which they have to pay by reason of this mixed carriage, the rate to-day from Winnipeg to New York is 16¼ cents. And, mark you, if the proposed railway can haul wheat as cheaply as the Canada Atlantic line, it can carry it from Winnipeg to St. John for 10·85 cents per bushel. My hon. friend says in emphatic terms that this railway is not going to haul any wheat. I do not say whether it is or not; but the hon. gentleman must get over these figures before he can convince the public that it is not. They are set forth in the official report, except as regards the Canada Atlantic, which I procured privately, and, as they are in accord with the information received respecting the Canada Atlantic, there can be no question of their accuracy.

When I speak of the traffic which this railway is going to handle, I point to the fact that 1,000 miles of this line from Quebec to Winnipeg are going to be in the province of Ontario and the whole merchandise traffic which now goes by rail from Grand Trunk points in Ontario and Quebec, except that on the new line west of the city of Quebec, will go via North Bay and Temiscaming over 1,000 miles of this useless line, and through the fertile clay belt to Winnipeg. In the face of that fact it is childish to talk of this railway having nothing to do. Within a week after the railway is opened, it will be busy hauling merchandise from eastern Canada. Let me call attention to the fact that the distance, as estimated by an expert officer of my department, from Toronto to Winnipeg by way of Chicago and the American lines over which much of the traffic has gone of late years—especially before the last two years, when the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway made some arrangement about taking the freight northward—is 1,400 miles by one line, and 1,394 by another. The distance from Toronto to Winnipeg by way of the Grand Trunk line to North Bay, from there by the Temiscaming line, and around by the projected line, is estimated at 1,171 miles, or some 200 miles shorter than the main route by which the great business was done for many years by way of Chicago. It may be that the estimated length of the new line is a little short. It is difficult to estimate exactly what it will be, but certainly it will not be more than 1,200 miles. If you take the route by the Canadian Pacific Railway from the city of Toronto to Winnipeg, you find that the distance from Toronto to North Bay is 226 miles, and the distance from North Bay to Winnipeg is 1,060, or a total of 1,286 miles, as against 1,200 miles by the projected road. So that, making a fair allowance for deviations, the length of the new line will be substantially the same as that of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Therefore, we have the city of Toronto placed in communication with the west by this system as directly as it is now by the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have that competition and its increased facilities established. From the city of Montreal and from the city of Toronto the distances will be practically the same. So that we have these connections established on the most favourable terms.

There is another line of trade to which just one word of reference may be made. It is the cattle trade. I want to call the attention of this House to a fact or two with which I think they are not acquainted, because they are not likely to have ever been brought to their attention. I want to call attention to the fact that one of the great industries of the North-west Territories is grazing cattle, as contrasted with raising cattle. Last year we imported into the North-west Territories no less than 50,000 head of what are called stockers, that is, young cattle, bought by the ranchers for the purpose of being finished and perfected for the English market. Where did they get them? They got 25,000 from the good province of Ontario, and our friend Mr. Craw-

ford, the Conservative member for one of the Torontos in the provincial legislature, says they have not at present facilities for sending their cattle to the North-west, and he wants the Grand Trunk Pacific built so that they will have more facilities. Where did they get the rest ? They got them from Mexico. Cannot the farmers of the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces raise cattle to supply the stock grazers on the Northwestern plains ? Why, Sir, it only needs to be stated for us to understand what a profitable business it would be for the farmers of the eastern provinces, who can raise cattle, but who are not able, on account of the want of pasture facilities, to finish them for the English market. Here we have 25,000 stockers in one year coming from far away Mexico, because we have not the shipping facilities to take them from eastern Canada. Not only have we not the shipping facilities to take cattle in, but we have not the facilities to take the cattle out; for I find that Mr. J. T. Gordon, in an interview says that his firm had last year to ship no less than 3,000 head by an American line because they could not get facilities over the Canadian line. And the cattle business in the North-west Territories is simply in its infancy. Last year we shipped out 42,000 head of cattle. That in itself is a pretty substantial business; but it is only a trifle as compared with what is coming. A necessary part of this business is the handling of stockers, and this is a business which the new road will do on an enormous scale, and in which it will be difficult for any other line to compete with it. It will pass through a northern country which will abound with cattle and through which they can be easily and favourably shipped. So we have in that business a large and important item, which will prove a great and substantial source of revenue to the new railway when it is constructed.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the prospects of this enterprise from a financial standpoint ; and I speak as one who has had a considerable personal knowledge of the development of the western country, and of the differences that have been produced in the financial conditions of the railway companies owing to that development. The net profits of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the year ending the 30th of June, 1902, were $14,085,000, and last year its net profits were $15,000,000. The company have made of their railway enterprise a magnificent success, and if they were called upon to-morrow to incur the liability to pay back every cent of public subvention which they have received, and all the money which they have received for lands, notwitstanding that, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would be a good, sound, and solvent concern. Compared with that enterprise, the route from Quebec to Winnipeg by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is a better route. For perhaps one-half of the way there will be a considerable business, particularly in the line of timber, which will constantly contribute to its revenue. And throughout that district, there are good agricultural lands from which we may expect, within a reasonably near future, a fair amount of traffic. The Canadian Pacific Railway, on the contrary, was built around the north shore of Lake Superior. It was built through a rocky country which did not then, and does not now, produce a single pound of traffic, and which is difficult to operate on account of its grades and the sharpness of its alignments and curves. The Canadian Pacific Railway along the north shore of Lake Superior is absolutely unproductive. Then speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway line across the prairies, it runs through the very worst portion of the territories. You could not select a line that could be very much worse unless you got right down close to the international boundary. But this new line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will run from Winnipeg to the Mountain pass through a territory, every mile of which is fertile and productive. It is hardly conceivable that such could be the case, yet the information in the possession of the government amply justifies the statement I have made. There is no such fertile stretch of country in the world. Now take the British Columbia part, for some reason best known to themselves, which nobody has ever been able satisfactorily to explain, the Canadian Pacific Railway chose the Kicking Horse pass, which is the worst pass in the whole lot, and it went through a line of territory which perhaps, of all the different belts that could be opened up through the Rocky mountains is the least productive. And it suffered in consequence. For years it got no traffic, except what its own construction gave, out of that portion which goes through the eastern part of British Columbia. The Grand Trunk Pacific, on the other hand, will go from the Rocky Mountain pass to the coast through as rich a timber and agricultural country as there is in Canada—a country rich in timber, mineral and soil. Then we must not forget that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was projected, there was no movement of settlement from the outside. There were no farmers coming to Canada in 1881 from foreign countries. At any rate their number was inappreciable, and the Canadian Pacific Railway suffered from that fact. That company had dozens of agents out trying to initiate movements of population into our western country but did not succeed to any considerable extent, and for years later there was practically no immigration of any serious volume into the North-west Territories or upon the lands from which the Canadian Pacific Railway had to draw its traffic. What movement of population there was came almost entirely from the eastern provinces. But what is the position now ? We had an immigration

into the North-west of 125,000 people last year. If it keeps on at that rate for the next ten years, think what that will mean for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Think of the difference in the position of that company as compared with that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which went travelling on for years and years before there was any appreciable influx of settlers. Let it be remembered also that when the Canadian Pacific Railway started business, it had no connections with eastern Canada and no way of getting business. What had it to do ? It had to go to Montreal and set to work at an enormous sacrifice to parallel the Grand Trunk Railway by connections all over Canada. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, on the contrary, will start with a magnificent system of connections, ready to open business the very day the road is finished. What does that mean ? It is impossible for us to conceive the difference that will make in the volume of business which the railway company will do. Consider these facts. Consider the prospects of this railway, and ask if there is the slightest reason why any sane, reasonable man should think this company will fail in its obligations to the government.

I have extended my remarks, Mr. Speaker, at much greater length than I had anticipated and must apologize. I have only one point further to call to the attention of the House. We have had in the North-west Territories, ever since this government has been in power, a state of affairs, under which the great bulk of odd-numbered sections of public lands have been held locked up by our obligation to furnish large quantities to railway companies. Many years ago the system was adopted of surveying the country into odd-numbered and even-numbered sections, and of holding the odd-numbered sections for railway purposes, to be given to railways as government land grants. The even-numbered sections were kept as homesteads. We have not been able to deal with the odd-numbered sections in the Territories or Manitoba, because of the fact that we had large obligations outstanding binding us to furnish certain specified quantities of land to various railway companies, under arrangements made by the previous government. I am not expressing any opinion as to whether that was wise or not, but that was our position. But we are now arriving at that position when, I fancy within the next two or three weeks, a final arrangement will be closed, under which the railway companies which have claims for land grants, including the Canadian Pacific Railway, will have those claims finally settled. I am pleased to say that as a result of this, an enormous quantity of odd-numbered sections will come back to the government and be available for disposition in any way which the government may be authorized by parliament to adopt. We shall have no doubt in the neighbourhood of 50,000,000 acres of odd-numbered sections to dispose of in such manner as parliament may authorize. I propose at an early day to submit a measure providing for the disposition of these lands. The first principle will be that the actual settler on an even-numbered section alongside an odd-numbered section shall have the preference in buying that piece of land at a price to be fixed in the manner provided in the Act. But I would point to the fact that we shall enter upon the business of selling something like 50,000,000 acres of land in the territories in a short time, and if we watch the manner in which the business of selling land by railways and land companies, has been going on, we have no reason to doubt that, if we choose, these lands will be disposed of with some degree of rapidity. What I desire to say is this : There is probably, out of that 50,000,000 of acres of odd-numbered section—the even-numbered sections are kept for the poor man's homestead—20,000,000 or 25,000,000 at present so far removed from communication as to be absolutely of no money value whatever. But in my judgment, within ten years from the time this railway is completed, 20,000,000 acres of land owned by the government at present will have acquired a value at least of $3 per acre. That is not a thing about which there is any question. We have seen it happen before, and we know it will happen again. I have quoted this to the House to show that, so far from the railway costing the people anything, the fact will be that the enhanced money value of the property of the government will be four times as great as will be necessary to pay for the road. I simply desire to add that whether you consider this scheme in its broad outline, or its comprehensive and careful details, or whether you consider the manner in which it achieves great results with a minimum of cost, I am satisfied it is a scheme which ought to commend itself to the enthusiastic support of this House.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, some days ago, on the introduction of the Bill, I made some remarks in reference to the question now before the House. I dwelt upon the points of the scheme laid before us as well as I could, considering that I had only had an opportunity to see the Bill after the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads the House, had risen to move the first reading. I have had an opportunity since of looking into the whole Bill, and I intend to supplement the remarks I made by a brief statement, as brief as I can make it, of the reasons which induce me to oppose the measure. Before entering upon

a discussion of the general merits of the Bill, however, I may be pardoned if I make reference to statements made by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and some other hon. gentlemen who have taken part in this debate. The Minister of the Interior prefaced his remarks with a criticism of the speech of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). I shall go more fully into the history of this measure later on, but, without doing so now, I may refer to one point. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals stated that he had heard of the Bill only a couple of weeks before it was introduced in this House —that is the measure of the Grand Trunk, which was discussed at full length in the committee. He afterwards said he never heard of the proposition to build to Moncton until nearly the middle of the session, and that this was tacked on to the original proposition of the Grand Trunk, which was to build the road from North Bay or Gravenhurst to north of Winnipeg, or to Winnipeg, passing over the prairie section and through the mountains to Port Simpson, and a branch from the main line to Lake Superior. To my astonishment I hear now from the Minister of the Interior that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) had the full proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway before him, and was appointed a member of the sub-committee of the council for the purpose of drafting the Bill which is at present before the House. If the hon. gentleman were a party to the whole scheme, he must have known of this line from Winnipeg to Quebec and Quebec to Moncton. The hon. gentleman gave the most emphatic denial, at any rate, to that part which includes the building of the line from Lévis to Moncton. The whole proposition arose out of a request of the Grand Trunk Railway for power to extend their road so as to get the trade of the prairie region of our country. To that proposal I do not suppose there would have been any serious objections by any member of this House. It might be duplicating lines, it might be passing over a section of country over which we are now subsidizing a line, but the feeling of the country was that if any road was to be built into the prairie region, the Grand Trunk Railway should have an opportunity of extending its lines to that country. But, to our astonishment, after the Bill had been delayed from day to day before the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, there was tacked on to the proposition of the Grand Trunk a line from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton. The necessity of that road and the probability or the possibility of its being utilized as a commercial undertaking has never been explained. It is evident that, as the first element, if that proposition is to have any chance of success, it must observe the conditions suggested by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If that road is to command traffic, it must be a modern road, with easy grades and curves and heavy construction. Over this section of the road we have no survey at all. The possibility, or, if possible, the cost of constructing a modern road through that country has not been explained by any gentleman on the other side. We have had a great deal of poetic talk about the development of the west, the teeming myriads of people going to settle upon the prairies, the millions of bushels of grain which are to be taken out of that country and poured into the eastern market—but we have had no statement from any authority as to the possibility of building a commercial road through that country. The hon. Minister of the Interior tries to explain the matter. He states that the modern way of building roads is to apply to this House and get a charter and then go into the undertaking. Let me show him the difference between that and the present proposal of the government. It is true there may be a walk over a section of the country. The possibilities of the road may be considered by the incorporators, and they apply to this parliament for a charter for the purpose of building it. But they have had surveys made before they go into the undertaking. In the present instance parliament is asked to grant an enormous sum of money for the construction of a road of which not even a preliminary survey has been made.

The hon. gentleman who preceded me, and the right hon. gentleman when introducing the Bill, tried to show that there was abundant information before the government in reference to this proposed plan. They stated that explorers had gone through the country and had made a partial location, that Sir Sanford Fleming had made an accurate location of that portion from Lévis to Moncton which the government propose to construct. I propose first of all to deal with these statements of the right hon gentleman and of the Minister of the Interior. The present distance from Lévis to Moncton was stated by the Finance Minister as 497 miles. The estimated distance by Sir Sanford Fleming from Chaudière to Moncton was nearly 400 miles, or, adding ten per cent for curvature, nearly 440 miles, or a saving of nearly 60 miles. He read to the House what he said was information which justified him in adopting this route. He read extracts from a report Sir Sanford Fleming made in 1864 describing the country, but he carefully eliminated from that, any description of the curvature or gradients. The route proposed in the Bill runs from Lévis paralleling the present Intercolonial as far as Rivière du Loup, or perhaps Rivière Ouelle. The shortest point of departure on the Intercolonial Railway for the purpose of making a detour to Moncton around the upper part of the state of Maine, would be at a distance of nearly 100 miles

from Lévis. Then the road from Lévis to that point 100 miles away must pass at a distance of not more than fifteen miles from the presently constructed Intercolonial. A line from Rivière Ouelle or Rivière du Loup to the boundary of the state of Maine, or to the impassable lakes that lie directly to the north of the state of Maine, would be at a distance less than fifteen miles from the Intercolonial. Then he proposed, according to the statement of the Prime Minister, to pass around to Edmundston and from Edmundston by a route which he described as passing at or near Chipman, and thence to Moncton. Sir Sanford Fleming, in his report, shows the absurdity of passing from Edmundston to Moncton. The only possible way of constructing that line is to run down by a road which is at present constructed from Edmundston to Woodstock. When you arrive at Woodstock you must make a turn easterly to a place called Gibson, where there is a road at present constructed, and from Gibson to Chipman and thence to Moncton. If you will take that line and scale it from Point Lévis round these points down along the valley of the St. John river at or near Woodstock over towards Gibson, from there by Chipman to Moncton, you will not shorten the distance of the present Intercolonial Railway by one mile. In the surveys that were made in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, we all remember that the Grand Trunk Railway had a road constructed to Trois Pistoles, and the New Brunswick government were building the European and North American road, and had it built to Moncton. The Nova Scotia government had a road constructed at that time to Truro. Then these were the objective points to make a connection between Moncton and Trois Pistoles, Rivière du Loup or Rivière Ouelle, cutting off a portion of the Grand Trunk Railway to make connection from Truro to Moncton. This line would constitute nearly an isosceles triangle between these three points. There were numerous surveys made over the northern slope of the St. Lawrence for the purpose of finding a route to Moncton. There were numerous surveys made for the purpose of making a connection between Truro and Moncton. After all the surveys were completed, the present line of the Intercolonial was found to be the most practical. Let me read the information procured by Sir Sanford Fleming upon the subject, since the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister gave him as an authority for the location of this particular line of road. He says :

> An air line drawn from Moncton to Rivière du Loup passes entirely within British soil, although near Little Falls it comes within two or three miles of the American boundary. This line is 260 miles in length.

Hon. Mr. ROSS, (Victoria, N.S.). What does he say about the road from Truro to Moncton ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Truro to Moncton—I heard the hon. gentleman speak about that subject. I heard the hon. gentleman remark that he could locate it more accurately with his eye. I heard the hon. gentleman state that the engineer told him in conversation that there would have been a better location from Truro to Moncton than the one at present, if it had not been for the powerful influences of Sir Charles Tupper who diverted the line in the direction of Springhill. It is curious that the hon. gentleman did not find it out till seven or eight years afterwards.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Would the hon. gentleman excuse me ? I knew the history of that road and everything connected with it before I had a seat in this House at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman was in the House in 1872 and 1873.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Yes, and in 1867 too.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. From 1867 up to that date. The Hon. Sir Charles Tupper whom he accused of diverting the line of the Intercolonial Railway to the injury of the people of Nova Scotia had no warmer supporter than the hon. member from Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Ross).

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Again you are wrong.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Notwithstanding the accurate engineering eye that the hon. gentleman talks about with which he describes that section of the country, Sir Sanford Fleming reports that the road as at present constructed has the best possible location that could have been decided upon to reach Moncton. Then we have any amount of information, I am glad to say, in the surveys that were made in 1864 as to the practicability of this short line road which was so graphically described by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He says that the day is past when men will travel fifty or sixty miles more than they ought to do for the purpose of reaching an end. We want short line communication, we live in a quick age, we have to pass quickly from one place to another. One would think, then, that there was no difficulty in constructing the road over that section of the country, that it was possible to get a line as the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says at least sixty miles shorter, or as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emerson) says, 205 miles shorter than the present line of the Intercolonial Railway. Let us see what Sir Sanford Fleming says in reference to that. Most accurate surveys were made from Moncton to Edmundston for the purpose, if possible, of getting a quick line of communication between Moncton and Edmundston :

An air line drawn from Moncton to Rivière du Loup, passes entirely within British soil; although near Little Falls it comes within two or three miles of the American boundary. This line is 260 miles in length.

He says that the construction of these lines, of which this is one, is quite impracticable. Then he goes on:

There are many engineering difficulties on each which render it necessary to depart materially from the straight course and if practicable for military reasons the building of an Intercolonial Railway on either of these lines touching as they do near the American frontier is pronounced by military authorities objectionable.

The construction of the line, therefore, is quite impracticable.

Beginning at Rivière du Loup and following the line laid down at the prescribed distance from the main boundary to the city of St. John, we find that in passing over the mountainous ridge, which separates the St. Lawrence from the Restigouche, not only is a maximum elevation of nearly 2,000 feet above the sea reached, but the surface passed over is of a very broken character; minor ridges nearly all crossing the line in a right-angled direction are constantly met with; these attain elevations ranging from probably 1,000 feet to nearly double that height above the sea and are separated by low lying water channels, of which may be mentioned, Lake Temiscouata, River Toledi, Squatook lakes, besides the branches of Green river. Several of these waters will not exceed 500 feet above sea level.

It goes on to state that:

The exploration similarly undertaken between the St. Lawrence and the Restigouche during the winter 1863-64, although it added to the information previously gathered, proved unsuccessful in the main object in view.

Here is the report of Sir Sanford Fleming. He gives the elevation for the road. What would the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) think of a railway built in that section of the country on which in some sections seven or eight miles in length there would be no possible gradient under seventy feet to the mile one way and sections with similar gradients for six or seven miles the other way?

Mr. EMMERSON. I understand the hon. gentleman is speaking of the survey from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston and down the River St. John?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am speaking of the surveys from Rivière du Loup to the Restigouche river. I am speaking also of the surveys from Edmundston over to Moncton. Edmundston must be the objective point of this line of railway. There is no other possible way. From a point fifteen miles south of River Ouelle or Rivière du Loup it must pass sharply round the state of Maine to Edmundston and go over from Edmundston to Moncton. We were originally told that there was a possible line from Edmundston to Moncton. What I am saying is that Sir Sanford Fleming has shown that that line is totally impracticable, and if you read this report in full you will see that the only line that he suggests there is a line down the St. John river to a point at or near Woodstock, then turning easterly in the direction of Gibson or to a point opposite. Fredericton, from Fredericton to Chipman and from Chipman to Moncton. The only practicable route that I know of in that section of the country is as long as the line of the present Intercolonial Railway with worse gradients and worse curvatures. Now, we are called upon in this scheme to spend a large sum of money for the purpose of making this road, according to the idea of the hon. member for North Norfolk, what? A first-class freight road with not more than four-tenths per cent gradients or a gradient of about twenty-one feet to the mile. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) stated in his speech yesterday that after having had conversation with Mr. McNicol, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other experts in regard to railway traffic, he was satisfied that with such gradients it was possible to contend with water communication, and that was one of his reasons for changing his mind in reference to the difference between water communication and all rail comunication. What have we expended on the Intercolonial Railway? According to the hon. Finance Minister, $68,900,000 to which is to be added the capital account of the present year. According to the hon. Minister of the Interior, $70,000,000 and according to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the capital account is nearly $72,000,000. What would be the result of building this new road? As described by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals from the point of departure it will run parallel with the present Intercolonial Railway to near the River Ouelle. What is the necessity of that? Then you are building a road for what? To assist the freight on the Intercolonial Railway? Will it bring a single ton of freight to the Intercolonial Railway? No. What would be the result of the building of a short line, such as has been described by the right hon. the leader of the government or by the hon. Minister of the Interior? What would be the result as regards traffic if you were to utilize the Chipman branch, or if the Grand Trunk Railway were to build a new line for the purpose of connecting Chipman with the point thirty-three miles north of St. John where this branch would connect with the Intercolonial Railway? You would utilize the Intercolonial Railway for 33 miles from St. John to Chipman and you would abandon the rest of it. Not a pound of freight originating in St. John would pass over the old Intercolonial Railway to Lévis. All that portion of the country through which the Intercolonial Railway runs, Temiscouata, Bonaventure, Matane, &c., would be deprived of efficient railway service. You would not run the same number of passenger or freight trains over the Intercolonial Railway because if you did

you would be duplicating your service, and so if you build that new railway it means the abandonment of a large portion of the Intercolonial Railway. If your new line is a shorter line with easier gradients, the traffic will go from Halifax to Lévis over it, and vice versa. If your new line to Moncton is all that is promised by the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior, the traffic will go over it, and no wonder that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) protested against the injustice that would be done to the people who have located along the line of the Intercolonial Railway. You will not only destroy a road in which we have invested $70,000,000 on capital account, but you will injure every private individual who has invested along that line of railway. We have accumulated deficits on the Intercolonial Railway for a number of years to the extent of $1,500,000 a year, if what should be charged to revenue was charged to revenue and not to capital, and now you want to make it so that the people of Canada will have to pay increased deficits on the Intercolonial Railway. A madder scheme never entered into the mind of man.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not believe it possible, I do not believe it probable, that when the government get correct surveys they will ever build that portion of the road. Why, the surveys on which the Prime Minister relies prove conclusively that that country is impracticable for a railway; impracticable for a modern railway nowadays. When Sir Sanford Fleming reported more than thirty years ago, he was talking of a railway which it was possible to use with 70 feet gradients and a greater curvature than is possible on a modern railway. But for a modern railway such as is talked of by the member for North Norfolk, not all the money and the credit that the government possesses could construct it from Moncton to Lévis by that route. What would be the use of a road nowadays with 75 feet gradients going up and five or six miles of similar gradients going down? Why, you have only to mention it to show the absurdity of this scheme, and the improbability of such a road ever being constructed and used as a commercial highway. The Finance Minister presumes that this section can be constructed for $8,000,000. It can not be constructed for anything of the kind. If the gradients to be observed in the construction of that road are anyway modern, it cannot be constructed for anything like that amount, and railway construction through a similar country demonstrates it. If such a railway as the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) speaks about were built there, the country would stand aghast at the amount of money it would cost. On the next section of the line we pass over the bridge and into the city of Quebec. We are told that the bridge has contracts at present with half a dozen railways. The Minister of Finance estimates that the share of the transcontinental line in the user of the bridge would be about $2,000,000. I suppose that would be a fair amount. I do not know anything about the cost of construction or the expenditure on that bridge, but if this line uses the bridge I suppose it will have to pay for it, and the assertion is that when the bridge is finished it will cost between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000. The Finance Minister estimates it at $4,500,000, and the user by the government railway would perhaps be fairly compensated for by $2,000,000. Then the railway goes from Quebec westerly to Lake Abbittibbi. We have had a wonderful description of that country from the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior. The Minister of the Interior has put upon the Table a map showing the routes which his officers have traversed, dividing it into twelve zones, and giving a description of each on the authority of Dr. Ami, an officer of the department. Let me tell the minister, in the first place, that this road from Quebec to Lake Abbittibbi does not pass over the height of land. The height of land drops a little towards Lake Abbittibbi, and the dividing line between the St. Lawrence and the Hudson bay is about the objective point which the road will take. Now, every man who has travelled in the northern section of this country knows it to be diversified with granite ridges, with little lakes in abundance and large lakes in every section. I wish from the bottom of my heart that that section of the country should prove to be the Eldorado which is described by the Prime Minister. It is a most difficult country in which to build a railroad on modern lines—a road equal to the Grand Trunk Railway, a road with modern gradients, a road with 90-pound rails, a road of that kind through such a country would cost an almost incalculable sum of money. I hope that the minerals that the hon. minister described may be found in that country. I hope that the potentialities of the waterfalls, described by the Minister of Finance, may be applied to modern science; for the potentialities would need to be vast indeed to make that road any kind of a safe commercial enterprise. I am not decrying the country, and perhaps some of it may be covered with timber which might be of more value than the same number of acres in the most fertile part of Ontario.

I hope, and it is the hope of every man in this country, that minerals of an economic character may be found in that section of country; but we have no information on that subject except the bald statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior that the officers of his department have found on the shore of Lake Abbittibbi, iron, gelena and soapstone or steatite. That is the only information we have on that subject. Pass-

ing westward from there you cross the height of land, and some of the largest rivers, probably, in the Dominion of Canada. It is not necessary to give their names, but there are seven or eight rivers which it would cost enormous sums to bridge. Continuing westward, you pass another lot of rivers which run into James bay, constituting the sources of the Moose river, most difficult to cross. The Minister of the Interior says there is here a district of arable land capable of sustaining a large population. The statement which I made when the Bill was introduced is the fact—that the granite ridge which occurs in that section of the country extends on the Quebec side up to James bay; and from that ridge there is a drop of 300 or 400 feet. From James bay to that dip is a distance of only 50 miles. In that section there may be arable land, and it may be a somewhat level country. Having a level so much lower than that of Winnipeg, I think that perhaps the fact of its being so much further north does not count much as to climate; and it may be that in the future that country, as far as Brunswick House, will sustain a large population. Does this railway go near there? It goes about 50 miles south of Lake Abbittibbi, which is 170 miles from James bay, or 120 miles from the nearest fertile land. So that the railway cannot be of the slightest benefit in reaching that particular section of the country. Then, you go westerly across these rivers until you pass to the north of Lake Temiskaming. I believe it is proposed that this railway shall pass 70 miles north of the extension which the government of Ontario are building up to Lake Temagami. What sort of country is it in that direction? We have no report. Are we near the arable plateau of James bay? No, we are far from it. This road does not run near it at all. It runs between the plateau and the height of land, and over that granite ridge of 300 or 400 feet high, which is continuous in that circle, and through a country which, notwithstanding the statement of the Minister of the Interior, is incapable of sustaining a population; a country of ridges of granite with muskegs between them. The hon. gentleman produces a map here on which you will notice that all the lines run north and south. They are drawn in that way because the man who prepared the map was very careful of his reputation. He divides the country into twelve zones which are made by the tracks of the explorers along the banks of the various rivers. As I have heard from geologists who have been in the country again and again, there is a fringe of wood along each river, which extends for two or three miles on each side of the river; but between that and the next river are impassable morasses and muskegs, which unless drained, are totally unfit for cultivation. Then passing to the north of Lake Nipissing, we go on to the north shore of Nepigon. There have been surveys made in that section, starting at a point 35 miles north of Lake Nepigon, and going westerly towards the Montreal river and westerly towards Winnipeg. A description of the surveys was in the department. They were made in 1872, but I think the records of them were burned in 1873. However, I had the privilege of conversing frequently with engineers who were in that section of the country. A surveyor named Keating had the surveying westerly. The surveyor of the country easterly was named, I think, Thompson. One of the men under him was Mr. Secretan, of this city. I have had from these men descriptions of that country, and the description I gave in my address a few days ago was strictly accurate. The hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. member for North Norfolk stated that we had surveys from the north of Lake Nepigon westward towards Winnipeg. I stated in an interruption that after passing the north shore of Lake Nepigon, the survey took a southerly direction until it struck the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and went on from that point to Winnipeg. Suppose a line were run westerly to Winnipeg, where would it strike? We have no description at all. Will it go south of Lake Seul or Lonely Lake and along the shores of English river, or will it adopt the most feasible route, which has been adopted by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Wabigoon to Winnipeg? A road constructed by the shortest line from the head of Lake Nepigon to Winnipeg would duplicate the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway for 242 miles from Wabigoon to Winnipeg. What would be the use of a road of that kind? The only possible use of it to the Grand Trunk Company would be for the purpose of making a connection with their terminus at North Bay and for building a road from that line to Lake Superior.

Now, the section of the country I have been speaking of is without surveys. There is simply a charter for a railway obtained by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. We are asked to enter into an undertaking which will cost an enormous sum of money. Do the Grand Trunk Pacific Company ask for it? Was it mooted in the request with which they came before this House? No, they could not get a simple charter for the purpose of obtaining connection with Manitoba and the North-west without being loaded down with the useless undertaking to build a railway from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton. The Minister of the Interior asked: Would you allow them to build a road to the head of Lake Superior? Would you allow them to build a road for the purpose of making their connections with North Bay? If you did, what would be the result? And he turned around and appealed to his followers as he asked this question. The result would be, he

said, that the enormous traffic, which would otherwise go to St. John and Halifax, would pass down to the Gdanr Trunk Railway to Portland. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that it would pass down first of all to Montreal, and if Montreal had the accommodation and was the seaport it ought to be—from thence into the ocean steamers. Is it necessary then to load down the undertaking with this useless expenditure ? And all for an idea ! Fancy a man representing the North-west Territories and Manitoba making it a condition, in behalf of Manitoba and the North-west Territories—a purely patriotic condition—that this expenditure should be incurred because of the possibility of thereby preventing freight going down to Portland and sending it instead to St. John and Halifax ! We have not had a statement from any minister as to the gradients on that road and as to the lines on which they intend to construct it. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that if we build it, it must be built on commercial principles, up to modern requirements. Is that possible ? Is it possible to build a road from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton on modern principles, or with a gradient of twenty-one feet to the mile ? Has it ever entered into the idea of the ministers what an enormous sum will be required for the construction of that road? Let me give you an instance. Let me take a road, which is comparatively easy for the greater section of it, compared with the one contemplated. I refer to the road from North Bay to Fort William constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, Sir, that road cost $60,000 per mile. To build a road from the head of Lake Nepigon to Winnipeg and from Winnipeg to Quebec, of even the character of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William—which is not a modern road, the gradients on which are fifty-six feet to the mile and more—would cost $60,000 per mile.

Mr. COWAN. Why be so modest ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What about ?

Mr. COWAN. Making such a modest calculation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am giving the facts. Does the hon. gentleman contradict them ? Does he know that my statement is incorrect ? I am giving it on the authority of parties who are at present on the road and are running the Canadian Pacific Railway, that that section from North Bay to Fort William cost them $60,000 per mile. But suppose we take the statement of the Finance Minister or of the right hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, that the cost will be $35,000 per mile. Is there any justification even for that expenditure ? Of what practicable utility will be that road ? Can any sane man tell me that there will be a carload of wheat taken from Winnipeg to St. John ? The hon. the Minister of the Interior gave half a dozen instances of railways carrying grain to Chicago. He gave the distance and the rate per bushel, and applying the same calculation to a railway constructed from Winnipeg to St. John, he said we will be able to carry wheat from Winnipeg to St. John for ten cents per bushel. I am not sure whether he did not say ten cents per hundred pounds, but he certainly said ten cents per bushel. Well, take the cost of carrying wheat from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. The distance by the Canadian Pacific Railway is 420 miles, and by the Canadian Northern Railway it is about 439 miles. The Manitoba government passed an order in council reducing the rate for the carriage of wheat from Winnipeg to Lake Superior to ten cents per hundred pounds. A modern car has a freight capacity of about 60,000 pounds, which would mean for the carrying of a car of wheat from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior, $60. Add to that the cost of bringing back the car, as it would not use more than one-third its freight capacity on the return trip. Take one-third off, 420 miles, and add the balance to 420, and you will have 700 miles. They are therefore carrying a carload at present 700 miles for about sixty dollars. That is the cheapest rate at which it is possible to carry it, and I do not believe that either the Northern or the Canadian Pacific Railway are able to realize any profit at that rate. You pay about six cents per bushel from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior ; you pay one-and-a-quarter to Midland ; you pay, as the Minister of the Interior said a short time ago, from two and a quarter cents up to three and a-half cents, and as much as four cents from Midland to Montreal. What would it take from there to Quebec ? A very little sum of money. Is it possible then that any railway can be constructed from Winnipeg to Quebec which would compete with that route ? If carriage by rail is cheaper than carriage by water, why is it that 45,000,000 bushels of wheat go by water from Chicago to Buffalo ? Why do not they send it by rail ? The distance is two and a half times greater by water than by rail. They send it by water for the simple reason that railways, even with the most modern appliances and gradients cannot compete with a water navigation. If you want to utilize the surplus products of the North-west and Manitoba by shipping them through your own territory, the seaport of the North-west and Manitoba is the head of Lake Superior. Utilize your means of communication from Port Arthur down through the St. Lawrence canals. If the St. Lawrence canals are not adequate for the purpose, the money you are about to spend in this useless undertaking would give us all the water communications we require. The Georgian Bay canal project, I believe, is the best. By that system of communication from the Ottawa river and Lake Nipissing to Montreal, you

would have a system equal to that from Lake Superior down to Buffalo and Chicago and the other American ports. I am with the right hon. gentleman to this extent, that I believe with him that the country is on the top wave of prosperity, and there is a feeling amongst the people that this is the propitious time for the development of our resources. There is a feeling in the country that we are lagging behind in the race, and that, to use the expression of the right hon. gentleman, we are, compared with our rivals to the south, like the toad under the harrow.

The people feel that now is the time to develop, as quickly as possible the resources of this immense country, looking to the day when we shall be an independent nation not dependent on any people or any country on the face of the Globe, when we have a population of twenty or twenty-five million. But the right hon. gentleman has not seized his opportunity, he has not brought forward the policy by which that opportunity may be improved. As I said, we duplicate the Canadian Pacific Railway from Wabigoon to Winnipeg. And then, in order that the Grand Trunk may carry their scheme into practical effect they must have a road to the head of Lake Superior. Why do they not abandon that idea if they intend to bring the surplus products of Manitoba and the North-west to the Atlantic seaboard by rail? They know that they would not be in the race if they did not use the modern means of communication by bringing the grain to our seaport at the head of Lake Superior, there to be shipped to the place of consumption in the eastern world. It is a necessity for them to have this connection at the head of Lake Superior. West of Winnipeg, for the purpose of opening up those fertile plains described so graphically by the Minister of the Interior, we assist them to build a line through a country to cover which with a line of railway we have already arranged to loan $9,000,000. In building from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, this line will go to Edmonton. Why dupulicate the line which has already been assisted ? Where is the necessity for having two lines of railway between Winnipeg and Edmonton ? There is none whatever. The extension of the road from Edmonton to Port Simpson will develop the country. I hope to see developed upon the Pacific, not merely the harbours of Victoria and Vancouver, but also that of Port Simpson, and to see those harbours thronged with ships bearing the products of the east to be exchanged for the products of our country. It may be that for seven or even for ten years that section may not pay, but eventually it will pay, and it will not only greatly help the development of the North-west, but it will benefit the whole country. No man on this side of the House has opposed such a proposition. Never has a Liberal-Conservative party failed in its faith in the country. Ours is the party that built up the country, and we have never opposed even a lavish expenditure where that expenditure carried with it a reasonable hope of benefit for Canada. But I fail to see a scintilla of evidence that the eastern portion of this road proposed by the right hon. Prime Minister will be of any use. It would have been a gratification to my old leader the late Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, could he have been present and heard the praise bestowed by hon. gentlemen opposite upon his policy which in his lifetime they condemned ; to hear his acts cited as examples and excuses for the government of the present day ; to find that in everything he is imitated by the very men who did the best they could to thwart his aims and to make impossible the carrying out of this policy. Everything that the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his friends condemned when we were in power and they were in opposition, is being adopted by them to-day, even to the policy of protection which for so long they resisted and denounced. But the hon. member for North Norfolk while he praised the acts of the late Sir John Macdonald, could not resist criticising them almost in the same breath. He could not resist having a fling at the Canadian Pacific Railway and the terms under which it was built. He condemned the scheme of Sir John Macdonald in regard to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway as extravagant. But he forgot to say that his own friends, when in power in 1874, put upon the statute-book of this country a proposition to build that road on terms far more extravagant than those which were afterwards secured by the Conservative government. They offered $10,000 a mile to begin with, the contractors to receive a sum per mile in excess of that amount which sum was to be agreed upon and to be paid in twenty-five years with interest at four per cent. Besides this the contractors were to have 20,000 acres of land per mile. But the hon. member for North Norfolk forgot to mention that. In his estimate of what the Canadian Pacific Railway, as built by the Conservatives had actually cost, he estimated $62,000,000 in cash and railway works completed, and he took the land grant as being worth $5 or $6 per acre—some very high figure——

Mr. COWAN. Three dollars an acre.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes—$60,000 per mile, and added this to the $62,000,000 given to the construction of the road. Why, when this land grant was given it was worth no such sum as that. It is useless, valueless, without railway communication. We bought the whole country for somewhere in the region of a million dollars——

Mr. SPROULE. A million and a half—three hundred thousand pounds sterling.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yet, though the land was worth nothing until the road was

built, the hon. gentleman has estimated it at the price which it might afterwards have brought. He forgot to say also that the Canadian Pacific Railway are taking from the Canadian government as part of their land grant nearly 2,000,000 acres of land in a country which was arid, upon which hardly a blade of grass would grow, intending to spend some $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 in irrigating it, and so giving it value and making it useful. In giving a land grant, we were doing exactly what the people in the United States did—giving a part of the land in order to have it all developed. We did it successfully. The Finance Minister did not say a word about it, he did not say one word finding fault with giving the land for the purpose of building that magnificent work of which we are all so proud.

Now, I may be asked, What scheme do you propose? We are told that the people of Canada are ambitious, that we are on the top of the wave of prosperity, that we are anxious to develop every section of the country. In my opinion, the transportation question is the most important one to settle. Cheap means of communication are essential to our development. I may be asked: What scheme do you propose instead of that submitted by the right hon. gentleman. There are a great many propositions, but none of them involve the absurdity of the proposition of building a line from Winnipeg to Quebec and Quebec to Moncton. It is alleged that we need to do justice to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which has been a great benefit to the country, and has expended large sums of money for which its stockholders have received no return. If it is necessary to give that company an opening to the North-west, if it is necessary, as north-western men say, to correct what they allege are excessive rates, for goodness sake, let us adopt a sensible plan instead of that proposed by the right hon. gentleman. Let it be left to experts to decide upon which is the best plan and most likely to develop our resources. Let us have some engineer to report upon the subject. Let us not go into this enterprise without any figures, without a single survey, without any technical knowledge of the country. Let us, before making this jump, obtain the fullest possible information. If the Grand Trunk people wanted to get into that section of country, their first proposition was the most sensible one, namely, the extension of the Ontario system of railways to Winnipeg and from Winnipeg to Port Simpson. I think the company's proposition had some merits to commend it, but the government loaded them down for no other reason but political reasons. Why did they force the Grand Trunk Railway Company, if they wanted to go in and develop Manitoba and the North-west, to build a railway to Quebec? Why did they force them to take over the Quebec bridge? Why did they force them to build useless lines of railway in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? Do the company want to do so? Is it in the interest of the people of the North-west? No, the people of Manitoba want to get the highest possible price for their grain, they want the cheapest possible mode of carriage for their wheat to the point of consumption. They do not want to load down the people of this country with the enormous debt which is proposed by the right hon. gentleman. What is the debt? The distance from Lévis to Moncton, as stated by the Prime Minister, is 425 miles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He estimated it at 400 miles, not 425.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But he added the curvature, and his statement was that from Chaudière Junction, giving what he called a liberal estimate, it was 425 miles. Estimating the cost at $35,000 per mile, you get $15,000,000. The distance from Quebec to Winnipeg is 1,400 miles, and estimating the cost at $35,000 a mile, you get a total amount of $49,000,000. Then there was the little calculation in reference to interest that has to be paid on cost of construction. When I made a statement the other day, I had not read the articles of agreement, I thought the government would pay interest on the money during the construction of the road, and that that was an expenditure not to be calculated in the amount of 3 per cent to be charged to the company. I find upon looking at the agreement that the debentures are issued and guaranteed by the government as the road is constructed, and that the company become liable for the 3 per cent on the expenditure on the eastern section from the time the government pay over the money. That was the statement of the Minister of the Interior to-day when he corrected me in my calculation. Take the calculation of the Finance Minister. Making a moderate estimate of $35,000 per mile for both of these sections, it amounts to an expenditure of $50,000,000. They have to pay interest. Never mind about our glorious surplus of $15,000,000. By making an actuarial calculation and applying that money we have in hand at the rate of 3 per cent or 3½ per cent interest, what will it amount to? The Finance Minister forgot that he lost interest on it from the time of payment to the time that he expended the money. There is 3 per cent upon $49,000,000.

Mr. COWAN. You are wrong. He allowed for that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know what the hon. gentleman says?

Mr. WADE. He included the interest in his calculation?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The three per cent payable by the company commences seven

years after the construction or the handing over of the work and after the company commences to operate. Then, for seven years we have to pay interest on the amount ourselves. During the next three years if the company earn the amount they are obliged to pay the interest, but if they do not earn it, the unpaid interest for three years is capitalized at three per cent. Then the hon. Minister of Finance calculates the distance in the mountain section to be about 450 miles which, at $30,000 per mile, would cost $13,500,000. For seven years we pay upon that amount. We pay the full amount of the expenditure for the purpose of constructing the road from Winnipeg to Quebec, we pay the full amount of the expenditure for the construction of the road from Quebec to Moncton, we hand the road over to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and pay the interest upon the cost of construction for seven years, and if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are not able to pay the interest during the three years succeeding the seven years term, we add that to the capital account and charge them three per cent upon it. How that obligation is going to cost the people of this country $13,000,000 or $15,000,000 is the most extraordinary thing I ever heard of. Surely we are expending the money in the construction of the road. We pay out the money for the interest upon it for seven years and these sums of money put together will impose an obligation upon us, as I calculate it and as it is calculated by the hon. Minister of Finance, of $70,000,000. Then, for the purpose of gratifying the people of Quebec who do not really want the road, which will be of no public utility to them, and for the purpose of expending $15,000,000 in the province of New Brunswick we are called upon to add to the debt of this country in the next seven or ten years an amount equal to more than $75,000,000. I will venture to say that when the road is completed you will find that the sum of money expended for the purpose of carrying out this contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will not be $75,000,000 because, as I said before, it is impossible that the road can be constructed for that amount. Having the experience and the knowledge that we have at present as to what roads cost in that section of the country and knowing that the expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of the road from North Bay to Fort William was $60,000 per mile, I do not think it is possible to leave that road in the first-class condition which it is proposed to do with ordinary gradients, not gradients of twenty-one feet to the mile, but ordinary gradients of fifty-two feet to the mile, for less than $125,000,000. What could we do with an expenditure of $125,000,000 ? What works for the development of the country could we construct with that money ? We could have a road, as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway originally proposed built to Fort Simpson. We could have our waterways enlarged to meet modern requirements which call for a depth of twenty feet, we could have the Georgian Bay canal built, we could have communication between the port of Montreal and the city of Quebec and the whole navigation of the St. Lawrence put in first-class condition. I will leave it to the people of this country to say which they prefer. If it is the question of transportation that is first in the minds of the people, if that is the all absorbing question, if it is a question as to what will tend to the development of this country more than anything else, seizing the present moment and making, if you like, a lavish expenditure for the purpose of developing the country upon the lines I propose will accomplish more to render the resources of Canada available than anything else. Cheap transportation will divert the trade of any country from one road to another. We have the experience of the United States. A half a cent a bushel will divert the trade from New York to Baltimore, or to Philadelphia, or to Boston. The expenditure for the building of the Georgian Bay canal would be justified by the results, the parties who built the canal would get a good return for their investment and you would be enabled to transport to Montreal wheat delivered at Fort William or Port Arthur for five cents per bushel which is nearly the present rate. The whole scheme of transportation ought to be thought out. The government of the country ought to appoint their experts for the purpose of doing it. They ought not to jump in with wild cat schemes for the purpose of developing the country as they pretend it is for that purpose, but there ought to be a thorough investigation, first, to ascertain what the results of any such scheme would be. I am confident that if a commission of experts, men who have studied the question, commercial men, engineers, looked into this proposition not a single man from one end of the country to another would be in favour of the scheme as proposed by the right hon. the leader of the government. We are told that boards of trade are petitioning in favour of it, that the Board of Trade of Toronto and the Board of Trade of Halifax have petitioned for it. I have a great deal of respect for the boards of trade but I have more respect for the intelligence of the people of this country either as exemplified by representatives on this side of the House or by the right hon. gentleman and his supporters on the other side of the House. I have a great deal of respect for boards of trade. Is there any feeling in the country in favour of this proposition Was there any agitation in the country in favour of it ? The hon. Minister of the Interior read letters in favour of it. I could read letters to the contrary. He quoted partial remarks by newspapers and he quoted my hon. friend from East Grey

(Mr. Sproule) as a supporter of transcontinental roads. He quoted my hon. friend from East Grey as saying that it would require fifteen or sixteen transcontinental roads in the prairie section of the country. What the hon. gentleman said was that to meet the requirements of the people of that section of the country and to carry out their grain in a couple of months it would require fifteen or sixteen transcontinental roads. Do they require anything of the kind ? For the purpose of the trade of that country it would be sufficient to erect elevators in the different sections of the country and large elevators at the ports on Lake Superior at which the grain is received to be shipped out for consumption in foreign countries. That is the proper system to adopt. No railway will put upon its road rolling stock sufficient to move the whole crop of the country in two or three months. It would pay no company in the world. If there was proper rolling stock, and if the elevators were sufficient to store the grain, there is sufficient railway accommodation in that section of the country at present. The commercial requirements of that country when they arise will be satisfied by railroads which are in existence, and by other railroads which will be developed by the people themselves. There is no necessity for the government entering into such a project. It may be necessary to develop new parts of the country to build railways, but there is no part of the Dominion so well served with railways now as Manitoba and the North-west. I venture to say that there is not 1,000,000 bushels available for sale in that section of the country which has not at present been carried by railroads to the point of shipment. The Minister of the Interior said that the Montreal 'Gazette' had stated that it was in favour of a line from North Bay to the Pacific, with such branches as the company thought it commercially wise to construct, and that the 'Gazette' stated that no one would have successfully attacked such a proposition. The Minister of the Interior gave that as the opinion of one of the leading commercial papers of Canada, the Montreal 'Gazette,' in favour of this scheme, but he forgot to read this portion of the 'Gazette's' article :

> This wild project should be dropped until there is time to find out what it means in the country financially and when that is made plain and thought over by prudent men it will be probably dropped altogether. It is to be regretted that the Grand Trunk project has had these political features appended to it.

That is exactly the view of a great many members on this side of the House. The Grand Trunk Railway came to parliament with a plain commercial proposition. They were anxious to enter into the North-west to compete for the carrying of the immense products of that fertile country. They came with a proposition of their own, but for political reasons, and for political reasons alone, they are loaded down with two useless propositions, namely, the road to Quebec and the road to Moncton. I hope yet that the right hon. gentleman will drop the scheme. I appeal to him not to risk the financial position of the country in an expenditure so ridiculous. If the country north of Quebec has the resources he thinks, let us develop it as we have been developing it in the past, and as Ontario has been developing the Temagami district ; let us develop it locally by roads through that section of the country. I have proved conclusively that there is no necessity for this road in New Brunswick. It is a useless appendage. It is a destruction of property at present owned by the government of the country. It will entail on us a loss of nearly $60,000,000 out of the $72,000,000 we have invested in the Intercolonial Railway. You are destroying one portion of your property by erecting a new property. You are giving no better line to accommodate the commerce of the country. Your scheme is ridiculous.

The Minister of the Interior talked about other railways having running rights over this line. The ex-Minister of Railways fully showed the absurdity of that. One would think it was a new power that was given to railroads. Why, the Railway Committee of the Privy Council can grant running powers to any railroad in Canada on any other railroad. What was the object of putting it in this charter and agreement, when it is in the law of the land already ? And yet, the Minister of the Interior told us that the agreement would never have been signed if that clause were not in it. As the Minister of Finance truly said, this power may be used as a lever for the purpose of making proper freight arrangements with other roads. It enables a company that has running powers over another road to make satisfactory arrangements for the carrying of their freight or the exchange of traffic.

Mr. DAVIS. Have we the power to grant running rights over the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway to another company ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Under the contract ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have it in the statute, and it is embodied in the new Railway Bill. The Railway Committee of the Privy Council have the power to grant running rights over any road in Canada to any other road on such conditions as they think right and equitable, and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has frequently exercised that power. Independent of that, some railroads have it in their charters. You will find it in the new Railway Commission Bill.

Mr. DAVIS. The new Railway Commission Bill does not interfere in any way with

the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It does not claim to interfere with their freight rates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am not talking about freight rates, I am talking about running rights. The Railway Commission Bill interferes with the Canadian Pacific Railway as much as it does with any other railway, except that a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway is exempted in regard to its freight rates. Their schedule of rates was approved by the Governor in Council from Lake of the Woods westward for a certain distance, and the Canadian Pacific Railway's contention was that that exhausted the power of the government to alter or amend their rates under the terms of their contract. Under the new Railway Bill a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway is exempt as regards freight rates, but that has nothing to do whatever with the power to grant running rights or make arrangements for the exchange of traffic over their road.

With regard to the question of routing, one of the special conditions is that freight routed in a particular direction is to be carried in that direction. Another condition is that the company will not discriminate against Halifax and St. John in favour of Portland, or, in other words, that freight which is given to them for the purpose of being carried to a specified seaport is to be carried to its destination, and they are not to use any influence for the purpose of diverting it to another point. The Intercolonial Railway once had an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway in reference to routing freight from Montreal to Halifax and from Montreal to St. John. We made a bargain not to discriminate against them, but to let any one who chose to ship over their line to do so. What was the consequence ? Any office boy on the Intercolonial Railway knew, without any instructions. knew what was in the interest of the railway, and wherever possible he would send the freight along the Intercolonial Railway, and give it the advantage of the haul. You cannot help that. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) said that a shipper at Winnipeg who wanted to send some material to Liverpool would go to the Grand Trunk Pacific office there for the purpose of routing it. As long as the railway sends the material to Liverpool, the man who sends it as a rule does not care which way it goes so long as it is sent. He is asked, 'What route do you want to send it by ? There are three routes—to Portland, to Halifax and to St. John.' 'I want to send it to St. John.' The official tells him, 'I will be glad to accommodate you, but you will have to wait a day or two for a car to that port. We have a car to-day going to Portland, and if you will send it there you will have the advantage of having a ship ready to take it to Liverpool, whereas if you send it to St. John it might have to wait a week or ten days before it would get a ship.' The smallest boy connected with the railway would see without any direction that every pound of freight is routed where it is most in the interest of the company to send it. That clause in your agreement is not worth a cent.

The clause with regard to the rolling stock I do not clearly understand. I do not understand whether the rolling stock on this road may be hired, or whether a company may not be formed to rent to the Grand Trunk the rolling stock that is to be placed on this road, without coming under the mortgage that is to be given to the government. Clause 22 of the agreement provides :

> The company shall equip both divisions of the said line of railway with modern and complete rolling stock suitable and amply sufficient for efficient operation and the handling of all classes of traffic to the satisfaction of the government, and the first equipment for the completed road shall be of the value of, at least, twenty million dollars, of which not less than five million dollars worth shall be supplied for the operation of the eastern division of the said railway, and the said five million dollars worth of rolling stock, together with all renewals thereof and additions thereto, shall be marked as assigned to the said eastern division and shall be held to be and form part of the equipment of the eastern division of the railway during the said period of fifty years and shall be used as the equipment appertaining thereto, according to the ordinary practice of railways during the said period of fifty years.

I do not clearly understand whether a company may not be formed for the purpose of leasing this stock to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and whether the railway company would not be performing the conditions of this obligation by putting that rolling stock on the road, and whether that stock would be liable under the mortgage, or only the residuary interest which the company has in the stock. My own impression is that a subsidiary company could perform the conditions of this contract by purchasing the stock and leasing it to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. If that is not so, and the company has to purchase the stock outright and put it upon the road, I would like to have an explanation of how this condition appears in section 14 :

> For the purposes of this agreement, the expression 'working expenditure,' as applied to the eastern division of the railway, shall mean and include all expenses of maintenance of the said division, and of the stations, buildings, works and conveniences belonging thereto, and of the rolling and other stock and movable plant used in the working thereof, and all such tolls, rents or annual sums as are paid in respect of property leased to, or held by, the company in respect of the said eastern division (apart from the rent of any other leased line), or in respect of the hire of rolling stock let to the company as part of the equipment of the said eastern division, but not including the rental of the said division payable by the company to the government.

This puts the hire of the rolling stock in the category of working expenses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is no doubt about that—on hired rolling stock.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why could not the whole stock be hired ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend, but if he will refer to section 35 he will see at a glance that it is not possible for the whole of the rolling stock to be hired.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I read that: 'A mortgage which shall be a first charge upon the railway, undertaking, equipment and property.' That is the only equipment that may belong to this company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If it belongs to the company my hon. friend speaks of, how could the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway give a first charge on it?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will they be conforming with the conditions of this contract if they lease this equipment and put it on the road?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not for the $20,000,000 of equipment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not to the extent of the $5,000,000?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not to the extent of $20,000,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, I would judge from what has been said by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that they can do it to the extent of $15,000,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They must be in a position to give on that $20,000,000 of equipment a first charge to the government. They may get the property as they choose, so long as it is once on the road, it is liable to the first charge of the government.

Mr. GOURLEY. How could it be unless they owned it?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the answer.

Mr. GOURLEY. You are putting a supposititious case.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If I am the owner of equipment or rolling stock and lease it to a company and agree to waive my charge in favour of the government, I have a perfect right to do it. It is a very simple thing.

Mr. GOURLEY. But the owner would not waive it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then we are to understand from the Minister of Justice that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have to put $20,000,000 worth of equipment on that road free from any mortgage, lien or anything else to any other company. If not, I am correct in my statement that they need not put on one cent of rolling stock except the $5,000,000 worth which will be liable to the government lien.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend be correct, then the contract is badly drawn. That was not the intention of the parties.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The intention of the parties is another thing. The Minister of Justice says that under this clause the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or transcontinental railway, have to put $20,000,000 worth of stock upon that road, which will go, without any other incumbrance, as security to the government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am glad to hear that such is the case, because that is a further security for the expenditure of $13,000 per mile and $30,000 per mile. I have no doubt that that was the intention, but I doubt very much whether the agreement covers it. We may take it for granted that the Grand Trunk Railway are obliged to put $20,0000,000 of stock upon the road, which will be security to the government for the loan of $13,000 per mile from the prairie section to Winnipeg and the loan of $30,000 per mile upon the mountain section. Then I see another clause which provides that $24,000,000 of common stock shall be taken by the Grand Trunk Railway, for which they may not pay a dollar, and be held by it as security for any advance or any endorsation or any agreement which they enter into. They get that stock for nothing, and it may be necessary to be held by them for the purpose of controlling the stockholders of the transcontinental railway. I hope that the government will take proper means to see that every dollar the company expends is accurately shown, so that the government guarantee will not cover more than 75 per cent. But that is a very difficult undertaking, for we know how railway companies and contractors whip the devil around the post, to use a popular expression. The government have no security at all that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will carry out its agreement except the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway. The hon. Minister of Finance has said that the old Grand Trunk Railway, with its enormous properties, with its assets to the extent of $250,000,000, is at the back of the concern. Well, the obligation of the Grand Trunk Railway to the government of this country is to be valued by the measure of the Grand Trunk Railway stock. What does it sell for in the market? Does this bargain have a preference over the stockholders, the debenture-holders, and the bondholders? Not at all. You have no security, therefore, with reference to any part of this agreement. All you have is the promise of the Grand Trunk Railway, whatever the value of that may be. Long

ago we advanced a sum of money for the purpose of constructing the old Grand Trunk Railway, which that company was to return. Our claim was superior to everything else on the road, but we found it necessary to put it behind all the other securities except the common stock. To-day the Grand Trunk Railway owe the people of this country a sum, with interest, in the neighbourhood of $30,000,000. That sum we never intend to collect. It is a virtual gift to the Grand Trunk Railway. We could not collect it if we wanted to, and might just as well make it a present. If we could not collect this sum, of what value is the promise of the Grand Trunk Railway ? I hope and expect that the Grand Trunk Railway will carry out its agreement. It has an excellent agreement. It will have a road from Quebec to Winnipeg which will cost it nothing for the first ten years and from Quebec to Moncton, and it will have nearly all the money required for the construction of the prairie and mountain sections. All it will have to raise is sufficient money to build a branch from its main line to Lake Superior, and I suppose it may build a line to North Bay, or it may connect with the Temiscamingue road, which is being built by the Ontario government. That portion of it is a good investment. I think they will have no trouble in raising money on the security of that portion of the road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior. I hope the Grand Trunk will be in a position to carry out that part of their contract. Their original proposition for a connection with their Ontario system and the making of a transcontinental road in that way would, I believe, have been in the interest of the country. But, I must protest, as I said before, against the enormous expenditure into which the government seeks to force us. My hope is that when the engineering parties examine the New Brunswick section and the Quebec section, their reports of the cost of building a commercial road there will be so alarming that the government will be compelled to back out of that portion of the scheme. And, if that should occur, I am sure that none will be more rejoiced than the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It would take two years to locate the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, before a dollar can be spent in construction. Hon. gentlemen speak of having the road built within five years after it is located. If the expenditure is to be in the neighbourhood of $35,000 per mile, and if the work is to be carried on under government supervision in a country where they can only commence the work at the two ends—taking the supplies up the Canadian Pacific and commencing construction near the Montreal river, and, on the other hand commencing construction at Quebec—it will require, under the system of contracts and with the contractors which the government can employ, not less than seven years to build that section of the road. So, it will be nine years and possibly more before the road will be in a condition to be handed over as part of the Grand Trunk transcontinental line. Interest must be paid on the money used on construction during that time. The parts that are built must be kept up, and, if possible, used. It is an enormous undertaking ; and, as I have said, I hope the the government, on looking into it, will grow alarmed and that the road will not be built. And when the facts are known to parliament and to the people of this country, I feel sure they will never allow such a gigantic expenditure for so useless a purpose.

Mr. HENRY R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). Mr. Speaker, I should be loath to interject myself in this discussion after the very able and exhaustive speeches to which we have listened, were it not that I come from a province that has been represented for a long time in the councils of the country by the gentleman who has the leadership of the criticism of the project now before the House. And I would the more hesitate to take part on account of the fact that that hon. member has been for many years my political leader, not merely in the arena of Dominion politics, but in the more restricted arena of provincial politics in the province of New Brunswick. However, I must deal with this question. I trust I shall deal with it briefly, and I hope to deal with it on broad national lines. I shall endeavour to deal with it from the standpoint of Canada and not merely from the standpoint of the province from which I come. And, in so dealing with it, I shall not have reference to persons, except in so far as they may have relation to facts stated, principles enunciated and conclusions drawn. We are told that this scheme has been precipitated upon the country, that it has been forced headlong into the arena. I think that before dealing with that, I should, for a moment, refer to the speech of my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Haggart) on that question of precipitation, I shall be called upon to cite one ex-Minister of Railways and Canals against another ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. It will be a case of the city of St. John vs. the riding of South Lanark. We have listened to a long, a somewhat long, discussion of this subject by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). In arising to address the House that hon. gentleman said he proposed to briefly give his reasons for opposing the Bill. I would not wish to say anything derogatory of that hon. gentleman, but I am sure that his speech showed a poverty of argument, while it was resplendent with affirmation and assertion. On the question of precipitation, at the very outset I would invite the attention of hon. members to a speech delievered by the hon. gentleman himself. We are told that there should have been delay, that

there should have been deliberation, and then more deliberation, that the country is not prepared for this scheme, that parliament receives it unprepared, and that the scheme itself has not been matured as it should have been before being brought before the House. In the speech to which I refer, delivered in this House on the 26th of May last, the hon. member for South Lanark made this statement:

The Grand Trunk Railway has done a great deal towards the development of this country, and the stockholders of that concern have had but meagre return on the amount they have invested. Anything the Canadian people can do in return for the great benefits that that company has yielded to this country ought to be done, other things being equal. If they propose to build a road which will open up a new territory in the North-west and make a connecting line with Quebc, I would rather see it assisted than any other scheme I hear proposed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order, the hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate. The Prime Minister applies that rule every time he gets an opportunity to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I ask that you apply it now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The rule is well known to the House that no hon. member can quote from a previous debate. We are all quite conversant with that rule.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would you allow him nevertheless to go on and make his quotations ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it would save time if I were permitted to read the extracts which I have before me, they are in print. Perhaps I could state from recollection what the hon. gentleman said, but as he has given me permission, I will read it, because it will recall to his mind what he did say, and said very well at that time.

There is no necessity for a commission as to railways. That commission might have been appointed before this session and the government might have formulated some policy, because now is the time to formulate a policy and to build the works that are necessary. The day of depression may come within a year or two, because this country cannot always be in the position which it is at present, and it should take advantage of the tide. A few years is a great deal in the history of a country, as it is in the history of a manufacturing enterprise We should take advantage of the opportunity at the present time to divert the traffic into this section of the country while the routes are being formed, because once you have traffic going in a certain direction it is almost impossible to turn it into another channel. Take advantage of the present tide in our favour. Canada is in a better position now than she will be for a number of years to come to adopt a definite transportation policy, because this is a state of affairs that cannot continue for a number of years. Take advantage of the present, formulate some policy which is destined to build up this country, take advantage of the opportunity which nature has afforded us, because we are now in the best possible position to secure for ourselves a place amongst the foremost peoples on the face of the globe.

I might also say that those words uttered by my hon. friend from South Lanark were the very words which were uttered by the right hon. leader of this House, in his speech explaining the scheme now before the House. Another extract which I am sure will be of interest to the House, is this:

My opinion is that if the government should decide to give any assistance for that purpose, the company which is entitled to the preference is the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That company has done a great deal to open up this country, they have spent a great deal of money, and have received very little returns for it. It may be the fault of the mangement of the company, but the fact remains that for the vast sums of money which that company has invested and which have had the effect of developing this country more than any other railway except the Canadian Pacific Railway, it has received very little return in the way of profits. I think the policy of the government should be to have this road built as far north as possible, to pass as near as possible to the height of land in order to tap a region of country which has not been opened up at present.

These words uttered by my hon. friend were prophetic. Little did he realize then that the government perhaps had under consideration just such a policy as he approved of, just such a policy as he deemed in the interest of the country. To-night we have listened to him discussing, first the section between Quebec and Moncton, and then the section between Quebec and Winnipeg. At that very time the Railway Committee were discussing the very scheme which is involved in this Bill. There was involved the completion of a railway from Quebec to Winnipeg, and my hon. friend, by his then spoken words, approved of that policy, the policy which has since been adopted by this government. It is true the hon. gentleman has taken exception to that portion of the scheme between the city of Quebec and the city of Moncton. He has done so in a very laboured way, I am bound to say, and he has done so, it seems to me, on false premises. In the first place, he has called to his assistance certain statements made by Sir Sanford Fleming, issued in 1864, and he has endeavoured to show that these reports confirm him in his objections to the route which is now proposed. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the route between Moncton and Quebec is a line of railway which extends back from Lévis to Edmundston, then down the River St. John, to about the centre of the province, and then, down one of the tributaries of the Miramichi, crossing the Nashwaak river, and thence on to Chipman and to Moncton. My hon. friend has stated here that according to the report and survey of Sir Sanford Fleming the line thus traversed was one that, to use his own words, would not be one mile shorter, that is, the distance between Lévis and Moncton would not be one mile shorter by that route than the distance between Lévis, or Quebec, and Moncton by the Intercolonial. Has he taken us into his confidence, so far as to

explain to this House that the surveys to which Sir Sanford Fleming made reference were the surveys made between Rivière du Loup and Edmundston and Moncton? An entirely different route, a route that lengthens the line by nearly one hundred miles. He has not taken into consideration the fact that Rivière du Loup is situated 123 miles from the Quebec bridge and he has not taken into consideration the fact that when you travel down by the present line of the Intercolonial Railway to Rivière du Loup, or formerly the Grand Trunk line between Lévis and Rivière du Loup, you travel a distance of 123 miles and that thence you cross over the intervening territory, a distance of 85 miles to Edmundston. He has sought to show by these reports that it was an impracticable line, that it was one which would be condemned and was condemned by the engineers. I am sure that if he had sought information from Sir Sanford Fleming he would have found out that he did not know in very truth that the short line to which he refers is the line between Rivière du Loup and Edmundston, that when you leave Rivière du Loup and travel out over the Temiscouata railway, because that railway traverses one of these routes, you go out seven or eight miles and reach a point on that railway where you have to climb 1,300 feet over the height of land, that you have to do that in sixteen miles, that on reaching the height of 1,300 feet you have to travel down again within a distance of sixteen miles and then you are on the same level from which you started seven or eight or nine miles out from Rivière du Loup. That is all the explanation that is necessary in reference to the statement that is made as to the impracticability of the route between Rivière du Loup and Edmundston and down the river. Now, my hon. friend has not disclosed to us the fact that there was, later on, in the year, I think, 1890—I am not sure as to the date—an application before the government of Canada, then led by the late Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald, for assistance for a railway from Montreal down through the centre of the province of New Brunswick to Moncton and that there was a survey made. Some twenty-five years after the survey made by Sir Sanford Fleming, there was a survey made from Edmundston to the city of Moncton and that survey was made by the Temiscouata railway company in conjunction with or under the direction of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and that survey located a splendid line. I have had information from eminent engineers, two of them whom I could name, that the line that was then located is one of the best lines, and would prove to be one of the best lines that there is in the province of New Brunswick, and that it will prove to be one of the best lines there is in Canada. I have received within the last two or three days a letter from an engineer who was engaged in that survey confirming the statement I have made and this route does not follow down the valley of the river St. John as stated by my hon. friend. He has quoted from the report referred to showing that any line between Edmundston and Moncton must necessarily follow down the valley of St. John, and he took us down the present location of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Woodstock, then he took us either by the back country or by the river route following the curves of the river down to Fredericton. He could reach Gibson by either route. No doubt these routes are excellent ones. I do not call them in question, but, I do know these are not central routes. Neither is a central route through the province of New Brunswick, neither is the shortest route, and neither of these routes which are condemned by Sir Sanford Fleming is the route to which I make reference, the one that was surveyed in 1890, the one that is capable of being on a line for through traffic and on a line for opening up a vast extent of rich country. I shall not refer particularly further to the route between Quebec and Moncton. I shall reserve that for observation a little later on in connection with some other remarks, but, I am only referring to it to show how illusory were the remarks of the hon. member for South Lanark in respect to his condemnation of the present scheme—the scheme to build a line of railway back of the Laurentian hills, or what you will call the Laurentain rocks back from Lévis, through that rich section of country, through the counties of Bellechasse, Montmagny, and other counties upon the borders of the province of New Brunswick, skirting around that projection of the state of Maine which comes up too far, alas for the good of Canada into our territory, going down to Connors' station and following down the river St. John to Edmundston, going from thence down to Grand Falls and on through a section of country splendid for the building of a railway, because I speak whereof I know, having travelled over ever foot of it myself. I have driven over the road in my official capacity as Chief Commissioner of Public Works in New Brunswick. I know the topography of the country, and I know whereof I speak. More than that, it is a land rich in its agricultural resources. Along that line are to be found some of the richest sections of country that are to be found in the whole province of New Brunswick. Then, in that section there are to be found rich timber lands which will be tapped by this railway. I think that the hon. member for the city of St. John in referring to this section of the country did justice neither to himself nor to the province which has for so many years honoured him when he said that that section of the country was not worthy of consideration. or he said that in effect because he said that when you skirted the

northern section by the Intercolonial Railway and skirted the southern section by the Canadian Pacific Railway, you traversed the only sections of the province that were worthy of receiving consideration in the way of building railways. There is that great central part of the province of New Brunswick that is practically untouched by the hand of man. There is that great section of country from the Nashwaak bridge on towards Moncton. I have had occasion to travel through what is known as the Gaspereau valley and I venture the assertion that it is one of the richest valleys, one of the most promising agricultural sections, one of the most beautiful spots that I have ever visited in the province of New Brunswick, and I am sure that the Annapolis valley does not present a prettier picture than the valley of the Gaspereau situated in the heart of one of the finest agricultural sections of the country. It was at one time in the history of the province occupied by people, but the people did not expect that railways would be built and many of them deserted that section because they had no railway facilities. I am sure that it certainly cannot be said of that section, near as it is to rich coal fields, that it is unworthy of the consideration of the parliament of Canada, that it is unworthy of being considered in the way of development by the construction of railways. But, perhaps I have digressed from the course of my remarks in speaking of this. I have spoken of it because of the knowledge that I have of it and I have spoken of the feasibility of that route by reason of the fact that I have information from men who are eminent in the engineering profession, from men who know whereof they speak, and I think that their report is worthy of consideration.

The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has said that the line via Edmundston and Woodstock will not shorten the distance to Moncton by one mile as compared with the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman should apologize to the House for having misled it. He should apologize for attempting to make out that the route surveyed from Rivière du Loup is identical with the route to be followed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Another feature of the speech of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was that it echoed the cry that the Intercolonial Railway was to be denuded of freight, and he asked the House : How about the competition with the Intercolonial Railway in the carriage of freight from St. John when this new road is constructed ? Well, let me in turn ask the hon. gentleman : How about the competition between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway from St. John to Quebec and to Montreal ? He alleged that the Intercolonial Railway would be injured because the new line will shorten the distance between St. John and Montreal and Quebec, as compared with the Intercolonial Railway. It is true that the distance will be shortened. But did not the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway short line through the state of Maine shorten the distance between St. John and Quebec and Montreal, and has not the Intercolonial Railway ever since been obliged to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway for freight and passengers. Did the Conservative government in the eighties think of the competition that would be afforded to the Intercolonial Railway when they subsidized the Canadian Pacific Railway short line, even though that short line traversed the state of Maine. I wonder what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) thought about that. Well, at this date, there need be no alarm, because if the Intercolonial Railway during those years has successfully competed against the Canadian Pacific Railway, it surely can compete against the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) described the line from the Chaudière to Moncton as a mad scheme and as an impracticable scheme, and as a squandering of the money of Canada. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was a member of the Conservative government in 1890, but whether or not it must be within his knowledge that negotiations were pending and promises made by the government of Canada, represented by its then distinguished leader, Sir John A. Macdonald, that there should be constructed a line from Edmundston to Moncton through the centre of the province of New Brunswick by way of Chipman, practically over the route which is now contemplated. Was that a mad scheme? Was that scheme unworthy of consideration? It received the promised support of the government, but it met its fate like the Harvey and Salisbury line, whether in the Senate or not I am not aware, but it certainly did not materialize.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No; it was refused by the government; I remember it well.

Mr. EMMERSON. But it was promised by Sir Hector Langevin on the floor of parliament.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was objected to by Sir John Macdonald for the simple reason that it was a competitor with the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With the Canadian Pacific Railway, you mean.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There was no subsidy given to it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, it might have been a competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but isn't it a wonderful thing that the Canadian Pacific Railway was not refused entrance into New Brunswick because it would be a competitor of the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend, in a

fine frenzy, almost agonizingly asked : What was the use of building this railway through the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that this line will not reach within hailing distance of Nova Scotia. There is a tradition in the provinces by the sea that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was Minister of Railways and Canals for a number of railways, and that he once travelled over the Intercolonial Railway. It is said that he travelled through on a private car with locked doors, which was thought to be a reflection upon the people whom he might meet, although these must necessarily have been his own political friends. It is also rumoured that in the city of Moncton, where the general offices and the great workshops of the railway are situated, the hon. gentleman actually remained for one half hour. If that be true, and that was the only time the hon. gentleman went over the Intercolonial Railway, he may be pardoned for stating to-night that this new railway is to be forced through the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the debt to be incurred by reason of the construction of this line between Moncton and Winnipeg. But he has apparently not listened with any spirit of receptivity to the statements which have been made with regard to that matter. The hon. gentleman must know that it was clearly shown by the Prime Minister when he presented this measure to the House, and as clearly shown by the Finance Minister later, that the obligations on the country involved in this scheme will not exceed $14,000,000. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) does not discriminate between the guarantee of the bonds and the expenditure of money. It is true that there is to be an expenditure of money in connection with the building of the line between the city of Moncton and the city of Winnipeg; but it is also true that after a certain period the interest on that expenditure is to be paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific; and it is also true that the guarantee of bonds on the prairie and mountain sections is simply an endorsement by the government, and not an obligation which will fall upon them. It is simply tantamount to the government of Canada taking collateral security and becoming responsible for an amount which they will never be called upon to pay.

After expressing the opinion that the indebtedness of the government would be very great, the hon. gentleman calls upon the government to halt. He wants time for the whole scheme to be thought out, and he asks the government not to jump into it with precipitation. He thinks there should be a transportation commission ; and yet his utterance of to-night was contradicted by his utterance on the floor of this House on the 26th of May last, to which I have already referred.

I do not think there is anything further in the utterances of my hon. friend upon which I need dwell, and I will turn my attention to the remarks which I have to make apart from the hon. gentleman's participation in the discussion.

We ought to realize that there is involved in the proposal before this House a really revolutionary action on the part of governments with respect to aid to railways. We are all familiar with the past history of railway subsidies. We are all familiar with the fact that heretofore the Dominion parliament has granted subsidies to assist in the construction of railways throughout this Dominion, which were supplemented in some of the provinces at least, by provincial aid. I know that has been true with respect to the province from which I come—that year after year the government of Canada aided the construction of railways in that province, and the province almost impoverished itself in endeavouring to aid these railways. I will not refer to the history of the Dominion in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That has been referred to many times, and is fresh in the minds of all. But I think I can take you into my confidence in respect to what has transpired in the province of New Brunswick, where many lines were aided by this parliament. I do not think what is known as the New Brunswick Railway was aided by the parliament of Canada. It may have been. That is the line of railway running from Edmundston down to Woodstock, thence to Fredericton, and also from Woodstock out to McAdam junction. But this particular line from Edmundston to Newburg junction, and thence to Gibson, opposite the city of Fredericton, received from the province of New Brunswick aid to the extent of 10,000 acres of land per mile. The best lands in the province of New Brunswick to-day are owned by the New Brunswick Railway and Land Company or its successors. Reference was made to the fact that the proposed railway from Quebec to Moncton traverses this extensive area of land formerly owned by the province and given as a subsidy, and these lands are now the subject of negotiation between the company which owns them and the government of the province. I believe there is an option on these lands—why ? Because they are splendid settlement lands, and because they are richly timbered, and the line of railway proposed in this scheme will traverse that extensive area of rich agricultural and timber lands. The lines of railway which were aided by this parliament and by the province were as follows : There was the Albert Southern, a line some twenty miles in length, in the county of Albert ; there was the Harvey branch ; and there was the St. Martin's and Upham line. These three lines, though aid-

ed by the government of Canada, and though contributed to by the people of the province, are to-day closed, and are nothing but streaks of rust; there is no evidence of their running. There were other lines—the Elgin and Havelock, which is running; the Albert Railway, the Kent Northern and the Short Line, which runs from the city of St. John on the west side, down through the county of Charlotte to St. Stephen, paralleling, by the way, to use the term as it is now understood by our hon. friends opposite, another line of railway running from the city of St. John to the town of St. Stephen. These two lines join the same cities, just in the same way as the Intercolonial and the proposed line will join Moncton and Quebec. The lines to which I have made reference have all been foreclosed and sold out under the order of the Equity Court. There are other lines in the province—the Caraquet, the Central and the Moncton and Buctouche—which are now practically held by the bondholders. I want to ask, with respect to these lines which are absolutely closed and are of no value to the country or the province, where are the subsidies, and what has been the net result? These are but illustrations of the consequences which have followed upon the system which was adopted by the Dominion and the province of subsidizing railways, and I am very glad indeed that these illustrations teach us a lesson. They teach us, so far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned, that it was fatal to subsidize railways by giving them grants of public lands. While the lands were given to the railways at the nominal value of a dollar an acre, equal to $10,000 per mile, they are to-day held at a valuation, I understand, of $7, and even $10 in some sections, per acre. That certainly proves that the province of New Brunswick would have been wiser had it borrowed the money at that time and held on to its land. With respect to these others, they squandered our subsidies and have not a dollar to show for them, which only shows in contrast the benefits of the scheme adopted by this government.

I do not propose to go over the ground traversed by hon. gentlemen who preceded me, but I want to say this. For a long time there has been throughout Canada a demand for another transcontinental line from ocean to ocean on Canadian territory. Such a road has been advocated in the newspapers and on the public platform. In the province of New Brunswick its construction has been frequently urged. Throughout Canada the feeling has taken root that we should have a transcontinental line right through Canadian territory from a Canadian seaport on the east to a Canadian seaport on the Pacific. To paraphrase a line in one of the psalms, the idea was that Canada shall have the 'dominion from ocean to ocean, from the river to the end of the land.' The time has come when we can realize the aspirations of our people. If in 1871 we could undertake to build a transcontinental line of railway, we would be justified to-day in undertaking to build two or three such lines. There is prosperity on every hand, there is a feeling of hopefulness everywhere, and if we want to keep pace with the aims and aspirations of the people of every province, we will have to push forward this railway scheme. It would be criminal not to do so. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) sounded the alarm when he said that unless we did something now, traffic would seek other channels, and we all know that once traffic has found a certain channel, it is almost impossible to divert it into others. It has been very truly said that the world was born again with the introduction of railways, and I am sure that the Dominion of Canada would almost experience a new birth, if this line were completed and we were in a position to put it into operation. There would then be such a tide of immigration, such a volume of traffic, that another line of railway would be a paying investment. There are so many changes in industrial, commercial, social and political relations, following the establishment of railways, that one can hardly tell, from one year to the other, what the conditions may be twelve months hence, and we have to adjust ourselves to the new and varied conditions. The extension of a railway into new and remote territory increases the value of our lands and other resources. New sources of supply are tapped, traffic increases, and with the increase of traffic there is not only a rise in value of the property along either side of the railway but an increase in the value of other property as well.

One thing which cannot fail to strike anyone who gives any study to this scheme is that it will be the greatest immigration agency Canada ever had. When you realize that the old Grand Trunk Railway, with its tens of thousands of shareholders in the old land will become an active immigration agency, when you realize that each of these 40,000 (I am told that is the number) shareholders will be an immigration agent for this country, you will have some idea of what benefit this policy will be to the Dominion. Every one interested in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and their securities will advertise Canada's resources; and both the Grand Trunk Railway and this company will be the greatest colonizers Canada has ever had—far more so than the Canadian Pacific has ever been. In this respect this scheme will be worth all the money Canada will have to expend upon it. There is another feature. We must all realize that the extension of a railway into new and remote districts increases the value of our public lands. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway as an example. The value of the lands bordering that railway justify alone the expenditure incurred in the construction of that road.

With the permission of the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—GERMANS IN CANADA, AND NAVAL SERVICE.

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

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Before the House adjourns, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) to an item in the Montreal 'Gazette,' concerning the arrival of a German war vessel in the harbour of Montreal and the recruiting of officers and sailors for the German navy. The item reads as follows :—

On the occasion of the visit of the 'Gazelle,' however, an exception is being made——

——with regard to recruiting arrangements——

——and the young Germans residents in Canada are to be afforded an opportunity of entering upon service with the 'Gazelle' without the necessity of going to one of the German ports. The announcement has been made by the imperial German consul that a medical examination of young Germans as to their fitness for military service will be held by the surgeon of the warship on Saturday, at 2 p.m., at the German consulate, 100 Sherbrooke street. No previous notice is necessary ; the young men should bring along their papers. He also states that Germans who wish to do their military service with the German navy may enter upon service right here with the 'Gazelle.'

What I wish to ask is if it is customary or right to allow recruiting by a foreign country in Canada, and, if not, whether the minister's attention has been drawn to this item ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I cannot warrant my information on this subject, but I think I am not far astray in what I am about to say. There is no recruiting by the 'Gazelle' of any officers or sailors for the German navy. So far as that point goes, I am pretty sure I am correct in saying that this refers to young Germans in Canada who are still German subjects and are here only temporarily. According to the laws of Germany these young men, German subjects, are liable to conscription and to serve when called upon in the military or naval service of their country. As I understand it, these young men are taking advantage of the presence of German man-of-war in the port of Montreal to pass an examination which otherwise they would have to go to their own country to pass, because, if they did not pass this examination they would be liable to some penalty. That is the information I have received to-day. I have had no opportunity of conferring with my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence, but I observed the statement in the press, and we have been making inquiries to ascertain whether my information on the subject is correct or not. We shall have full information in a short time.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, August 14, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). When the debate adjourned last evening, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of the benefits which will result to the country, in the way of colonization, from the scheme now under discussion. I was pointing out that the lands along the route of the proposed railway would be very much more enhanced in value, and I propose to dwell for a moment on this point of the question more particularly as regards that portion of the route with which I am familiar. I know that in the province of New Brunswick the sections which will be opened up by this railway are very rich in agricultural and other resources and only require greater railway facilities to become centres of settlement. In those districts there are rich forest preserves, which have as yet scarcely been touched. Only those portions near the streams have been worked, leaving vast regions from which immense stores of wealth can be taken. There are besides abundant mineral resources and a soil well adapted for agriculture. In the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Queen's and Sunbury (Mr. Wilmot) there are rich coal deposits, which only need to be brought into touch with the market. So that from whatever point of view you choose to look at it, the projected line through that province cannot fail to promote settlement, to enhance the value of land, and aid in the development of rich forest and mineral resources. Coming to the province of Quebec, with which I am of course not quite so familiar, I have been fortunate enough to have had placed in my hands a reference, which I think will prove that the portion of that province to be opened up by this transcontinental railway is a very promising one. For many years there has been a strong desire on the part of people living in that section, who are familiar with its fertility and resources, for railway facilities. In 1884, the then member for Bellechasse in the

Quebec legislature, the late Faucher de St. Maurice, who was one of the leaders of the Conservative party of that day, and far more patriotic than any possessed by that party to-day, read in the Assembly a letter from the Reverend Mr. G. Boulet, parish priest of St. Magloire, in which that clergyman said :—

I see by the press that you and your friends are working to have a railway built which will pass along the southern front of the county of Dorchester, Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska. That would be a grand and patriotic undertaking, a most happy conception, one that should long since have been realized.

That is exactly the line to be taken by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway except that it crosses the county at Lévis instead of Dorchester.

In rear of the above named counties there is a magnificent valley, most suitable for the construction of a railway. It is neither hilly nor rocky. Starting from Metgermette, sloping down to Edmundston, there is a regular and fertile plain. Any company that would undertake to build a railway there would find all the necessary material on the ground. Cedar and spruce abound.

Well, Sir, Edmundston and the valley that extends to it in New Brunswick, is exactly the land over which the new line is proposed to be built.

Why do not our governments direct their colonizing and improving energies in that direction. The soil is suited to all kinds of cultivation, the climate is milder than the northern one of the Saguenay region.

This is exactly what my right hon. friend the Prime Minister proposes doing, but which the Conservative party of to-day—unworthy descendants of men like Faucher —will have none of. It was Mr. Faucher de Saint Maurice who said :

From the south shore of the St. Lawrence is the frontier of Maine, the land must be rescued from its unvisited isolation, and that heart of New Brunswick must be opened, but by an artery that will send its pulsations east and west to give life to the commerce of our country. But it is the federal, not the provincial government that must accomplish the work.

Further on he said :

Unfortunately my influence, humble as it is, goes not beyond the provincial sphere, but some day, men of large views and iron nerves will arise to accomplish the patriotic task, which the letter I have read so recommends, and whomsoever they may be, future generations will bless them.

These were the utterances in 1884 of one of the Conservative leaders of that day, and an eminent littérateur, in whose footprints the Tartes, the Casgrains, the Monks and others of our day were ever proud to follow. This shows the opinion held at that period of the rich resources of that section of the province of Quebec, which hon. gentlemen opposite are now so anxious to decry. From Moncton to the interior of New Brunswick, through the counties of Queen's, York, Carleton, Victoria, Madawaska, on into the province of Quebec, there is a long unbroken line of country, rich in agricultural mineral and forest wealth.

I do not look upon this scheme as merely one for the purpose of finding an outlet for the rich products of the west. If it were necessary, it would be well perhaps to have it for that alone. But when you combine the other attractive feature, the development of the country, with that of colonization, it certainly is a scheme which must commend itself to the people of our day in Canada. It certainly will receive the plaudits of those who are to come after us, of those who will enjoy the rich benefits which will result from the accomplishment of this great project.

Now we are told that in northern Quebec there are conditions very similar in character to the conditions which exist in that section to which I have just now referred. There always has been, and is to-day, I believe, a great desire in the province of Quebec to colonize its undeveloped country. Away back in 1853, and from that time down, the cry through that province has been, Colonize. The national poet of French Canada gave the watchword to the people when he said, 'Let us take possession of the soil.' He wanted them to enter the forest, to open up roads, to establish settlements, and to turn a desert region into gardens of plenty. For fifty years the people have been called upon to push forward colonization projects, but they could not respond to the call. It was easier for their young men, as it was easier for the young men of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, to cross over into the borderland, to go into the great neighbouring republic, and as a result the New England States contain to-day, I might almost say, millions of the bone and sinew, of the brawn and brain of our maritime provinces and of the province of Quebec. This is more true of those provinces than it is of the province of Ontario, because in Ontario the people have enjoyed the developing influences of railways. It is true, they have made many sacrifices to obtain these railways, they have adopted schemes of bonusing railways by the municipalities, and they have had great assistance from their national and provincial governments. But even there the blighting influence of these enticing calls from the southern republic has been felt, and this is further true in the maritime provinces and the province of Quebec. If these young men could have been kept in our country, they would have helped to build up Canada, they would have found means of earning their way into the vast regions of our northern country. This railway now contemplated will do all this for our young men who are now living here ; it will do more, it will invite people from abroad. It will estab-

lish settlements, it will broaden out our settled area, and it will increase the value of our great domain. This railway will create a highway through the heart of a region which possesses untold resources, the wealth of which, for petty political reasons, the opposition of to-day are willing to deny. They are ready and willing to hold their country up to the wide world as a land confined to a few valleys, the greater portion of which is as barren as the Tartar steppes. I was pained to hear my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways refer to his province of New Brunswick in the way he did. He was willing to hold up that province as one the greater portion of which did not contain resources worthy of consideration. It seems to me he has not, in that respect, done justice to his own province.

Speaking in a general way, the line from Quebec westward will pass along the northern slope, as I understand it, of the Laurentians, and that dividing line will cut through the vast valleys out of which spring the Batiscan, the St. Maurice, the Gatineau, the Coulonge, the Desmoines, and the Ottawa rivers. From the best sources of information that is from men who have travelled over and over again through these great sections, the resources of that country are three-fold—forest, mineral and agricultural. On the Batiscan, away north beyond the parish of St. Narcisse, there are forests of spruce which extend westward and northward all along that line, in addition to the pine and spruce forests north of the rivers I have just mentioned.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). May I interrupt the hon. gentleman to ask what report he is reading from ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not reading from a report.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I thought he was reading from some clergyman's report.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will pardon me, I am only giving him some information which I am sure will be of benefit to him, because it relates to the province of Quebec.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to hear his remarks, but I thought he was reading from some clergyman's report.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, it would certainly be much better if it were from a clergyman's report.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman would appreciate it all the more.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend, I know, likes things tinged with theology ; perhaps he would appreciate still more anything that was tinged with religion, but in this case I am not drawing for him a religious picture. The proposed line will run through a region of country that will supply the pulp industries of the world for a century to come. The reports which have been read to this House, containing the information which I am endeavouring to give at this moment, are confirmatory of all that has been said in regard to it in official documents. The province of Quebec have sent out many exploring parties into that section of the country, and in the archives of the province are records showing the great value of the resources of that region, giving full information as to its topography and as to its mineral, agricultural and forest wealth. We cannot shut our eyes to these facts. It is all very well to say there is no information; it is all very well to refuse to accept the information which comes to us from all these sources. In the days when the Canadian Pacific Railway was projected we did not have any such information with regard to that proposed line as we have to-day with respect to the projected line now under discussion.

I think one hon. gentleman stated in the House that in all that region you could not find a tree as large as a man's leg. That is an assertion tending, as I think, to mislead the country. And it is easy to make such assertions. It is easy to deal in a spirit of levity even with important matters like this ; but that spirit should not characterize the utterances of hon. members of this House, especially when dealing with a project of this character. For this is not a question merely of and for to-day. This is a work for the future of our country, and it is one that is fraught with great possibilities, not merely for us, but for our children, and not merely for us and for our children, but for those who shall come into this country. We are putting forth our best efforts day by day and year by year to influence the best citizenship of other countries to come to our land, where they can build for themselves homes under conditions that offer them every hope of prosperity and happiness. Now, as I understand, there is in the Crown Lands Department of Quebec, information of an official character which refutes the insinuation covered by remarks such as the one to which I have just referred. And, while it may be asserted in this House for a purpose, that that country has no rich timber resources and offers no opportunity for industry, we know that the statement is refuted by the actual conditions prevailing in the province of Quebec. Annually the government there have their sales of timber limits ; and what values are placed by the business men engaged in the great lumber and pulp industry upon the privileges offered at these sales ? We know that the highest prices are obtained by the Quebec government for these timber limits. Business men, looking for investment for their capital, attach greater value to the resources of that country than hon. gentlemen opposite seem to do. The fact that these men place so high a value upon the timber resources

of that region would alone justify the government in deciding that this land must have railway facilities, apart altogether from the grander scheme of furnishing 'spout,' as it is called, for the great grain reservoir of the west through Canadian territory to Canadian seaports. The government should not lose sight, and I am sure does not lose sight of the importance of settling and peopling that timber region, and developing and working the resources of sections which are now, in a sense, isolated and removed from civilizing influence of railways and centres of population. It is objected that these timbered lands are watered by rivers which flow towards the markets of the country, and that they afford channels by which the timber can be more readily and cheaply brought to market than can be done by railway. That may be true of certain strips of land bordering these rivers. But we all know that there are heights beyond, that there are sections somewhat remote from these rivers which the lumberman cannot tap, so that their rich timber resources lie dormant. We know that that country has these great timber resources, or whence come the vast quantities of pine that float down the Gatineau, the Colounge, the Desmoines and Black rivers ? For a hundred miles beyond the timber limits now leased and worked, there are pine and spruce forests, as I am informed, but they cannot be worked, because there are no railway facilities, and because, as they lie north of the height of land, the rivers flow northward, and so carry the timber away from and not to the market. As I understand it, this railway will be on the northern side of the Laurentian range, and it will be to the northern side what the rivers I have named are to the forest wealth of this side of the slope. I am also informed that there are rich mineral deposits, particularly of phosphate, as well as deposits of precious ores. This is, perhaps, in a sense, conjecture. The value of an undeveloped mineral country is, after all, a matter of conjecture and speculation ; until you have your mines actually working, even the fairest prospect cannot be counted upon as a certainty. The geological formation of the Laurentian does not change as you go north ; it is the same great upheaval, and the same conditions prevail. What is to be found in its strata on this side of the range is to be found on the other side also, but in what proportion remains to be discovered. All this will be discovered when this railway shall have made it worth while for the prospector and the miner to undergo the toil and incur the expense necessary. The road, as designed, will pass along a chain of lakes that extends, link by link, from Lake St. John, in the east, to Lake Abbittibi, in the west. That the Lake St. John country is an agricultural region no one can deny. Only those who know nothing about will venture to deny it.

The land is exactly of the same character as the land to the westward. The soil is watered by a similar source, and enjoys similar conditions conducive to fertility.

Mr. GANONG. Is this road supposed to go from Quebec to Lake St. John ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. GANONG. Then why is Lake St. John included in the description of the route of this road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It does not go to Lake St. John. There is a road now to Lake St. John. This road goes from Quebec. I refer to Lake St. John as the eastern extremity of a region which is rich as an agricultural section, and I say that there are continuous links of lakes running eastward from Lake St. John, that the Lake St. John region is known to be rich and that the country surrounding the other lakes to the westward is of the same character.

Mr. BROCK. You are all wrong.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) shakes his head. Anybody who knows nothing about it is in a position to deny, but those who understand it, those who have information upon the subject, are not in that position. There is one thing that is known and known to a verity, and that is that there are very many rich farms to the north of us on the Gatineau river, along the Desert, and on the Baskatonge. Even to-day, without these facilities, the pioneer has gone in and he has demonstrated that there can be carved out in that region rich and flourishing sections of agricultural country. I am informed that only the other day there left the city of Montreal a colonizing expedition to visit this rich, this fertile, this splendid section of country, and I fancy that the very anticipation of this line of railway is what has induced these adventurers to go into that section of the country. They want to pre-empt the land for future occupation, they have gone there for that purpose, and already the fruits of this scheme are becoming evident in the province of Quebec. There are away north in sections of the country not penetrated by others than the explorer fine farms that have been snatched from the wilderness by the lumber operators. These farms are well situated, only that they require facilities for marketing. They are situated on the shores of lakes or streams or on the slopes of the hillsides. All this is evidence of the fact that there are in the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick—I shall not refer to the province of Ontario as we are all familiar with what has been said in respect to that province—lying alongside the proposed route of this road lands rich in forest wealth and having prospects of rich mineral resources. These require development, and in their development settlements will be established and new constituencies created. In the province of

New Brunswick we are complaining and suffering to-day from the fact that we are losing at this redistribution a seat in this House. In the province of Ontario, they are losing, I think, six representatives, and if it had not been for the results of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Algoma district, Ontario would have lost more than six. Now, these provinces, in order to retain their representation, must have the development of those sections of country which are now lying dead and dormant. The hope of New Brunswick lies now upon its great interior, in the development of its mineral resources, in making marketable its rich forest wealth and in the creation of rich agricultural districts. Decade after decade they are losing their representatives on the floor of this House. There must be something done to arrest this decay, and the same is true in respect of Ontario. If the Canadian Pacific Railway could establish settlements and assemble population to the extent of thousands and tens of thousands in the Algoma district to the north of the Nipissing, surely these other provinces by reason of this scheme, this railway, being projected through them can establish settlements, can make additions to the population, and effect the maintenance of the status of the provinces in the Dominion. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that where so much has been said on this subject I will be only wearying the House and worrying myself if I were to attempt to elaborate more on this subject. It is fruitful of discussion, and I am sure, in a sense, very profitable, but there are other features of this scheme with which I desire to deal, and they are practically the features which while it is not sectional, will affect in a marked degree the constituency from which I come. I have said that the leadership in the criticism and condemnation of the Bill now under discussion comes from a gentleman who has for many years been the leader from New Brunswick in the councils of the executive of this Dominion. A gentleman who has held a very high position not only in his own province, but in the cabinet of the Dominion, and who has wielded a very marked influence, and I am bound to say worthily wielded that influence. The very fact that he criticises and condemns this measure, as hon. members know, must necessarily have an influence.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Brock) says 'hear, hear,' and quite true. It would be very strange if it were not so and yet I think it is due to the members of this House that they should inquire into the character of that criticism and condemnation. The fact that he has criticised and condemned the measure caused a great upheavel amongst gentlemen opposite. I could see a glow in their countenances. At the conclusion of the speech these hon. gentlemen so delighted with the utterances of the ex-minister, were forgetful of the past. I could not hear an echo of anything that had occurred with respect to that hon. gentleman in the very recent past, nor could I see any evidence of memory on their part, as to what they had been saying about him for the past seven or ten years. I realize that when men die nothing but good is said of them, and that in many instances they are sainted. When a Liberal departs from the ranks of his party and gives comfort to our opponents, these gentlemen canonize him, and we hear from them not a hint of Drummond steals or of Tarte traitors. That is all forgotten, and these gentlemen cherish the idea that there can be wiped out from memory for all time, that which they have done and said. It was amusing to see our Conservative friends cross the floor of the House at the conclusion of that speech and congratulate the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Their leader headed the phalanx and one after another they crossed the floor to felicitate their former opponent.

It is my purpose to consider and to discuss the utterances of that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) particularly in connection with the features of this scheme between Moncton and Quebec. In the first place, the hon. gentleman said that there should not be a railway constructed from Lévis to Moncton over the route indicated, because it would parallel and duplicate the present Intercolonial Railway, and in his letter to the Premier the hon. gentleman stated that it was practically because of that proposal that he resigned his portfolio. In taking that high moral ground, as he claims conscientiously, he has perhaps unconsciously ascribed to himself a monopoly of all the conscience and high moral tone which may appertain to members from the province of New Brunswick. He insinuates that those who differ from him are not actuated by the same high moral attributes which he possesses. Indeed, the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) went so far as to say once in this House, that there was no one in the province of New Brunswick who favoured the proposed railway between Quebec and Moncton except those who hoped to profit by the expenditure of the money. A more unworthy stigma was never cast upon the people of New Brunswick, and coming from so high an authority it is worth inquiring how far it may be true. The hon. gentleman admitted that the city council of Moncton passed a resolution favouring the scheme, but he said in effect, that they would not have passed that resolution if they only waited to learn all about it from him. Let us remember that the Moncton city council is constituted without regard to federal political lines, that there are Liberals and Conservatives in that council and that the mayor of the city is a Conser-

vative. That council unanimously passed a resolution favouring this scheme in its entirety, and favouring it unequivocally and without reservation. Later on, the Moncton Board of Trade discussed the matter as they had discussed it six or eight months before, at which time they favoured by resolution practically the scheme which has been adopted. In their recent resolution the board of trade declared strongly in favour of the scheme, but not unanimously. There were actually two who opposed the resolution. One of them, I believe, is the managing director or president of the board of directors of the 'Times' Publishing Company, a newspaper which neither at the present time nor in the past has supported anything that savoured of Liberalism. The other opponent of that resolution was the editor of that newspaper. These two were against the leading Conservative business men, and against the leading Liberal business men, and against the citizens of Moncton generally. These two gentlemen stand on record, the lonely two in the city of Moncton, opposed to the construction of that line between Moncton and Quebec. However, they do not count, and therefore it may very well be said that the Moncton Board of Trade is unanimous in favour of the government scheme.

The first objection made by the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) to that line, is that it parallels and duplicates the Intercolonial Railway. It seems to me, however, that it is possible that two lines of railway may connect at the same points, and at the same time one need not necessarily be a paralleling or a duplicating of the other. It is a new idea that because two points are connected by a certain railway there shall consequently be no other railway built to connect these same points. Why, Sir, the records of parliament are teeming with illustrations antagonistic of that principle. For years in New Brunswick we have been practically doing the same thing as is now proposed, and the same rule has been applied throughout the Dominion. I am informed that the Department of Railways and Canals administered by the ex-minister in 1899 bonused the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway to parallel the Michigan Central from Ridgetown to St. Thomas, a distance of 44 miles, and that these two railways only varied in distance from each other, from a few rods at the minimum to about four miles at the maximum. The government gave that bonus on condition that the Lake Erie Company could not secure adequate running rights over the Michigan Central. When the ex-minister stated that the proposed line from Quebec to Moncton would parallel the Intercolonial Railway, I am sure that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was one of those who applauded. And yet, in 1899 when the Lake Erie and Detroit River bonus was under consideration, the hon. member for Bothwell moved to strike out the proviso in the resolution, so that the bonus would be given without any condition being attached. He not only spoke, but I find by reference to 'Hansard' that he was on his feet thirty times in his efforts to have that proviso struck out. More than that, he divided the House on the question. He claimed that the fact that the railway was runiung alongside of another was no reason why the government of Canada should withhold aid if it were serving the interests of the country. I will not take up the time of the House in quoting from the speeches in that connection. One of the reasons he advanced why there should be no conditions, was that the Lake Erie road afforded an outlet to the lake shore townships; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the railway now under consideration, going eastward in the same direction as the Intercolonial, should not be aided by the government of Canada, even though it affords an outlet for the rich and unlimited products of our western country. Then, the Canadian Pacific Railway line was chartered from Toronto to Windsor, although from London to Windsor it runs less than two miles from the Grand Trunk Railway, and for a considerable portion of the way these two railways run side by side like a double track. That principle has been established throughout the Dominion time and time again; it has been established in this parliament; and yet this objection is brought forward as something that should constrain the parliament of Canada to prevent the construction of an all-Canadian railway to Canadian seaports. In the case to which I have referred, my hon. friend from Bothwell urged the repeal of the condition upon which the subsidy was granted, even though the two railways ran practically between the same fences, whereas in the case before us there is beginning a short distance from Lévis a range of hills separating the two railways entirely. The Intercolonial serves a very good purpose on the northern slope of these hills, and the proposed railway will serve a like good purpose in furnishing facilities to the residents of the country on their southern slope.

I have referred to the paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, speaking of paralleling, claims that this railway will dismantle the Intercolonial Railway, and the words are repeated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). While the hon. gentleman wishes to take very high moral ground in reference to this question, he does not refrain from indulging in a line of argument which I consider is a very great descent from the high moral altitude which he had assumed. He has referred to the construction of the proposed railway as a dismantling of the Intercolonial Railway, and he has claimed that it will not only

injure the traffic of the road, but will simply depopulate the city of Moncton, where the workshops of the Intercolonial Railway are situated. It is all very well to offer an argument of that kind, but it must be based upon such facts as will support it. The hon. member, in the days when he was Minister of Railways and Canals, did not refuse to bonus a railway running from the town of Campbellton, N.B., crossing through the province, and connecting at the St. John river with the Bangor and Aroostook. The railway to which I refer is known as the Restigouche and Western. It commences at Campbellton and runs up the waters of the Restigouche to Matapedia; thence up the Restigouche to the Upsalquitch, thence westerly to the waters of the Tobique river, which it crosses; thence to St. John river at or near Edmundston; on the other side of the river it connects with what is known as the Bangor and Aroostook Railway system, which communicates with the city of Bangor, in the state of Maine, and thence with the city of Boston by the Maine Central. If the aiding of railways in New Brunswick would injure the Intercolonial Railway, there never was aid given to a railway that would do more damage to the Intercolonial Railway than that one. Because, what was the object of that railway? It was in order that the people living at Campbellton and along the shores of the Baie des Chaleurs down to the Gaspé coast should be brought nearer to the American market. They send their fish, their lumber and all their other products to the American market. They seek such a market over the Intercolonial by way of Lévis and across through Vermont. This line when completed will afford them railway facilities direct through New Brunswick and through to the state of Maine to the cities on the American seaboard. And yet there was no cry against that railway on the ground of injury to the Intercolonial. The necessities of trade and the interests of the people, it was deemed, demanded its construction, and no cry of that kind was raised. But because to-day, from a national standpoint, it is deemed necessary to have a trunk line of railway from the east to the west, forsooth the Intercolonial must stand as a barrier against it, even though the Intercolonial may not be in a position in any way to carry out the objects designed by the project under discussion.

In this connection, I might say that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, when he made the statement as to this road dismantling the Intercolonial, neglected to explain to this House that a few years ago he, as Minister of Railways and Canals, entered into a contract with the Grand Trunk Railway Company whereby that company, for a period of ninety-nine years, or during the existence of that contract, should hand over to the Intercolonial Railway the freight which they gathered in the western country which is tapped by the Grand Trunk. This freight was to be handed over at Ste. Rosalie or at Montreal, and he failed to inform the House that although the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway may be projected into the maritime provinces, although the section between Quebec and Moncton may be completed and in operation, yet that traffic thus covenanted to be given over to the Intercolonial Railway by the Grand Trunk Railway at Ste. Rosalie and at Montreal must continue to be given to it during ninety-nine years or during the continuance of that agreement. Then will the establishment of this line take away one jot or title of the freight which the Intercolonial Railway receives from the west to-day? By no means. Did he tell the House that the traffic, which is to be carried by the proposed line of railway between Moncton and Winnipeg, is a traffic which is not yet in existence? Did he say that the Intercolonial Railway receives to-day or has ever received any portion of the traffic from the extreme west? He knows that the Intercolonial Railway has never received such traffic. He knows that although we have spent millions in the extension of the line from Lévis to Montreal, it was not designed to get traffic from Manitoba and the Territories but to get the Ontario traffic. The object was to get the Intercolonial Railway into the metropolitan city of Canada, to gather there all the freight possible from the province of Ontario and carry it over the Intercolonial Railway. It was a very wise scheme which time has justified. But this project will in no way interfere with that traffic. Supposing this line were built from Winnipeg to Quebec and stopped there, do you think that the Intercolonial Railway would ever receive any portion of the traffic brought from Winnipeg to Quebec? Only one who is insane would think so for a moment. We know that it would not. But what we do know is that the construction of this new line from Quebec to Moncton will add to the prospects of the Intercolonial Railway getting a portion of that traffic. From the city of Moncton to Halifax and St. John, there must be necessarily an increase of traffic by reason of the construction of a short line to Moncton. When the traffic has been brought to Moncton, it must go thence either to St. John or Halifax; and the strong probabilities are that it will necessitate the construction of another track between Moncton and Halifax. Nor did the hon. gentleman say anything with respect to the traffic that may come from the west, and which can continue over the Intercolonial Railway as far as Truro and then down to Sydney. All this shows that the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to excite the animosities, prejudices and passions of the people of Moncton. The people of that city have pronounced unanimously in favour of the project before us; and as a representative of the county of

Westmoreland and having some knowledge of the neighbouring counties, I say that the people are to a man almost unanimously in favour of the construction of this line. They realize what benefits will come from it. They realize that Canada requires to-day a transcontinental line truly Canadian, and they know that the only way to have that is by carrying out to its full fruition the project under discussion.

There is another feature which the hon. gentleman held up as a menace. The shops at Moncton, he predicted, are to be demolished. Well, Sir, the shops of Moncton were there almost to the same extent as they are to-day before the Intercolonial Railway was extended from Lévis to Montreal. And engines are now being built at the machine shops connected with the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton. The hon. gentleman knows that the necessities of the road will require that to be continued. He knows further that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway itself will require a terminal at Moncton. He knows that Moncton will be doubled in population in the next ten years by virtue of this scheme. He knows that the train hands by the hundred reaching that terminal point at Moncton will have to build homes there. He knows that workshops will have to be established there, and yet he tries to excite the passions and prejudices of the people of that city. He desired to have a line from Rivière du Loup over a 1,300 feet summit down to St. John by the valley of the St. John river, and he appeals to the prejudices of that city because forsooth this scheme does not contemplate such a line. The Intercolonial Railway, he says, is to be injured by a railway from Quebec to Moncton. But according to the hon. gentleman, the Intercolonial Railway would not be in any way injured by the construction of a line from the city of Quebec to St. John. Although he has the welfare of the Intercolonial Railway at heart to such an extent that he resigned his position and would almost go to death for it, he voted in the Railway Committee to have a line established and constructed by the Grand Trunk Railway from Quebec to St. John. But if any railway would injure the Intercolonial Railway, such a railway would do it, because no portion of its traffic could by any possibility go over any part of the Intercolonial Railway.

And in that very attitude, it seems to me, he shows an inconsistency which would almost lead one to conjecture that the real cause of his resignation was not the building of another line from the city of Quebec to the maritime provinces. If it is wrong to build to the city of Moncton because of the Intercolonial Railway interest, it would be doubly wrong to build from the city of Quebec to the city of St. John, because it would add to that damage tenfold, aye, a hundred fold. I utterly and absolutely deny that there would be any diminution of the traffic now enjoyed by the Intercolonial. The western traffic does not come to the Intercolonial to-day. What traffic is handed over by the Grand Trunk, under agreement, to the Intercolonial will continue. And I say there will be no diminution of the local traffic between Lévis and the city of Moncton. I have greater faith in my own province than to even harbour a suspicion that there will be any diminution of that traffic. Take the great fisheries of the Baie des Chaleurs, take the great and flourishing Miramichi district, with its untold wealth of timber and its great fisheries at the mouth of the Miramichi and down all along the north shore. Are these to be wiped out because, forsooth, there is a short line of railway established in the interest of Canada between Quebec and the city of Moncton? I say nay. I say that the development of the north shore is only in its infancy. I say that the increased value of timber lands in that section of the province, the great output of lumber, the establishing of industries based upon the great mineral wealth along that line, will all tend to make the Intercolonial what it is destined to be, a blessing, not merely to those living along the line, but to all New Brunswick, and, to an extent and proportionately, to the whole Dominion. I do not think that the Intercolonial has ever had a better friend than I, in my humble way, have endeavoured to be. And I would be very sorry indeed, by act, or vote, or word, to do anything that would in any way interfere with the prosperity of the Intercolonial Railway or the people along its line. I recognize that the Intercolonial has done more for Canada than any other agency. It has cemented the eastern and western provinces together as nothing else has been able to do. But I say also that the establishment of this new line will clamp together as in a vice the western and eastern provinces. It will make it possible for the people in the extreme east to exchange their products with the people of the west, to their mutual advantage. It will not merely bring us the products of the western prairies, but it will take back to the people there the manufactured products of such centres as Sydney, Halifax, St. John and Moncton. Why, I know as a verity that, to-day, in the city of Moncton, there is an industrial establishment which has increased its capitalization from a quarter of a million to a million of dollars. And with what object? With the object of manufacturing in their line of industry for the extreme west. They are already establishing a branch in the city of Montreal and another branch in the city of Winnipeg. And this railway bringing the city of St. John two hundred miles nearer to the city of Quebec and to the city of Montreal, and bringing the city of Moncton at least one hundred and forty miles nearer to the city of Montreal, will enable this company, as it will enable others, to carry on their

business to greater advantage. And surely these are considerations which should move us. I am willing, even if we did not gain any local benefit at all, to vote in favour of the people of Canada contributing of their means for the building of a national highway through our own territory to our own ports. I am not voting or speaking in any selfish or local spirit. But I do realize that the advantage to be gained through this road will be mutual; I realize that the greater facilities for transportation that it will offer to the producer of the west and the manufacturer of the east, will enrich every section of the country and the country as a whole.

There is one thing to which I feel I should make reference, although I do so with some hesitation, because I know, that, in a sense, the matter is treated as merely academic. Those who have paid any attention to the course which I have pursued in relation to this railway project, if any have done me the honour to observe that course, will know that I have advocated, not merely in this House, but in the Railway Committee, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into the west and the operation of railways by government. The government owning and operating that road could assemble the western traffic, bring it to the city of Quebec, and pass it along over their Intercolonal Railway, even at the longer haul, assuring to our own eastern ports that traffic, even though this were done at a loss. I was honest in my conviction, and am very strongly in favour of the ownership and operation of railways by governments. But I found that when I made that suggestion, even before the Railway Committee, it did not meet with any hearty response from any section. I did not find hon. gentlemen opposite very enthusiastic in their approval of that idea. And I have had sufficient experience in public life to realize quite clearly that, however strong the view I may entertain, however conscientious, sincere and earnest I may be, my view cannot prevail against the views of the majority. Government is a matter of compromise, and when we could not have that which I advocated, as I stated before that committee when this matter was being discussed, I accepted the next best thing, and I considered that the next best thing was the government construction and ownership of the spout from the wheat fields of the west to the shores of the Canadian Atlantic.

Now, what does that accomplish? It insures the regulation of rates, it insures a control over the traffic, it makes it possible for the government, while not suffering the disadvantages of government operation, to enjoy the other advantages incident to the government ownership and operation of railways. I realized this when that measure came before the committee. It will be remembered that the proposition was to build a railway from the west to the city of Quebec, where it was to stop; and I realized that if that were done the maritime seaports during the winter months would not in any sense participate in the traffic that would be brought through. Why? Because it would be a company-owned road and a company-operated road down to the city of Quebec, which port they would utilize during the season of navigation, and that at the close of the season they would seek ports more to their advantage, even though those ports were in the United States.

Mr. GANONG. Could they not be tied up just the same?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are tied up already, and there are provisions in the lease which will bind them hand and foot so that they cannot do more than that. We have done more, we have not merely tied them up by reason of what is contained in that contract, but we have made it to their interest to bring this traffic over to the maritime provinces. It would not be to their interest, having reached the city of Quebec, if they were obliged to pass over the Intercolonial, or if they were to have themselves running rights over the Intercolonial, it would not be to their advantage or interest to carry their freight some 600 or 700 miles when they could dump it right on board ship within 300 or 400 miles. But by building this short line we bring them 200 miles nearer to one of the best seaports in the maritime provinces, a seaport that is now being utilized to the advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway and to the advantage of Canada; I refer to the port of St. John. By the operation of this Bill we bring that seaport 200 miles nearer to the seaport of Quebec and the proposed terminus of the road; therefore, we enable this company to take its produce from Quebec to St. John, which they would not do if it were a matter of passing it over the Intercolonial.

Now, I discriminate between the Intercolonial being extended at the expense of Canada, and bringing freight down over the Intercolonial to the seaport; I realize the distinction between that and a company-owned road which stopped at Quebec and then attempted to use the Intercolonial with respect to its winter traffic. Realizing that, I feel that the present arrangement is one that brings to the Canadian people practically all the advantages of government ownership, and it removes from the people the disadvantages which are incident, certainly in the opinion of many members on both sides of this House, to the government operation of railways. Now, this question of government ownership is one of vast importance, and I know how strongly the people in my own section of the country feel in favour of that idea. I am also conscious of the disadvantages connected with it. I know that while the govern-

ment could own the road and perhaps operate it to the city of Winnipeg, yet when they came to operate a road from Winnipeg westward they would be met with obstacles which are, as they have been presented to us, almost insurmountable. Take the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In order to make their railway successful they have been obliged to establish hotels all along the line. Every one who has gone over that line through the Rockies and around the prairies, has found in all the large cities hotels established and run by the Canadian Pacific Railway corporation. Could a government do that? There is not enough elasticity in government mangement to enable a government to do that. It would be necessary also, having reached the extreme west, to establish a line of steamships for the Orient. Would it be possible for the government to engage in operations of that kind? I know the difficulty which has been experienced in government management of the Intercolonial. If a new business were proposed to be established along the line of the Intercolonial, or if it were necessary to seek some concessions necessary, creating business for that road, some rates that would be reasonable, some provisions to make connections, the first thing the promoter of that scheme would do would be to come to the general manager and explain it. The general manager would say, I will consult the Minister of Railways and Canals. He would consult the Minister of Railways and Canals, and perhaps after a long period of time, the matter having been forgotten, another interview would be arranged, the promoter, the minister and the manager would meet together, and perhaps they would finally arrange upon some plan. But time would go on, parliament would have to be consulted, the proposals would be made by the minister, opposition would come from hon. gentlemen opposite, who would look with suspicion upon them, who would criticise them and oppose them, with the result that the man, wearied by the delay, would perhaps go over and make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, Sir, I know that has been the case in many instances. I remember an occasion when there was a derelict vessel in the port of Halifax not able to carry its cargo to the destination, and application was made—this was some years ago—to the management at Moncton for a rate that would enable them to take that cargo by railway to its destination. The reply came back from Moncton, we will refer to Ottawa. It was referred to Ottawa, and six months afterwards a reply came to the city of Halifax. Is that elasticity? Does that show that government management of railways is of a satisfactory character? We realize the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway and other great railway organizations have a corps of specialists going through the territory through which their railways run, instructing the farmers in the establishment and operation of creameries and dairies with the object of creating a traffic for these roads, advocating the interests of the railways, it is true, but, incidentally advancing the interests of the country at the same time. They are in this manner building up and advancing the trade of the country. Could the government do that? Would the government do it? Strong as I am in favour of government ownership, I recognize the advantages incident to the operations of corporations in that direction. In the province of New Brunswick the gentleman who has been for a period superintendent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Oborne—I think he has since been removed—has actually had established a stock farm or depot for the purchase of cattle in order that the railway should have the benefit of transporting these cattle to the ranches of the west, as was indicated by the hon. Minister of the Interior in his speech. That industry is being carried on to-day by the Canadian Pacific Railway in New Brunswick. I know, as a matter of fact, that when I was connected with the government of New Brunsick, the superintendent of the Canadian Pacific Railway frequently consulted the government in respect to the assistance that should be afforded in the establishment of dairies and creameries, in building up traffic along the line, and in the creation of traffic, and I am glad to say that in some slight measure, at least, the government was then, as it has been since that day, in a position to aid in the upbuilding of that traffic. It is all necessary, and while government ownership has its advantages there are connected with it some disadvantages which we should not lose sight of. However, I have felt that when you cannot get the best thing, or what you think the best thing in the interests of your constituents and in the interests of the country, it is always wise to accept the next best thing, and I am proud that this scheme involves all the elements that it does. I think, while it has been described as a hybred scheme, it is one that combines the advantages of government ownership, escaping its disadvantages, with the advantages of private ownership where private ownership can help to build up the country in a way in which the government could not do, thereby developing the trade of the country, opening up the country colonizing the country and in every way conducing to the advantage of the country. Our country is so great, its resources so varied and exhaustless and there are so many new things to be done, that it makes this problem of public ownership a very difficult one indeed, and if you can combine the advantages of the one with those of the other you have surely measureably gone in the direction of solving the problem. It is not an easy one. The whole question is one of

such collosal importance that you cannot simply bind yourself hand and foot to a question of government ownership. I wonder how many hon. gentlemen opposite there are who would subscribe to that doctrine. I wonder if the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) would follow the leadership of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals in the direction of pubilc ownership. The hon. ex-minister in speaking of this subject, spoke with a vehemence and with a passion in his onslaught on the government which did not characterize his speeches in times past in this parliament when defending the government. Strong advocate though he has been of government ownership, he was yet willing, as shown by the letter he wrote to the right hon. leader of the government, that this scheme should be aided in its entirety to Quebec from the west in the same way that it has been aided on the western sections. As I understand it, although opposed to the scheme as it has been modified, he was willing that there should be a subsidy given in that direction and that the road should be under the control of the Grand Trunk Pacific. He was willing to accept that as an alternative. Surely, as an advocate of government ownership, if he got the measure of government ownership which this scheme provides he should have been willing to have accepted it in its entirety ; with its features of private ownership with government aid by way of a guarantee. I feel that I have perhaps wearied this House in the discussion of this question, which, as I intimated a few moments ago, may be considered an academic one, but, we must remember that we are making history. We must remember that we are establishing a principle which may be followed in future years and that it is well for us not to lose sight of the main discussion as to whether we have followed a proper and expedient course, because, after all, this question of public ownership is a question of expediency. The scheme which has been agreed upon by the government is one which they deem to be expedient in the interests of the country. In it they combine the two systems. The old system has passed away in its entirety, the new system has been ushered in, and we must understand as to where that new system will lead us. It would be a matter of impossibility for Canada to acquire all the present systems of railway and to operate them. The government could not undertake to conduct their vast operations by direct agency nor could it be expected to extend the service with the rapidity which would be needful. The question perhaps after all may be ranged with that of the speculative as to government ownership, but we have to inquire as to whether we are not having by the proposed scheme many of the advantages if not all the advantages that must be secured to us if Canada were in a position to acquire all the other systems of railways now within its borders, or leaving that alone, leaving that as too colossal a thing to undertake, if Canada were undertaking to make this new road a government road from east to west. There is, not only in the rapid advancement which displays itself on every hand, not only in the methods of industrial production, but in the aims and aspirations of our people, justification for the departure which has already been made and for the policy adopted by the government in this connection.

How much further the trend of events may lead us in this direction, only the future can disclose. But certainly, as representatives of the people we must realize that in going so far we have taken a step in advance, and accomplished some good to the people of Canada. It has been said that private opinions and judicial utterances are at one in concluding that railways are on a plane with the highways of the country. So they are, but only in a sense, because the highway can be used and operated and taken advantage of indiscriminately, whereas, the railway has to be controlled in its operation, and to that extent there is a vast difference between them. At all events, it behooves the people of Canada to consider the matter from the economic point of view, and considered in that light there is only one answer—from an economic standpoint this scheme is unrivalled. It gives government aid and support, and yet it does not inflict burdens on the people; in other words, it lends government credit to a government controlled road, although not a government operated road. There are so many objections to government operation of railways, as we saw in the discussion before the committee, that those who hold views in favour of government ownership and control may very well hesitate as to the soundness of these views. The political objections to government operation are very great. I can see at once the weight of these objections, and though they are not easily answered, yet there are answers to them. The danger of party control is not in my judgment so serious after all. It certainly is not sufficiently serious to enable us to decide the question on that consideration alone, and especially when we take into consideration the fact that we must all recognize that large railway corporations have a great political influence. By this scheme of the government we have curbed to a certain extent the political influence that may be exercised by private corporations. Look at the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We built the Canadian Pacific Railway, we equipped it, we paid for it, we gave them the money to run it, and they have been running it and making their millions, but the country does not own one cent in it. We all must recognize the influence which that great corporation has wielded in Canada since 1881. Its influence is felt to-day; its influence I believe is being felt in the discussion of

this question in parliament, and its influence has been felt since the project was first spoken of in the newspapers. Of course, under private ownership there is competition, but there are also formidable evils. There is the possibility of discrimination in favour of the few as against the many. How many times has this parliament considered the question of discrimination, not merely as between individuals in the matter of tariff rates, but as between communities; as between the long haul and the short haul; as between the carriage of wheat and the carriage of flour; as between the interests of the east as compared with the middle east in connection with freight rates; as between the interests of the west as compared with the middle west; as between local communities and as between those living in the same community? All these difficulties are incidental to private ownership, and these evils are curbed, controlled, and regulated by this scheme which the government has asked parliament to approve of. The existence of secret and preferential rates on the railways has been such in the past that they have militated against the interests of the country; they have militated against our industrial advancement; they have militated against the industrial advancement of particular communities, and they have created havoc to private enterprise. This scheme which we are now considering, in a measure controls these things, allied as it is with the legislation introduced by the government in the Railway Commission Bill.

Another disadvantage of private ownership lies in the precarious securities which are floated upon the market, and the injury that ensues in financial circles. These securities are 'beared' and are 'bulled,' and to-day a railway stock may have an apparent value which to-morrow may have dropped to zero. The scheme proposed by the government is such that there cannot be any such fluctuation of values in connection with it. We know the havoc that has resulted in the United States in connection with speculation in railway stocks. This will be prevented by the government guarantee, because we know that government guarantees have an established value and do not fluctuate between extremes. There is a confidence in them on the part of the people which tends to the preservation of their financial standing. That is something that ought not to be overlooked in Canada.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, at the hour of recess I was referring to the relationship between government ownership and private ownership, and their relative effects upon railway securities. I was showing that by reason of the sudden and extreme changes in the quotations of railway stocks, there was in private ownership danger of a disturbance in financial circles; and I was pointing out that by the scheme propounded by the government this danger was removed, in as much as the securities placed on the market had a government guarantee, and were therefore more stable and less fluctuating. But this perhaps is a field that should be traversed by the moralist or the economist; and while it may be food for thought for us, it comes more properly within the purview of their inquiry. There is one thing in connection with government ownership which I am sure is apparent to all, that is, that government service necessarily costs more in proportion than private service. I think hon. members of this House without distinction of party will concede that; and to that extent it is an argument against public ownership, and certainly against the government operation of railways. Given the same efficiency in management, the same energy and economy—and all this must be assumed—there certainly could not be any objection to the government operation of railways. Another feature of the government embarking in a general scheme of ownership of our lines of railway would be the questions that might arise in the future as to the construction of additional lines and of branch lines. There would also be involved, by reason of the pressure that might be exercised upon parliament, the question of the duplication of railway lines. There might be too tight a rein exercised, or it might be too free. It would all depend on the political pressure that would be brought to bear. To the extent that this might operate either in the one direction or the other, it would be productive of injury to the public interest. You could not be too stinted; and it would not be in the public interest to have too free a hand. The interest of communities not served by railways, or not having the advantages of government lines, would always be brought to the front and parliament would be besieged time and again for the duplication of lines, in order that these communities might share in the advantages of government-owned railways. All this would be launched into the arena of political warfare. Even the fair adjustment of rates as between different communities, and the rates that could fairly be charged upon the different articles of traffic, would be a football for political parties. That would be a matter of the highest consequence, as there would be depending upon it commanding commercial interests. Of course, we must all look to the future to furnish a more acute condition with respect to railway rates. Such will become more and more controlling, as modern industrial methods are applied and perfected, as business is conducted on a more expansive scale, and with a lessening margin. This feature is not an alarming one, perhaps, and should not be considered as very serious at the

moment, and yet it is one the importance of which should not be minimized. Another argument which is advanced against government ownership, one in which I do not share very largely, is that it restricts the field of private activity, and narrows the scope for individual effort and achievement. A test of the utility of public ownership by the experience of other countries affords nothing convincing either one way or the other. If you take as illustrations the cases of Europe, Australia, or Africa, all of them presenting different conditions, you find nothing to convince you. In the older countries such as Switzerland, Germany and France, the results achieved are certainly not convincing. They are not on the whole against government ownership. Taking the experience of South Africa and the different states in the Australian commonwealth, and of New Zealand, you have nothing that is positive. But, we could not be governed by the results there, even if they were very marked and convincing, as their conditions are entirely different from ours. It makes no difference whether the government is monarchical or democratic ; the results vary with the conditions. In England we recognize the fact of private ownership; but the prevailing geographical conditions have governed the policy pursued by that country. Each railway in Great Britain seems to serve a certain area ; each railway has its own particular sphere of influence ; and the same difficulties are not presented in that country that are to be found in Canada and the United States.

Now, Sir, I am sure that I would not be doing justice to the House if I were to pursue this subject further. I have simply touched on the fringe of the subject, and I leave it to be elaborated by hon. members for themselves. But there is one thing I do wish to say, and that is in connection with the proposition made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in regard to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay, in order that that railway might participate in the traffic which comes over the lakes. I have a strong sympathy with that idea : but, I recognize that this scheme is in no sense a barrier to the final carrying out of that great project. It in no way affects the future in that connection. The government of Canada will be free—it may be in the remote future, or it may be within a reasonable distance from now—if it deems that course wise in the interests of Canada, to acquire a railway connecting with the present system of government railways. That may be for the future to determine ; but if I can at all judge of the disposition of parliament to-day, I do not think it would be possible to carry such a scheme through. But the day may come when it will be in the interests of Canada that it shall be done. However, those living in the maritime provinces must recognize that if that scheme were carried out, it would not mean the carrying of the traffic from the lakes to our seaports in winter. It would simply mean that traffic would be carried from the lakes during the summer season down to the port of Quebec, and it would in no sense have a relationship with the present system of railways in the maritime provinces.

Passing from that subject, I ask the pardon of the House if I refer again to the route between Quebec and Moncton. I have observed the criticism to the effect that surveys had shown that there are impenetrable barriers obstructing that route. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals referred to a survey made by an enginner by the name of Davey. The hon. gentleman refers to a route extending from Rivière du Loup diagonally and in a south-easterly direction across the province of New Brunswick to the valley of the River St. John. The survey which was made by Mr. Davey was not —I would ask the House and the country to remember that—a survey over the present route back of Lévis down to the valley of St. John near Connors station, and thence following that valley to Edmundston, and thence on down reaching Chipman. It is not a survey of that route, but has reference to a route across the divide, from the shores of the St. Lawrence to the valley of the River St. John ; and undoubtedly any engineer would experience difficulty in the crossing of this divide, whether in the province of Quebec or whether an attempt were made to cross diagonally through the New Brunswick area. There is a number of divides, and I shall not weary the House with naming them, but that is a proposition distinct from the one under consideration. The illustration I gave last evening with respect to the Temiscouata route bears out what has been stated by Mr. Davey regarding his survey. The Temiscouta meets one of these barriers in its route to Edmundston, but the proposed line of railway at Quebec goes back of that divide. It does not run diagonally, but follows through the valleys until it reaches the valley of the St. John. It has no divides to cross, and when it reaches the St. John river it follows that river down until there is a natural opening, leading across to the valley of the Tobique. Then there is a river with an unpronounceable name, a tributary of the Tobique, and through the valley of that river you go until you come to a tributary of the Miramichi, and you follow that until you go on to Chipman, and thence to Moncton. You cross none of these divides, and the engineers to whom I have referred say that that route is a splendid one, that they are not obliged to cross any of these barriers, and it is practicable, in every sense of the word, from a commercial standpoint. Therefore, the criticisms which have been made in that connection are wholly unwarrantable.

I would be pardoned perhaps if I give to

the House some distances in connection with the route which may be followed to reach the city of St. John or Moncton, commencing at Quebec. In the first place, we have the present route of the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John through Maine. I commence at Quebec because that is the starting point of the proposed Quebec and Moncton section. Going over the present route of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the city of Quebec by way of Megantic, thence on down to Mattawampkeag and to Vanceborough and Macadam to the city of St. John, you travel a distance of 422 miles. If you were to travel over the route from Chaudière by the Intercolonial Railway to Rivière du Loup, from Rivière du Loup, by the Temiscouata road, to Edmundston, then from Edmundston to Woodstock, and from Woodstock to Macadam, and thence to St. John, you would travel 452 miles, or 30 miles longer than the present route by the Canadian Pacific Railway between Quebec and St. John. If you were to travel over what is known as the St. John Valley Railway—the one which was advocated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) last evening—you would start at Chaudière to reach Rivière du Loup, a distance of 123 miles, thence to Edmundston, 81 miles, from Edmundston to Newburg Junction, 109, from Newburg Junction to Fredericton, 59, and from Fredericton to St. John, 67 miles, or a total distance of 430 miles. Then there is another route, starting from Chaudière by the back country—I mean the country back of Lévis—to Connor station, and thence to Edmundston and Fredericton, by the river route on the west side of the St. John river, and thence to St. John, you would travel a distance of 403 miles. Showing clearly that if St. John were your objective point, going by the proposed route of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to the city of Fredericton, by the river valley, you would travel a distance of 403 miles. Then there is the route, which was surveyed in 1890 by surveyors of the Temiscouata and the Grand Trunk Railway Companies. The distance by that route to the city of St. John will be 383 miles, going down by Chipman, showing conclusively that by the route proposed, the central route by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to reach St. John you would travel a shorter distance, by at least 17 miles, than you would have to travel by any of the other routes which I have mentioned.

Now, this must be borne in mind that by the Intercolonial Railway from Chaudière to Moncton, the distance is 488 miles, or nearly that, and to the city of St. John by the Intercolonial Railway is 89 miles. I was informed only very recently by an official of the Intercolonial Railway that the actual mileage from Moncton to the city of St. John is ninety. That makes the whole distance from Chaudière to the city of St. John, by way of Moncton and the Intercolonial Railway 588 miles. So, if the route projected is followed, the central route through the province of New Brunswick by way of Chipman to St. John, you have a saving of distance of at least 200 miles in round numbers, bringing the winter seaport at present used, nearer by that distance to the city of Quebec than it is now by way of the Intercolonial. Surely that is a matter of consideration, a matter of importance, not merely to the citizens of St. John, but to the people of the west and to the people of all Canada in view of the vast traffic that must exist in years to come, indeed a matter of supreme importance, and one that the parliament of Canada should not disregard at this stage. All this shows that the government has been wise in selecting this route and that, even without regard to sectional opinion, without regard to the interest of this or that local community, the aim and object of the government has been to afford facilities in the interest of all Canada. It is claimed that the government should build branch lines from the different points. I say it would not be in the interest of Canada as a whole that this should be done. While personally, as a citizen of New Brunswick, I should like to see such a branch line from Chipman, connecting at Norton for the city of St. John, yet I do not think that that would be a matter of interest to the people of all Canada. If this were done there, it would have to be done at other points. Trade will seek its appropriate channel, and, according to my idea, the appropriate channel for heavy freight traffic from the west to the Canadian seaboard in winter is the route I have named. The company have taken power and authority to make connection with St. John, and it will inevitably follow that that connection will be made. And it is in the interest of all Canada that she should have it. More than that, it will be in the interest of the Grand Trunk itself, because it will be in their interest to get the best, the closest possible connection and run by the best and shortest route. Now, all this question of route is one which must be determined by the engineers. I recognize the fact that distance is not the only element to be taken into consideration. Gradients, curvatures and alignment of the road are of equal importance. They are all of supreme importance in considering the necessities of modern railway transportation. The road must be of a character to allow traffic with the heavy engines and immense trains which are seen on our great systems throughout Canada and the United States. There is another thing which must not be lost sight of, and that is that whatever the railways cost under this scheme, the expenditure will be among the Canadian people and upon Canadian soil. I am sure that will not be lost sight of by the people of Canada when they come to determine upon this question,

when it is submitted to them for their approval.

I fear that I have wearied the House in going over so much and repeating, as I have been obliged to do, a great deal of what has been said before, and very much better said. But I would like to emphasize this one point, that if you remove from this discussion the speech of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair)—and he built up his argument by taking an extreme view and using what I may characterize, without offence, as very extreme and extravagant language—you find that nothing has been said against the bargain that has been made between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific. I have listened to all the speeches delivered by the gentlemen on the other side, and they have in no sense assailed the bargain. They have not punctured it in even one little essential. The bargain is recognized to be in the interest of the people of Canada, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot show to the contrary. If they have made any argument at all, it is against the character of the railway and the route. That is an argument which might have been used, and which may be used, by the shareholders of the Grand Trunk when they come to consider the question whether they will confirm and approve the agreement entered into with the government. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not even brought into issue the discussion of the benefits which are to accrue to Canada if this project is brought to a successful completion. They have attempted in small ways to say the route is not the proper one. But bear in mind that that is a question that is to be determined by the engineers and by the government later on. The best route is to be followed, and the best course is to be taken, in attaining the object it is desired to attain. There was another feature. It had been heralded abroad that the government is doing an improvident thing in building the road from Winnipeg to Moncton and handing it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific under lease for fifty years. Hon. gentlemen opposite attempt to excite the prejudices of the people by saying that the government is building this road and giving it to a company for a period of time. Now, they fail to tell the country that for the whole cost of that road no burdens will be placed upon the people, because the company will repay every dollar of interest after a certain period of time. And yet, while this impression is being—not made, but attempted to be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) last night made a most remarkable statement. He said, speaking of that portion of the contract providing for the construction of the road between Winnipeg and Moncton, that the company would be glad to get rid of this section of the great transcontinental line.

Now, if this is a great boon to the company, and if we are asked to deplore the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific is given a lease and management of the road for fifty years, surely the boon is to the company, else why the complaint? Yet the hon. member for South Lanark says that the company will be glad to get rid of the obligation of running that road, will be glad to get free from that portion of the agreement. Surely these two positions are entirely inconsistent, surely hon. gentlemen are wrong in the one contention or in the other. It seems to me they are wrong when they claim that we ought not to give these powers to the Grand Trunk Pacific, because the Grand Trunk Pacific has entered into this agreement, and I feel sure that when men of the business skill, men having all the qualifications to carry on a great enterprise like this, are willing to enter into this agreement, it is because they expect to carry it through. Certainly, it is an agreement for the benefit of Canada. Sir, if there is one thing for which I shall have reason to be thankful for hereafter when I look back over my life, it will be that I had some little share in contributing towards this great achievement. I believe it will be a great achievement without any parallel heretofore in the history of Canada. I believe that it is the crowning achievement of a great life. I believe that Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the First Minister, when he comes to look back over his life, a life that has already been fruitful of great good to Canada, will look upon this as the crowning achievement of the most successful career in the history of Canada.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). In attempting to occupy the time of the House in continuing this debate, I am aware of the fact that at the present stage of it I am unable to add anything very new, very spicy or very attractive. The ground has been travelled over so often, and the subject has been criticised so thoroughly, that I cannot hope to say very much new upon it at the present time. I had the pleasure of listening to an hon. gentleman that might be regarded above all others as the one who would be likely to give us some information as to the wisdom of this scheme, and its importance. I listened to him for the purpose of finding out the strongest arguments that could be advanced in favour of it by one who is said to be destined to fill the position lately occupied by the late Minister of Railways and Canals. I congratulate the country and his party as well upon the acquisition to their ranks when he reaches that post. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) started out by saying that he was reluctant to speak unkindly of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, who had been in a measure his political godfather, who had brought him into public life, and to whom he was largely indebted for whatever success he had achieved in political life. Yet I re-

gretted to notice that when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) intimated, as I think unfairly, that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals might be in his place yet if he had been allowed the privilege of handling the contracts in connection with that road, he was cheered to the echo by my hon. friend from Westmoreland. I thought how unkind human nature is sometimes.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman is incorrect in his statement.

Mr. SPROULE. Then my eyesight must have deceived me, for I certainly thought I saw him cheer most vigorously that statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk, as well as many other statements criticising the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not want to be placed in any false position. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, will take my word when I say that I did not do so. If I had, I would readily acknowledge it, but I did not.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly I accept the hon. member's statement, because I do not wish to do him any injustice. But I do think, even if I had not credited him with that exhibition, that I saw quite enough last night and to-day to justify the same conclusion in the adverse criticisms that he has indulged in against the man to whom above all others he is indebted for his position in public life to-day.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think perhaps the indebtedness is mutual.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I am glad to know it. He referred to the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and said that his speech was characterized by a poverty of argument and a strength of assertion. Well, there is no doubt whatever, after listening to the variegated and kaleidescopic way in which he handled this subject, that it was at least very different from that of the hon. member for South Lanark. What I heard reminded me of one of my Celtic friends, who, I think, came from the place where the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) came from. He was located on a small ten-acre farm in our part of the country, and some of his neighbours who had moved out west, induced him to move to Manitoba. He went up there and bought a 50-acre farm, and when he came back he was asked how he liked it. He said that he enjoyed it very much, that it was so big that he could just wander over it all day like a goose enjoying himself. And so the hon. member for Westmoreland wandered over the subject, like that farmer who enjoyed himself wandering over his new farm so different from the one he had here. But whether the hon. gentleman contributed to the literature of the subject or the strength of the arguments advanced on that side, I will leave to the judgment of the country at large. He followed that up by saying that the total outlay to the country in connection with this scheme would not involve more than $13,000,000 or $14,000,000, and he referred to the statement made by the Minister of Finance as being absolutely correct. Now, it has always staggered my comprehension to understand how such a conclusion was reached, because every one admits that the government is bound to build the eastern section, and according to the fairest calculations made with regard to the cost of that section, it ranges from $55,000,000 to $75,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite admit as well that the money must be borrowed by the government from some source, that it must be expended in the construction of that road, and then for them to say that we are going to incur an expenditure of only $13,000,000 or $14,000,000 on the whole undertaking from Moncton in the east to Port Simpson in the west, is something that I cannot understand. I want one of these hon. gentlemen to go up to the province of Ontario, appeal to one of the Ontario farmers and try to convince him with that kind of reasoning. I am inclined to think that the farmer would answer this way: I do not understand your reasoning. If I were to apply your reasoning to one of the ordinary operations of life upon the farm it would be something like this. I have a farm. I want to improve that farm, I borrow a couple of thousand dollars, I put up a magnificent building upon my farm, I put up good fences upon it, I make roads, and I provide the other conveniences of life, but to do that I have to put a mortgage against my farm for $2,000. The interest upon this $2,000 at three per cent, will only cost me $60 a year. Therefore, all these improvements have only cost me practically $60. Now, he would say that if your reasoning is correct I do not owe anything on the mortgage, the mortgage will be paid by somebody, I do not know when or how, but I do not even concern myself about it, because if I take the intelligent reasoning of the hon. Minister of Finance I do not owe the amount of that mortgage, I only owe $60 a year. I have paid that, I have paid everything and in fact I have only incurred an expenditure of $60 to accomplish all that I have done. That argument would be just as reasonable and just as logical as the argument presented to this House, that this new railway scheme is to be accomplished and that we will only incur an expenditure of $13,000,000 or $14,000,000 and that that is all the country is committed to. That argument is not logical and will not hold water. The hon. member for Westmoreland said that the policy of the government is a revolutionary action in connection with this scheme. I agree with him that it is a revolutionary action. We have nothing to equal it. It is

something new. It at least has the merit of novelty. Then the hon. gentleman went on to struggle with the question of whether the railway can be built through central New Brunswick and he referred to some engineer's report which he did not quote, who the engineer was he did not tell us, when the survey was made is unknown to the House, as far as anything he told us was concerned ; yet he observed that it was a better route than could be found in any part of New Brunswick and that if the road were built by that route it would be a valuable one for trade. Throughout the whole of the hon. gentleman's argument I noted one thing. He came back again and again to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and he said some very unkind things as to that hon. gentleman decrying his province stating that he had said that his province is a poor province, that the land in the centre of it is no good, that it contains mountains and valleys over which railways could not be run, but I noticed throughout his whole argument that the gray spectre which confronted him, the nightmare which was troubling his dreams was what the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said in his argument in criticism of the Bill. He referred to that hon. gentleman seven times, but as soon as he took hold of the subject he dropped it as though it were a piece of hot iron. The thought that was passing through my mind was that he hesitated to proceed because of the consciousness of the ingratitude he displayed towards the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals or because he knew that there would be a day of retribution in the future. But, he came back to the subject again and again; it was like Banquo's ghost that would not down. He made seven attempts to down it but he did not succeed, and when he tackled it for the seventh time he was as unsuccessful in rebutting the arguments of the hon. ex-minister as he was upon the first attempt. He gave this House no argument whatever to refute the strong and logical statements made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that this project was a most unwise one and that it was one which was altogether uncalled for. I have said that the hon. member for Westmoreland went back seven times to deal with the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He tackled the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) five times and he was quite as unfortunate in rebutting his arguments as in meeting those of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Then he travelled over New Brunswick six times. He went on to tell us about the wealth of central New Brunswick, of northern New Brunswick, of southern New Brunswick, and of the Tobique valley, rich in mines, in clay, in forest and fisheries, but he never told us how a railway could be built across it by any except the one line which he advocated. Then he came back to northern Quebec and travelled over the country four times, and then he went from Lévis down to Edmundston. He told us about the Laurentian range, about its geological formation on one side, about its flora, and how rich its trees were, and he told us that the other side of the Laurentian range was exactly the same. Then he led us away up to Lake St. John and told us about that beautiful sheet of water and went over the rich agricultural prospects of that region. Then, he said that all the other sheets of water were equally good for agricultural purposes west and north of that. I thought he was going to supplant the Minister of Agriculture. Then, he brought us back again, travelled up the mountain and travelled down again and finally came to the question of the government ownership of railways. His speech reminded me of a trip that I took last fall to Rossland. Travelling over the Canadian Pacific Railway you leave Robson and you discover that the engineers have adopted a peculiar way of getting up these mountains. They had to overcome a rise of several hundred feet so they built the road up a little then back again and up a litle higher, then back again, and then a little higher still. You are carried upwards for a time and then you are carried back again.

Mr. COWAN. Just like Jack and Jill.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, something like Jack and Jill. You are carried back again on what is called the switch-back and each time you rise a little higher and the engine is puffing and panting and toiling ever on and up until it rises to the top of the mountain just like the hon. member for Westmoreland. He went back and forth seven or eight times until he led us up to the top of the mountain and when he looked down from it along the road there was nothing but hills upon hills, desolation and the remains of trees that had burned, under growth and vegetation which had come up afterwards. He said that there were rich mines below but we had not unearthed them yet, and he spoke of the unlimited wealth that we were likely to bring to light somewhere but he did not tell us where it was or when it was to occur, and in this performance I think he displayed a strong resemblance to the locomotive carrying us to the mountain top. He did not present one argument in favour of the contention which he was advancing and he left it at last in despair. Then, last night he occupied the floor for forty-five minutes. He first gave us a very nice introduction and then he proceeded with a reading of thirty minutes duration. The reading was not very attractive, I suppose, because the light was bad, but after forty-five minutes he collapsed for want of breath or argument. I do not know which. He tackled it again this morning and he gave us another exhibition of his reading qualities and this was better because the light was better, but

he finally abandoned that and dealt with some other questions in a manner which he was pleased to represent to the House as argument.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) announced that there would be no difficulty whatever in building a railway through New Brunswick, but he could not exactly say where this railway was going. However he thought it would reach St. John ultimately, indicating that St. John was the most important point for that railway to reach. When he spoke before in the House, he told us that the new railway would shorten the distance by 200 miles, which was a much more generous estimate than that ventured by the Minister of Finance or others on that side, but to-day the member for Westmoreland did not risk saying how much the distance would be shortened. The hon. gentleman admitted that government ownership of railways was a failure and that the experience in European countries would show this, but at all events he was certain that any work done by the government would cost more than if done by private individuals. I could not help picturing the contrast between this language and the language he used in the Railway Committee, when he was strongly advocating the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay with the object of ultimately continuing it to the west. Then he was defending the scheme of the ex-Minister of Railways for all he was worth, but now that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) and he are not in accord. I wonder whether the portfolio of Railways looming up in the distance had anything to do with so suddenly changing his logic and his arguments. The hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) also reminded us that he was painfully making history in his two-hours speech. Well, we all know that he was doing something painfully, and if it was history he was making, I can tell him that it will never be read to the credit of himself or the party he supports in this project. It is history he will regret, and when generations yet unborn come to read it, they will treat it as a record of folly on the part of this government.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Do you mean to say that any one yet unborn would read that speech ?

Mr. SPROULE. Possibly they may read it out of curiosity. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) was excusable if he had the idea that he was making history, but he certainly was grinding out history at a fearful cost to the finances of the country and the feelings of the people who listened to him.

The hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) presented the strongest argument from the government benches in defence of this extraordinary scheme, and I wish to refer for a moment to what he did say. The most noticeable thing about his speech was the manner in which he dodged around knotty points. Here is an example which will serve as a fair illustration of his procedure. To strengthen his contention that it was desirable to have another all-rail route to the west, he quoted me as saying that if the possibilities and probabilities of that great west were realized, we might expect that there would be 400,000,000 bushels of grain to handle, and that to carry this it would take not one railway or two railways, but a dozen railways. He tried to justify himself from this statement, in his proposal to build another railway. I drew the minister's attention to the fact that this argument was very unfair to the member for East Grey, and that it had no foundation in fact. The truth is that what I did say was, that if the hopes of the people of the west were realized, as to the rapid influx of population to the west and the expansion of agricultural life, they would in time raise 400,000,000 bushels of grain, and if they required to have that immense quantity hauled within the two or three months between the commencement of the harvest and the closing of navigation, twelve railroads would not be able to accomplish the task within that short period. I pointed out that it would be impossible to handle such a production of grain in the short time within which they are anxious to rush it out, and I went on to say that even suppose a dozen railways could do it, it would not be the part of wisdom for them to try to do it, because it would be unprofitable, inasmuch as during the balance of the year these railways would be lying idle. That is a fair sample of the mode of argument which the Minister of the Interior pursued. He reminded me of the Artful Dodger in one of Dickens' novels. We know that the Artful Dodger was an adept in dodging around here and there, and making people believe there was something happening that never did happen ; one time he was in your pocket and another time out of it, and again he was under your arm or behind your back, but you never could know exactly where to place him. The minister gave us a great many quotations, but if they were all as fallacious as those which I personally know to be fallacious, then we can pin very little faith in his statements. He treated the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) just in the same way as he treated the member for East Grey. His arguments were notoriously weak and notoriously unfair as well. The hon. minister proceeded to tell us that when a railway company applied to parliament for a charter, they didn't have surveys and plans and specifications. That may be true, but when they are applying for an Act of parliament they are not commencing to build the road, and before they spend a single dollar in construction they will have their plans and their surveys and their estimates made as to what the road will cost, and all this information will be submitted

to the board of directors beforehand. Have we not a right to ask the government to give us that information which the engineer of any railway company would give to his directors, before they would deem it wise or unwise to embark in the scheme. But he gave that as a reason why the government were justified in taking up this scheme without the information we ought to have to enable us to judge of it wisely.

He says he is prepared, as a matter of government policy, to liberally subsidize railways, even colonization railways. Well, we want to know where he stands on that question, because, so far as I can judge, the sentiment of the great agricultural classes of my province at least is opposed to subsidizing railways liberally; and the hon. gentleman is not in accord either with the sentiment of the farmers of his own province, if I may judge by what I see in the press, nor the sentiment of the farmers of the province of Ontario. When the government give us a policy of this gigantic character, they ought to give us the information we desire to have.

The hon. gentleman, dealing with the objection that we cannot successfully have running powers over the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, said that was effectually disposed of by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). How did he dispose of it? He told us that the Canada Southern and the Grand Trunk were running over the same section of road for 220 miles in western Ontario. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) pointed out the other night that while through freight might be carried over a short line of railway, it could not be carried equally well over a long line, because it would be necessary to change the engines and provide a fuel and water supply, a double set of hands, round houses for the storage of engines, and many other things, that would not be required on a sh rt line. The hon. Minister of the Interior reminds us that it was claimed that the railway might take through freight, but it could not take local freight, and he said the hon. member for North Norfolk had disposed of that by saying that he himself had shipped local freight on the line I have referred to. Did the hon. member for North Norfolk say that it was a matter of common occurrence that the people of the country could use that railway for handling local freight? The hon. member for Hamilton declares that they do not; the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who lives in the locality, declares that they do not. Therefore, there is no conclusive argument to show that it is possible for the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to give running powers over 1,800 miles of railway to other companies.

The hon. gentleman went on to say that the arguments addressed to the House by the hon. member for Hamilton were futile, absurd and ridiculous—why? Because he said that if you parallel the Intercolonial, you are going to injure its earning powers. In answer to that the hon. gentleman declared that the earning powers of a railway are generally increased by the construction of another railway through the same part of the country; and as an evidence of that he stated that the property of the Grand Trunk Railway was never so valuable until after the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, and therefore he expects us to conclude that if the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Moncton is paralleled, its earning powers will not be impaired nor the value of the property reduced. Well, to say that is to say something that the experience of life does not bear out. We will suppose that there are 10,000 tons of freight from the west to be carried from Lévis to Moncton or St. John. If that is carried by one railway to-day and two railways carry it in the future, will the earnings of the two roads not be what were originally the earnings of one? It is true, the freight will be somewhat increased; but a portion of the freight of the first road is of necessity taken from it. If the development of the western country brought more freight to Quebec to be taken eastward, would it not be handled by the Intercolonial Railway, and would not the earnings of that railway be increased to that extent by this new road, if it is ever built, and if it is a success?

The hon. gentleman refers to the statement that this policy is an abandonment of the government's policy in extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, and he holds that it is not, because the Intercolonial was not brought to Montreal to enable it to get a portion of the grain traffic from the west, but for the purpose of reaching one of the great commercial centres for commercial purposes. We were told, over and over again, when we purchased the Drummond Counties Railway and brought the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, that it was for the purpose of increasing its earning powers by securing additional freight, so that instead of having deficits in the running of that railway, every year we would have a surplus. Was not that the argument advanced by every hon. member on that side of the House? I say it was.

The hon. gentleman said that the first proposal of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, which was for a railway from North Bay to the west, was not a good scheme, and that he would not support it. Why would he not support it? Because if that railway succeeded in bringing trade from the west, it was trade that was going to Portland. My answer is, could the government not just as well have made it a condition that the trade brought over that line should go over the Intercolonial in the future as to make the agreement we have to-day? They could do it quite as easily and as effectually. That would make the Intercolonial a more valuable property to Canada and give

us an all-rail Canadian route. The hon. gentleman said : 'We tie the profitable portion of the line—speaking of the western section —to the unprofitable part of it, and condemn the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to take the bad with the good and operate the two together.' Well, I propose to deal with that point later. He further said : 'The building of another line of railway as a competitor does not injure the present railway. If the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway carries out its contract, it will cost us no more than what the hon. Minister of Finance has said. The Grand Trunk Railway is worth more to-day on account of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway.'

And he went on to argue that the high standing of the Grand Trunk Railway was undoubtedly guaranty that it would be able to pay the interest on the bonds and on the cost of the eastern section. But if the Grand Trunk Railway is worth so much to-day, how is it that it has never been able to pay us back anything on the $15,000,000 we gave it in 1855 or 1857 ? Why is it that from that day to the present, it has never been able to pay the interest on that loan ? Away back in 1855 or 1857, we loaned the Grand Trunk Railway $15,142,000. The simple interest on that amounted, at confederation, to $10,457,000 of which not a dollar has ever been paid. What does the debt amount to to-day ? There is an accumulation of interest since confederation of $32,708,000, making a total interest of $43,165,000. and a total indebtedness of $58,308,000 due the 30th June, 1903.. If it cannot pay us a dollar on that debt, is it any more likely to pay us any interest upon the heavy expenditure we must incur to build that road from Winnipeg to Moncton ? Remembering what has happened in the past, it does not seem to me that the outlook for our getting anything from the Grand Trunk Railway in the future or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway very promising. We often hear it said how munificent we have been in our gifts to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But, if we compare the two companies, we will find that we have done much less for the Canadian Pacific Railway than for the Grand Trunk Railway, and we have had some return from the Canadian Pacific Railway which we are never likely to have from the Grand Trunk Railway.

What has the Grand Trunk Railway received from the public ? It received first the original loan of $15,000,000 on which there is an accumulation of interest since amounting to $43,165,000, making a total due in principal and interest of $58,308,179. In addition to these sums, the Grand Trunk Railway and its amalgamation have received :

Aid from the Dominion government..	$ 2,850,843
From Ontario, provincial aid..	2,671,333
From province of Quebec, provincial aid..	1,354,797
From Ontario, municipal aid.....	$5,723,954
Province of Quebec, municipal aid..	293,774
Total..	$12,894,701

The amount given to the Great Western in 1869, when debt was compounded, was $1,152,568, and to the Northern Railway, in 1877, owned and run by the Grand Trunk Railway, $3,258,760. Or in other words, we have given to the Grand Trunk Railway up to date $75,614,208, of which we have never received a dollar in return, either principal or interest. Yet we are told that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will surely pay the immense obligation it is undertaking, that Canada will be recouped every dollar, that Canada need not be afraid of the expense, because we have the Grand Trunk Railway behind the scheme. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, says the Minister of Finance, may be men of straw, but we have the Grand Trunk Railway, with its assets of $150,000,000, behind it. Therefore we can feel perfectly safe. We are in the hands of a company which will pay back every dollar to Canada. Well, I cannot say that I share this confidence.

I wish for a short time to direct my attention to what may be fairly regarded as the first and only policy ever initiated by the present government. It is a policy which is entirely its own, and by which it must either stand or fall. The wild, hilarious enthusiasm with which its advent was hailed was something seldom seen in this House. In its incoherency and unmeaningness it resembled the paroxysms of hysteria. One could not understand the enthusiasm, the joy, the acclaim with which that policy was hailed. The scene could only be likened to what is occasionally witnessed by a medical man in private families. He goes on a medical visit and has to remain a long time in the house. A number of women are present, a great interest is felt, and finally when the happy event is over, all is confusion and admiration and joy and sorrow all mixed up. What is the cause of it all ? It is because of the advent of a young heir. After ten or twelve years of married life, it is the first and only one. Unbounded is the general joy and great the general admiration, as the young hopeful is dangled before an admiring world. See what a rising star of the east has appeared, and just think what it shall do when it grows to be a man. Think of its future possibilities. In like manner, hon. gentlemen opposite admired this bantling of the government, looked upon it and at each other, and cheered and wondered that ever so much was accomplished. I leave it to the dry-nurses to handle it for the next few years, and after that, I will pass it over to the tender mercies of the electors of Canada, and I am quite sure they will deal with it. But what does it mean to Canada, this political monstrosity that has been born into the world, and at whose birth there has

been such clapping of hands, such admiration, and such joy, and such sorrow, that these emotions seem the result of hysteria ? Time alone can tell. But, in the first place, let me say that its advent was at the most inopportune time that it could possibly present itself——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They always come unexpectedly.

Mr. SPROULE. There is another strange resemblance that I had not noted. It comes at the time when we should naturally begin to think it could never come—at the tail end of a long session, after the House has been struggling for five months to get through its duties, and when we might reasonably have expected to end our arduous labours and be free, each of us, to look after his own business. But this proposition comes before us at the end of a long session, when there is no time to consider it, no time to deal with it. It is altogether too important a matter to be forced on us in this way. And yet, we are told, that we are to have morning sittings. The excitement of the closing of the session is started so that we may rush it through without proper consideration and without affording the people of the country time to size it up through the press, and to understand what it is they are being committed to. The next question I ask is whether there have been any demands from the people in any section of the country for another transcontinental railway? Have the boards of trade asked for it? I do not know of a single one, except that one resolution was said to have been passed by a few members of the Toronto board of trade, a resolution engineered by my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell). What gatherings of farmers have asked for it? What province has been clamouring for this scheme? Was it demanded in the west ? I do not think so, for hon. gentlemen opposite have been unable to show us that there has been any such demand. Has Ontario called for it? No, for I say distinctly that the sentiment of Ontario is against the subsidizing of railways.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the sentiment of Ontario; I say that without any hesitation. Was it demanded by New Brunswick? Well, we did not hear anything of it until this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was launched. Was it called for in Cape Breton ? My hon. friend (Mr. Johnston, Cape Breton), who speaks of it, had not a word to say about it before this scheme was broached. He was in favour of extending the Intercolonial to Georgian bay. But, as to this new scheme, he was as dumb as the proverbial clam in his own part of the country. Was it demanded by the labour organization? By no means. The government party have engineered through a few resolutions by those bodies since the scheme was proposed, but nothing was heard of it from that quarter before. From what class, then, does the demand for this road come ? From one class only—the grafters and exploiters; the same class of men who engineered the Crow's Nest pass scheme, and who profited by it so well; the same class of men who are forever hanging about parliament and the party in power trying to get something out of the state for which they give no return. True, we have had the clamour from that class. I see in one of the newspapers that this scheme is headed by Senator Cox, which leads another newspaper to speak of this as the march of Coxey's army. In view of that, I thought that there was a peculiar appropriateness in the words of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), that we had come to the parting of the ways. It will be remembered that Coxey organized a great army of tramps and set it travelling through a part of the United States and scattering desolation in its path. These tramps had their last grand rally at a certain point, where Coxey addressed his hearers. He said : We have come to the parting of the ways; we had better divide here; half the army had better follow the course of empire and go west, and the other travel east where the wise men came from, or if they don't like that they can go to Halifax. I think that when this Coxey's army divides, a large part of it will go to Halifax, when the people size them up.

Now, in connection with this scheme, we have no mandate from the people to undertake the building of a transcontinental railway, and they add to the debt of the country for that purpose a sum not less than $125,000,000. No government in Canada before has attempted such a gigantic scheme without first gaining the consent of the people. We are told that we built the Intercolonial, and that we decided to build it before surveys had been made. True, but we built that road carrying out an agreement of confederation. We commenced to build the Canadian Pacific Railway without a complete survey, but again we were carrying out an agreement of confederation. We had undertaken these tasks in order to gain the advantages that would accrue to Canada from the union of the west with the east and from the union of the maritime provinces with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. But we had the mandate of the people for these works. In this case, there is no such mandate. This, it is said, is an attempt to solve the important problem of transportation which has been engaging the attention of the government at various times since they came into power. For seven years we have heard about the great problem of transportation and about what hon. gentlemen opposite were going to do

with regard to it. They were making our canals and improving our harbours, and doing a great deal, as they told us, to solve that great transportation problem. Is this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme a wise attempt to solve that question? Is it a scheme to which the government have given sufficient careful consideration before presenting it to this House? Had the government such information before them as would justify them in undertaking this gigantic work? It seems quite clear that they had not. They told us themselves in the speech from the Throne that they had not that information, for one of the subjects to be brought before us was the appointing of a transportation commission for the purpose of taking this question into consideration. And I have here a copy of a return brought down to this House on the 19th of May of a report dated the 6th of April last. In this the Minister of Public Works states—

> That he has under consideration questions affecting the transportation of Canadian products to the markets of the world through and by Canadian ports with a view of placing the Canadian producer in a position to compete, and compete successfully, through all Canadian channels with the producers and exporters of other countries.

Then he goes on to outline the information that we required to enable us to deal intelligently with this question in the future. He says:

> The minister further states that the questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.
>
> This involves the consideration of their transportation:—
>
> From place of production to Canadian seaports.
>
> From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.
>
> From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.
>
> From Canadian seaports to Europe.
>
> From place of production through Canadian ports on the Pacific.
>
> As it affects the products of the eastern provinces of Canada it involves their movement:—
>
> To the seaports.
>
> From the seaports to Europe.
>
> It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made.

And for the purpose of making this comprehensive and thorough inquiry he proposes that a commission shall be appointed. Then the minister recommends that a commission be appointed consisting of Sir William Van Horne, John Bertram and Harold Kennedy, of which Sir William Van Horne shall be chairman and convener, for the purpose of making such inquiry and obtaining such evidence and information. They were to make such reports and recommendations as they might think requisite, and subject to any further instructions which might be given by the Governor General in Council. The minister further recommended that such commission be authorized to employ such scientific and professional assistance as its members may desire, and that the duration of the commission should be during pleasure. Then the minister goes on to recommend that this commission be appointed. Therefore, am I not justified in saying that they have undertaken this scheme without that information which was considered so necessary? Why do we require that information? To enable us to move intelligently, to enable us to formulate a scheme that will not only include transcontinental lines, but include as well our waterways, our harbours, our inland marine, that will include transportation of the products from the west to the east and stuff from the east to the west, that will enable us to map out a scheme that will do no injustice to our waterways but help them to implement the railways, and the railways to implement the waterways; that will do no injustice to Ontario but will assist Ontario when the sclieme is carried out; that will do no injustice to the west but will help the west as well; that will do no injustice to Quebec but will be valuable to Quebec as well as to Ontario and to the maritime provinces as well as to the western provinces. Then, to sum it all up, we would be able to crystallize all these desiderata into one grand transportation scheme that would include all the advantages that we possess from waterways, and railways, and from inland marine, from inland transportation, as well as from land transportation—it was to include the whole of them. It was to be one comprehensive scheme drawn up along intelligent lines, so that when we built a railway we would not be injuring a canal, when we deepened a canal we would be assisting a railway. It was to be a grand national scheme of transportation that would be valuable for Canada in the future, and defensible by the government. But we could not do that intelligently, we were told by the government, until that commission was appointed, until that commission had time to inquire, until that commission reported, until that commission's work was analyzed so that intelligent men would be able to deal with the problem of transportation in the best interests of the entire Dominion. Sir, we have had none of that information. We were told that it was not only desirable but important that we should have it, that without that information we would be going it blind, we would be doing what was the part of unwisdom, we would not be acting like intelligent business men, such as those claim to be who are controlling the destinies of Canada. I say in face of the fact, I am justified in the contention that this was information which the House and the

country ought to have, which the government ought to have before they determined upon undertaking this gigantic scheme that commits the country to such a vast sum of money. Then I say there was no justifiable reason for committing the country to such an undertaking at the present time, in the absence of this information, without a matured policy, without the data that was requisite, without the services of explorers, without scientific knowledge. Without all these things we could not, as the right hon. minister said who moved that resolution, reach a conclusion that we ought to reach intelligently, one that would justify them in undertaking a scheme that would be a real solution of the transportation problem for the future.

Now, my hon. friend undertook to deal with the arguments of the ex-Minister of Railways. In my view those arguments were so strong, so logical, so convincing, so comprehensive, because they covered every point that could be suggested, that in my judgment the members of the government had not a leg to stand on, or a justification for the scheme, after he was done. I do not wonder that they felt a little sore over it, that they directed the vitriol of their eloquence against him, because he did them a great deal of harm. He showed up, not only their inconsistency, but the unwisdom of their action, and the unreasonableness of which they are guilty in committing the Dominion of Canada to this enormous expenditure. Let us examine for a short time the reasons they give to justify this undertaking. The first is the urgent need of the west for increased facilities to handle its grain. Now, this brings up the question whether such urgent need in the west exists to-day. Where is the urgent need for this new railway in the west, a need so urgent that, as the Premier says, we cannot wait another day, another hour, we cannot put it off till to-morrow, we have not a moment to spare; and he expressed the hope that we had not waited too long already. Now this suggests the question, How are the products of that country handled to-day? Is there such urgent need at the present time? I do not think so. If we look into it carefully, I am sure we will not come to that conclusion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that it took five months to get a carload of grain from my ranch to the lakes; it remained all the time in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Surely, there was need for additional facilities between that country and the lakes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say a word in answer to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), who told me not very long ago that he did not care whether the Grand Trunk Pacific was built or not, because he had all the railway accommodation he wanted.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to inquire how they handled their products now. They had between sixty and seventy million bushels of grain last year. From the commencement of the season of transportation of that grain until the 1st of July, there were forty-four million bushels came eastward, and the balance of it was either sent west or was consumed in the country. It was handled by one railway then only partially equipped, and every bushel of wheat was taken out of the country by the 1st July this year. The balance of the wheat either remained in the country or has gone westward to China and Japan. Now, if with their present facilities, which are acknowledged to be very imperfect and which are being improved every day, they handled the bumper crop which was raised in that country last year and they had it out of the country by the first of July, it does not seem to me, although, there may have been some local blockade, that there was such trouble in getting the grain out of the country. If it be true that the crop was handled by one road which had given a contract for 20,000 additional cars and which had only got a fraction of that number for their needs during the season when the grain was handled; if it be true that it was handled by one road which had given a contract for twenty-five additional locomotives and which had only got three or four; if that one road, only partially equipped and in an imperfect condition successfully handled that crop, admitting that there may have been local blockades with which I shall deal later on, then, I say the urgent haste will not be so apparent for additional transportation facilities between the east and the west as hon. gentlemen say. We are told that they will not have a greater crop this year than last year. In what position will the railway be this year? The Canadian Pacific Railway will have a great many more cars to handle the produce of the west, it will have a great many more engines, it will be better equipped for the work. The Canadian Northern has got into the country in the meantime and it is also tolerably well equipped to handle the produce. If one railway got the grain out by the first of July this year—the first one better equipped than it was last year, and the second one tolerably well equipped—will there be any great difficulty in them handling the same amount of grain this year—because it is not contended that there will be any more grain this year than last? That does not justify the contention that there is an immediate and urgent need for further transportation facilities for the purpose of handling that grain. Let us inquire how that grain is handled? First it is sent to the elevators in the country. There was elevator capacity for twenty-five million bushels last fall. They have 13,500,000 bushels of elevator capacity at Port Arthur and Fort William or they will have this fall. There are addi-

tional elevators being erected in the west this year, we are told, that will store 10,500,000 bushels of wheat at least. In addition to that at different ports on the Georgian bay there is elevator capacity for about 5,000,000 bushels of grain. What does that make in the aggregate ? It makes an aggregate of 54,000,000 bushels of grain, or 10,000,000 bushels more than were sent out of the country last year and they do not expect to have a larger crop this year than they had last. What will be the ordinary course in the handling of that grain ? It will go first into the country elevators. The railway will be moving it eastward to the great inland port of Fort William and Port Arthur. Vessels will be carrying it to ports on the Georgian bay and south of the Georgian bay. As fast as the train can carry it from the west it will be landed at Port Arthur and Fort William, the elevators will run it out to the vessels and they will take it to the Georgian bay and the ports south of the Georgian bay and these elevators will be gradually filled up. This grain is moved eastward all the time and by the time the grain is threshed in the latter part of the season and by the time navigation closes about the middle of December a large portion of the grain will have gone eastward. Perhaps eight or ten million bushels will have been carried eastward and forty or fifty million bushels will be in the elevators of the west, in the elevators of Port Arthur and Fort William, and in the elevators on Georgian bay, and during the winter that grain will be distributed. With these facilities for handling the grain, what do we require ? We require more elevator capacity in the west, at the lake ports on Lake Superior and on the Georgian bay. We can always get vessels enough to handle the grain after it reaches Port Arthur or Fort William, and the grain will be moved eastward all the time. We require proper facilities for bringing that grain from the elevators in the west to Port Arthur and Fort William. We are getting improved facilities every day. It is easy to provide them for the future without the expensive outlay which is involved in this scheme. That is the way the grain will be handled in the near future. How will it be handled in the distant future ? The grain produced in the eastern section of the prairie country will be sent eastward on the lines I have indicated. The elevators will have it stored ; from those elevators it will be taken to the lake ports, and it will be carried eastward all the time. But we will have a very valuable and increasing trade westward with China and Japan. A magnificent trade is being rapidly built up with these countries and we will send millions of bushels of grain and barrels of flour to feed those 450 millions of people in that great eastern country who must depend in future on what we will be able to send them for a large portion of their food supply. Then, we will have another route in the future. Where will the grain go from the Peace river district, the Edmonton district, the Prince Albert district, and away north and westward ? In the future that grain will be sent out by way of Hudson's Bay route. I have no doubt whatever of it. That is our great inland port. Just as sure as we are standing in this House to-day—I have said it before after carefuly analysing the conditions of that western country and the conclusion is more firmly fixed in my mind to-day—this will be one of the great routes of the future. Then, we will still have an increased amount of grain going eastward for two purposes—for the purpose of supplying food to the eastern provinces and even to the province of Ontario and for the purpose of transportation out of the country. We will have these routes in the future handling all the products of that great western country; China and Japan will be one route, the Hudson bay will be another route and the route by way of Port Arthur and Fort William will be the third. When you divide the amount of grain to be shipped out between these three routes there will not be the congestion that a great many people fear even if the development of that country in the future should be as great as most of us anticipate. Then, I say, we cannot and will not be able to utilize this scheme to carry grain from the Peace river country away through to Moncton, to transport it to St. John and load it on vessels to take it to Europe. It is an impracticable scheme. It never will be carried out in so far as carrying grain is concerned because no railway in the world can carry grain for 2,800 or 3,000 miles, and we have no example, as far as I know in the history of the world where grain has ever been carried for that distance on a railway. A large share of the grain will come east but there will be another disposition of that grain in the future which is not perhaps thought of much at the present time. The farmers in that country will change their system of farming.

They will do as they do in Ontario ; they will feed a large percentage of the grain they raise on their own farms, convert it into beef and pork, and send it out of the country in that profitable form. Half the wheat consumed in Ontario to-day is brought from Manitoba and the West. We raise more grain in Ontario than would feed our people if it were used for that purpose, but we have changed our system of farming, and we are feeding our grain to cattle, to hogs and to fowl, and we are conducting a profitable industry in that way. The people of the west will sometimes discover that the constant cropping of grain will impoverish their farms, and that they too will require to keep stock and feed that stock with a large proportion of the grain which they raise. If a proportion of the grain raised for export were stored in the elevators

at Port Arthur and the Georgian bay, there would be this great advantage, that during the winter season, when the railways were not otherwise amply employed, they could take carload after carload of that grain east. That system will also have the advantage of distributing the grain to the millers of Ontario, who are now using immense quantities of it. The manager of the institution at Peterborough told me the other day that in a short time when his factory would be running to its fullest capacity, they would be using from 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 bushels a year, in connection with the manufacture of cereal food. He told me that most of that grain would come from Manitoba and the West, and in addition to that they are going to build a large flour mill for the purpose of grinding flour in bond. The grain will be stored in their elevators on the Georgian bay, and as they require it, it will be brought to Peterborough by rail and ground into flour and shipped eastward. This is the means by which grain will come out of the West in the future. We have no reason to apprehend grain blockades. The fact is that taking all the possible conditions into consideration, even with the greater production in the West, we will not in the future have the difficulty in handling it that we experience to-day. I was for a short time engaged in the milling industry, and we found that for ten months out of the twelve our mills had to be supplied from the West. Notwithstanding that we are raising more grain in Ontario now than in times past, nearly half of the grain ground in our mills comes from the West. But it comes from the elevators on the Georgian bay. We bring it in the summer from Port Arthur to these elevators, and then it is distributed to the mills in Ontario. Not only do we use it for grinding into flour, but we use it for feeding our stock. It is also a fact that we get an immense quantity of bran and shorts from the West, because the supply of feed for our stock in the great province of Ontario requires that we should do so. We have no reason to fear that the grain of the West will not have sufficient facilities to find its way to market.

We are told, as another reason for the building of this railway, that it will afford a short route to the seaboard, and that it can carry traffic at the cheapest possible rates. According to the Finance Minister, this railway will be 2,800 miles in length to the foot of the Rockies. What railway can carry grain for 2,800 miles and make it pay? There is no railway in the world that can do it. Neither can grain be carried at a profit from the more easterly points of Regina, Moosejaw or Prince Albert. Grain is being carried to-day from Winnipeg to Montreal for 11 cents a bushel, or it will be on the first of September. Why, if that railway were built to-morrow it could not carry grain at 11 cents a bushel for 1,400 miles. We may, therefore, dismiss that as a reason why this railway should be built at the present time, because there is no doubt that this railway cannot carry it as cheaply as it is being carried to-day by part water and part rail route. As another reason for the construction of this railway we were told that we should have a railway to an ocean port on all-Canadian territory, so that we would be independent of the Americans and the bonding privilege. Well, we can accomplish all that by building a line from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, and thence to Moncton, a distance of 209 miles. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is an all rail route through Canada, except where it crosses the state of Maine for a short distance. We have the Grand Trunk Railway going westward, and we have the Intercolonial Railway going eastward, and if we filled in that link from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston and thence to Moncton, we would have an all rail Canadian route, and we would be as independent of the Americans as this new railway can make us. That reason will not appeal to the Canadian people as a justification for the government undertaking this enormous expenditure. We are also told that the influx of immigration to the West makes it necessary that we should provide railway facilities for the future. Well, they are building new railways in the West every day. The Grand Trunk Railway proposed to get into the Western territory if the government never adopted this scheme at all. They have their road now to North Bay, and their first proposal was to go through to the West. They would have done that whether the government interfered or not. Again we are told in support of this project that it will open up new territories for settlement in New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario. We have had settlement going into these new parts of the country for many years and has any one pretended that the existing lines are over taxed in supplying the needs of the settlers. We have a railway running from Calgary to Edmonton for ten years, and until within the last two years I am told that it never paid a cent upon the investment, and that it is only paying two per cent to-day. Has the settlement in that part of the country overtaxed the capacity of that railway? Not at all. There is comparatively little settlement along that 198 miles of railway. I passed over it last fall, and the settlement was very sparse. It has never been a paying road. Then, what has become of the Regina and Long Lake Railway, which has been built ten or twelve years? Has the settlement along the line of that railway overtaxed its capacity? It has never yet paid anything on the money invested in it. The portions of that country through which these railways run are not half settled to-day. You might put hundreds of thousands of people, without overcrowding

them, in the districts where we have transportation facilities already without overtaxing the capacity of the railways. I say that the supply of railways in many portions of the western country is ample, whereas, in other sections railway accommodation is badly needed. The Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific are building more railways every year.

Then we had that magnificent scheme for development of that country, devised and launched last year by the premier of Manitoba in his deal with the Northern Pacific and Canadian Northern, by which he secured to the country the advantage of 1,800 miles of railway—one of the most valuable deals, in my judgment, ever carried out in this country. Did he saddle the country with an expense of $125,000,000 to do it? Not a dollar. We are told that we must incur that expense to have control over the freight rates of this proposed line; but the premier of Manitoba secured control over the freight rates of those railways for ever without adding another dollar to the debt of Canada. We are told that we require to provide railway facilities for Manitoba and the North-west; but he secured those railway facilities and reduced the cost of transporting grain out of the country without incurring a dollar of expense. I am glad the hon. premier of Manitoba is here to grace this floor with his presence to-day. I say he has done more for the west by that stroke of statesmanship a thousand times over than will ever be accomplished by this proposed scheme of the government.

I understand very well that our North-west is a great country; I do not underestimate its value and importance. I know that the great future of Canada is bound up with the west, and I believe it will be necessary in the future to provide for a development that has been unparalleled in the history of this country. But we claim that that can be done without the unwise expenditure or the heavy increase in the national debt involved in the scheme before us to-day. We know it can be and will be by other schemes less onerous and equally valuable, which will be initiated and carried out by the Conservative party in the future. What have we already done for that country? We built the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are told that that great undertaking cost this country over $65,000,000 of cash and 25,000,000 acres of land. Was it an unwise expenditure, considering the condition of the country at the time? We were told last night what that country had cost us, and the value that had been given to it by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I say that in proportion to what the Minister of the Interior says that great country is enhanced in value by that expenditure, in that proportion he justifies what the Conservative party has done in the past for the benefit of that country. We have given assistance to the Grand Trunk Railway for the same purpose, and we are willing to give it assistance in the future, though we do not endorse this scheme, because we are as anxious and willing to provide for the future of that great country as the present government is. We have very lavishly subsidized the Canadian Northern, because we had control of the freight rates of that railway, and because we desired to increase the size of the spout that was carrying the grain out of the country. It would be an easy matter to double the tracks of the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific, as I have no doubt it will be necessary to do in the near future, and in that way double their capacity for handling freight; and it could be done at very much less expense than this scheme will involve. We have made very heavy expenditures upon our canals. We have been told by the government from year to year that they were perfecting our canal system to provide a means of transporting the grain from the west to the seaboard. Last year they told us what wonderful things they had accomplished—they had finished the canals, which their predecessors had been dabbling with for years, and had provided a continuous water-course from Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence, through which the grain of the west would float along in palatial steamers to the ocean carriers, the bottle-nosed ships which were going to carry it to the markets of Europe. They claimed that they were developing every highway of commerce at once, unlike the Conservatives, who developed one and left the others, and that they had finally settled the great transportation problem. They had finished our canals, deepened our waterways, and provided more lights along the St. Lawrence. But now we are told that all this is futile, and that they have to devise another scheme. And the urgency of it is so great that they cannot wait even a few months until the next session of parliament, but must introduce it at the end of the present session. What will this scheme involve to Canada if it is carried through? It will involve an addition to Canada's debt of at least $125,000,000. I have listened very carefully to the estimates made by every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the other side of the House, and I say that if you build such a road, having regard to its alignment and its gradients, which the hon. member for North Norfolk says must be equal to those of the New York Central, which handles 2,000 tons in one train, I say that $125,000,000 will be added to the debt of Canada by the eastern section alone. I say that $125,000,000 will be added to the debt of Canada by the construction of that eastern section, and in saying that I am within the mark. I make the prophecy that provided we build the kind of railway declared to be neces-

sary for the carrying of grain in the future, we will add to the debt of Canada $125,000,000. No $13,000,000 will do it. How do we stand to-day? We have spent up to the present on railways $258,800,000, and we have never grumbled at that expenditure, because it was for the development of the west and the east. On our canals we have spent $103,484,000, or on the two combined we have spent $362,345,000. We have at present, in round numbers, a national debt of $268,000,000, and by this project we will add to that debt at least $125,000,000. What will be our position then? We will owe about $400,000,000. I want the Canadian tax-bearer to understand what we are being committed to.

Mr. COCHRANE. We will be bled white then.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. This present year we have $9,733,000 of debt falling due, which must be provided for by another loan. Next year we will have $20,926,000 falling due, which must be provided for in like manner. In 1905 we shall have $4,866,000 falling due that must be taken up. In 1906 $12,166,000 will be due and will have to be met. So that up to the year 1906, when it is not claimed that this road will be finished, we shall have to provide for an amount falling due of $47,693,000, to meet which we will have to borrow money. In addition, we will have to provide $155,000,000 to carry out this undertaking. Add that to the debt we are carrying, and what will become of our credit? Will we be able to borrow money at as low rate of interest as to-day? I am very much afraid we will not. We are to-day on the wave of prosperity. Cycles of good and bad times follow each other as regularly as day and night, sunshine and cloud. And I am very much mistaken if the demoralization of stocks does not indicate that we are now on the verge of hard times. Let shrinkage of values continue, let there be decrease in our importations and reduction in our revenue as the result, and where will we be? Remember that we must raise inside of those six years very close on $200,000,000 by borrowing, and let me ask the hon. Minister of Finance what will then be the dilemma in which he will find himself, and how he will handle it? My right hon. friend the First Minister smiles. Is it at something that is passing in his own head that he is smiling?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is what is passing through the head of my hon. friend that amuses me.

Mr. SPROULE. If the problem with which we are to be confronted amuses the right hon. gentleman, he is welcome to all the amusement he can derive from it. But careful, thoughtful business men will study out these things in their own mind, and will ask what solution the right hon. gentleman proposes, and he will be obliged to answer that inconvenient question. But it is said that this heavy expenditure will tide us over the hard times. I admit that it will do some good, but it will be at an awful cost to the people, and whether the benefits we will receive from that heavy expenditure will make up for the additional burden of taxation caused by this heavy outlay, is something I am not prepared to even guess at.

I have said that the sentiment of the country, in Ontario at least, is against the subsidizing of railways largely in the future. Has the government had any mandate from the people to put through this project? No. I challenge the Prime Minister to-day to dissolve this House and go to the country upon this scheme. Dare he risk it? He dare not. If he should do it, and if the people should return him to power, then he may carry out his scheme and I shall not offer any objection. But when does he propose to appeal to the people? Not until the die is cast. Not until it is too late for us to back out. Not before we are committed to one of the most gigantic follies ever proposed. We will not be able to get rid of this scheme by paying $328,000, as we did for our indiscreet railway venture into the Yukon. We will have to carry out the scheme in some way in the future and my sympathy will be, not for the right hon. gentleman, because I do not think he will be returned to office, but with the men who will be elected to office and on whom will fall the carrying out of this measure. Who wants this scheme? The west do not want it. They do not consider it the best scheme. They do want more railways, but they say they do not want this railway. Does Ontario want it? We have had no voice from Ontario calling for it. Who then wants it? It is the Grand Trunk Railway and the grafters attached to that company, the men who have always been trying to exploit the country. But do the Grand Trunk want the eastern portion of the scheme? We know they do not, for their proposition first was to build up from North Bay to the west. They very reluctantly allowed that eastern line to be tacked on to the one that they proposed. My honest opinion is that they neither want it nor believe that it will be carried out. Why do I say so? Because there is a very convenient clause in this Bill which I think was put in there for a specific purpose. The Grand Trunk want to get into the west and, under this arrangement, they will get into the west. But they do not want to go into the maritime provinces at all, and do not want to be obliged to build eastward of Montreal, nor do they want to build a new line from North Bay to Montreal. Section 21 of this Bill provides:

> The Governor in Council shall have the power at any time to suspend the progress of the work on said eastern division until the then next session of parliament.

This is a very convenient section for a political scheme like this. The hope is that

this will carry the maritime provinces for the government, by holding out the hope of the expenditure upon another railway. It is hoped that it will carry Quebec on the same cry, and especially by the assistance of two or three millions that we are going to give to the Quebec bridge. In Ontario—why, no one knows what we are going to do in that northern country, building a railway through the great clay belt. The proposed expenditure in Ontario combined with the gerrymander, it is hoped, will carry that province. And, of course, the scheme will be in favour in the west. It is a political scheme, designed for the purpose of carrying elections and give the government another term of office. But I am inclined to think that, should they succeed, they will have their engineers report that this eastern section is an impracticable scheme, and so the government will submit the question to parliament. Don't you think you had better drop it ? In the meantime, the Grand Trunk will have its line in the west. It is to be subsidized west from Winnipeg by the guarantee of bonds to the extent of $13,000 a mile on the prairie section and $30,000 a mile in the mountain section through to Port Simpson. With this they will have all they wanted, and they are hoping that the eastern section will be dropped. If all this results in giving the government another term of power, I do not think we shall hear much more about the eastern portion of the road. It is a purely political scheme. What advantage is it to the people of Canada to build a railway and then give it away ? We are told that the people of Canada will continue to own it. What advantage would it be to a farmer to build a house and barn on his farm, and then hand it over to another person for ten years without interest and for forty years after that at three per cent on the money ? I think the farmer would say : That is a bad investment for me ; better sell my farm and go into some other line. It is very well to say that the people of Canada will own this line. They tell a story of a little boy who was asked by a visitor, who owned a colt that was in the barnyard ? 'I do,' said the boy, 'but father does as he likes with it.' This road would belong to the government, but the Grand Trunk would do as it liked with it. We own the road, but we give it away for fifty years, and, in my judgment, to give a railroad away for fifty years is to give it away for ever. We are assured that we shall get the interest on the money. Well, I have given you an account of what the Grand Trunk has done with us in the past. No man can say with certainty that they will pay that interest any more than they have paid the interest which they undertook to pay us years ago. We loaned them $15,000,000 to build the Grand Trunk Railway. Have they paid three per cent on it ? Have they paid two per cent on it ? Have they paid even one per cent on it. They have not paid a solitary dollar. We are told that their road is worth twice as much as it was before the Canadian Pacific Railway was built. Has this enabled them to pay that interest ? Not a cent. And if this road is built and passed over to them, we shall receive no return, the interest will accumulate and will stand against the country for the time of the contract and for all time in future. A great deal is made of the argument that the right is retained in the government under this contract to allow other companies to use this road on equal terms. Well, we have heard enough argument on that subject to convince me, at all events at least, that this is utterly impracticable. Let me add an instance to those already given. When we were chartering the Canadian Pacific Railway it was found necessary to establish a connecting link between it and the roads of western Ontario. So we built the Gravenhurst and Callender line, subsidizing it to the extent of $11,000 a mile so that it would be independent and all roads could have running powers over it. We surrounded it with every safeguard that able lawyers could devise, so as to assure the rights of all these railways. But it was thought necessary to give it into the possession of one road to handle, because we could not run it by a commission. What road should we give it to, was the question. There was the Canadian Pacific Railway at one end and the Grand Trunk at the other. We decided to give it to the Grand Trunk, so as to have the greatest assurance of competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But, under the conditions established, the Grand Trunk was to give full running rights to all other companies. The Grand Trunk entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway to use that road, and the Canadian Pacific Railway did use it for a few years. But has that arrangement been satisfactory ? Why, there was a dispute a few years ago when, for a whole summer the trade of Ontario was hampered and inconvenienced because of the failure of these two roads to agree. We had freight coming from the North-west to Toronto down by way of Carleton Place, carried over two hundred miles of road more than was necessary merely on account of the disagreement between the roads. And this, notwithstanding that we had surrounded the independence of that link with every safeguard that the ablest lawyers in this House could suggest. This is pretty good evidence that we are not likely to receive much benefit from retaining the nominal control over the proposed road that the hon. Minister of the Interior and his colleagues tell us that we shall retain. This idea of a number of roads using one line in common is a delusion and a snare. If we could not, as in the case I have given, secure the independence of a road 198 miles long, how shall we secure the independence of a road 1,800 miles long ? There is not the slightest

chance of it in my opinion. But these are the arguments that are used to justify this proposal that the government shall build the expensive part of the road and then give it away for the benefit of the company—for, as I say, to lease this road for fifty years is practically to lease it for ever, and the interest will simply accumulate, as the interest has accumulated on the money we have already loaned the Grand Trunk. That money was loaned in 1845 and not a dollar of interest has been paid yet. Is there any guarantee that they will pay the interest upon this ? In my judgment there is not.

Then there is another thing. We have a juggling between three companies that seems to be inexplicable, unfathomable, and that we cannot properly analyze, an agreement between the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Railway belonging to the government. The government agree with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk Pacific has nothing behind it except the stocks they are going to subscribe. But the government tell us they have the full weight and power of the Grand Trunk behind them, and they say that the Grand Trunk Pacific may arrange to amalgamate with the Grand Trunk. We will have the government railway amalgamating with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we will have the Grand Trunk Pacific amalgamating with the Grand Trunk. We will have two sets of stockholders, playing into the hands of the stockholders holding the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and playing into the hands of the same stockholders that are holding the stock of the Grand Trunk, and they can manipulate it as they like, the contracts, the stocks, the bonds, the sales, or anything else, and no man in Canada to-day can say what will be the operations of these three companies combined in the future. No analysis of them can be made to-day, no intelligence in this House can explain it to-day. I say, therefore, it is unwise, it is improvident and it is improper. Our past experience with the Grand Trunk justifies the belief that it would be unwise for us to undertake that scheme at the present time, and, therefore, I am opposed to it.

What does this scheme mean to the province I represent ? Suppose we build that road, and it is a success. Suppose it carries all the grain from the west to the east, and the stuff from the east to the west, what does that mean to Ontario ? It means that in proportion as you make that road a great success, you impoverish the transportation routes we have to-day. You take away the trade that comes to-day to our Georgian bay ports in the east, that comes from Port Arthur and the head of Lake Superior in the west. It takes away the earning powers of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and of the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway. It reduces their earning powers to the same extent as you make this other line a success. You must, therefore, do it at their expense. You must do it at the expense of our harbours, at the expense of the towns and villages along the line of the Georgian bay, at the expense of Collingwood, of Midland, of Penetanguishene, of Parry Sound, of Meaford, of Owen Sound, of Kincardine, of all those lake ports that are handling that trade to-day. You will do it at their expense, you will sidetrack all the populous towns and cities in western Ontario. You will take the grain trade of the country away from them, and leave us hundreds of miles off this great artery of commerce, if it turns out to be what its sanguine supporters claim it will be. I say that the Ontario electorate will not view it with pleasure, because if you make it a success you are handicapping Ontario to that extent. We were told from the government benches the other night, that the road is going to carry cattle from Ontario to the west. We were told with a great flourish of trumpets by the Minister of the Interior that 25,000 head of cattle last year were carried from Ontario to the west, and so many thousand head of cattle came in from Mexico. Why ? Because they have not facilities to carry more cattle from Ontario. I never heard of a single animal being stalled for want of railway facilities to carry more cattle from Ontario. Our present facilities could have carried five times as many as they did. But he takes the cattle that were brought in by the settlers, by the ranchers who were driving them out of their own country, and he uses these as an argument to justify the expenditure on this new line. That shows how the hon. gentleman is handicapped for arguments. I say we are sidetracked in Ontario, you are doing a great injustice to the people of Ontario. What does this mean to every Ontario farmer to-day ? I say if this railway is built, the eastern section will cost $125,000,000, including what will be paid for the first seven years on the guarantee that we give for the western section. There is no doubt whatever it will cost us that sum in the next ten years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How do you reach these figures ?

Mr. SPROULE. I say the eastern section of 1,800 miles cannot be built, if the railway is made up to the standard to that described by the member for North Norfolk for one dollar under $125,000,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Could the hon. gentleman give us a little closer estimate ?

Mr. SPROULE. I can give you the cost of the sections of the road that are already built through a somewhat similar country.

Mr. TALBOT. But the hon. gentleman said just now that he knew nothing about the country, that nobody knew anything about the country.

Mr. SPROULE. The government themselves say that. I am basing my reasoning upon what we know of the cost of railways that have passed through a country similar, according to the reports of engineers on this very section, what it would cost to build a railway of this character. I say it will cost 125 millions, and that sum must be piled on to the debt of Canada. What does that mean to the Ontario farmer? There are said to be in Ontario 455,000 families, and this will mean an addition of $125 of debt imposed on every family in Ontario. Let them think of that in the future. According to the population of Ontario, her portion of this heavy expenditure will amount to $45,525,000. This I say is an addition to our debt, it is another mortgage against every Ontario farmer, and every Ontario family of five persons, it represents a mortgage of $125 registered against every Ontario family, the interest upon which they must pay for all time to come until that debt is wiped out, and it will never be wiped out in the life of the youngest member of this House. Let them think of that for a moment, and then triumphantly claim what this great achievement means that the present government propose to accomplish. Let them ask themselves whether they will be justified in endorsing that undertaking, that baby policy, that monstrosity of politics, that has been launched upon the world in connection with this scheme. When the people of Canada have digested this policy properly I am quite sure what the result will be. Sir, once more I dare the government to dissolve this House and appeal to the country to-day. Dare they ask a mandate from the electorate for this heavy undertaking? They dare not do it, I challenge them to do it. We will willingly accept the result on this side of the House. I warn the government that if they still insist upon carrying out this policy, it will stand as a monument of folly to their credit. They are writing a page of history, as the hon. member for Westmoreland said, and they are writing a page of history which will be read in future, and which will not be complimentary to them, or creditable to their statesmanship, to their judgment or to their business ability. They are building that monument to themselves and that monument will stand in commemoration of what they have done. I am willing to abide by the results, but I have only sympathy for the poor rate-payers who are to-day being plunged into the dreadful abyss. They cannot see what is before them in the future, the thraldom of the yoke is imposed upon them, and chains are shackled around them which cannot be unfastened for the rest of their natural lives by virtue of the great policy which was introduced and upon the advent of which we all heard such an hysterical acclaim as was given when the right hon. leader of the government gave it to this House, to this country and to the world.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). Mr. Speaker, I must first of all apologize to you and to the House for attempting to speak in a language that is not my mother tongue, but I feel it my duty as a Canadian holding a mandate from the people, to express in as concise and clear a manner as I possibly can my opinions on this question of national importance. I shall not detain the House at any length, because I am well aware that already the arguments on this question, pro and con, have been fully adduced. It has been my privilege to sit in this House since 1896, and during this comparatively long parliamentary period no question has ever been brought before this parliament to compare in magnitude with the present proposal. Indeed, one must go back to the old days of 1878 and 1879, when the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was explained to the House by Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways and Canals, to find a parallel to the present situation. Sir Charles Tupper, in 1879, presented his famous motion by which the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was to become a government measure. It reads as follows

> That engagements have been entered into with British Columbia as a condition of union with Canada; that a line of railway to connect the Atlantic with the Pacific shall be constructed with all practical speed. That the Canadian Pacific Railway would form a great imperial highway across the continent of America entirely on British soil, and would provide a new and important route from England to Australia, to India and to all the dependencies of Great Britain in the Pacific; as also to China and Japan.
>
> That reports from the mother country set forth an unprecedented state of enforced idleness of the working classes, and the possibility of a scheme of relief on a large scale being found indispensable to alleviate destitution.
>
> That the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway would afford immediate employment to numbers of workmen, and would open up vast tracts of fertile land for occupation, and thus would form a ready outlet for the over-populated districts of Great Britain and other European countries.

And, Sir, again to-day, notwithstanding what has been asserted by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the countay demands that a new transcontinental railway shall be built with all practical speed, as 25 years ago it demanded the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A quarter of a century ago the announcement was made that a transcontinental railway should be built as an all-Canadian route, and to-day

Canada demands that this promise be implemented by the construction of a second national line, thereby giving employment to numbers of workingmen and opening up fertile lands to the tillers of the soil. It has been said Sir, that time is a great healer, and it may also be said that time is a great educator. Who amongst the old parliamentarians who sat in this House in 1878 and 1879, could have then ventured to predict that the day would come when the question of a new transcontinental would become a live issue in Canadian politics? Much as we may differ on details of this Bill, much as we may differ as to some of its features yet the necessity in which the government finds itstlf to present such a measure to the House and to the country at this juncture must indeed be regarded as a happy necessity. This policy is not a monument of folly, as was so inaptly said by the member for East Grey. It is a bold and it is an aggressive policy, but one which is sanctioned by the Canadian people. I fully recognize that hon. gentlemen on the other side would be remiss in their duty if they did not criticise the details of this measure as members of His Majesty's loyal opposition. Governments, after all, are only human; we all know the truth of the old Latin maxim, 'humanum est errare'. The Oposition, under our parliamentary system, exists for the very purpose of preventing the adoption of any measure which may not be desired by the people, and one of its attributes is to criticise in every detail any proposal of the government which it may consider is unduly pressed before the House. It is the duty of an opposition to discredit the economy and show the weak points of such a measure. But in my judgment there are broad propositions in this enactment which should rally the unanimous support of the House, as they will rally the unanimous support of the country.

First, as to the necessity for providing new transportation facilities there is no question. We are all unanimous on that point. As to the imperative need of keeping Canadian trade within our own control instead of permitting it to flow year after year into American channels, there is no difference of opinion. As to freeing our country from commerical bondage, as to the expediency of opening up the ports of our Atlantic sea-boards, as to the wisdom of developing new Ontario, new Quebec, the prairies of the west, and the great lone land on the north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, we are all of one mind. This policy of the government is a broad one, and its very essence makes for Canadian solidarity, Canadian unity, Canadian commercial independence and Canadian stability.

I listened with much pleasure to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), and if I speak to-night after him, let him not think it is because I can compare my ability with his. I am too young a member of this House to attempt to answer his very able speech, but, Sir, I am fully aware that when he says for instance that this policy is a monstrous policy, that it is a monument of folly, I know that he exaggerates just as he exaggerated in 1898, when he denounced the Yukon railway contract, submitted by the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair), whom he now extols to the seventh heaven. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), as a result of this scheme, told us this afternoon that the country would incur an indebtedness of $125,000,000. I could not but smile at the fantastic figures presented by the hon. gentleman. Did he not to-day, as he did some years ago, obey the dictates of his imagination? To-day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has done his best to run down the great lone land of the Canadian west. He and his friends represent the country through which this railway shall run as a country of muskegs and rocks; but in 1898, when the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals came before this House and sprung upon it, as the members of the opposition said, a contract which had been signed before parliament assembled, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) represented the acres of snow in the valley of the Stikine river as being able to produce recurring crops of gold year after year. Sir, I have his speech from which I quote the following:

> In the first place, Mr. Speaker, we will suppose that 500,000 free miners went into that country and located the various claims comprised in these 4,000,000 acres. Two years would be a very moderate estimate of the time required for this.

Sir, I ask my hon. friend, whose honesty of purpose I shall not discuss, where are those 500,000 free miners to-day? At that time my hon. friend, for political motives, wanted to extol the richness and wealth of the Stikine river valley, the projected route of the Mackenzie & Mann railway. He and his political associates are given to such exaggerations when it suits their purpose. This afternoon the hon. gentleman issued his challenge to the right hon. leader of the government. 'Dissolve the House,' said he, 'and appeal to the people.' Well, Sir, I will not play the part of the plumed chevalier of olden times, and pick up the gauntlet which the hon. gentleman has thrown across the House; but I can tell him this, that if to-day parliament were dissolved, and an appeal were made to the electorate on this very bold and aggressive policy, the country from one end to the other would support the present ministry. The government has been charged with hasty action in this matter. We are told that public opinion is not ripe, and that this scheme has not yet been matured. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, as a French Canadian, that if there is one thing which early in my political life I came to recognize, it was the pluck, the

grasping power, the grit of the British people ; and this is a measure which in its very essence shows these British characteristics, because the government realize quickly and sharply that it was wanted by the country. Let me recall to the hon. gentleman a historical incident. On the 26th of November, 1876, late at night, one of the editors of the London 'Times' called on Lord Beaconsfield, who was then the Prime Minister of England, and told him that he had learned during the day that the then Viceroy of Egypt, being in financial straits, was looking for a syndicate to purchase his shares in the Suez canal. At once Lord Beaconsfield, without consulting parliament, summoned the few colleagues he could gather together in the city of London, and the result was that that very night he pledged the credit of Great Britain to a very large amount for the purchase of those shares. It was a bold stroke, and it was bitterly criticised by some members of the opposition ; but, Sir, the people of Great Britain knew what was pluck, what was energy, what was true statesmanship, and posterity will for ever declare that Lord Beaconsfield, a man of foreign extraction but of British citizenship, like our own premier, rendered a most valuable service to Great Britain for the part she has to play on the European continent.

My hon. friend this afternoon stated that there was no demand for this project, that public opinion had not pronounced upon it, except some railway grafters. You are aware, Sir, that some years ago this project was presented to parliament by some well known gentlemen; and, if I have to refer to them as grafters, it is because this is the expresssion used by the hon. gentleman and he will be much surprised to find amongst those so called grafters some of his most prominent political friends. Let me quote the names of the late Senator Francis Clemow, Mr. Victor Chateauvert, candidate for the Conservative party in Quebec West, and the late Hon. Mr. Dobell, who had been a Conservative, but who joined the Liberal party because he thought his principles would be in safer hands with that party than with the Conservative party. This scheme was known as the Trans-Canada Railway, and it received the approbation of all the large public bodies in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) can state that during last year he travelled from Quebec to Vancouver, and that from every board of trade the unanimous consensus of opinion was in favour of this scheme. The Board of Trade of Quebec represented by its President, Mr. Tanguay, came before the honourable the Prime Minister on the 10th of February, 1901, with a petition in favour of this scheme, which concluded as follows :—

> On this financial basis the promoters of this enterprise would be prepared to suggest the following advantages to Canada, advantages which have never yet been offered to the country by any other railway corporation :—
>
> 1. To construct the entire road with steel rails and steel bridges of Canadian manufacture, thus offering to the new steel and iron works at Sydney, Midland, Sault Ste. Marie and Hamilton an immediate market for an immense quantity of steel.
>
> 2. To give free transportation from Quebec to any point on its line for all immigrants and bona fide new settlers and their effects.
>
> 3. To carry wheat from all points on its line in the province of Manitoba to the ocean steamer at Chicoutimi or Quebec for nine cents per bushel, thus saving the farmer of Manitoba about seven cents per bushel on present freight rates to the seaboard.

But there is more than that. If the hon. gentleman says that this scheme is only promoted by grafters, what will he think of my hon. friend who represents the county of Colchester (Mr. Gourley) ? Last winter, that hon. gentleman came from the great city of Truro to the small city of Quebec to attend the meeting of the Board of Trade, and there delivered an eloquent speech in favour of this very scheme. As far back as 1884 the Quebec legislature adopted resolutions in favour of a similar policy. This new transcontinental line will develop the resources of new Quebec to an extent which I cannot describe. The right hon. the first minister was taunted by the leader of the Opposition and the Conservative press for having made an oratorical display in presenting this measure to the House. Well, I have read very carefully the reports which have been published on the new district to be opened up by this railway and according to these reports the northern region of Quebec will benefit to an extent it is difficult to overestimate. If you will permit me, I shall read opinions given by people who were in a position to know, of the nature of the soil, of the minerals found and the other resources of these vast domains. In the great speech which he delivered, the Prime Minister spoke of the missionaries, the voyageurs and the trappers, who, in the olden days, explored the vast prairies of the west. He spoke of La Verendrye, whose sons were the first to climb to the summit of the Rocky mountains. This, Mr. Speaker, was no oratorical display, but an unvarnished statement of plain facts. This was a lesson in history to the young generation, who, in days to come, will be travelling through those distant regions in railway cars, those regions where 200 years ago the only white people ever seen there were those pioneers—men of my race and blood, and of whom I am justly proud. If you wish to know what is the nature of the soil you have to refer to the accounts given by those very men who crossed those vast plains many years ago. Here in the city of Ottawa you have the university conducted by the Oblate Fathers. As my hon. friends from the west know, the missionaries of this order have been the pioneers in the west. I have read the reports given by them and describing the Pine river valley,

the Peace river valley and Hudson bay district, and all these reports tend to show that there is in that distant land quite a new country just as rich and fertile as the southern part of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Amongst others I have read a report from Father Nedelec, an Oblate Father, and an Indian missionary, who answered several questions put to him by Mr. Scott, the secretary of the Trans-Canada Railway. Father Nedelec says :

The country is generally habitable, except a few places, chiefly along the coast. Along the east coast the fishing is good. All kinds of grain, except wheat and buckwheat, also fruit and vegetables, are, as a rule, grown with success, except a few scattered places along the coast. I find it difficult to say what population might be supported in this territory. There is room for millions with improved agriculture and the development of industries. In some places the climate is better than that of north of Germany, better than Norway, north of Scotland. Lake St. John, Newfoundland. In some parts the natural resources are magnificent, and others not so good. As a general rule it resembles Quebec and the district of Lake St. John. All I can say is that the country is larger and more habitable than can be imagined. The soil is generally of a clayey nature. Between Lake Temiscamingue and height of land, white and red pine, spruce, soft birch abound; on the other side of the height of land spruce, soft birch and cedar.

Another Oblate Father whom I know personally, who was one of my professors at the Ottawa University, gives similar evidence. I refer to Father Paradis, former missionary at Moose Factory. He says :

This territory is very suitable for settlement and the land is first-class. From Lake Temiscamingue which is 650 feet above the sea, the Moose factory, a distance of 300 miles is one black clay plain, very suitable for grain, and well wooded with maple and other hard woods. At the height of land, 920 feet above the sea, pine is found in abundance also some very large poplar. From Lake Abbittibbi to James bay the finest spruce in America is to be found, and on the south side of the mountain some red pine.

He then speaks of the temperature, after which he discusses the produce.

The best possible potatoes and all root crops are grown here. Grain has not been tested to any great extent. I think wheat would succeed as well as in Manitoba. Oats, hay and barley would certainly succeed. Natural hay, excellent for cattle raising, is very plentiful. Excellent beef is raised here.

Then he comes to minerals, and refers us to Dr. Bell's report. He said :

See Dr. Bell's report. I find him very conscientious is his reports, gypsum abounds at the mouth of the Abbittibbi river. I think there is coal and petroleum under the river. Iron is plentiful. Mineral springs abound.

I think this country might be compared to Germany in Europe and the Fort Albany district with Russia.

The climate resembles that of Kamouraska, with the same flowers, wild fruits, such as gooseberries, strawberries, juniper berries and cranberries.

Let me now refer to the report of Dr. Bell, head of the Geological Survey Department, on this same region :

A considerable portion of the territory southward of James bay is fit for settlement. My own explorations have not extended eastward of the basin of Moose river. In that basin a great deal of good land is found between the watershed of the great lakes and the commencement of the low level country to the south-west of James bay. The soil is mostly brownish, gravelly loam and light coloured clay, with sand in some parts. In the coniferous forests, when the ground is level, the surface is apt to be covered with deep moss, but when this timber has been burnt off and replaced by deciduous trees the ground is dry. The summer and winter temperature resembles those of the county of Rimouski—the summers not so hot, nor the winter so cold as at Winnipeg. The average snow fall is about three feet or a little more, still not quite so great as about the city of Quebec. Potatoes and all kinds of root crops have been found to do remarkably well. Hay also grows luxuriantly. Barley would, I think, be a sure crop every year, and rye could also be grown with advantage.

I have had experiments made at New Brunswick House and at Norfolk on the Abbittibbi river, with a great variety of field and garden seeds and the results proved that this region is capable of growing anything which can be raised, say in the county of Rimouski. I regard the region as well suited for stock raising and dairy farming and it is not unlikely to prove fit for grain also.

Minerals are to be found in this region ; nearly all the metals are to be looked for in the Huronian formation, a belt of which is believed to run all the way from near Lake Abbittibbi to the south of Lake Mistassini, and this would be crossed by any railway from Quebec to James bay. Iron and gypsum are abundant to the north-west of Moose Factory.

We have also the report of the Rev. Mr. Bompas, the Anglican Missionary at Hudson's bay. But foremost, is the report of Mr. Henry O'Sullivan, F.R.G.S., a man well known in the province of Quebec, and a surveyor of great reputation. Mr. O'Sullivan, as chief surveyor of the Quebec Lands and Forest Department, has surveyed that region three times, and I beg to quote some of his conclusions :

1st. What proportion, approximately, of the territory in question, south of East Main river, and west of Lake Mistassini, would you consider to be fit for settlement ?

A. From what can be seen by following the principal watercourses and occasional runs inland, I may say that over two-thirds of the land area should be fit for cultivation, for there are no mountains of any great extent, and the land generally rises in easy swells from the lower levels of the river basin, and unless extensive swamps may exist in the level plains between the main waterways, there is no reason why the greater part of the country would not be fit for settlement, should climatic conditions prove favourable.

He speaks of the climate and then goes on to a description of the grain and other crops :

4th. What description of grain and root crops do you consider could be profitably raised

if there were railway communications through the centre of this territory ? And is the country suitable for raising live stock ?

A. Oats, barley, pease and buckwheat. Wheat has been raised at Waswanipy, about the centre of the region in question, and the grain grown from seed raised there succeeded as well as from the seed sent there by Dr. R. Bell, director of the Geological Survey, from the experimental farm.

5th. Is the country well timbered, and with what kind of timber ?

A. The country is, in general, well covered with spruce, the chief marketable timber ; poplar and bouleau (white birch) are also found in abundance, wherever forest fires have made their marks. Banksian or jack pine is seen in the forest districts, but there is no white or yellow pine beyond the height of land, with the exception of a few scraggling groves in the neighbourhood of Lake Abbittibbi.

Now, the right Rev. W. Carpenter Bompas, Bishop of Selkirk, who has lived nearly all his life in the territory says :

The approach of your railway to Hudson's bay I think most valuable in every way, both in the way of commerce and in defence of the Dominion, if needful. Your further course, by way of Norway House, Green lake, Athabasca Landing and Lesser Slave lake, I deem very advantageous in the way of commerce and partly for settlement of the country, and especially as a route of communication with the far north country of Mackenzie river and the far northern lakes, Great Slave lake and Great Bear lake, with their fine fur country and the rich timber and soil country of Athabasca.

Then you come to Peace river, which I deem one of the chief gems of the whole Dominion. I think it certain to be settled up as soon as your railway reaches it. It has been a shame that so fine a country should remain unsettled only for want of some means of communication with it.

Permit me, Sir, to quote also from a very eminent man employed by the Department of Lands and Forests in the province of Quebec, Mr. Crysostome Langelier, who has written a book on this section of the province of Quebec, under the title 'Le Bassin Meridional de la Baie d'Hudson. He says :

In all the southern basin of this bay no mountains nor continuous highlands are to be met. Properly speaking, there are no basins, the river is simply running across vast plains level almost with the general surface of the soil. * * * In the region nearest Hudson's bay the ice has left no marks of erosion.

* * * * * *

What has just been said indicates that there are no mountains in the southern basin of Hudson's bay. A few hills here and there can only be noticed. They are of such small elevation above the general range of the ground that they seem to have been placed there simply to make one remark the general uniformity of these Silurian plains. One cannot even see there, those small hills formed by masses of gravel or other diluvian compounds, which are to be met in the plains of the Saskatchewan, where they have been gathered up in mounds by the currents which ran between the Caribbean sea and Hudson's bay. The area of good farm land comprised in this region is immense. The soil is formed of that clay which in our province supplies the most fertile tracts. Nearly in all directions the clay lies in thick strata, which form an arable land of inexhaustible fertility. These layers of clay are sometimes intermingled with sand or gravel, which only adds to their value as land fit for cultivation. This clay is sometimes to be found in compact masses, but in general it has been brought there by the action of the water combined with that of the ice, and in that state it is far more friable and of far more easy cultivation.

These clay lands stretch from Lake Mistassini to Churchill river, in all that flat country which surrounds the southern part of Hudson's bay. That is to say, that they cover an area of about 250,000 square miles. It is in this region, drained by Moose and Albany rivers, that they find their greatest development and seem to offer the best soil. This is nearly the opinion of Dr. Bell, who, during several years, has explored that country, as a member of the Geological Survey. * * *

What has just been said can give a fair idea of the lands around James bay, and which stretch north of the Laurentian plateau, from Lake Mistassini to the source of Albany river. In the vicinity of Lake Mistassini the soil is equally good, as it is averred by Mr. James Richardson's report, a man whose experience and competency are well established : 'The land is composed of rich soil, mixed with sand, well suited to agricultural purposes. This country lies on calcareous stratas, whose decomposition has resulted in forming a rich soil. The surface is level, not rising more than 30 feet above the lake, which fits that region for agricultural enterprise.' A soil just as good, if not better, is to be found in the region of Lake and River Abbittibbi. 'Lake Abbittibbi is surrounded on all sides by land formed of clay ; it is level region.

Here, I have given you the information of men who know, of men who have travelled in that country, of men who have studied the geological features of that country. It is also well known that the plateau where the Rivers Ottawa, Gatineau and Lièvre meet, contains at least 10,000,000 acres fit for agriculture. We have the reports in the Department of Land and Forests of the province of Quebec showing that this land can sustain at least half a million people. Our lumbermen will tell you—and there are some of them who sit in this House—that the water-powers are immense, splendid, and that country offers a great future for our pulp industry. Railways have wonderfully developed our timber resources of late years. They have also greatly helped our colonization movement. Let me quote what was said not long ago by the Quebec 'Chronicle' speaking of the Lake St. John district, where, as you are aware, there is a railway heavily subsidized by the government of Canada and by the government of the province of Quebec. A few weeks ago the directors of that railway went into that district to inspect the road and they reported that the movement of colonization was perhaps the most gratifying of all. The Quebec 'Morning Chronicle' of August 1st, 1903, may be quoted as follows :

The movement of colonization is perhaps the most gratifying of all. The new townships north and west of Lake St. John are being rapidly filled up in consequence of the generous policy of the railway company, which carries all new settlers and their effects free of charge. In Normandin nearly all the lots are taken, and new settlers now have to go further, into the townships of Girard and Albanel, some settlers being now as far as 75 miles from the railway. The surveyors on the line of the Trans-Canada Railway have discovered some magnificent land further west, and if this new railway goes on, as the whole population of the Saguenay ardently desires, we may look for a great colonization movement in that direction.

It will be remembered that the province many years ago gave large subsidies—some people thought too large—to the Lake St. John Railway. The wisdom of that policy is now amply justified, not only by the progress and development of the country, but by the fact that the provincial treasury is to-day receiving a revenue from the lands and lumber trade of this district sufficient to pay the interest upon the subsidies granted. It is not often that governments get so direct a return for aid to public works.

From all these facts it will be seen that this beautiful country is progressing in a marvellous manner, and it is not to be wondered at that the directors of the railway have returned from their annual inspection much gratified with what they have seen, and full of confidence as to the future of the road.

Sir, for many years past, the government of the province of Quebec, and indeed the government of the province of Ontario, have been clamouring for better terms. Better terms for what? Better terms because the provincial governments had not sufficient means to develop colonization. I make bold to say that with this transcontinental railway traversing as it will the northern part of Ontario and the northern district of Quebec, the question of better terms will be partially solved. You thus give to colonization a new impetus, and you indirectly remit to the provinces what they have expended so liberally in the past, and which has benefited directly the federal government.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the provinces of Quebec and Ontario have been clamouring for better terms for years. Might I ask him when the province of Ontario asked for better terms except at the last conference to which it was invited?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is not conversant with history. If he will go to the Library he will find the resolutions adopted by the Quebec conference in 1887, which was presided over by the Premier of Ontario, no less a man than Sir Oliver Mowat.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there a request from Ontario at that time for better terms?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly, my hon. friend must be aware of that. One of the principal resolutions adopted at that conference referred to the better terms which have been demanded from the federal govrnment.

Mr. SPROULE. By Ontario?

Mr. LEMIEUX. By Ontario, by Quebec, by Nova Scotia, by New Brunswick, by all the provinces except British Columbia. The same demand was repeated last winter, and the question is indeed a vital one for Ontario and Quebec. The reason why these provinces are clamouring for better terms is that they have not sufficient revenue to enable them to promote colonization. I repeat again that the construction of this railway in New Ontario and in New Quebec will partially solve the question of better terms. Coming now to the contract, I find that the government has made a bargain most advantageous to Canada. Compare this contract with the one passed between the Dominion government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. Compare the resources of the country in 1880 with those of to-day—and you will admit with me that the bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific is an extraordinary good one. In rough figures—and excluding all subsidies given the Canadian Pacific Railway—in recent years, we can say that this company has received from Canada: 1. $25,000,000 in cash. 2. $35,000,000 is completed works. 3. 25,000,000 acres of land.

The Grand Trunk Pacific receives no land grant. The land—at least under a reform government—will remain the property of the settler. The Canadian Pacific Railway was exempt from taxation. The Grand Trunk Pacific will be subject like all other corporations to taxation. There were monopoly clauses in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. It nearly threatened the Dominion with secession on the part of Manitoba.

This controversy of historical importance was carried on for several years between the Dominion and Manitoban governments regarding the terms and operation of what was called the 'monopoly' clause. The rights or restrictions which were so obnoxious to the provincial government are found in clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's charter as follows:

> For twenty years from the date hereof no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from any point at or near the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such line as shall run south-west or to the westward of south-west, nor to within fifteen miles of latitude 49. And in the establishment of any new province in the North-west Territories, provision shall be made for continuing such prohibition after such establishment until the expiration of the said period.

There is no such monopoly embodied in the present contract. Bygones are bygones—but one cannot help saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been royally treated by the Canadian people. The great company has certainly been quite a factor in

the making of modern Canada—but Canada has done her duty in no half-hearted manner.

What are the principal features of this contract ? The company is to build its own line from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, but the government will pay interest on certain of its bonds for seven years. The government will build the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, but will not charge the company any rental for seven years. The net outlay by the country on these two items will be about $13,000,000. The section from Moncton to Winnipeg will cost money. We will incur a large expenditure, but let us not lose sight of the fact that as soon as constructed this line will be taken off the government's hands by a responsible company, which will pay in rental a sum equal to or more than the government pays in interest. In return for its outlay on construction, the country will possess advantages almost incalculable. 1st. It will own a first-class road from the Atlantic to Winnipeg ; 2nd. It will lease that road to a great and powerful company during a term of fifty years ; 3rd. It will dictate rates not only to the Grand Trunk Pacific but control also those of competing routes ; 4th. It will be in a position to give all other railway lines running and haulage powers, not alone from Moncton to Winnipeg, but right through to Fort Simpson.

These are only a few of the many advantages drawn by the country from that contract. But there are others.

1st. The security for the bond guarantee is to be found in mortgages which may be foreclosed by the government in case of default.

2nd. The control of rates is a powerful weapon in the hands of the government—a weapon which will protect the people against extortion by this company or its rivals.

3rd. The running powers over the line reserved to other companies will prevent these from asking any subsidies for new roads.

4th. The company will provide shipping accommodation on the Atlantic and the Pacific termini.

5th. It will purchase its material in Canada.

6th. It deposits $5,000,000 as a guarantee of its good faith.

7th. It accepts the proposition that the aid extended to it is given for the purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade, and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels.

But I go further and say, the bargain is also advantageous to the Grand Trunk Pacific. It must be so, because the company would not have engaged itself (a) to build the western section; (b) to operate the whole line; (c) to pay 3 per cent per annum on the cost of the leased property; (d) to submit to government control of rates; (e) to concede running rights; (f) to quote as low rates to Canadian ports as to American ones; (g) to ship all unrouted freight to Canadian ports. To have accepted those conditions is the evidence on the part of the company that it is convinced that there is a vast business to be done and done at a profit.

Let us not forget that our North-west has become the promised land of the immigrant, and that the last few months have witnessed a marvellous influx of population from foreign countries into those territories. Let me quote a few statistics. According to the report of the Immigration Commissioner at Winnipeg, dated June 30th, 1902, the arrivals of immigrants at that city in the year 1900 numbered 31,510, and in 1901, 32,005, whilst in 1902 they numbered 55,261. Let us take now the land sales. According to the report of the Deputy Minister of the Interior for the year 1902, the fiscal year recently ended, has shown sales of 2,201,795 acres, or 1,580,768 acres in excess of 1901.

The combined area of land disposed of by the government under homestead entry, by sale, &c., and by the railway companies, amounted to 4,954,847 acres, showing a very large increase over the figures of 1901.

Not long ago the Minister of the Interior, speaking at the Metropolitan Church in Toronto, made the following significant statement :—

> The tide of population is only beginning to rise—I am not one of those who are inclined to undue optimism. I am in the habit of looking at rosy and exuberant predictions in a somewhat cold-blooded way ; but having regard to the sources of information at my disposal, I should not be at all surprised if by the first day of July, 1905, there were about 750,000 people in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and perhaps a million.

And the minister added :

> Here, then, we have the situation in a nutshell—a vast and productive territory becoming quickly occupied by a throng of people who will be called upon to take up the duties of citizenship almost at once, whose successful pursuit of agriculture will make them financially independent, and who in a short time will constitute a most potent factor in the national life of Canada.

But, Sir, in connection with this immigration pouring, as it does, into our great west, there is a future which, in my judgment, clearly establishes the fact that the movement of population will not cease until there are millions settled on the prairies of the far west.

We are all aware that up to the middle of 1902 the proportion of new settlers in the west was not much over half American, but after that date it was considerably greater.

We are also aware that during the last three or four years immense tracts of Canadian lands have been secured by American capitalists. Sir, what is the cause of this sudden American migration towards Canada ? Are the tables turned ? Shall the United States pay, as we did ere long, a tribute to Canada ? Sir, the cause, the rea-

son is obvious. The Americans have reached the limit of the good land in their own territory and are coming into Canada in thousands. The reports they are sending back will for many years to come result in increasing immigration from the United States, because the land they are settling upon is admittedly better than that of any of the states west of Iowa.

This is not a dream, this is not the whim of an imaginary mind. The day is not far distant when the west will be thickly settled by the vast army or foreigners which is now and for many years to come, invading it. Amongst those welcome invaders the Americans will figure amongst the most numerous.

Permit me, Sir, to read the extract of an interview published in the month of September last, in which Sir William Van Horne expresses his opinion on this new invasion :

> The homestead lands immediately along the railway track have been taken up, but you must remember that the territory is enormous, and that when all the homestead lands are taken up, the population will be numbered by millions, and the railway mileage will be increased tenfold. In Manitoba, I suppose, practically all the homestead lands have been taken up, and practically all the railroad lands have been sold. This is also largely true of Eastern Assiniboia, but as you go further west, of course, the unoccupied areas increase. I regard this as a permanent movement. It is not stimulated by speculation as the earlier movement was. The great majority of the people are coming with the intention of remaining permanently as farmers, and not for the purpose of buying up lands for an advance The greater part of them are people from Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska and others of the better western States, who have been successful, who originally bought their lands very cheaply, or took up homestead which they are now able to sell at very high prices, and who are coming to the Canadian North-west to repeat this operation.

If the rush of population goes on at such a rate, if our prairies are becoming the great wheat fields of the world, is not the government doing their duty towards Canada in securing at once the transportation facilities which are already or will soon be of urgent necessity ?

Sir, this project has been bitterly criticised by a man from whom you might expect better, and who once was amongst the leaders of the Liberal party in this House. The argument of the ex-Minister of Railways was not a criticism, it was a bitter attack. It was not reason ; it showed too much temper. In fact the temper that permeates the whole speech of the ex-minister shows that the true inwardness of his resignation has not been yet revealed to us. His speech is full of dread and alarm, as it is full of bitterness. It is an onslaught on his colleagues, and it would reflect on the Prime Minister, if we did not know the Prime Minister and his colleagus as well. I listened very carefully to the speech of the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) and knowing what we have done to support him in days gone by, I could not help but think that the old French adage is still true : 'Gratitude, thou are written on sand ; ingratitude, thou are written on brass.'

The speech of the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) is a tissue of contradictions. First he condemns the Winnipeg-Quebec section, and then he announces in the same breath his personal predilections for it. He is against a line from Quebec to Moncton, but he would favour a line from Quebec to St. John. He condemns the government for giving the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the prairie section, or what he calls the fat section, and he says that not until there are 5,000,000 people settled in the southerly portion of the North-west, perhaps when fifty years have elapsed, will there be some settlements in the northern territory. He says that it will injure the Intercolonial Railway if this line is built in New Brunswick, but at the same time he says that the grades to be overcome would keep the new road from being able to compete successfully with the Intercolonial Railway. He told us that a measure of this importance requires a long preparation, but what about the Yukon Railway contract, which we Liberals in this House supported in 1898 ? It was sprung upon the House during the first days of the session, was prepared by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair), and I well remember the onslaught of the opposition, how they clamoured, and how they appealed to the Liberal party to respect parliamentary government. In these days gentlemen opposite represented the ex-Minister of Railways as Cromwell himself, ordering away the mace from the House of Commons, but to-day, in their estimation, the ex-Minister of Railways is a great man in the country, and his words should be taken without cavil by the people of Canada. Let me now quote to the House some extracts from an interview which the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) gave to that book of books the 'Mail and Empire.' on the day this scheme was launched by Mr. Hays, on the 24th of November last. I will present that interview in all its nakedness : naked as a silver plate, naked as a church wall. Here it is :

> Ottawa, Ont., Nov. 23.—The announcement of Mr. Hays of the intention of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to apply at the forthcoming session of parliament for the incorporation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway has aroused great interest here, although the intimation was not unexpected. In recent speeches in British Columbia Mr. Blair, Minister of Railways, alluded to the wonderful development of western Canada, and the necessity of keeping abreast of the times in regard to transportation facilities He referred then to the possibility of one or more new transcontinental lines being constructed.
>
> The 'Mail and Empire' correspondent asked the minister to-night if he had at the time in his mind the possibility of the extension of the Grand Trunk Railway to the Pacific coast. Mr. Blair replied :

'Well, so long as the subject is one new of public knowledge I may frankly say that I knew what was coming. Mr. Hays has discussed the matter with me on several occasions, but until a definite conclusion was reached by the company I did not feel at liberty to speak of it. I am free to confess that in my judgment the development of the Canadian North-west and British Columbia will be so rapid in the next few years as to afford ample traffic for three transcontinental lines, and I am glad to know that the Grand Trunk Railway Company seeks to share in that development. To build a railway from Gravenhurst or North Bay through New Ontario, across Manitoba and the Territories to the Pacific coast via the Pine or Peace river passes—the route which, I believe, the Grand Trunk Railway contemplates to adopt—cannot be less than 2,500 miles. It is a pretty big undertaking, but it has been done before, and can certainly be accomplished again.'

Mr. BROCK. There is nothing about Moncton there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. That relates to Toronto chiefly.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let me remind my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) that he himself is quoted by Mr. Castell Hopkins, a good Tory of Toronto, as saying :

Mr. Brock, M.P., said that it would be an inestimable boon to the country.

Mr. BROCK. What would be ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In all frankness, I must say, however, that my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) explained to me last night that he meant another route. I do not know if it was further north or further south, but he meant some other route than the one contemplated in the present Bill. I accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman. I only hope he does not decry this route because it has originated in the mind of the Liberal party.

You have also probably heard, Mr. Speaker, of a gentleman well known in my province, the Hon. L. P. Pelletier, the would-be leader of the Conservative opposition in the legislature of Quebec. Not long ago this gentleman made a speech in one of the dining rooms of the House of Commons, in which I believe, he invented the phrase, that the people would consider this scheme as 'Coxey's scheme.' Speaking in Toronto, on Wednesday last, the same gentleman——

An hon. MEMBER. Who is that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. L. P. Pelletier, the organiser of the future victories of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, in Toronto the day before yesterday, he is reported as having spoken as follows :

Yesterday he had the pleasure of hearing Mr. Blair denounce the government on the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill. It was grand the manner in which Mr. Blair asked Sir Wilfrid why he could not wait. It was Senator Cox who could not wait. The proposed road was to be built through a country the birds only knew about. The building of the road was an outrage. An enormous amount of money was to be expended for the construction of a road from which the country would receive no benefit whatever.

But, Sir, the same Mr. Pelletier—I have the paper here—oh ! that my enemy had written a book—on the 28th of November, 1902, speaking at a banquet, where my hon. friend the able Minister of Justice was present, spoke as follows—I repeat his statements verbatim :

Gentlemen, you will before long spread your wings and look for a future in this province which is yours ; if you wish her to be prosperous she must prosper with you. An immense project has not long ago been traced on the map of Canada. We are to go in the districts of Keewatin and Athabaska to exploit the natural wealth which the Canadian Pacific Railway has not yet attained. To this we applaud with both hands—and the statesman who conceived the gigantic scheme of the Canadian Pacific Railway must thrill with joy in his grave.

But we say : Will this be done for the greatest advantage of Canada or to the benefit of some American ports ? We have in the northern region of this province seventy million acres of land—as good, as fertile as the western lands. We are able—by an all-Canadian railroad—which will be the shortest route to develop our own resources as well as the western ones.

This is the same gentleman who spoke to my Tory friends about 'Coxey's scheme,' and who now appeals to the electors of Ontario against it.

Let me come back to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. We have not only to look at the interviews he gave some months ago. Human nature is liable to contradict itself after such a length of time. But let us read the statement which he made before this House when the ministerial explanations were given as to what I will call the causes of his resignation ; but, as I have said, these have not been clearly revealed to me as yet. In that speech, which he delivered on the 16th of July, he quoted from his letter to the Premier as follows :

As I have said, I am in favour of the whole line being built and owned by government ; but having abandoned any expectation in that regard I am equally in favour of the whole line being a company line, if any portion of it, or a substantial portion, is to be a company line, and therefore I am prepared, since Council has determined to go forward with this undertaking at once, to co-operate with my colleagues in guaranteeing the bonds over the whole line to an extent not exceeding three-quarters of the cost of the construction of the railway.

Therefore, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, who threw so much ridicule on the project the other evening, who said that it was one of Senator Cox's schemes, and that his conscience would not allow him to stay in the government and defend it—that same gentleman said not many days

ago that he was in favour of a company building the whole line, extending from Quebec to Port Simpson, with the government guaranteeing three-fourths of its cost.

Now, Sir, what, according to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, is the cost of the construction of such a line? He puts it at $139,000,000 for the whole line from Moncton to Port Simpson. Let us deduct $19,000,000 for the portion from Moncton to Quebec, which he is not willing to assist in constructing, and for the other portion there remains a balance of $120,000,000. Three-fourths of that amount makes $90,000,000, which the hon. gentleman was ready to guarantee.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is he under the impression that the government is guaranteeing three-fourths of the cost of the eastern section.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, Sir, I am repeating the words of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, which show that he is not consistent in the declarations he has made.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman answer my question? Is he under the impression that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, was speaking of guaranteeing only three-fourths of the whole cost, and does he say that the present scheme is to guarantee three-fourths of the whole cost? The hon. gentleman says the whole cost is $120,000,000, three-quarters of which is $90,000,000. He forgets that we provide the cash for the 1,800 miles of the eastern section.

Mr. LEMIEUX. One would require to make a whole speech on the question brought up by the hon. gentleman. As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the government is at present very bitterly attacked by a leading party organ of the Conservative party, the Montreal 'Star.' It is interesting to read what the 'Star' said on November the 3rd, 1902, on this subject:

THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

As announced by a special cablegram from our London correspondent on Thursday, a second railway to the Pacific coast in Canada is to be constructed in connection with the Grand Trunk system. The work will involve the building of 2,500 to 3,000 miles of railway, and the expenditure of from $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. That the great North-west needs additional railway connections with eastern Canada is obvious. The recognition of this fact and the construction of a second Pacific line under the auspcies of the statesmen who so boldly proclaimed that the first could never earn enough money to pay for its axle grease is a splendid vindication of the policy which brought the pioneer road into existence.

Of the merits of the particular scheme adopted for providing western Canada with the required additional railway facilities it will be impossible to judge until further details are announced. It is to be hoped that provision will be made by parliament for ensuring that the immense traffic of the new transcontinental line shall always find its way to Canadian ports.

The 'Star' of to-day materially differs from the Montreal 'Star' of the 24th November last. Let me quote also a statement made by the Conservative premier of the North-west Territories, Mr. Haultain. In an interview with that gentleman, published in the Montreal 'Star' of the 27th of November last, he is reported as having said:

I believed that at the end of five years, if there were two transcontinental railways, they would have all the grain they could carry, that is, so far as the Territories are concerned. At present there is a serious blockade, and the farmers are accordingly losing 10 cents a bushel on their grain. I have letters from the west complaining that buyers have taken advantage of the situation and reduced the price 10 cents a bushel below what it is at Fort William, leaving out the ordinary railway freight rate. I intend to see Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and ascertain whether it is not possible to obtain relief in some way.

What did Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, president of the Canadian Pacific Railway say on this subject? I find that in an interview on November 27th, 1902——

Mr. COWAN. What paper?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Montreal 'Star' of course, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy said in reply to the question: 'How about the Grand Trunk Railway proposed invasion?

There is plenty of room for another road north of us, but, at the same time, the settled districts are already well served by lines. As a matter of fact, I should estimate that there is not a fifth or a sixth of the land within 10 miles of the lines up there which are under cultivation. If the Grand Trunk goes in as a colonizer, there is plenty of work ahead for it and for other roads as well. It is a big, growing country, and is only beginning to develop.

I could quote Sir Sanford Fleming, I could quote the hon. leader of the opposition himself.

Mr. INGRAM. Could the hon. gentleman quote any Conservative papers since the scheme came out?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is really too innocent. He expects too much from the Conservative papers. Mr. Meighen, who is ardently interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway and who is a brother-in-law of Lord Mount Stephen, said:

Another point: In granting a charter for a transportation company of this character, it should be specifically mentioned that the terminals, both on the Pacific and the Atlantic, should be on Canadian territory. We do not want to furnish transportation for American railway and shipping companies. We want to develop our own country and its ports.

Mr. Gear, president of the Montreal foreign exchange, gives this opinion in the Montreal 'Star.'

I think there is ample room in the west for not only the Grand Trunk Railway, but other

lines as well. The Grand Trunk Railway will open up a country of great agricultural promise, abounding in mineral resources and forest wealth.

This is taken from the 'Star' of November the 24th, 1902. In that same paper Senator Forget, one of the leaders of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, in fact the financier of the Conservative party in that province, is quoted as saying:

The establishment of a second transcontinental railway by the Grand Trunk is the best thing that could happen to Canada. It is the one great thing that will cause settlers to have great confidence in the west, and by doing so will especially benefit the Canadian Pacific Railway from the very time that such an announcement was made.

Mr. BARKER. Can you find something about the line from Moncton to Winnipeg?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall try and gratify my hon. friend. Mr. Reford was quoted a few days ago by the Minister of Finance. Let me quote another authority on the transportation question. Mr. H. Montague Allan, of the Allan Line. Mr. Allan said:

Mr. H. Montagu Allan, of H. & A. Allan, shipping agents, said: 'I am strongly in favour of the Bill as a whole, but have not had time as yet to take it up in detail. The shortening of the route from Quebec to Moncton will not, in my estimation, have a detrimental effect upon the Intercolonial. What we want is the shortest possible through route.'

An hon. MEMBER. What politics?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is a well known Conservative.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was his father?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The father of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me now quote Mr. Thomas Harling, of the Canadian Lake and Ocean Navigation Company. Mr. Harling said:

Mr. Thomas Harling, of the Canadian Lake and Ocean Navigation Company and the Canadian Ocean and Inland Line, said: 'Although there are some features to which objection might be taken, I think that on the whole the Bill is favourable to the development of the country. As regards the question of paralleling the Intercolonial, I would say that the shorter the line can be made to the seaboard, the better the chances to obtain business. The long line debars business at present, and cannot compete with the shorter lines to Portland and Boston.'

Mr. Alexander McFee, a good Conservative from Montreal, and ex-president of the board of trade said:

Mr. Alex. McKee, ex-president of the board of trade, said: 'The proposed shortening of the route from Quebec to Moncton must be a part of this scheme. The Intercolonial should not be taken into consideration at all, for it being in touch with these centres, is the commercial needs of to-day. The government should enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to make its part of the undertaking a financial success, so that it will not be hampered in providing rolling stock, &c. What is of the greatest importance, after the rails are laid, is proper facilities for handling all the freight that offers. The Grand Trunk has shown admirable enterprise in double-tracking its present lines, and it is for the people to encourage it. There are no two opinions about it, that if we are to bring the products of the industrial centre in the east in touch with the west, the Grand Trunk, being in touch with these centres, is the company that should be supported. In speaking of the east, Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces must be considered together, and consequently this transcontinental railway must bring the Atlantic seaboard in touch with the west.'

This gentleman is a well-known Conservative of Montreal. He has appeared before our committees several times. He belongs to the Albany Club of Montreal, if there is any Albany Club there. His opinion under the present circumstances is highly valuable to the government. But, Sir, these are not the only pebbles on the beach. Let us read what Sir William Van Horne says. I quote from the New York 'Evening Post':

'Canada,' he said, 'has been adding sides to her hopper for a long time——

This, you will see, is quite a historic interview.

—but has neglected to enlarge the spout. She has for years been spending millions generously in the development of the interior and her railways, but has neglected her outlet to the Atlantic. Her crops and industries have grown and the hopper is simply full to overflowing, and the outlet at Montreal is not large enough. Her exports take the easy routes by the great lakes and the Erie canal to Boston and New York, simply because Canada sits comfortably by and does not see what she is losing. . . . The position of the Canadian Pacific Railway is absolutely unassailable. For that reason, it is our policy never to oppose anything. The trans-Canada road has started with better prospects than the Canadian Pacific had once. When the Northern Pacific road was built, everybody thought it was way up north beyond nowhere. Then the Great Northern was built, and people promptly forgot thinking of the Northern Pacific as far north. Then came the Canadian Pacific, and that seemed to run through the Arctic regions. We would hail with delight a parallel route from Atlantic to Pacific to help us develop the country. There is enough of it up there for us all.

The next question is, will the construction of this road hurt the Intercolonial Railway? And here I desire to accept the challenge made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). He said this scheme was an outrageous scheme, and that neither he nor any of his officers had been consulted. If any of the officers of the Intercolonial Railway had been consulted, he was sure that they would have condemned the whole scheme. Well, Sir, I have a friend on the Intercolonial Railway. We have had very few friends on that road, we of the Liberal party. I have asked my friend if the construction of this road would injure the Intercolonial Railway. I have his answer here. Mark my words, this gentle-

man, whose name I am not at liberty to give, but whose name I will give to any hon. member, provided he will not divulge it——

Mr. BROCK. We will take your word for it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Thanks—this gentleman is one of the highest officers of the road, one who has handled the freight and passenger traffic for twenty years. He writes me under date of August 10th, 1903, as follows :

I take the first chance to give you a synopsis of my ideas as to how the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—when built—will affect the Intercolonial Railway.

While many of our opponents are factious enough to believe that the Intercolonial Railway will be ruined and merely become a local line, I for one, do not believe so, and to any moderate and reasonable man not affected by 'too much' party—who will take sufficient time and interest to look into this matter—I think he will find, in my judgment, that instead of the Intercolonial Railway being ruined, that its earning powers will be greatly increased.

For many reasons which I can adduce, among which is the fact that the public should understand that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be two distinct corporations traversing two different parts of Canada, and in no way connected with each other, except in their mutual stock interest. That the government have a contract at the present time for 99 years with the Grand Trunk Railway whereby they are to hand over, and do hand over to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal, all eastbound freight routed east of Quebec and Lévis, and I understand that this contract can only be cancelled by the government giving to the Grand Trunk Railway twelve months' notice to that effect.

Now if what I say is correct, I fail to see where the Intercolonial Railway will lose any of this eastbound freight that they are now getting, and I take it when the Grand Trunk Pacific is finished through to Moncton, that the winter export business, which the Intercolonial Railway does not get now, and are not likely to get in the future ; so that instead of the Intercolonial Railway losing business, rather it will gain largely in its earnings on what I call the two Atlantic divisions from Moncton to St. John, N.B., and Moncton to Halifax, as this new road will hand over at Moncton, train-loads of export stuff, which will reach the trans-Atlantic steamers at the two points named, so that the earning powers of the Intercolonial Railway will be greatly increased on these two divisions, more than making up for any deficit that might occur on its main line between Lévis and Moncton, but I do not admit that any decrease will take place even on that section, for the reason that, as already stated, the Grand Trunk Railway handing over their traffic freight from Ontario and the west to the Intercolonial Railway, owing to the increase of traffic caused by the opening of that section, which will give the Intercolonial Railway much more freight than they receive at the present time, so that I cannot see why these gentlemen can say that the Intercolonial Railway will be ruined.

It is a well known fact that in 1867, when the Intercolonial Railway was built, it was not talked of as a transcontinental road, but considered a link in the confederation chain between the east and west. Besides, at that time the line was looked upon as being more a military road. This was a strong argument for its being built by the north shore of the St. Lawrence, owing to any trouble that might arise in case of war with the United States, which was then a very much discussed subject.

Again, it will be noted that the Grand Trunk Pacific will pass through a fine section of the province of New Brunswick. As a matter of fact this section is considered almost a virgin forest, well wooded with timber, pulpwood, &c., &c., and will open up fine farming lands, splendid water-powers, &c.

Now as to the comparative distances from Lévis to St. John, N.B., and Moncton via Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific, the following statement I believe was pretty near the mark, viz. :—

	Miles.
Lévis to Moncton, by I.C.R...	488
Lévis to Moncton, by G.T.P...	368
Saving in favour of G.T.P...	120

Mileage from Lévis to Moncton by Grand Trunk Pacific made up as follows :—

	Miles.
Lévis to Connors, N.B..	130
Connors to Edmunston, N.B..	32
Edmunston to Nashwaak	123
Nashwaak to Chipman..	32
Chipman to Moncton..	51
Total	368

Lévis to St. John, N.B., by Grand Trunk Pacific as follows :—

	Miles.
Lévis to Chipman, as above..	317
Chipman to St. John, N.B., to be built..	66
Total	383
Lévis to St. John, N.B., by I.C.R...	577
Saving in miles by G.T.P. to St. John.	214

I am quite well satisfied that looking into this matter calmly, and what I know of that section, that the building of this line from Winnipeg to Moncton will eventually redound to the credit of the Laurier government.

Here you have from one of the leading officials of the Intercolonial Railway, a man who has managed the freight and passenger department at St. John, at Moncton, at Montreal and at Quebec, the statement that instead of lessening the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway, this new road will greatly increase them. He says also in his letter that the Intercolonial Railway was built as a military road. I need not recall to the House—I have been speaking too long already—that the Intercolonial Railway was constructed from an imperial point of view. I need not recall here the early history of its construction. The House is familiar with it. The long route known as the Robinson trace, was selected in preference to others, because it was considered the safest in the event of war with the United States, and because, at all seasons, the troops could have access to our Canadian ports.

Let me read, Sir, a few extracts from a memorandum presented by Sir John A. Macdonald to the imperial authorities at the inception of the Intercolonial Railway, and you will see that as far back as 1858 the people looked upon the Intercolonial, not as a commercial venture, but as a purely military route, built for the only purpose of protecting Canada against any contemplated aggression on the part of the United States. The fears entertained by Sir John Macdonald, of our neighbours were not received with the same levity, as the fears expressed the other day by the premier were by our hon. friends opposite. I find the following in his memorandum :

We would further mention some facts which show that while the means of resisting invasion are in no way increased, the facilities for accomplishment are daily becoming greater. There are now no less than seven American railways terminating directly at the Canadian boundary, and a far greater number touching the waters of the River St. Lawrence, and the Lakes Ontario and Erie which divide Canada from the United States. All these roads may be said to form together a continuous line, running parallel with, or in easy proximity to, the provincial boundary ; and by their means, America would be enabled to concentrate, with the utmost expedition and ease, all her forces upon any quarter, and to choose her own point of attack.

Was this a bogy, as stated the other night by the ex-Minister of Railways ? Sir John A. Macdonald spoke of a possible invasion, just as the leader of this government spoke of possible complications with the United States, which might bring about the cancellation of the bonding privilege. Sir John added :

It may be urged that war with America is impossible, or at least an event so unlikely and remote as to justify no expenditure in anticipation of it. Admitting that the character and moderation of the federal government afford assurance of continued amity, it is not to be forgotten that there are other elements, not subordinate, whose influence may at any time become too powerful for control. The best safeguard against aggression is the power of repelling it.

Sir, this is a state paper well worthy the name and the pen of Sir John A. Macdonald:

The knowledge of our weakness and exposure to attack may do much to precipitate that which, were our strength understood, would never be undertaken. It is now well known that, being cut off from England, the province cannot make her resources and strength available should the necessity for their exercise unhappily come to pass ; and when the occasion does arise, it will be too late to provide the means. The road cannot be constructed without a due regard to reasonable economy for several years, and experience shows how impossible it is to foresee what events within that period may interrupt the friendly relations with a country the peculiar constitution of which vests so much power in a class whose interests or passions may, at any time, prompt them to acts which would necessarily lead to a rupture. While, therefore, the commercial or material advantages to Canada which would follow the construction of the road are comparatively unimportant, she feels it her duty to urge the high national considerations which demand that the work should be undertaken.

I could quote also from the address sent by the Canadian people to the Queen in August, 1858, bearing on the same subject. But I have quoted enough to show conclusively that the Intercolonial was built as an imperial highway, as a military route, and was not considered from a commercial point of view. Will the new road from Moncton to Quebec parallel the Intercolonial Railway ? We have been told that it will. Sir, I am familiar with the district through which it will pass, and I am only sorry to say that this road will not traverse the beautiful counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. But I will not belittle this great question with local or selfish interests ; I will have an opportunity of speaking to the government, and of speaking loudly, when the time comes for the government to implement the promises that have been made by the previous Conservative administrations to the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure many years ago. I say that the new line will not parallel the Intercolonial. There are points of divergence which range from 70 to 80 miles. As the leader of the government said the other day, there are mountains between those two lines. But what if the two lines were parallel ? We all remember that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was first constructed between Ottawa and Quebec it was contended that it would ruin the Richelieu Navigation Company, and also the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which runs south of the St. Lawence. What has been the result ? The Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company has never paid higher dividends than since the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed. The Grand Trunk Company has doubled its traffic, and the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway line between Montreal and Ottawa and Quebec is that part which pays the best. Moreover the Canadian Pacific Railway between Ottawa and Montreal has not only constructed a line on the north shore of the Ottawa river, but it has constructed the short line. We have added to the Intercolonial the Drummond County Railway, which was so vigorously oposed by our friends opposite, in order that more transportation facilities might be provided for the growing traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, and the Drummond Railway parallels the Grand Trunk.

Will this new line be a wheat carrying road ? Sir Wm. Van Horne and others have expressed grave doubts as to the probability of this road carrying any wheat east of Lake Superior. It has been said that an all-rail route could not compete with our water route as regards rates. I will admit that our water route will always give the harvests of the west a cheaper

transportation, provided we equip wisely and intelligently our harbours and channels, but no one can deny that we have a winter, and that during five or six months our river is closed. But this road will not only be a wheat carrying road. There will be in a near future an enormous traffic of the widest variety between the east and west. The wheat output must not only rivet our attention—far from it. Has there not sprung up a cattle trade ? Will not the western ranches increase year by year ? Who could deny that this cattle trade does not and shall not depend chiefly upon an all-rail route ? Besides, this new road through its connections in Ontario and Quebec, will afford our manufacturing interests an easier access to the western market.

I am not an extreme protectionist, but I can presume that some day or other our tariff may possibly be raised against the United States.

Mr. BROCK. Why not at once ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Time will tell.

Mr. BROCK. But time will not wait.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let me tell my hon. friend that when the tariff is raised, when we have duties as high as he desires, the whole country, Ontario and Quebec chiefly, according to his own statements, will be teeming with industries, and our manufacturing interests will be largely developed. Then, Sir, will my hon. friend be satisfied with the water route and will he not prefer to expedite his products and merchandise to his North-west consumers by the all-rail route ? But, I have been told that the all-rail route can successfully compete with the water route. Of course, I may be wrong, I do not wish to prophesy upon such a doubtful subject, but I am told that immense quantities of wheat are sent from Chicago to New York by the all-rail route and that the proportion is even sixty per cent of the western wheat harvests ; that though the Chicago shippers have the option of the lake route in summer, the railways get their share of the traffic; that they hold their own and that they pay large dividends, although their lines are far from direct. What are the rates ? By the all-rail route from Chicago to New York the rate is 8·4 cents per bushel, the terminal charges are 1·25 cents a bushel, making the total rate 9·65 cents per bushel. To-day the Canadian Pacific Railway charge for carriage on their rail and lake route from Winnipeg to Montreal, is 13·4 cents to 15·4 cents per bushel. Then, the American railways on an all-rail haul succeed in getting the rate nearly 4 cents below the Canadian Pacific Railway with its lake and rail route, and as I said a minute ago they pay dividends. This is done by easy gradients as was explained the other night by the hon. member for North Norfolk. Therefore, if such is the case, we can safely hope that this new national transcontinental road may become a wheat carrying road.

Sir, the right hon. Prime Minister referred in his speech the other day to the possible hostile attitude of the United States. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals ridiculed the idea, and he added that during the seven years he had been in the cabinet he had not heard a thrill on this subject. Has he forgotten the attitude taken by the United States about our Yukon Territory ? Has he forgotten the attitude of the United States upon the Alaska boundary question ? I need not refer to our many baptisms of blood in former days not to speak of the filibustering raids before and since confederation, but can he forget the McKinley tariff and the Dingley tariff—which are an illustration of what a policy of discrimination can be towards a friendly neighbour ? Has he forgotten the Washington treaty of 1871, or how it was carried out by the United States ? Has he forgotten the draft treaty of 1874, a treaty which was prepared by the late Hon. George Brown, the father of the Liberal party in Ontario, a treaty signed by the British ambassador, by the Canadian representative and finally rejected by the United States Congress ? Has he forgotten the draft treaty of 1888 ? Has he forgotten their treatment of Canada in the Behring Sea award ? The right hon. Prime Minister said that a time may come when complications, which God forbid, might arise, which would bring about the cancellation of the bonding privilege. This statement was hailed with derisive cheers, and I was surprised to see with what levity, nay, with what scorn, such an announcement was received from hon. gentlemen opposite and from the Conservative press at large.

Sir, is it possible that in our day and generation, the hon. gentlemen should be, to that extent, at variance with themselves, and their principles ? I remember the day, not far distant, when our leaders were loudly accused of disloyalty because they advocated reciprocity with the United States. I remember those inflammatory speeches in which the Liberal party was roundly abused on account of its so-called annexationist proclivities. We were charged with disloyalty, nay worse, with treason. The echoes of the memorable campaign of 1891 still ring in my ears.

Times have changed, and the history of the last eight or ten years has proven how utterly false and despicable were those charges. But, Sir, where do the extreme loyalists of yore stand ? The idea of an all-Canadian route is despised ; a policy of 'Canada for the Canadians' is received with contempt ! Yet, Sir, is not the danger

pointed out by the Prime Minister a tangible one ? It may be argued that the bonding privilege is of mutual benefit to both countries. This I readily grant. But I make bold to say that the cancellation of the bonding privilege would injure Canada to a greater extent than the United States.

I can safely assert that not an insignificant portion of the American press and a very large body of aggressive American politicians—for reasons we can easily detect—are decidedly opposed to that bonding privilege. The New York 'Sun' has been quoted, I could refer to the 'American Expansionist ;' the presidential message of Cleveland has been read, I could recall the deliberations of a special committee of the Congress appointed in 1890, to study the commercial relations with Canada. Has not the Canadian Pacific Railway itself been threatened many a time with the American hostility ? There are not a few who in the United States consider the Canadian Pacific Railway as a great military highway for the benefit of the imperial government.

Sir William Van Horne took it upon himself to go to Boston and deliver a speech upon that very question. Speaking on December 12, 1892, he said :

> It is pretty clear from the evidently inspired utterances of a section of the public press, and from the reported presence of a powerful lobby at Washington, that an organized attempt is to be made to secure legislation restricting or destroying the competition of the Canadian railway lines ; and in support of the movement the most absurd mis-statements are put out, calculated to excite prejudice against the Canadian railways. The Canadian Pacific Railway particularly is made to appear as an arm of the British empire sustained and kept alive by unlimited subsidies for the purpose of destroying American commerce.

I have quoted this speech in order to demonstrate how uncertain and how frail is this bonding privilege. We are practically at the mercy of our powerful neighbour. Complications which I do not anticipate, but for which we may not be directly responsible, may at any time, put an end to the bonding privilege. Such being the case, apart from the purely commercial aspect, I say that the construction of a new transcontinental railway, binding together as it does those rich and vast territories and traversing Canadian soil from sea to sea, freeing us from any foreign bondage should any complications arise in the future, is a project of national importance to Canada.

Sir, can we afford to build a new transcontinental railway ? Let us compare the condition of Canada fifty years ago with what it is to-day, and let us from that, judge what Canada will be fifty years from to-day, when this contract shall be at an end. The following is a comparative statement showing the advancement of Canada in the matter of population, foreign trade and railways and also showing the enormous growth of the three cities of Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa :

	1850.	1900.
Population..	1,842,265	5,371,315
Foreign trade.. ..	$34,000,000	$448,000,000
Railways, 66, 18,140 miles worth..		$1,100,000,000

	1860.		1903.
Montreal	90,000	with suburbs	300,000
Toronto..	44 000	"	250,000
Ottawa	14,000	"	70,000

The following figures will indicate the progress we have made since 1896 :

	1896.	1903.	Increase.	Per cent.
	$	$	$	
Imports entered for consumption.	105,361,161	224,816,612	119,000,000	113
Exports, the produce of Canada	109,707,805	214,401,675	105,000,000	97
Total trade.	215,068,966	439,218,287	224,000,000	104
Revenue	36,000,000	66,000,000	30,000,000	90
Railway earnings	50,000,000	83,000,000	33,000,000	60
Exports, the produce of the mines	8,000,000	34,000,000	26,000,000	325
Exports of manufactures	9,000,000	20,000,000	11,000,000	120
Bank assets.	316,000,000	581,000,000	255,000,000	80

Canadian unity, Sir, has been accomplished by the patriotic, by the unfaltering work of three generations of men. The story of the marvellous change of which we are to-day the happy witnesses falls into three periods each with its own special watchword. The historic struggle for responsible government—for Canadian liberty, marks the first period. Then came confederation, binding together the several British provinces scattered over the North American continent. The third period bears witness to the long looked for unity of the Canadian nation, a unity brought about, not only by the obliteration of racial and religious prejudices through the social intercourse, but also—and in a large degree—through the civilizing influence of commercial relations, so highly

developed by this great agent of civilization —the railway.

Responsible government, confederation and Canadian unity, these are, Sir, the successive ideals which followed each other in a natural process of historic development. Before resuming my seat I can not help expressing the opinion that the launching of this second transcontinental railway will, in the eyes of history, be considered as the crowning act of the Prime Minister's parliamentary career. To him, as well as to his great rival, Sir John A. Macdonald, will be due the two great Canadian highways. Meternich's bitter phase in reference to Italy : It is but a geographical expression : shall never apply to Canada.'

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I believe that Canada's further national development and welfare demands a second transcontinental railway. I believe that government ownership throughout of such a railway would be in the best interests of the country and people, both present and future. But as it has been shown that only one member of the cabinet, as it was, supported government ownership throughout, and as the feeling in parliament in its favour is confined to a few members on the Liberal side, to wait until belief in government ownership had grown sufficiently to ensure the building of a transcontinental railway as a government work, would mean leaving the western country without a competing outlet, either east or west, too long for the good of either west or east. If we cannot get what we want, the next best thing is to get what we can, on the best terms we can. That being the case, I support the present arrangement. Because it doubles the industrial and productive area of Canada. Because it doubles opportunity for every man in Canada. Because it offers the shortest and best all Canadian line from tide water to tide water, summer and winter. Because it is the only all-British railway across the continent under one management. Because it is so situated as to be most secure from foreign invasion ; giving depth, and therefore, strength to our country, to the advantage of both Canada and the empire. Because it gives development and competition in transportation to 1,200 miles of grain growing country in the west, as compared with 400 miles of such country developed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Because it develops vast coal fields on the Saskatchewan, Athabasca, and Peace rivers, for the supply of fuel to the prairies. Because it gives the most northwesterly part of the prairie region, which is furthest from the Atlantic, a short outlet to the Pacific. Because it connects the railway system of Canada with 2,000 miles of steamboat navigation on the Athabasca, Peace, Liard and Mackenzie rivers, their great lakes, and the Arctic ocean. Because it develops mining and lumbering in northern British Columbia and provides facilities for profitable interchange of mutual necessities between the prairies and mountain regions of the far west. Because it ensures a third railway outlet from and through the wheat fields to the lakes. Because it develops a thousand miles of northern Ontario and Quebec, at present unknown and inaccessible. Because it cuts nearly 200 miles off the present Intercolonial distance between Quebec and Canada's nearest winter port, St. John. Because by government ownership and control of rates, with modern construction, and adequate equipment, it provides an all-year-round outlet for western grain ; and gives the merchants and manufacturers of eastern Canada profitable access to the market of the great west. Because it does this without land grant, tax exemption or provincial or local aid of any kind. Because it induces the investment of one hundred millions of British capital in Canada ; and correspondingly interests the British public in Canada's welfare. Because co-operation with the Grand Trunk Company secures effective, satisfactory and business-like operation ; ensures fulfilment of all engagements, provides business from the start, and secures the government from payment on its guarantee. Because by that co-operation all principal points in eastern Canada are put in direct connection with the west without extra cost. Because it transfers the through-traffic interests of the Grand Trunk, from the western states, to western Canada. Because it provides against over capitalization for effective government control of rates, and secures running rights to other roads throughout its whole length. Because an Atlantic outlet for the Canadian Northern, and extension of the Intercolonial to the wheat fields, is provided for without a cent of additional public cost. Because it gives maximum public control for a minimum public outlay, and absolute security for the financial responsibility assumed.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, as it is pretty late in the evening, and as a number of our members have gone to their homes, I move the adjournment of the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, though it is yet somewhat early in the evening, as I am sure my hon. friend has an important speech to make, and as the attendance in the House is rather slim, I feel inclined for my part to agree to the motion of my hon. friend. But I would like to intimate to the House—and in this I hope I shall have its support—that commencing on Monday next our sittings ought to be more extended in evening than they have been up to the present time this session. I think—and in so saying I believe I also express the feeling of the House—that it is time we should think of such a thing as prorogation.

Therefore, I propose that on and after Monday next the House should sit late, and even pretty late.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I may say that the reason why a speaker on this side did not follow the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) this evening was owing to an arrangement which we had that he would speak about one hour, and that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Smith) would have an opportunity of beginning his speech not later than a quarter to ten; but as the hon. member for Gaspé spoke till about ten minutes past ten, the hon. member for Wentworth was precluded from making his speech this evening. I think this explanation is due to this side of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no fault to find.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I wish to say, in answer to the Prime Minister, that I would like to listen, to the debate and understand it, and I can assure the right hon. gentleman, that sitting in the House from eleven o'clock in the morning till twelve at night, imposes upon any one, who cares to listen and understand, what is going on, a great mental task; and if he has anything to do beyond that time, he is driven from morning till night. Therefore, I would ask the Prime Minister, whether eleven or twelve o'clock, is not the latest hour, to which we shoull be called upon to sit ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know my hon. friend's feeling, but I may say that my mind is made up—I am ready to vote.

Mr. J. CLANCY (Bothwell). I assume that the right hon. gentleman has of course consulted the leader of the opposition, as I think he would be entitled to do, before he made this announcement. The right hon. gentleman knows that we have commenced two sessions per day; and, while we all devoutly hope for an early prorogation, at the same time, he knows that we have entered upon the consideration of a class of legislation that should occupy the greater part of an ordinary session, and I hope he will defer committing the House to an understanding that we are to sit very late. He must see that that has somewhat the appearance of forcing the measure through at a time when members are not in the same trim that they are earlier in the session.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) We are in splendid trim on this side of the House.

Mr. CLANCY. In a word, I wish to call the right hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that his announcement will not be very well received.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only to point out to my hon. friend, who is an old parliamentary hand, this fact, that this session we have not followed the rule which prevailed in my earlier days, when I first came into this parliament, not to adjourn before twelve o'clock, sometimes not till one o'clock. I do not intend to force the discussion. On the contrary, I think the opposition should have every latitude. But, on the other hand, my hon. friend must admit that we should not adjourn at half past ten, but should sit later.

Mr. CLANCY. The right hon. gentleman knows that if we have been adjourning early, it has been at the instance and for the convenience of his own supporters. I am not at all complaining of that, but I would like the right hon. gentleman, before he comes to a final conclusion, to consult the leader of the opposition. It is only fair, I think, that that should be done.

Mr. GOURLEY. And at the time the right hon. gentleman first came to the House, the strenuous life was not as popular as it is now, and it depends on food and sleep. In those early days members of parliament had a stimulant of some kind, which enabled them to maintain an all night session, and which we do not have.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, August 17, 1903.

The Speaker took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I have noticed that several hon. members much more competent to deal with this question than I am, and much more accustomed to speaking, have made apologies for the length of their remarks. Let me say, while possessed of all reasonable modesty, that I esteem it to be my duty to be guided rather by what I think is proper and necessary to be presented to the House than by the question of the time which my remarks may occupy. The question that is presented for our consideration is one so broad, so far-reaching that, if we had months to consider it, aye, if we had months to debate it, there would yet remain aspects of the question which would be useful to be presented and valuable to be considered. But I will endeavour, having regard to the importance of the case, to confine my remarks and my criticism to as reasonable a space as I can. I believe in the future of Canada. I have as great confidence in the future of Canada, perhaps, as any hon.

gentleman in this House. I belong to a party that has always had faith in the prosperity and achievements of Canada. As firmly as I believe in the rapid advancement of any part of it, I believe and look for the rapid advancement of the great west. I believe that, as representing a constituency, and as representing also the interests of Canada as a whole, it is my duty and the duty of every hon. member of this House, irrespective of politics, to see to it that the west has reasonable facilities for transporting to market its enormous product. And I will not be behind any hon. gentleman in conceding reasonable facilities to the west, or any other part of Canada, consistently with our duty in administering honestly and fairly the resources of the Dominion and in controlling the federal exchequer.

The Speaker, who closed the debate, was the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I have greatly admired the manner in which the hon. gentleman presents his arguments, although I have not often been able to see the cogency of his argument. I admire very much the forcible, earnest and sometimes, if I may say so without offence, the almost dictatorial manner in which he presents, as the ultimate conclusion of the matter, the view he happens to take of it. However, I do not propose, on this occasion, to deal with the manuscript which the hon. gentleman presented the other night. It contains five introductory sentences, and twenty 'becauses'; or four introductory sentences with one 'because,' and one other sentence containing twenty 'becauses,' as you prefer the punctuation. If his reasons are good, his statement is unanswerable. But the strength of his 'because' depends upon the cogency of his proposition. If one of them is good and broad enough to cover the whole proposition, the proposition is sustained. It is like presenting a number of reasons to the Court of Appeal—if you have one strong one, you may abandon the rest. I do not consider that the time of the House would be well occupied in discussing these 'becauses.' And the reason is 'because' all the hon. gentleman merely gives is twenty texts. He advances not one proposition, not one argument, not one fact in support of these twenty texts. It would be as easy to formulate forty texts, and I believe you can subdivide these forty into forty others in dealing with a great proposition such as that before us. It reminds one of the case of puss and the fox. I do not remember the story very well; the younger members of the House who have been more lately under instruction than I, will recollect it more clearly. But as I remember it, it was something like this: Puss, with her usual modesty said she had one method of getting clear of dogs. But the fox said he had ten in hand and ten times ten in a bag. Just then the baying of a hound was heard. Puss ran up a tree; and from the top of the tree she had the satisfaction—I presume it was a satisfaction, because we all condemn boasters—of seeing a dog's nose very close indeed to the fox's brush. Now, these reasons or texts of my hon. friend from Alberta, I am afraid, are somewhat the same as the fox's methods. I am afraid that, if put to the test, they would hardly answer. For instance, take the hon. gentleman's because' of two miles of shortened distance. I am afraid that, upon investigation, that would hardly bear criticism.

Now, I come to the speech of the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). If there is an hon. member of this House whom I enjoy listening to, an hon. gentleman who, I think, delivers his addresses in a graceful and pleasing manner, one who makes the most out of a bad case, if he happens to have a bad case—and sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, he very often has a bad case—it is the hon. member for Gaspé. But while, like the hon. member for Alberta, the presentation of his case is admirable, I fear that also like the hon. member for Alberta, his logic is not always conclusive. An hon. friend near me suggests that it is very limpy, and so it is. Let me refer to some of the hon. gentleman's statements in support of that proposition. The hon. gentleman says that under our parliamentary system, the opposition exists for the very purpose of opposing any measures which are not desired by the people. Now, I forgot to say that it will be my pleasing duty to concur in a great deal of what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I give my full concurrence to this proposition of the hon. member for Gaspé. He says that the function of the opposition—and he stated that he did not blame us for discharging our function—is to oppose any measure which might not be desired by the people. That is exactly what this measure is. Canvass this country from one end to the other, go where you will and the preponderating voice is, and the overwhelming voice will be when the scheme is fully understood, absolute condemnation of this measure. The hon. member for Gaspé says it is also the duty of the opposition to criticise any measure which may be considered as unduly pressed. It was evident that the right hon. leader of the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) realized the weakness of his case in this respect and sought to defend himself by urging the immediate necessity for relief and the demand of the public. My hon. friend from Gaspé also realizes that this measure, which he himself describes as the most momentous that has been introduced into parliament since confederation, and which is introduced at the eleventh hour, at the very end of a long session, should not be brought before us now. It is unduly pressing the measure; it is unduly exercising, not the right, but the power of the administration, when a measure of this kind is brought in at this stage and pressed through parliament.

Now, the hon. member for Gaspé says that the policy of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is to run down the great lone land of the great North-west and the policy of his friends is to represent the country through which this railway shall run as a country of muskegs and rocks. Let me just interject, in passing, the question: What does the hon. gentleman mean by 'the great lone land' through which this railway is to run. I thought that the proposition of the leader was to build a road to carry out the millions of bushels of grain awaiting transportation and to alleviate the congestion that exists. A great lone land, forsooth. And yet the hon. gentleman talks in this way as regards a great proportion of this enterprise. A great lone land for the present it certainly is, in northern Quebec and northern Ontario, along the borders of Lake Huron and Lake Superior; a great lone land it is as concerns the mountains west of Winnipeg, a great lone land it is from the mountains to the Pacific ocean, and it must necessarily be so for many years to come. But I refer to this because the hon. gentleman, and other hon. gentlemen upon the government side of the House, have been, to borrow his own language in reference to the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), indulging in imagination. They have been imagining that which they wish to exist, they have been trying to show that members on this side of the House have been belittling the west. Why, Sir, I challenge the hon. gentleman, I challenge any hon. gentleman supporting the government, to show one instance where one hon. member on this side of the House, either in this debate or in any previous debate in the House of Commons or out of it has decried or made little of the land which the Conservative party opened up and developed. But what are facts. Is it a fact that the member for East Grey did decry the great lone land? It will be in the judgment of the House whether it was the hon. member for Gaspé or the hon. member for East Grey who did so. The hon. member for East Grey, in the course of his magnificent presentation of the case, made this statement:

> I understand very well that our North-west is a great country. I do not underestimate its value and importance. I know that the great future of Canada is bound up in the west, and I believe it will be necessary in the future to provide for a development that has been unparalleled in the history of this country.

Is that decrying the west? Is that withholding from the west those legitimate means of transportation which it has been the policy of the Conservative party in the past to give, and which it will be the policy of the Conservative party in the future to give. If 'the Conservative party should, ever renounce that policy, I would cease to remain a member of it. He says too that is the policy of 'his friends.' Well, if it is I think I have answered it pretty fully, if not effectually. Is it the policy of his friends in the great lone land he refers to? Sir, is it the policy of the man in the west who more than any other man in the Dominion of Canada, the Hon. Mr. Roblin, a gentleman who sat upon the floor of the House the other day, and who has been instrumental in obtaining for the west a policy which is magnificent beyond description, a policy which has done much to solve the great transportation problems in the west.

The hon. member for Gaspé announced, with what he meant to be a flourish of trumpets, that he had a mandate from the people upon this question, and I believe that some hon. members supporting the government are foolish enough to imagine that they do have a mandate upon this question. I would like to ask thoughtful and considerate members on either side of the House whether any one of them—of course we know the right hon. leader of the government said he had a mandate—I would like to ask whether if any hon. member of this House has really a mandate from the people in regard to the proposition that is before us at the present time. Why, Sir, it is known that this scheme was created, it was born, and I think it was stillborn, within a few hours, or a few weeks of the time it was presented to this House. Not one hon. member, I venture to think, has ever presented the question to his constituents. Nay, I may say upon the authority of the right hon. leader of the House, that not one member on his side has presented this question to his constituency in any shape or form, for the right hon. gentleman announced that his own following did not know what the policy was. A mandate, forsooth. Then, the hon. gentleman refers to the challenge, as he called it, made by the member for East Grey. He says that if the government accepted it they would win out. He says that from one end of the country to the other the people would rally to their support. Well, Sir, why not accept the challenge? Call it a challenge, call it a request, call it a prayer, if you like, on behalf of the people of this country, in justice to the people of this country, in the name of fair-play to the people of this country; I ask the question, and at the same time I make the request, why not give the people a chance, why not give them a chance to say whether this vast expenditure shall or shall not be incurred by the government. It is right, it is constitutional, it is fair-play; the opposite course is not in harmony with the constitution, not in harmony with the equitable working out of the principles of responsible government. I invite the leader of the government to consider this proposition. He says he has no ear for those who say, To-morrow, and to-morrow and to-morrow'; he has no ear for those who say, 'Wait, wait, wait': he has

no ear for those who say, 'Pause, consider, deliberate.' The hon. gentleman can give this oportunity to the people without losing one hour of time. He can, in the meantime, fortify his position if it is tenable at all; he can in the meantime send properly equipped exploring parties into the country and give us that adequate information which we are now denied. Hon. gentleman tell us of the vast resources in northern Quebec and northern Ontario. I do not deny them. They make rosy pictures, I do not dispute them; they give glowing accounts, I do not dispute them. I merely say I do not know, and I echo the sentiment, the honest sentiment, of the majority of the members of this House, when I say so. Remember that you have not the whole intelligence of the country represented in this parliament, you have not all of the true sentiment of the great body of the electorate who sent us here to be their servants. And I again ask the right hon. leader of the government, would it not be wise, would it not be judicious, would it not redound to his credit in the future, if he accepted the request of the hon. member for East Grey and gave the country an opportunity to pronounce upon this great question?

But the hon. member for Gaspé is too zealous, and like all too zealous friends, he proves too much. The right hon. leader of the government gave us to understand that this was a new proposition; the hon. member for Gaspé gave us to understand that it is not a new proposition. He gives us to understand that it is identical with the trans-Canada Railway. He says that was endorsed years ago by the government of the country, as I understood him. Well, this is news to us. But I question both his facts and his conclusion. I do not think this scheme is identical with the Trans-Canada. There is no proposition there to go to Moncton, there is no proposition there for this system of half government ownership and half company ownership, there is no proposition there to form a partnership, and a very questionable partnership it is, between the Dominion of Canada, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and Senator Cox—there is nothing of that kind. But on the other hand, there is this in the Trans-Canada, that they made promises, according to the hon. gentleman's own quotations, which were of vast importance to this country if implemented, and which are not to be found in the proposition now before the House. Their first proposition was—

To construct the entire road with steel rails and with steel bridges of Canadian manufacture, thus offering to the new steel and iron works at Sydney, Midland, Sault Ste. Marie and Hamilton and immediate market for an immense quantity of steel.

Hon. gentleman on the other side will take nothing for granted, it appears, at the present time. They say: Oh, but there is the same thing in the agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as with this other company.

Mr. COCHRANE. No.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) says no. Any schoolboy fifteen years of age will say no, and the country will say no, but, my word for it, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will say yes, because they have said it before. But the fact is that it differs in this particular:

To construct the entire road with steel rails and steel bridges of Canadian manufacture——

——in so far as we can, in so far as it is possible. These contracts differ in this most important degree.

To give free transportation from Quebec to any point on its line for all immigrants and bona fide new settlers and their effects.

That is a pretty fair proposition, because that scheme was launched as a colonization road, and that was its main purpose, as this one is if you reduce it down to its essence, and the only thing it really is. When reduced to its proper proportions, it is a colonization scheme only. This is a sample of the kind of argument which, with all its grace and all its beauty, the hon. gentleman presented to the House, and this shows what it amounts to upon being analysed. But the hon. gentleman has not yet displayed his great weakness. Here is a better specimen of it. He is not far behind the right hon. leader of the government in that respect. The right hon. leader of the government said: We have mountains of information, the people are entitled to what information we have, they are entitled to know just where we stand in this regard. I am not attempting to repeat the graceful sentences of the right hon. leader of the government, because the right hon. gentleman, I need not say, has a manner of turning his sentences which it is hard to equal. I am only giving the substance of his argument. He says: I will give you the proof, and then the right hon. gentleman proceeds to give the proof, and he gives us instances of a number of gentlemen who, from 1700 and something down to 1793, had made explorations in the west. The efforts of these devoted men, these men of self-sacrifice, of great endurance and of heroic purpose, are not to be discounted within their sphere, but the right hon. gentleman fails to give us that data and the only data from which we can form any intelligent conclusion, that is actual surveys made upon the ground, actual measurements of the heights and the depths over which we have to pass, that reliable information which would guide intelligent business men in considering whether this proposition is a feasible one or not. I do not stand second

to the right hon. gentleman in admiration of the distinguished men whose names he has mentioned, but, when it comes to a railway matter, as the right hon. gentleman was speaking of a time before railways were known, aye, before Watts, if it was Watts, discovered the powers of steam, and before Stevenson had invented the steam engine, before railways were thought of in the Dominion of Canada, to bring proof of this kind before this House is to acknowledge the weakness and fallacy of the proposition. The hon. gentleman with whom I am particularly dealing now follows in the same strain. He tells of the vast resources of northern Quebec and northern Ontario. I am not disputing that what he says may be all correct. I am saying that we do not know. But he calls as witnesses, whom?—surveyors, engineers, experts? Not at all. He calls as witnesses gentlemen whose veracity, whose fairness, whose candor or integrity, will be questioned—clergymen—four clergymen, or five—it does not matter about one or two clergyman, more or less, upon a question of this kind. He calls as a witness a learned doctor, too, and upon this he rests his case. Is this not showing the weakness of his case? I submit that no greater condemnation of a scheme could be afforded than is afforded by this hon. gentleman. But let me refer to one gentleman who might be considered an authority cited by my hon. friend. He is Mr. Henry Sullivan, F.R.G.S.

Mr. BENNETT. Not 'Cap.'?

Mr. LENNOX. No; I will refer to the 'Cap.' afterwards.

Mr. BENNETT. 'Cap.' will be in for a contract.

Mr. LENNOX. This gentleman is only speaking of a small section of the country, and he says:

> From what I have seen by following a number of the water courses and occasional runs inland——

That is not a very extensive exploration—'occasional runs inland.' Then, omitting that which is irrelevant, he says:

> Unless extensive swamps exist on the level plains between the main waterways there is no reason why the greater part of the country would not be fit for settlement should climatic conditions prove favourable.

In other words, the qualifications are much more important than the main proposition. He says he made 'occasional runs inland.' How far or for what purpose we do not know, and he says: If there are no extensive swamps. There are likely to be extensive swamps, and then he says that if climatic conditions are favourable he sees no good reason why there should not be settlement. Hon. gentlemen opposite were charmed with the untested generosity of the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) the other night. Suppose he says: I am going to give you, by reason of your services, $1,000 less $999. That is about the meaning of this report. Having gone over the hon. gentleman's quotations, I am inclined to think that he hardly did justice to the case. I want justice done in northern Quebec and northern Ontario, and when we read these reports the conclusion of the whole matter is that there is a good deal of pulp wood up there, that there is a chance that we can raise potatoes, that we can raise oats, and that in some regions we can raise barley, and stops there and leads to the conclusion that the conditions of northern Ontario and northern Quebec are not better than that, I protest. I believe they are better. I am not behind my hon. friend, I am ahead of him, in appreciation of the resources of this northern country; but I say, granting all that has been said, there is no basis upon which we can form a conclusion as to whether the possibilities of the future of that country are such as to justify the government in rushing in with mad haste to construct an enormous work of this kind. So far I have been in harmony with my hon. friend. I see very much along the same lines as he does. I have not endeavoured to entice him from the beaten path, but my hon. friend makes a proposition here that I am inclined to agree with again. I agree with every word of it, almost; I agree entirely with the conclusion of the matter. Let me, before referring to that, refer to a peculiar coincidence. I said that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver)—it is only just to that hon. gentleman that I should refer to his speech or to his manuscript—divided his becauses under twenty heads. My hon. friend with whom I am dealing divides these advantages thus: 1, 2, 3, 4; then again: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; then again: a, b, c, d, e, f, g; total 18. This is not quite coincident with the speech of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), but it shows such a remarkable family likeness as to lead one to infer that perhaps these two speeches were prepared in the same camp.

Mr. BROCK. In the same caucus.

Mr. LENNOX. In the same caucus my hon. friend suggests. Another hon. gentleman suggests by the same man. But that is not the gist of the matter with which I have to deal. The hon. gentleman said—and I agree with him in his conclusions: 'But I go further and I say the bargain is advantageous.' Advantageous to whom? To the country? Oh, no, that is not what he said. 'But I go further and I say the bargain is advantageous to the Grand Trunk Pacific.' Does anybody deny that? The Grand Trunk Pacific people, call them what you will, are at all events shrewd business men, and you may bet your last dollar that

the bargain will be advantageous to the Grand Trunk Pacific and to all who are allied with them. The hon. gentleman says: 'It must be so, because the company would not have engaged itself'—then comes the subdivision: '(a) to build the western section; (b) to operate the whole line.' Let me transpose these for the purpose of directing the sense of the House to the great cogency of this argument: 'It must have been advantageous, otherwise the Grand Trunk would not have agreed—to operate the whole line.' What marvellous self-denial! A company willing to operate the whole line and willing to build the western section. If they had been willing to build, and if the government had been astute enough, and had been enough alive to the interests of the people of this country, to require them to build the eastern section, then the hon. gentleman would have had some foundation for talking. But they are to build the prairie section, in the country which is to be inhabited in the almost immedate future by teeming millions of people, the country which the hon. Minister of the Interior describes as unequalled, not in Canada, but in the world. Go in and possess that land. And they have agreed to operate the eastern section, which is to be built for them without the expenditure of a single dollar, and placed under their control. I have always thought that if you were making an absolute gift to a person, it was not good manners for him to ask the price or to pry into the question where you got it, or to say, I will go and select the article myself. But here we have a government making an absolute gift, in reference to this eastern section, of nearly $70,000,000 to this company, and this company, according to the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), has engaged to operate it but only upon condition that they supervise the construction. What magnanimity! And they have agreed '(c) to pay 3 per cent per annum on the cost of the leased property'—from fifteen years from now, barring strikes, barring delays, barring quibbles at the end of the construction period; for, when the work is completed there will be a delay of another year and the company will say, it is not yet completed. About sixteen years from now the people of this country will be in a position to demand a balance sheet, and a final settlement of the account, and then God knows what an amount this country will have been committed to. They have also agreed, the hon. member says: '(d) to submit to government control of rates.' My hon. friend is a lawyer and a most astute politician—an old member of this House. Does he not know that all railways in this country, except the government railway, have to submit to have their rates controlled by the railway commission? And yet he advances this statement as an argument. They also agree, he says: '(e) to concede running rights; (f) to quote as low rates to Canadian ports as to American ones.' I hope my hon. friend does not show any particular astuteness as a lawyer, because lawyers are all honourable men, and are particularly candid. But he shows the astuteness of a politician when he says that this company has agreed—not to carry produce at the same rates to Canadian as to American ports, but to quote rates as low to Canadian ports as to American ports. One day when I asked an old Irishman who was collecting an account, what he had to say about a fraudulent entry made by his opponent, he said 'Why, paper won't refuse ink.' And this paper of the railway company will not refuse the quotations which the master hand of the railway enterprise shall see fit to put there. But quoting rates and giving fair terms are two different things; in other words, the control of discrimination and the stoppage of discrimination are entirely different propositions from the mere matter of quoting rates. But I come again to the part with which I agree, completing the connection. The hon. gentleman says: 'But I go further, and I say, the bargain is advantageous to the Grand Trunk Pacific. It must be so, because—to have accepted those conditions is the evidence on the part of the company that it is convinced that there is a vast business to be done, and done at a profit.' I agree with that. I agree that it is a profitable bargain for the Grand Trunk. I agree that it is a bargain likely to result in the further enrichment of the millionaire who is engineering this thing through at the present time, and his camp followers who are supporting him in the measure. But what I call the attention of the House and the country to is that it is going to be too profitable to the promoters of the scheme and vastly too unprofitable and unfair to the people of the Dominion of Canada.

Now, what is the price? I have a little book here. It is not a Bible, but it is a good book; and from it I get the price. I am glad I have this book. Hon. gentlemen upon the government benches, the hon. members of the government, the right hon. leader himself, have failed to give the House that enlightenment or the country that information, which it reasonably demands on this important question: What is to be the price? But I am within the fact when I say that the hon. members of the government had in their possession this little book, which was presented to them as the initial move in this vast transcontinental, all-Canadian line; and if they had consulted this book, or if they had seen fit to see what is in it, we would have known better at this stage what the price is to be. This is a book issued by the Grand Trunk Railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific, I do not know which. Where any hon. member can draw the line between these two companies I do not know. It is also issued by 'the interests,' whatever they are,

which are promoting the scheme. Whether that means Senator Cox or not I do not know. Hon. gentlemen are as able to form their conclusion as I am. Hon. members of this House will remember the assiduity with which members of the Railway Committee endeavoured to elicit from those who were promoting the scheme in the committee whether or not a subsidy was required. They were dumb as a porcupine, somebody says.

You would think that they had not formed a conclusion, that in their innocence they had come to the railway commission without having thought of the matter, but back of that, when this matter was first discussed in the newspapers, in November last, this pamphlet was issued. It may have been ready before that, but I have no reason to suppose that it came to the notice of the government before that day. It is headed: 'government aid or subsidy required.' The hon. Minister of the Interior tells us that throughout the Dominion there is a demand for another railway, that there is an outcry in the west and in the centre and repeated right down to the sea for an additional railway. There is a demand, no doubt, a demand which is at the back of this whole matter, and to which it owes all its impulsion, and that is the demand of Cox & Company on the government for a subsidy, as set forth in this pamphlet. Before setting forth in the pamphlet this demand, these gentlemen tell us of 'the Dominion's needs.' Evidently they thought the government did not know. These railway promoters have evidently not a very high opinion of the government, and they perhaps know and understand the members of the cabinet better than we do. Under the heading I have mentioned, this little pamphlet goes on to say:

> The unanimous report of all explorers who have travelled over the territory north of the Georgian bay and Lake Superior, is to the effect that it will not in the immediate future furnish business sufficient to support a railway, and it would not, therefore, be a business proposition to build one there.

That is what we find in this pamphlet. But it is a business proposition I am after. If the proposition be not a good business one, I do not care whether it emanates from the Grand Trunk Railway or anybody else. I shall not support it. If this be not a business proposition, it will not work out with the business men of the west. These men are sharp to look after their own interest, they are bound to progress, and if my hon. friend thinks he is going to gain favour with the people of the west by an unbusinesslike proposition, if he thinks he is going to secure their support by appealing solely to sentiment, I am inclined to the opinion that he is reckoning without his host. This pamphlet gives a black picture of the country through which this projected railway is to pass—a picture altogether out of harmony with the glowing one given by my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). It proceeds to say:

> It would not therefore be an unbusinesslike proposition to build one there unless it was used as a link to reach the more fertile lands of Manitoba and the North-west; the mileage through this unproductive section is estimated as 1,000 miles.
>
> The line from Winnipeg to the Rocky mountains for a distance about one thousand miles, will pass through a fertile territory but without population, or business, which must be created, but which is undoubtedly capable eventually of sustaining a very large community. It is, therefore, considered, by the interests presenting this proposition, as not unreasonable for the government to assist in the undertaking, which will guarantee the road being built in a first-class manner, and up to modern standards in all respects, as to roadbed, bridges, stations, equipment, &c.; and assure the development of as virgin and as more extensive section of country north of the Canadian Pacific Railway than was opened for settlement by the construction of that railway, and extending north of the boundary line.

Here is the point as to the subsidy:

> It is, therefore, quite as much in need of, and entitled to aid from the government, on its merits, at this time, as the Canadian Pacific Railway was at the time it was constructed, about eighteen years ago.

Here we have a definite proposition from this company at a time when they did not intend to run that unprofitable branch from Lévis to Moncton, and they demand from the government, as a condition of their constructing the line, a subsidy equal to that granted the Canadian Pacific Railway. This will be, I submit, a measure of the cost which we may expect to incur in the construction of this road, now that practically the whole burden of construction is assumed by the government. What did the Canadian Pacific Railway cost the country? $65,000,000 in cash and $75,000,000 in land, is about the lowest estimate of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not disposed at present to controvert their figures. I might, if I wished, show that they are valuing the land at more than it was worth at the time the company obtained it. But let that go. $140,000,000, we will say, is the amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and definitely and specifically this new company was formed on the proposition that they should receive equal aid. What do the facts go to show? Do they go to show that this undertaking will cost the government as much as $140,000,000? I shall again appeal to the authority of the Grand Trunk Railway, taken from this pamphlet, in support of the proposition that the road will cost every dollar of $150,000,000 before it is completed. I attach no importance to the fact that, as to the western section, there is only a guaranty, whereas the eastern section is to be paid for directly by the country. The government assume the total liability, and it is not to be supposed that it will ever be wiped out. The government build the eastern section, and three quarters

of the prairie and mountain section, and the total outlay, the total guarantee of the government, is the proper measure to be used in estimating the liability of the government expense to the country. But the First Minister and the Minister of the Interior answer us that the government have absolute security and absolute immunity from the possibility of having to pay. They point to the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway assets amount to $150,000,000. Well, admit the $150,000,000, and I am still doubtful. I do not like the way this thing has been launched. I do not think it is open and above board. With whom are we dealing? We have been told time and again that we should not deal with a company which is not in existence. But we know that we are dealing with such a company. Worse than that, we are dealing with two companies, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and no man on earth can discover the line of demarcation between them. It is like the case of: heads I win, tails you lose. This is a cover which is always used when men want to reap the profit, if profit be made, and slink out if loss be incurred. It is the sleeping partner business. It is not profitable to the country. It may be profitable to the company; but should there be disaster, that disaster will be loaded on the country. What is the security of the Grand Trunk Railway? If a man comes to me and wants to borrow $1,300 and I ask him for security, and he says he will give Mr. Brown, and if Mr. Brown borrowed from me $1,500 in 1865 years ago, upon which he has paid neither a cent of capital or interest, would I not be justifiable in refusing to take him as security? Could you blame me? It is said that a man will pay his own debt when he will not pay a suretyship debt, it is a common tendency in such cases for the man to say: I am not called upon to pay; let the creditor lose who took the profit. Then, what is the position in which the country stands in relation to this proposition? We are offered the security of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. In 1865, they borrowed $15,000,000 from the people of this country. They have not paid it back. Worse than that, like the debtor I have spoken of, they have never paid a single cent of interest, and, on the 30th June last the amount due stood at $58,308,179. I have no word to say against the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I recognize that, side by side with the great Canadian Pacific Railway, they have done much to develop the interests of this country, and, of course, they have done it to their own great advantage. But when it is put forward as a business proposition by any hon. member of this House, when it is put forward by the right hon. leader of the House and the chief members of his cabinet that we are secure in a contract of this kind because we have the security of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I ask what reason is there in believing, what common sense is there in believing, that the position and action of that company will be better in the future than it has been in the past? What guarantee have we that we shall be better treated in the future and in this new deal than we have been in the past? And if the treatment accorded us should be the same, at what untold millions will the amount of their indebtedness to the people stand? Now, I have a further word to quote from this little book of facts; —bear in mind, 'facts'—not theory, but cold facts as set forth in this book issued by the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself, the company that has the certificate and endorsement and guarantee of the government. You cannot dispute the honesty of your own witness; you cannot cavil at the respectability of the man you put in the witness box. And I know the government will dispute the testimony of this veracious chronicle.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Voracious?

Mr. LENNOX. Veracious and voracious too. We are told here that the railway from Quebec to the Pacific coast will be 3,025 miles long. This is made up by specifically giving the distances five hundred odd miles to North Bay, and the remainder for the western stretch. At that time, that is what the railway company contemplated building; and it should never be forgotten by members of this House who wish to give an honest, fair and full consideration to this measure that we are dealing now not with a proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, not with what they wanted to do, but with that proposition and an unprofitable tail tacked to it, forced upon them reluctantly, forced because of political exigencies and political necessity, as a means, as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) would have us understand, of rallying under his banner and to his support, as against the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) in a solid phalanx, the voters of New Brunswick. We shall see how it will work out. I do not wish the hon. minister—no, he is not a minister yet—I do not wish the hon. member for Westmoreland any worse luck than he had in the delivery of that speech; I do not wish him any worse luck than he will have when he meets the ex-Minister of Railways, if that hon. gentleman thinks it worth while to lift him up, shake him a little and drop him into one of the bottomless ravines over which this new railway from Lévis to Moncton is to pass. We have no absolute guide as to what the length of the Lévis to Moncton road will be. I will not take the extreme. The right hon. first minister said that it will shorten the distance from 80 to 120 miles, as compared with the Intercolonial. The hon. Minister

of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), I think, put it at sixty miles. The ex-Minister of Railways puts it at 77 miles. The distance by the Intercolonial is 488 miles. Let us take about the average of these estimates of saving and take off the odd 88 miles. This would leave us with 400 miles of railway to construct here, making a total construction of the whole railway from Moncton to the Pacific coast of 3,425 miles. Now, I have to refer to another key to unlock the hidden mystery which contains the secret of what this railway is to cost us. The government has not seen fit to tell us what it will cost, so we have to find out the facts for ourselves. The interests presenting this scheme—'scheme,' I think that is the very proper phrase used—further states :

According to the reports of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year 1901, the present railway, with a mileage of 1,301 miles, and a capital account of $63,640,028 cost the country, $48,900 per mile. On this basis, to extend the government railway through to the Pacific coast as has been proposed in some quarters, would cost the country $141,810,000, entailing an annual interest charge at three per cent rate paid by Canada of $14,254,000.

This is a business proposition. The voice of the people from all quarters had not been heard by the right hon. Prime Minister at that time. He had not felt the throb and beat of the heart of this country, of which he speaks. They are dealing with cold, hard propositions of fact. Does the government want to throw doubt upon the word of this member of the Senate ? For the Senate is not what is was in years gone by. Time was when, according to gentlemen opposite, it was useless, worse than useless, a drag upon the interests of the country, a menace to our best interest that ought to be wiped out and a clean slate made. All this we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite at one time. But the Senate is all right now. We have the certificate of the right hon. leader of the government that the Senate is the very thing required. As rapidly as Conservative Senators die out, the Senate is filled from the ranks of the truly elect. So the government will hardly say that this is a sham and a fraud, that it is a hold-up, that it is intended to intimidate the government, and that it is for this reason it is stated that, at the rate the Intercolonial cost the country, it will cost over $141,000,000 for the government to extend its railway, not from ocean to ocean, but from Quebec to the Pacific. The government dare not say that these gentlemen were doing otherwise than presenting a conservative and reasonable estimate of cost, as they were bound as honest men to do in endeavouring to make a deal or bargain with the government representing the people of Canada. The government will not dispute the testimony of this witness. So, you have a mileage of 3,425 miles from Moncton to the Pacific coast. At the rate given by the promoters of this scheme, $48,900 a mile, you have a total cost of $167,482,500. The company undertake to pay one-quarter of the cost of the western section from Winnipeg to the Pacific. If we estimate this at 2,000 miles, we get a total cost for that section of $97,800,000, and one quarter of this would be $24,450,000. And, deducting this amount from the total cost, we find that the government's share, according to the estimates of the Grand Trunk Railway 'Facts,' to be $143,032,500. Leaving a total cost in excess of the 25 per cent which was paid by the company as estimated by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, of $143,032,500, coming pretty close to their figures when they demanded that they should stand upon the same basis as the great colonization road, the great iron link between the provinces from the east to the west, the Canadian Pacific Railway—$140,000,000 on the one hand, and $143,000,000 to be paid by the government on the other, and a paltry and miserable excess of 25 per cent upon the western branch to be paid by the Grand Trunk, and which is alone to be paid by them.

But this is exclusive of a lot of things that they would naturally like to leave out. To get the true amount we must consider them. I am not going to take into consideration the fees which we have to pay to the London agents in negotiating a loan, the expenses of the Finance Minister in his journeyings from Canada to London and from London to Canada—at an enormous expense to this country—in endeavouring to float this loan; but I am going to count the interest. Now, five years is the time estimated for construction. We will not want the whole of the money at once, but we will want some of it almost at once, and we will want all of it before the road is completed, so I average it at half the time. So that instead of charging five years' interest at 3 per cent, I charge two and a half years' interest at three per cent, and we have on that account—and those who are familiar with matters of this kind can correct the figures if they are wrong, but they are approximately correct—we have $10,625,000 for that interest account. That brings us down to the time when it is supposed that the road will be completed. But we have to take into account the prevalency of strikes and setbacks of that kind. We have to understand that in a scheme so gigantic as this, it is hardly conceivable that it will go along without a hitch ; so it is questionable whether it will be completed at the end of five years. But let it go at that. Say at the end of five years we will have expended on principal and interest account, $153,657,000. Does it end there ? The right hon. gentleman said, when he was adducing his proof the other day—which turned out to be of a fallacious character, of the ornamental character that I have referred to—he said, 'This is not all.' Let me say, this is not all. You have to add the interest at

three per cent lost on the seven lean years, which equals 21 per cent for the period. You have to compound it. Why? Because you have to borrow every dollar of the money required, and when a man has to borrow he cannot pay back, and whether you call it additional interest on principal or interest upon interest, it all comes out of the same treasury and comes to the same result—it will not cost less than 25 per cent of the funded amount at the end of the construction period, namely, $153,657,500, not less than a quarter of that sum to carry it through those seven lean years—and I do not think there will be any fat years in this case—the years while the government is allowing this company nominally and actually to have this property for nothing. That brings us to a total of $38,414,375. Talk of $13,000,000 as being the outlay to this country! I have shown—and the figures, though they may not be right in detail, in principle they are incontestable—I have shown that down to the end of the time when the company say that possibly they will begin to pay, down to that time we have expended in interest account alone not less than $48,000,000. Well, 'this is not all,' as the right hon. gentleman says. We have three years during which the company may or may not pay something on account. We do not know, no one knows, the government do not know; the future alone can tell. But we have to stand idly by for fifteen years from to-day and keep pouring our money into what may prove to be a bottomless pit, and at the end of fifteen years when the account is made up, then for the first time the country will know and realize what an enormous expenditure this has been of the resources of the people.

Now, 'this is not all.' It may be said—and in dealing with a proposition of this kind I am determined not to say one word beyond what I actually believe, I will not stretch one argument beyond what I believe, and history, the great vindicator, will verify what I say—it may be argued, I say, and fairly argued, by the government, that we won't have to pay $48,000 a mile for the western section, because the guarantee is limited to $13,000 a mile for the section from Winnipeg to the mountains, and $30,000 a mile for the section west through the mountains. I have, however, preferred to make the account on the first view of the matter advisedly, for this reason, that there is no man who has even a limited knowledge of politics, or parliamentary government, whether parliament be led by the right hon. gentleman or whether it be led by the hon. leader of the opposition—who will soon be on the other side of the House—I say, let it be led by one party or the other, once this scheme is launched, you cannot invoke the condition as to $13,000 and $30,000 a mile as the limit of our liability. Why? Because once they have enjoyed in construction and reached this limit, the company says, We cannot go on, we must have more money—why, then it must have more money, the absolute cost will have to be met by the people of this country. So I am right in presenting the proposition as it is presented by the friends of the government and by the company which is negotiating this project, and I am right in availing myself of their figures.

But in order that I may make no mistake, in order that I may be quite fair, I put it the other way. It has been said by a good many hon. members that the distance from Winnipeg to Moncton is 1,800 miles. The figures I have, show 3,025 miles of the original mileage by the Grand Trunk from Quebec to Port Simpson, and it is 400 miles as I have mentioned, from Quebec to Moncton. I estimate the 1,800 miles from Moncton to Winnipeg at $48,900 a mile, what the Intercolonial cost. This is a fair account of the known difficulties, the peculiar difficulties of the new line, of the haste with which it is going to be constructed, and on the basis of the statement made by experts of the Grand Trunk Railway. This makes $88,020,000. I said when I was beginning that the useless branch, that worse than useless branch, the branch that is going to militate against the interests of the Intercolonial, would cost not less than $70,000,000. Now, the 1,000 miles of the prairie section at $13,000 a mile, makes $13,000,000, and 625 miles of the mountain section at $30,000 a mile, makes $18,750,000, so you have a total expenditure far beyond the line suggested by the Grand Trunk Company, of $119,770,000. Add the two and a half years' interest on construction account, compounded equal to say 88½ per cent, equal to $10,080,450, and you bring up the sum that is to bear interest to a total of $129,850,450, at the end of the construction period. This will have to bear the interest for the next seven years, during which, the railway will be absolutely and admittedly unproductive to the people of Canada. I count the interest as amounting actually to twenty-one per cent which, capitalized, will be not less than twenty-three per cent, or $29,865,603, making the total capitalized amount at the end of the seven year period $159,715,083. Then comes the period of uncertainty. If the railway begins to pay, if it pays enough to pay all its officers, to pay all the contractors and all their needs and all the incidentals it will then begin to pay the government, but there will be the question of the construction account and accounts of that kind and this company will not begin to pay if they have in their minds what I think they will possibly have in their minds at the end of the ultimate period. There is $14,374,357 that it will take to carry the account at simple interest, for the three years of uncertainty, making the total $174,089,440. Will hon. gentlemen say this is speculation. It is, but it

is speculation upon a sub-stratum of facts greater than any presented by any hon. gentleman from the government benches. It is speculation and computation based upon the best information available in the House of Commons to-day. It is computation based upon the figures of the gentlemen with whom the government is dealing. It is computation based upon the figures of a gentleman who can do no wrong to Canada—a senator of Canada. There cannot be any doubt about it. Now, Sir, let it be uncertain; its range is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $200,000,000 down to $150,000,000. What may happen ? Where are we at then ? That is what no man can tell. The right hon. leader of the government says : We had to construct the unprofitable end of the road and we had to give them the land of promise so that we might be able to control the rates. I have not heard the criticism of that feature of the scheme answered yet, and I do not think I will hear it answered unless I hear it in this which perhaps is the key to the whole situation. Those who have the immediate control of the matter find themselves subject to forces that stand behind the throne in the matter of elections, they find that party exigencies, in view of the fact that elections are coming on, compel them to submit to those who are in a position to dictate their terms and to say to the government : That is what you have to do. Give us a subsidy equal to the Canadian Pacific Railway, give us a contract—upon the basis we have presented to you, upon the basis of the Intercolonial Railway. Take the unknown section along the shores of Lake Superior, take this section which we refuse to construct, take the section from Lévis to Moncton and we will take that which has been well described as the garden, agriculturally speaking and minerally speaking as respects a certain portion of it, perhaps, of the world. The government say that they have confidence that these gentlemen will redeem their pledges. I have no confidence. The right hon. gentleman says that they have taken the unproductive sections so that they can control the rates. Could he not have taken the western section just as well as the sections east of Winnipeg ? Sensible thinking men outside of this House—you never can convince some men in this House—sensible men outside of this House will fail to respond to the argument presented by the right hon. gentleman. You could, as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) says, control the rates if you took over the other end. Every member of parliament knows that, and every man in this country, before the elections come on will know it as well or the Conservative party will be recreant to their duty to the people of this country. The company are given the productive end; they have the reservoir, they have the fountain source of supply. It is not very far down hill from Winnipeg to the international boundary. The American boundary is riddled with railways and southern Manitoba is in the same state. Where will the right hon. gentleman be and where will his government be—thank God they will not be in power fifteen years hence—but where would they be if the company should say at the end of fifteen years : Take your key, take your controlling section, take your bloomin' 'spout,' take your eastern section, keep it, we have the source of supply, we are the masters of the situation, we have the cards and we will play them as we have played them before; take your bloomin' end, take that or take a compromise of twenty-five cents on the dollar or we will switch the products of the land we have developed in the west, we will ship the products of the garden of the west, not by your line, not by the unpaying line which you forced us to take against our will, but through the United States to American ports. Who comes down ? The coon comes down. You are powerless. I attribute no wrong to any government which may be in power at that time. It matters not whether it is the Conservative or the Liberal party which are in power at that time, the situation is inevitable, and those who are then in control will have to succumb ? That is what in all probability will happen, and that is what, I venture to say, is in the minds and hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. gentleman talks about the heart of the people; that is what is in the minds and in the hearts of these gentlemen at the present time.

Now, I will come to what I have said in reference to the question of better terms raised by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). I am sorry he brought up that question but he did bring it up. He spoke of the colonization question and also of the question of subsidies to local railways. I do not propose to say that under no circumstances will I consent to subsidies. I will wait until a definite scheme is proposed. I do not say that under no circumstances will I join in granting money for colonization purposes, but I do say that it appears to me that the question, for instance as respects northern Ontario or northern Quebec, of granting subsidies to railways for the purpose of colonizing these portions of the country is one that should not be favourably entertained by the members of the Dominion government without good cause clearly shown. It is local in its nature and whilst we have necessity for every dollar we have for the development of Canada as a whole it seems to me that we should not apply ourselves so vigorously as in the past to the subsidizing and promoting of colonization railway schemes. Now, that is the more manifest when we consider that we have awaiting us in the west vast untenanted tracts of prairie which will return a rich reward to all who go in there to settle. But, I am not in any case

in sympathy with better terms. It was said by the hon. gentleman that Ontario had joined with the other provinces in the raid for better terms. I say all the more disgrace to Ontario's premier, if Ontario did. Ontario surely knows that the larger proportion of that which is given by way of better terms comes out of Ontario itself. Ontario does not want better terms for the purpose of colonizing or building railways if the resources of the province are fairly administered. I had no sympathy with the leader of the Ontario government when he announced the scheme that he did announce with such a flourish of trumpets on certain political platforms in the campaign in North York. If they had fairly and honestly administered the resources of the province of Ontario, if they had not rejected the appeals of Sir William Meredith and others to conserve the timber interests of the province, if they had not squandered its resources on the Captain Sullivans and American citizens and men of that stamp, the province of Ontario would not to-day be taxed as it is. The government would not be taking her railways for provincial purposes to the detriment of the municipalities; taxing her insurance companies, and so to an additional extent depleting the pockets of the insured, taxing dead men in their estates; taxing the people by all sorts of devices for the purpose of raising money to administer the affairs of the province, which if properly administered would not require any better terms or any of these illegitimate ways of raising a revenue.

The hon. Minister of the Interior corroborates the hon. member for Gaspé in saying that the Grand Trunk Company and Senator Cox have a snap. I think it is only just to the hon. Minister of the Interior to give his exact words; but, like the hon. member for Gaspé, he is very zealous, and he proves too much. He proves that the country through which this railway is to pass is such a garden that it is the most iniquitous proposition to give the company a subsidy. It is not denied that we are giving them a subsidy. It is not denied that we are giving them $13,000,000. Why $13,000,000 is mentioned more than any other figure I do not know, because it has not come out in any computation that has yet been given.

Mr. COCHRANE. An unlucy number.

Mr. LENNOX. An unlucky number as my hon. friend says. This railway according to the hon Minister of the Interior, is projected through a fertile country, the best part of Canada, with the best immigration swarming into it that has come into any country in most part, so that if there has ever been a case where a railway should be self-supporting, where there should not be a subsidy, it is this case. The Americans have not granted aid of any kind in support of their magnificent railway development since 1871; and if they can forego that very expensive luxury and still have a magnificent system, it is time for Canada to pause and consider where it shall draw the line. Although I do not say that it should be drawn hard and fast in every case, I shall scrutinize every scheme very closely before I consent, as representing the county of Simcoe, to giving one dollar of the hard earned money of the people for the promotion of a railway of this kind. The hon. Minister of the Interior said:

> The net profits of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the year ending the 30th of June, 1902, were $14,085,000, and last year its net profits were $15,000,000. The company have made of their railway enterprise a magnificent success, and if they were called upon to-morrow to incur the liability to pay back every cent of public subvention which they have received, and all the money which they have received for lands, notwithstanding that, the Canadian Pacific Railway company would be a good, sound, and solvent concern. Compared with that enterprise, the route from Quebec to Winnipeg by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is a better route. . . . . The Canadian Pacific Railway, on the contrary, was built around the north shore of Lake Superior. It was built through a rocky country which did not then, and does not now, produce a single pound of traffic.

Then, speaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway line across the prairies, he said:

> It runs through the very worst portion of the territories. You could not select a line that could be very much worse unless you got right down close to the international boundary. But this new line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will run from Winnipeg to the Mountain pass through a territory, every mile of which is fertile and productive. It is hardly conceivable that such could be the case, yet the information in the possession of the government amply justify the statement I have made. There is no such fertile stretch of country in the world.

Hon. gentlemen probably thought I was rather exaggerating when I was talking of gardens; but I am taking the cold, calm, deliberate, judicial statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior. With regard to the route through the mountains, he said:

> Now take the British Columbia part, for some reason best known to themselves, which nobody has ever been able satisfactorily to explain, the Canadian Pacific Railway chose the Kicking Horse pass, which is the worst pass in the whole lot, and it went through a line of territory which perhaps, of all the different belts that could be opened up through the Rocky mountains is the least productive.

So that we have all the cream left. The Canadian Pacific Railway took the skim milk, and the cream is to go to the Grand Trunk.

> And it suffered in consequence. For years it got no traffic, except what its own construction gave, out of that portion which goes through the eastern part of British Columbia. The Grand Trunk Pacific, on the other hand, will go from the Rocky Mountain pass to the coast through as rich a timber and agricultural country as there is in Canada—a country rich in

timber, mineral and soil. Then we must not forget that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was projected, there was no movement of settlement from the outside.

Then he points out the vast influx of settlement that there is to-day and the teeming millions we must expect in the future, and he sums up by saying :

What is the position now ? We had an immigration into the North-west of 30,000 people last year. If it keeps on at that rate for the next ten years, think what that will mean for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

I need not pursue the matter further. What plausible reason can the most fertile imagination suggest why we should give to the Grand Trunk Pacific admittedly $13,000,000, probably $150,000,000, besides entering into an unknown liability, in the face of this testimony from a man so prominent in the counsels of the party, and one who should know the west and what it can produce, if any man in the government does ? Why should we give a subsidy at all in such a case ? We have the hon. Minister of the Interior showing the vast resources of the west, which are fully capable of sustaining any railway, and we have, on the other hand, but upon another branch of the case, the most capable and qualified member of the government as it existed until a few weeks ago, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, denouncing the scheme as wholly indefensible upon the financial side as well as upon all others. And we have the most meagre information as to those parts of the railway about which it is important to have information—the passes in the Rocky mountains and that section which extends along the northern shores of Lake Superior and Lake Huron.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. LENNOX. When you left the Chair at one o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with some statements made by the Minister of the Interior. I was pointing particularly to the fact that he, in common with many supporters of the government, had painted the west and the future of this country in glowing colours. In that respect, I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman. It would be strange indeed if I did not. I would be forgetting the principles I have imbibed during a long period of years from the history of the Conservative party. I am not a whit behind the hon. gentleman in believing that there is a great future for this country. If the affairs of this country are administered as they ought to be, that great future is not far distant. And if I am impressed with the progress and the development which are at hand for the older provinces, I am equally sensible of the great future, the great prosperity, the great aggregation of wealth—'wealth beyond the dreams of avarice'—which await the sturdy, energetic and capable settler of the great west. With regard to a statement made by the Minister of the Interior, which he seems to take great pleasure in repeating time and again, that the members on this side show uncompromising hostility to the scheme before the House, let me say this : I have no brief to speak for hon. members on this side. I have no mandate to express their sentiments. I am merely voicing my own opinions. But I have ears that can hear and a modicum of understanding, and I have failed to find any utterance on this side which bear the construction given by the hon. gentleman. But what I recognize is that, taking all the facts and circumstances into account, there cannot fail to be, to a large extent, uncompromising hostility to the scheme before us. But there is a most important difference between uncompromising hostility to this particular scheme—and I notice that hon. gentlemen supporting the government, with remarkable unanimity, speak of it as a scheme—and no better word could be used to describe it—and hostility to a well devised measure for the relief of our great west. While there may be uncompromising hostility to this particular scheme, I am not aware that there is any hostility in the ranks of the Conservative party, in or out of this House, to a carefully considered policy for the development of this great country as a whole. One and all, we recognize that the providing of every reasonable facility for bringing to the markets of the world the produce of the great west is of paramount importance and necessity. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) asked, in concert with the Minister of the Interior, whether Canada was able to bear the expense of this scheme. Let me say to the House that Canada can afford to pay for everything she needs, for everything that will tend to her development, for everything for which she will get a fair return. Therefore, speaking for myself—and I believe I am in harmony with the consensus of opinion on this side—I am prepared at any time to support any expenditure so long as it makes for the general development of this country. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and my hon. friend the member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) are close partners in another regard, and partnership, Mr. Speaker, is the order of the day. We have in this scheme the most complicated system of partnership ever devised in connection with parliamentary government in this country. Each of these hon. gentlemen by a singular coincidence, unearthed all the newspapers of last November to show that several gentlemen of prominence, of commercial standing, whose opinions are weighty, have expressed the opinion that a properly devised and financed scheme for the speedy development of the west would be in harmony with their views. They quoted the hon. member from Toronto (Mr. Brock)—and there is no

gentleman in this House for whom I have a greater regard. What they quoted from that hon. gentleman had the merit of brevity. But I imagine there must be a context to it, and I would like to hear the whole of it; but even if that hon. gentleman had declared himself unreservedly in favour of the present scheme, if he had not merely limited himself to saying that he would endorse anything that made for the general development of the country, I would still, without any abatement of my regard for his sincerity refuse to go with him to that length. But even if hon gentlemen opposite could quote hon. gentlemen on this side as endorsing the scheme before us—and they have not so far succeeded in so doing—that would not be a convincing proof of its merit. One swallow does not make a summer; and taking the word in another sense, one swallow, even if it be $13,000, as announced by the right hon. leader of the government, will not satisfy the insatiable thirst of Senator Cox and his camp followers.

I now come to a question upon which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior stands alone, so far as I have been able to observe. He tells us a story about the Mexican cattle.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the Texas Steer.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, the one-eyed steer. He tells us that the west required last year 50,000 stockers, and that 25,000 were obtained in Ontario and the other 25,000 had to be sought for in Mexico. Why? Because of the lack of adequate railway facilities. If I am not mistaken, he said they could not be got in the province of Quebec because we had not the requisite railway facilities. We could obtain 25,000 in Ontario, but not the other 25,000 in Quebec. Of course, we must give the hon. gentleman credit for veracity. We must credit him with a desire to tell the truth, and we want to give him credit for an ordinary common sense. But it is difficult to account for his making the statement I have just drawn attention to, except on the hypothesis that he had been led astray by an exuberant imagination. Have we not the same facilities for transport from the province of Quebec that we have from the province of Ontario? The assertion is a mistake. It is found upon investigation that the hon. minister is not correctly informed—for I certainly assume that it is only owning to incorrect information—and even a little study of the situation would have set him right. Here is the statement:

> There is another line of trade to which just one word of reference may be made. It is the cattle trade. I want to call the attention of this House to a fact or two with which I think they are not acquainted, because they are not likely to have ever been brought to their attention. I want to call attention to the fact that one of the great industries of the North-west Territories is grazing cattle, as contrasted with raising cattle. Last year we imported into the North-west Territories no less than 50,000 head of what are called stockers, that is, young cattle, bought by the ranchers for the purpose of being finished and perfected for the English market. Where did they get them? They got 25,000 from the good province of Ontario, and our friend Mr. Crawford, the Conservative member for one of the Torontos in the provincial legislature, says they have not at present facilities for sending their cattle to the North-west, and he wants the Grand Trunk Pacific built so that they will have more facilities. * * Where did they get the rest. They got them from Mexico. * * Here we have 25,000 stockers in one year coming from far away Mexico, because we have not the shipping facilities to take them from Eastern Canada.

I am not personally acquainted with Mr. Crawford. I have known him as a public man; I have had the pleasure of reading his speeches. But if speeches are an indication of men's minds—and if they are, God help some of these hon. gentlemen on the other side—if a man's speeches are a measure of the calibre of his brain, I take Mr. Crawford to be a sensible, intelligent, practical man. That is the reputation he has. I know that in a county where I was stumping—some hon. gentlemen will say that what I am about to say is no great certificate of Mr. Crawford's ability—it was recognized, where I and some others were going to speak, that if we could get Mr. Crawford, we should have an exceptionally strong man.

Mr. CLARKE. He is a good man.

Mr. LENNOX. Do you think that Mr. Crawford ever, in the Ontario legislature or elsewhere, was ass enough to ask the people of Canada to build a railway costing from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 for the purpose of carrying stockers from Ontario to the great west? My hon. friend says that the difficulty about the carrying of cattle was a want of cars. We know something in this House, and the people outside know a good deal more; and I am quite willing to leave it to the country to say whether the hon. gentleman's information is correct when he leads us to understand that there is shortage of transportation facilities from the east to the west. If there is, we have never heard of it. I have understood—and I have some reasons to know something about it—I have understood and known, that the freight cars are going back to the west empty. Our great measure of prosperity will be attained when that western country is so thickly settled that return cargoes by land and water will be carried from the east to the west. In the same line the hon. gentleman tells us of congestion in the west which has retarded the trade of merchants there. He would have us understand that, these merchants having bought their goods in Europe, or in the great wholesale houses of Montreal and Toronto, the movement of west-bound freight has been so great that there has been a blockade and the merchants could not get their goods. I do not doubt the

honesty and good faith of my hon. friend. He is in a worse position to judge of this measure than even some other members of this House. He has been away for the greater part of the session. He has come in in a hurry. He has taken his food, as it were on the wing. He has not digested his argument. And it is asking the people too much to ask them to digest some of the arguments he used. Congestion in westward bound freight upon the railways? I will be glad enough when that is realized. That will be the acme of our prosperity, when, upon the great lakes and upon our railways, it is found they are as busy in returning goods to the west as they are in carrying out the products of the west. Any one who has studied the question, any one who has read the article a few months ago—or it may have been even a year or more ago—in the 'Canadian Monthly' by Edward Farrer, must see the importance and the significance of the fact, which I trust the hon. members of the government will take note of, and the time when we shall have complete control of our carrying trade and complete satisfaction in it, the time when we shall be able to reduce the cost of carriage by land and water—that is by land and water combined, which, I say, is to be the ultimate scheme for carrying the products of the west to the east—will come when we have the return cargoes to be taken to a large population in the west.

Now, the Minister of the Interior attempted to show what the first Minister found it important to show, but failed in showing—that there is a demand and a need for the construction of a railway such as they propose. When I come to that, I will produce my proof, and I do not intend to advance anything of which I shall not present proof, or, if not absolute proof, evidence which it is reasonable to present to a deliberative assembly. Before I deal with this point of the Minister of the Interior I want to say a word with reference to the older provinces. I say, and I have said before, that we are prepared to do justice by the west, we are prepared to do even more than justice to the west, as we are ready to act in anticipation of the strides they are making. The people of the west do not want proof of this for they have faith in that Conservative party as was shown in the recent election in Manitoba. For the record of the Conservative party is an unbroken record of good faith of belief in the country and of earnestness and liberality in carrying out what they have professed. But while I say that for the east and the west, and speaking as I do in a sense for the centre, I want to say something for the older provinces of Ontario. I want to say that the fortunes of the west and the east are bound together. In the larger sense there is no east and there is no west, there is no north or south, it is one combined country, and the sooner you obliterate those boundaries, the sooner we make one bold, grand fight like Britons for the general good of all, the sooner we will bring about a realization of the roseate pictures which have been drawn for us by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, we have forty-five cities and towns served by the present Grand Trunk system. By the census returns, which I dare say are not padded in the interest of the province of Ontario, those cities and towns have a population of 1,000,940 people. Among them are some Quebec cities. For instance, there is Three Rivers, the only debateable one in reference to my proposition. But I want to say that in those forty-five cities and towns, aggregating over a million people, aggregating almost a million people, if you take out the province of Quebec with its 68,840, if you push through a scheme providing for the shortest route for the raw material out of Canada by this new line without breaking bulk, if that is the policy rather than the policy inaugurated in 1878 to develop a varied industry, to develop agriculture as the handmaid of commerce, and commerce as the handmaid of agriculture, I say if you are to develop that policy, you will give the go-by to these forty-five cities and towns and leave them and their artisans, and their skilled mechanics, and their merchants, without the profit that should come to them mutually by a turn over of this commerce. Have hon. gentlemen opposite lost sight altogether of the fact that the west is not going to be solely an agricultural country? The people of the west have the energy and the pluck to build up tall chimneys, a large population is going in there to consume the products of the west. It is not by taking the shortest route to the seaboard upon a 3,000 mile haul that you are going to encourage the development of varied industries. Mining, for instance, will furnish an enormous home market for a portion of our products. The great scheme developed in 1878 by Sir John A. Macdonald did not mean a mere tariff policy—and that is where my hon. friends make such a great mistake—it meant not only a protective tariff, but a development of all the great industries which were adapted to the circumstances of this country. Therefore, I do not want a policy which will have the effect of crippling a vast portion of the wealth-producing class in the Dominion of Canada. We have our cities and our towns to consider in Ontario and Quebec, and in a large measure, to the extent of a million souls, the effect of this policy will not be to develop, but to injure, the cities and towns I have mentioned.

The government saw the weakness of the scheme later on. You will recollect, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill of the Grand Trunk Pacific has been so altered and mutilated that its political godfather, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) can now hardly recognize it. As the government proceeded with it they endeavoured to make off-shoots, and try to satisfy the various

cities and towns to the south of the proposed line. Well, I venture to say that this policy will not be very beneficial. You may as well try to cut off a rapidly flowing stream by digging a trench at right angles as to try to control the through traffic over that railway, as the hon. gentleman suggests it shall be controlled by aid of the branches to these towns. As a measure it will go through, but the effect will be felt, and I call the attention of the champion of the labour element at this stage to the disastrous effect the government scheme will have upon the workingmen. While I desire to help the hon. gentleman as far as I can, my policy would be to strengthen the centre, to build up the country as Britain built up the empire, by bringing the product of all her colonies and dependencies into the centre, to benefit each other by an interchange of commerce. Now, in that view the Conservative government inaugurated its policy. They deepened and widened our waterways, upon which a large expenditure of money has been made. We have, since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and since extending our shore line along Lake Superior to Lake Huron, continued to develop our waterways and to expend enormous sums of money. Shall we now have to right-about-face and do away, to a large extent, with the results of that expenditure of money ? I say no, for the locality I represent, I say no, for the localities in which I am interested—I need not say perhaps for the town of Collingwood, because I see my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is here, and I have little doubt that he will realize the importance to Collingwood of the scheme that is proposed. I know my hon. friend has been longer in the House than I have. I know he occupies a unique position, I know he is the leader of a great party—the McCarthy party. My hon. friend, I understand, rather laughs at me because I adopted the leadership of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), when I said I was proud to be under the leadership of a gentleman who fought as long and persistently as he did in favour of a certain question. It is true that my hon. friend's party is smaller than it was. Mr. Stubbs has gone to his reward. The other hon. gentleman who was at one time a supporter of his, is a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect, and I will not further refer to him.

But my hon. friend has the satisfaction of leading a united party. They all vote the same way and when you get a party in the House of Commons that all vote solidly that is the balance of power. Talk about the balance of power in the old days ! Still there would be stragglers, there would be those who would not follow party lines. But, my hon. friend occupies an exceptional position, a position that is unique in the history of parties. Therefore, I would not, I suppose, be wasting time if I endeavoured at this stage to try to win my hon. friend and his party back from the pernicious course they have adopted, a course which is detrimental to our county as a whole, a course which will rob Collingwood of the benefit of every dollar that has been expended on its harbour, a course which will make a sham and a delusion of every dollar that is spent there, a course that will rob this county of every dollar of the benefit which otherwise would result from the subsidy granted for the construction of vessels granted last session. I can hardly believe that my hon. friend, although he does not think as well of me as I could wish, although he deplores my acceptance of the leadership of a gentleman probably who is not as old as myself, will turn a deaf ear to my appeal. If he is deaf to my entreaties I hope he will not be indifferent to the interests of the county which I in part represent, a riding which did him the honour to elect him when he was quite a young man and which did him that honour in a large measure—and I say it without any disrespect to the hon. gentleman—because of the respect and esteem in which that county held the late gifted Mr. Dalton McCarthy. I speak of this because I want to get the whole party.

Mr. McCARTHY. You got enough of the party in 1896 to suit you.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman has taken occasion to refer to 1896, and I do not pretend that I do not know the significance of the reference. The hon. gentleman refers to the election of 1896, when I was a candidate and was woefully defeated. The hon. gentleman refers to the election of 1896 when the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy, whose memory I greatly honour, although I did not see politics in the same light as he did, was a candidate and when he was strong in the personal affections of the people of North Simcoe, whose affections he had earlier secured for advocating a grand policy for this country. There was a triangular fight in which you do not know where you stand. Mr. Stewart, the present superintendent of the forestry branch, was a candidate of the reform party, so-called.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) but I think this is a little outside of the question before the House.

Mr. LENNOX. It is a good story.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I know you would not stop me were I not going beyond the limits of the question. I will only say that I received the support of some of the best men of the Conservative party in North Simcoe and that I am proud of my achievement on that occasion. I was

beaten, but the people know better now. They now know how to recognize a good thing when they see it, and I venture to state that when the elections come on again that they will recognize a good thing and that it will not redound to the benefit of the hon. member for North Simcoe. But, I am not a man who bears resentment. I remember the hon. gentleman in other days and speaking as regards the attitude of the hon. member for North Simcoe upon this question I confine myself to a suggestion which I think will be in harmony with the views of all hon. members in this House. I have to admire the consistency with which 'the party' I refer to has followed the present power. I do not know that it is inconsistent with anything the hon. gentleman has hitherto done or said. Independence, in the sense in which the hon. gentleman professes it, generally means independence of the wishes of the electors, independence of traditions because I have no doubt that my hon. friend bears no resentment to this side of the House from which in the past he derived great political advantage. I have no doubt that when we come to power again we shall have a large measure of support from him. Notwithstanding what has happened may I hope that my hon. friend will desert for a time the Grand Trunk Railway interest and vote in the interests of North Simcoe? I have the right to speak upon that question. Will he do this or will he deny the interests of North Simcoe and rob Collingwood, the large township of Nottawasaga and the surrounding territory generally of the benefits that have been conferred upon it by the Conservative government in the past and by the present administration in more recent times? The labour interests are represented by the hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Sir. Wm. Mulock). The interests of the city of Toronto are identified to a large extent with the interests of the large constituency of North York. The hon. Minister of Labour represents that constituency and he also represents the labouring classes in this country. Will he vote for this measure which will not only be detrimental to the city of Toronto, and to the constituency of North York which he represents, but detrimental also to the great labouring classes whose champion he should be?

I said that the hon. Minister of the Interior had attempted to show that there was a demand for and a need of this railway policy that the government have propounded. I have referred to the fact that in support of that contention he has confined himself to quoting extracts mainly from the papers of November last. I prefer a better source of information. I want to go as much as I can to the best source to find out what are the needs of the west. I have been out west recently, and I have communicated with many gentlemen in the west. I have also what to my mind is the authority of probably a gentleman best qualified to speak for the west, a gentleman who has proved himself to be capable of grappling with the transportation problem as it affects Manitoba and the west. I refer, of course, to the Hon. R. P. Roblin. On the 10th August he granted an interview to the 'News' in which he said:

> The people of Manitoba and the Canadian west are strongly opposed to the governmet of Canada granting one dollar of the public money or an acre of land to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway as an all-Canadian route from coast to coast because they do not see any material advantage in its construction to the people of Western Canada.
>
> 'It appears to be an undertaking in the interests of Senator Cox and others,' said the Hon. R. P. Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, to a reporter of the 'News,' at the King Edward Hotel this morning.

This gentleman has been through a recent election in Manitoba, he is in constant touch with the people of the west, and he if any one ought to know the feeling in the west. He says the people there do not see any material advantage in the measure, and if they do not, how can the government see a bonanza in it?

> Continuing, Mr. Roblin stated that the feeling in the west was for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Depot Harbour, by government purchase of the Canada Atlantic. They further favoured the construction of an addition to the Canada Atlantic from a point near Parry Sound to a point on the Canadian Pacific main line, near Sudbury, in order to shorten the all-rail trip between Ontario and Manitoba. The view of the west regarding the extension of the Intercolonial was exactly expressed by Hon. Mr. Blair in his speech in the House of Commons yesterday. The people of Manitoba were 'commercial' in their ideas, and the proposed construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway had failed to awaken any great public interest, simply because the people could see nothing in it for Manitoba.

Speaking of the railway from the Canada Atlantic near Parry Sound to Sudbury, I may say that on the very day of this interview I was at Sudbury, and I found the promoters of that railway actually on the ground. The engineer was there organizing the office, and he told me that some sixty miles of that railway would be constructed this autumn.

> But would not its construction as a competing line to the Canadian Pacific benefit the eastern merchants and manufacturers as well as the western merchant, by lowering the the freight rates between Ontario and Quebec, and Manitoba?' asked the reporter.
>
> 'I do not think so,' replied Mr. Roblin. 'The road would, to all intents and purposes, be a Grand Trunk one, in spite of the statements of the government to the contrary.' He went on to say that there was not the slightest indication on the part of the government that the freight rates would be in any manner improved except by the natural course of events.
>
> 'Where is the demand for the construction of this road,' continued the Premier of Mani-

toba. 'I fail to find it anywhere.' Manitoba to-day needed no more railways, for the average distance from the farmer to the railway in Manitoba was but five miles. The Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern would be quite able for the next twenty years to supply all the railway necessities of the west. What was wanted was an increased equipment, especially in rolling stock.

Now, I will give the House some statistics on the matter of rolling stock. Railway authorities agree that the measure of a railway's capacity to perform the service for which it is created is gauged by its ability to provide suitable equipment. Taking the returns for 1902 as given in 'Facts' by the promoters of this scheme, we find that all the lines of railway in Canada, combined, had the following equipment :

	Total in Canada.	No. per 100 miles.
Engines	2,344	12
Passenger cars	2,644	13
Freight cars..	68,875	365

The freight cars were distributed among the great railways of Canada as follows :

	No. of Freight cars.	No. per 100 miles.
Grand Trunk Railway..	24,462	775
Intercolonial Railway..	9,689	774
Canadian Pacific Railway..	21,342	291
Canadian Northern.. ..	1,760	141

The equipment of engines was as follows :

	No. of engines.	No. per 100 miles.
Grand Trunk Railway.. ..	705	22
Intercolonial Railway.. ..	280	21
Canadian Pacific Railway	745	10
Canadian Northern..	47	4

I propose for a moment to analyze these statistics. The Canadian Pacific Railway, taking its total length, is 146 engines short of the average of engines possessed by all the railways of Canada; and when you reflect on the many little local lines which have only one or two engines in some cases, you realize the necessity that exists for increased equipment on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Northern is 100 engines short of the average. The total shortage of these two companies in this respect is 246. In the matter of freight cars the Canadian Pacific Railway is below the average by 5,402 and the Canadian Northern by 2,800, making 7,202 in which these two companies are below the average equipment of the railways of Canada. Is there any reason why the equipment of these two great lines should not and will not in the near future equal that of the Grand Trunk ? We have the Intercolonial in equipment side by side with the Grand Trunk, a magnificent asset, purchased, I admit, at a very considerable expense to the people of this country, to begin our work of developing anew the products of the west. The Canadian Pacific Railway, to have an equipment in the matter of engines equal to that of the Grand Trunk, requires 883 more engines than it has, and the Canadian Northern requires 225 more engines, or a total between these two companies of 1,108. The Canadian Pacific Railway freight equipment is below that of the Grand Trunk by 33,872 cars, and the Canadian Northern freight equipment is below that of the Grand Trunk by 7,925, or a shortage between these two railways of 41,794 cars. Looking at the congestion and the delay in transporting the products of the west, is there an hon. gentleman here who is not convinced that even if the Canadian Pacific and Canadian Northern Railways obtained a tithe of this equipment, there would be abundant facilities for transporting the products of the west for many years to come ?

You will have then 1,900 instead of 792 engines upon those lines, 64,900 cars instead of 23,102, or you will have practically the present rolling stock of those two railways multiplied by three. Let me not be misunderstood. In giving these figures I am not casting the slightest reflection upon either the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway. The Canadian Northern Railway is in the process of rapid development. It is showing an energy perhaps unexampled in the history of Canada. It has hitherto been devoting its energies to construction rather than equipment, but it is now coming to the front; and by the time we next meet in this House, no doubt the rolling stock of the Canadian Northern Railway will be vastly increased. Then as to the Canadian Pacific Railway, although it has not cars equal to the Grand Trunk Railway in mileage, it has an aggregate of freight cars and engines almost equal to the Grand Trunk Railway. When we reflect that the Grand Trunk Railway has been in existence over half a century and the Canadian Pacific Railway only comparatively a few years, and that it operates in a country which is full of engineering difficulty—difficulties that were declared by hon. gentlemen opposite to be absolutely insurmountable—when we take these things into consideration, we must give the Canadian Pacific Railway credit for the position in which it stands to-day. We have been told that the Canadian Pacific Railway have ordered 2,000 additional cars and two hundred and twenty-five additional engines. These are probably in its service at present, and will relieve to a great extent the congestion in the west. What is wanted it not additional roadbed, not to multiply the roadbeds and to duplicate the expense of the system, but to consolidate, as far as possible, and to provide efficient equipment upon all these great trunk lines—equipment at least equal to that of the Grand Trunk Railway.

I have read the well considered statement of the hon. Mr. Roblin, who emjoys the confidence of the people of Manitoba to an extent seldom accorded to any public man. I

hardly think, however, that the government would care to adopt Mr. Roblin as a witness. There is not a bond of concord between them, but I shall produce a witness between whom and the government there is a strong bond—a gentleman whose authority they dare not dispute, a gentleman whom the right hon. the leader of the government publicly announced as the best railway authority in the Dominion of Canada or on the continent of America, a gentleman whom the government desired as chairman of the Transportation Commission. I refer to Sir William Van Horne. What does he say? He says:

> The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or any other all-Canadian route will never voluntarily carry a carload of wheat by the all-railway route around the great lakes to an eastern Canadian port for shipment abroad, for the simple reason that it will never pay any road to do so. Nor will the transportation problems in the west ever be solved by the construction of an all-Canadian route from coast to coast.

I cannot conceive what testimony could be more convincing than that of this gentleman who was selected to solve the transcontinental problem. His declaration I take to be a condemnation, as square and fair as you can imagine, of the government's scheme. Sir William Van Horne went on to say:

> That the Canadian Pacific Railway shipped every carload of wheat that it was possible to ship by their steamship lines on the great lakes from Fort William to Owen Sound, and thence east by rail, or else by way of Buffalo and the Erie canal. The long haul around the great lakes was dreaded, because it was unprofitable and the bulk of the grain brought by that route was carried during the winter months, and used by the millers of Ontario to keep their mills in operation during the cold season. There was altogether too much talk of an all-Canadian route by people who were entirely ignorant of the situation.

That is rather cold justice meted out by Sir William Van Horne to the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. He further said:

> He considered that in discussing the all-Canadian route, a great mass of the people seemed to forget what it cost to construct a road through such a country as that around Lakes Huron and Superior. They also seemed to forget that such an unprofitable piece of road had to be maintained and kept in the best of order. Such a piece of construction was like a bridge; there was no profit in it, but it had to be constructed and maintained. The Canadian Pacific Railway had been practically forced to expend their $25,000,000 grant from parliament in constructing their line through the rough country, and part of the money derived from the sales of their lands in addition.
>
> Sir William declined to say anything upon the fast Atlantic service, or directly on the railway situation at Ottawa, 'in fact,' he said, 'I simply don't read what is written about the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway project.'

Mr. LENNOX.

Let me direct the attention, especially of hon. gentlemen on the government benches, to where we are at. We have Mr. Roblin claiming that this scheme is not demanded, 'not needed,' says Mr. Roblin, 'not effective even if constructed.' That covers the ground pretty well. The only point hon. gentlemen have to ascertain is whether Mr. Roblin is in a position to judge. 'It is not a solution,' says Sir William Van Horne, 'not practicable, not reasonable.' No one can doubt Sir William Van Horne's competency in these matters. He has been giving his attention to railway matters for years. He was requested to take the chairmanship of the commission which was to solve the transportation problem.

I have another source to quote from, and this ought to be testimony, if not for the cabinet, at all events, for the following of the cabinet—a gentleman whom these hon. gentlemen were accustomed and proud to look up to, the ex-Minister of Railways. He too joined in saying that, while he severed his connections with great reluctance and without a vestige of reason except the question of the interest of the country and the difference of the policy of the government, while his relations with his colleagues were friendly and all that could be desired in that regard, and while he appreciated the position he had, yet he was forced to resign from his position because he had come to the conclusion, that, to use his own words, the scheme was absolutely and utterly indefensible. Nor is that all. We have the statement of the promoters of this railway. I will not read it again, it covers practically the same ground as that which I quoted you this morning. But what I quoted then with regard to another point will apply to this, that there is no population in what we will call the lake section, there is no population in the prairie section, and there is no population, while there are great engineering difficulties, in the extreme western section. In all these statements, there is not a suggestion of relieving any congestion in the territory served by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern. The road is launched as a colonization and immigration road. It is pointed out, how much the Canadian Pacific Railway has done to people the west, and it is suggested that this railway would have the effect of increasing the rapidity of inflow of population into the country served by this road. Now, am I right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. If hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, are through with their interruptions, I wish to say that there have occurred instances of men shouting before they are out of the bush, and I am inclined to think that those who shouted a few days ago, when this measure was introduced, will raise a different note when they face the electors. I do not think they will feel

quite so hilarious. I see the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy)——

Mr. GOURLEY. Hit him again.

Mr. LENNOX. No, I am only going to appeal to him. I see that hon. gentleman always in the front rank of those who wish to interrupt me. I suppose that his interruptions proceed from the best of motives. I suppose it is to give me encouragement. I know it must proceed from some worthy cause. But he leads the interruption. I wish him merriment of it when he comes to North Simcoe again. There, as suggested by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), he has got rid of his native town of Barrie.

Mr. BENNETT. The electors there would have given it to him.

Mr. LENNOX. I was going to say: Am I right in concluding from the facts that the question of blockade in the west, as the cause of the government proposed like the question of bonding privileges, was an afterthought and a myth? I think that those who study this question in cold blood, not answering to a party lash, will come to the conclusion that both the suggestion of a blockade in the west and the suggestion of our being on the eve of losing our bonding privilege are afterthoughts and makeweights, a padding in the effort to defend the scheme, which, as the ex-Minister of Railways has said, and proven, is absolutely indefensible. I like to give my hon. friends of the government credit for the best motives. I notice that the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) claimed that the ex-Minister of Railways had shown in the debate great warmth and a spirit of hostility. I am not concerned with that. I have only to say that we have the certificate of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) that absolutely no motive actuated the Minister of Railways but the loftiest motives and the desire to promote what he believed to be the best interest of the country. I leave the Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for Gaspé to fight out that question of motive. I want to know, do the government know they are on the wrong track?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). No.

Mr. LENNOX. Well, they will know it in a few minutes, and on very high authority. There is a good deal the government do not know, and when you travel from the ministry to some of their following, it is across the mountains and over vast ranges of country. Hon. gentlemen can go on interrupting if they think fit. I say the government does not know that except in equipment, we have ample facilities for the carriage of western grain, and that this fact has been definitely stated by ministers of the Crown. Then, where are we at? Are we going to have another resignation? A minister who was in the House this morning, and a strong member of the cabinet, has said so. We have lost two of these strong men this session, and three before this session. The late Sir Oliver Mowat went out while it was perfectly safe. Sir Louis Davies went out for a safer and better position. And we lost the late Hon. David Mills, who was promoted to a position on the bench. I do not refer to men who died in harness, but those who left the cabinet voluntarily. This session we have had two men who have left the cabinet because they did not find the policy of the government such as they could support. Are we going to lose another? I said he was a strong man. I presume the House has anticipated of whom I speak, for you naturally pick out these men. I refer hon. gentlemen to the debate on the 7th of May, last session, an excellent speech had been made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) on the question of transportation, more particularly as affecting the waterways. I refer to the reply of the Minister of Agriculture to that speech. He is the strong member of the cabinet, who, I think, will probably be forced to resign unless he has changed his opinions since then. He says at page 4377:

> The waterways of Canada are far superior to to those of the United States. . . . . But that the government have already taken steps to remedy, and to-day there are large contracts being carried out for the improvement of Port Colborne, at the completion of which I venture to think that port will seriously rival the port of Buffalo in the facilities and advantages which it will afford for the transhipment of grain and other products from the ships plying on the great lakes to those which ply on the canals. . . . . This fact of itself makes our waterways far superior to the waterways of the United States where no such cargo can be carried from the interior of the continent to the seaboard without breaking bulk at Buffalo and transhipping into smaller vessels to pass through the Erie canal.

That is only introductory. Now the hon. gentleman makes his confession, and he then and there deliberately proclaimed that we needed no more railways and no more shipping facilities, no more improvement to our waterways, but that what we wanted was rolling stock and ships. He went on to say:

> But putting politics aside entirely, let me say that Canada as a whole, both this government and its predecessors, has devoted enormous sums of money to the solving of the transportation problem and has never shrunk from doing what the country thought necessary in order to provide transportation facilities. Our canal system is probably the greatest on the face of the earth. Our government railway, the Intercolonial, and the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway, both of which have been largely assisted by this country are probably, in proportion to our wealth and population, the greatest railroad system on the globe. Canada has borne, and is to-day bearing the burden, by paying the interest on the debt incurred for the purpose of perfecting

our transportation facilities. These facilities are not at all utilized to their full extent. Our canal system is not at all utilized to the one-hundreth part of its capacity. If the enterprising capitalists of this country would undertake to supply the necessary vessels, there is nothing to prevent our canals being utilized in a way hitherto undreamed of, and I have no doubt that the investment would prove profitable both for the promoters and the country.

Under these circumstances I venture to think that neither the government or the people of Canada can be looked upon as recreant to this part of their duty or lacking in enterprise and determination to advance along the lines of material progress. If these facilities have not been utilized to the utmost possible extent, it is because the people of Canada have been devoting themselves to other things—the farmers to the production of goods, the merchants to selling these goods to advantage, and now they are beginning to see and understand that greater facilities in the way of transport are necessary, not in the shape of canals, not in the shape of railway tracks, but in the shape of improved rolling stock for the railways, and of ships for the utilization of the canals which now exist.

I need not refer to any more of the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture. I commend them to that hon. gentleman, and I hope he will digest them before he records his vote. I say deliberately that it will be a pretty sharp turn for the Minister of Agriculture to take, after expressing these views only a year ago, to vote for this railway deal now, to take back all that he said then, unless he is willing to confess that he was wrong then and that he is right now.

Now, other gentlemen have spoken in support of the government and have been replied to pretty fully, as a rule. I wish to refer to one gentleman who stands in the relation, we may say, of parson to the party, and of parson to the government, a gentleman of extreme moral attainments, a gentleman who, whenever there is a difficulty, steps in and smooths the troubled waters, and gives good advice, gives us the benefit of his long experience in the House, a gentleman who has, I think, occupied pretty nearly every side of every question that has been presented to the House of Commons for a number of years—I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). When that hon. gentleman tells us what we ought to do, and gives us facts and figures, his record is such that I like to look carefully into the matter before I decide to accept his facts. I will not say a word against that hon. gentleman, but I will quote his own language and give his own description of himself. Speaking on the budget debate in 1902, I find his saying, on page 1523 of the Debates :

> There is one thing in connection with that administration which I think the administration in power may properly take into consideration. We had in Canada in the early years of the Mackenzie administration, a strong protectionist feeling.

Mr. LENNOX.

They never let it out for a long time. The hon. gentleman was giving a warning to the Finance Minister of the present administration, calling his attention to the mistake they made in 1876 or 1878, and urging him not to repeat that mistake. He goes on to say :

> There were in the Liberal party, among the supporters of Mr. Mackenzie, a number of members who believed that the duties should be advanced and that the government should adopt a protective policy of a moderate character and to a limited extent. This policy was advocated by the members for the city of Hamilton who were supporters of the government, by the members of the city of Montreal, who were supporters of the government, by the members of the city of Toronto, by the member for South Brant and by myself.

We never heard of it. He goes on to say :

> These demands, it is not necessary to say, were of the most moderate character. There were good reasons for adopting this policy. The revenue of the country was insufficient to meet the expenditure even with the careful and economical administration of Mr. Mackenzie.

He then goes on to point out that certain gentlemen coming from the maritime provinces, Mr. Jones and others, threatened the government if they raised the duties, and that the government surrendered to the threats of the members from the maritime provinces. He goes on :

> Our chances were thrown away. I fought for an increase in the duties, for I believed that the salvation and existence of the Liberal party depended upon the government taking the course that my friends and myself then advocated. We failed. The duties were not increased. . . . . I went to my constituency——

Let me pause here. The hon. gentleman has shown us that he had a conviction in favour of a protective policy, that many other members of the Liberal party held the same conviction, but that a different policy was adopted. Now we come to see what he does. Does he, as an honest man, go out and announce that he is a protectionist ? Let him speak for himself :

> I felt it. I went to my constituency and held meetings for the two years that elapsed before the elections. I held twenty or thirty meetings in each year, because I felt that my position was in danger. I felt that as a supporter of the Mackenzie government I was liable to be defeated, and in June, 1878, I wrote to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. I had previously implored our friends to go into the field, to hold meetings to combat this new principle, and I had warned them if this was not done they were in danger.

That is the description that the hon. gentleman gives of himself. He says while he believes in protection that for two years he held twenty or thirty meetings in each year and that at these meetings he proclaimed free trade and denounced protection. He was deceiving the people, and his speeches were being quoted from one end of the

country to the other as the speeches of an honest man. Then the hon. gentleman goes on :

Now, the mistake of the government of that time was simply this. They underrated the force of the currents of public sentiment that pervaded the country. They did not realize how strong a hold this doctrine of protection had taken upon the public mind. They failed even to take advantage of the circumstances they might have taken advantage of, by combating vigorously in every riding in the Dominion this so-called heresy. They failed to do it, and they were beaten.

This moralist, this hon. gentleman who comes to guide this House, is the same hon. gentleman who for twenty-five years occupied as false a position, politically speaking, as an hon. gentleman could assume, and yet this hon. gentleman comes now and asks us to accept his doctrine and facts and conclusions upon a matter as important as this. He continues :

Now, I am afraid I shall be considered an inconsistent man.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says there is no trouble about that. I must confess that I cannot hold on to the doctrines of absolute free trade, as my hon. friend does, in the light of the experience I have passed through and the knowledge I have obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) is not discussing the question which we have to examine. I would remind him that we are discussing the question of the transcontinental railway.

Mr. LENNOX. This is along the same lines, but I will be guided by you, Mr. Speaker. However, I had about concluded my remarks on that point. I was referring to this matter for the purpose of informing the country who it is that is giving it advice and information upon these matters of grave importance. It is important that we should be in a position to judge whether we should take that hon. gentleman's statements without any question or not. The hon. gentleman is not without a record upon the immediate question before the House. The hon. gentleman attended the Railway Committee of this House on the 3rd June last, and he spoke upon that occasion. He has since spoken. The other day when he spoke I understood from what he said that he endorsed with much praise the policy which is now proposed by the government, including the extension from Lévis to Moncton. What did the hon. gentleman say, and he said a good deal more that I will not bother with ? On the 3rd June, 1903, in the Railway Committee, in the presence of hon. members who may be here in the House, the hon. gentleman said :

I do not believe in saddling five or six hundred miles on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to make a connection at Moncton, to compete with the government railway making that property valueless.

A pretty sharp turn.

The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) commented upon the fact that hon. members on this side of the House applauded the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) when he was outlining what he believed to be the proper policy in regard to railways and was criticising the present policy, and showing that it was not in the interests of the country. Why should we not applaud ? Has the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals become suddenly wicked and bad ? He was an honourable man until a few weeks ago. Everybody then on the other side of the House would applaud him. He could not speak without rounds of applause from the government benches. Have hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House not only no toleration for anybody who is speaking, but no toleration for any man who differs from them in his views and who once belonged to their party ? I am inclined to think from the moment that any hon. gentleman of their party asserts his independence he is to be drummed out of the House. He is to be avoided, calumniated and defamed, and he is not even to have the consolation of the Conservative party applauding him when his words commend themselves to the sound sense of the Conservative party. The hon. member for Westmoreland made rather a long speech, but not too long, and I will tell that hon. gentleman that if he will begin to talk good, sound, common sense in the interests of the country, although he has been a great transgressor, we will applaud him too.

Now, I come to a point which it is not pleasant for me to deal with, but in connection with matters of this kind we are not to be guided by our heart, but by our common sense, and we are to discharge our duties in the light in which we deem to be in the best interests of the country. Nobody can sit in this House without having a great deal of admiration for the great ability and the very unique powers of expression possessed by the right hon. leader of the government, but in this case there is a very great question involved in the attitude of the right hon gentleman. Referring to the bitterness which is said to have characterized the speech of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, let me say, on the other hand, that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has gone out of his way on all occasions to certify to the bona fides and good intentions of the right hon. gentleman, as I am quite aware, when he opened his speech in the way in which he did. It showed great generosity and an inability to be petty or small. But I occupy a different position, as regards the duty I am called upon to discharge, and I have the right to place before the country the position, so far as the record shows it, in which the right

hon. gentleman stands in regard to this question which is now before the House. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, in his remarks the other day, referring to the question of his not remaining in the cabinet at a time when it was desired that he should remain in the cabinet, directed attention to the letter which he wrote on the 10th July to the right hon. First Minister. In that letter he says :

The suggestion which was made to me when I stated to council my inability to become responsible for the policy which the government was apparently determined to adopt with reference to the transcontinental railway project, that I might delegate to some other minister, or that you yourself might take charge of the carriage of the resolutions and measures in parliament, appears to me more impracticable the more I consider it. It does not seem to me possible that, while declaring myself in Council as disapproving strongly of the government policy on this question, and therefore unable to support the same in parliament, I could retain my position in the cabinet and avoid the public advocacy of a proposition which it would be especially my duty as Minister of Railways to present to parliament and defend before the country. This course of tacitly accepting a measure which my judgment strongly condemns I consider, on reflection, as neither fair to the government as a body nor just to myself.

The hon. gentleman says that he exonerates the right hon. gentleman from having in person asked him to remain. There can hardly be any hon. gentleman so obtuse to what is due to himself as a member of parliament as to say for one moment that the offence is to be condoned of asking or urging or consenting to a member of the cabinet remaining in the cabinet when it is known in the cabinet that his views are diametrically opposed to those of his colleagues on a large question of policy which is about to be introduced. Therefore it is important to the country to know just where the cabinet stands in regard to that question. Did the cabinet or did the cabinet not desire that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals should remain in the cabinet, knowing his views to be hostile to the measure, and so desire to deceive the public during the entire passage of this Bill ? The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) said :

I am pleased, however, Sir, to be able to avail myself of the present opportunity of exonerating the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) from the charge which has been frequently made against him since this difficulty has originated. The right hon. gentleman has been charged with having made a suggestion to me that I should, having the opinions which I entertain with respect to the railway scheme that the government have determined upon, remain a member of the government and should quietly and silently continue to act as a colleague with him in that administration. The charge which has been preferred is that this proposition was made by himself to me. I am bound to say, in justice to the right hon. gentleman, that the proposition did not emanate from him, and I make this statement, not at his instance, but as a matter of fair play to him and of fair play to myself. In the correspondence which ensued pending my contemplated resignation I referred, as you will remember, to the circumstance that such a suggestion had been made in Council, and I mentioned the reasons which I thought had rendered it impossible for me to favourably entertain such a suggestion. I did it because I thought that there were perhaps members of council who would think I was over punctilious in declining to pursue that course, and I was glad afterwards that I had mentioned it in the correspondence, because there are many warm personal friends on the government side who, between the time that my resignation was known and the time that the explanations were made, have criticised me because I had not pursued that very same course. I say, therefore, that I very gladly avail myself of the present opportunity to make that matter straight.

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has made the matter perfectly straight, as to whether the suggestion originated with the right hon. leader of the government or not; but that does not alter the position of the matter. I regret to have to say, that if the leader of the government sits in the cabinet council and hears a nefarious proposition such as this enunciated, silence is not enough. That public morality, or the semblance to it, shall be maintained, requires that any member of the cabinet who respects his position, and much more the leader of the government, shall at once rise in his place and say, so long as I am a member of the cabinet, so long as I am the leader of the government, no such thing can be or will be tolerated by me. That is all I wish to say on this subject. It is not a pleasant subject, because in many ways I have the very highest esteem, personally speaking for the right hon. leader of the government; but it is a matter of public importance that I should refer to it.

Now, it would perhaps be virtually an impertinence on my part, at least it would be assuming a great deal, if I attempted to criticise the able speech delivered by the right hon. leader of the government, recognizing as I do that our esteemed leader is to speak upon this question. I would be arrogating to myself a position which can be much more ably taken, not only by our leader, but by others who are to speak after me. But there are some matters in the right hon. gentleman's speech that are so easily answered that I may perhaps refer to two or three of them. Speaking of the question of the proposed line from Lévis to Moncton paralleling the Intercolonial, I do not want to discuss whether in the strictest sense it is a case of paralleling or not. I assume that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has dealt with that question; and if he has, that is a sufficient reason for me not attempting to improve upon what he no doubt ably handled. This is not a question of a play upon words; it is not a question whether there are two lines

at equal distances. It is a question of whether this new road, as a transcontinental line, will or will not divert a large or some considerable proportion of through traffic from the Intercolonial Railway. Can there be any doubt about that? Can any hon. gentleman on the government side of the House argue that the effect of the construction of this railway will not necessarily be for a long time to come—for all time to come—to divert that western traffic to which the Intercolonial would otherwise be entitled, a large proportion of it at least, to the new line? I am not at all concerned with the argument of the right hon. leader of the government in regard to the large mountain ranges which he says lie between the Intercolonial and the proposed location of the new line. That may well be. From what I hear, and from what I have been able to read, I think there are plenty of mountains thereabouts. There may be dividing mountains, and I think there are mountains that will present almost insuperable difficulties to the passage of this proposed line. But that is not the question. It is not the local traffic we are talking about. It is the question of the great transcontinental trade; and the inevitable result of this policy must be, as hon. gentlemen who are candid must admit, largely to divert the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, let me refer to an incident which I think will become historical, that is, the right hon. gentleman standing on the shores of the Georgian bay at Depot Harbour in 1896. Depot Harbour is situated on an island, and I can almost imagine the scene of the right hon. gentleman looking out upon the waters as being a parallel to that of the great Napoleon when he stood looking out from his lonely island. The incarceration of Napoleon on the island of St. Helena had a very marked influence on the history of Europe, and the cogitations of my right hon. friend upon the occasion when he looked out on the angry waters of the Georgian bay, are going to have a very important influence—a very disastrous influence I think—upon the destinies of this great Dominion, unless the people stop it. I hope they will stop it. I am not going to indulge in any pious exclamations. I am not a particularly pious man. I am sorry for it. I will not say, 'grant heaven that it may not be too late.' But I will say, in all candour and all earnestness, that I hope the hon. gentlemen who usually support the government will study this question so fully, will give it such unprejudiced consideration, that it will not be too late to prevent this measure being pressed through this House at this time. I do not want it to be permanently stopped in one sense. All I want is that the people shall have an opportunity of pronouncing upon it. Stay it for the present. Do you think time will be lost? The right hon. gentleman refuses to listen to those who say to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow.

He turned a deaf ear to those who asked him to wait. He repelled the advice of those who counselled deliberation and care. There is no time for that, he said, this is the time for action, this day, this hour, this very minute must be taken advantage of. It is all very well for the right hon. gentleman to become dramatic, but I claim that investigation here is action in its very highest form, the highest act of which moral man can be capable of is a well considered, deliberate system of thought, and evolving from thought a great measure which otherwise would not be given to the world. This is a time for action, but action of the mind rather than of the hand. The time for that kind of action which would bring together in one focus all the information that can be got upon this gigantic scheme. Then if it be demonstrated—and I do not believe that possible—that this scheme is a good one in the interests of the country, in the name of all that is reasonable let it be carried out. But I do urge the right hon. gentleman to reflect and deliberate. I say that until we have proper information as to where this line should be located, as to what are the difficulties we have to surmount, as to what it shall cost, we ought to delay taking action.

Standing at Depot Harbour and gazing at the vast expanse of waters to be seen from that harbour, the right hon. gentleman reversed the policy of his life. Up to that time, he had a strong bias for government ownership; but he tells us that on looking upon these waters, he found adequate reasons for reversing that policy. Mr. Booth there told him that he had to create trade, that he had to build elevators, and that he possibly might have to build hotels, and the right hon. gentleman concluded that these things could never be done by a government. Yet we find Mr. Booth, although single-handed and alone, and wearied after the exertions of building a most magnificent railway enterprise, willing to renew his efforts and do what the right hon. gentleman shrank from doing. The right hon. gentleman, backed by such an able galaxy of cabinet ministers as assembled here in 1896, was frightened at the prospect he described the other day, and what has been the result? The result has been a complete reversal of the policy of the government on the transportation problem. Ever since 1896, we have been expending money at a very rapid rate in the development of our waterways. In 1896 we expended on canals and waterways, out of capital account alone, $2,477,000. In the subsequent years, we spent as follows:

In 1898	$3,419,000
" 1899	4,225,000
" 1900	3,093,000
" 1901	2,941,000
" 1902	3,885,000

Making an aggregate of upwards of $20,000,000 expended out of capital alone. I have not included 1903 or 1904. We have made the expenditure to 1903 and are committed to the expenditure of 1904. To what end have we expended this money in deepening our canals, improving our docks, enlarging Fort Colborne and improving our waterways generally, sums vastly exceeding what I have mentioned, because there are large sums paid out of consolidated revenue as well? To what purpose all this expenditure, if we are to adopt this policy, which will thoroughly cripple, for all time, the development and utilization of our waterways? This is not all. We have expended upon the Intercolonial Railway in these years an amount aggregating $14,000,000, making a total expenditure on these two sources of about $35,000,000, or if you included the expenditure on these two sources of 1903 and 1904, you will have an amount reaching nearly the figure of $50,000,000. I say in all earnestness, if the right hon. gentleman at that time, when he knew that this great transportation problem was before the people of this country, when he knew that thoughtful men had realized that perhaps more than another question worthy of the attention of the greatest minds of this country was the question of transportation, when he knew that the money of the people was being expended with a generous hand upon the development of waterways and the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway, so that to-day the Intercolonial Railway stands side by side, in equipment and in every particular, the peer of the Grand Trunk Railway, making a part of a great chain by which we hope in the near future to relieve any congestion in the west—I say if the right hon. gentleman then intended to change his policy, was it not the part of reasonable prudence that he should have given some indication of his change of heart to the House before we arrived at this stage of things?

I was referring to the matter of the Intercolonial Railway, which brings me to the question of an all-Canadian route. I have referred to that in connection with another branch of the matter, and I may say, speaking only for myself, that whilst I realize that it is very desirable that we should have an all-Canadian route, I recognize too that we have an all-Canadian route. We have, in fact, two all-Canadian routes. We have the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal, we have also the railway operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, which leaves Rivière du Loup and proceeds down to St. John, so that we have only to double the track from Lévis to Rivière du Loup, and we have two complete and perfect all-Canadian routes. I would prefer to have a Canadian route, with no portion of it in American territory. Yet, the matter that seems to me most important is not, as the right hon. minister says, that it shall be every foot and every inch upon Canadian soil, but that its ports shall be Canadian. I recognize that it cannot be just as profitable to us to have it pass through American territory. I recognize that it is to our interest in building up our various industries and promoting the wealth and progress of this country. But, as to whether a few miles of it shall be through a foreign country, why, if that is a complete bar, then the policy of countries in Europe and elsewhere must be all wrong. Who has heard of any agitation in favour of such a principle among the protective countries of Europe? Certainly I have not. Of course, others may have had more experience than I, but I would certainly be surprised if such a thing obtained.

This brings me to the question of the bonding privilege; and when I have referred to that—and very briefly—I shall conclude. And I shall do so without making an apology, because I rather committed myself to not making one when I began. Otherwise, I should certainly make an apology now for occupying so much of the time of the House. I will make a kind of apology, I will say that, whilst I do not regret dealing with these questions from the standpoint I have taken, and in the best way I could, I do regret that, having such magnificent material, I have not been able to present it better. I recognize that if I had handed to some hon. gentleman on this side of the House, the brief, if I may call it so, that I have here, and given them a few hours to look it over, probably a more effective service would have been done. But that is not practicable under our system. All that I have to do and all that any hon. member of this House has to do is to advocate those principles which appear to him in the best way which he can. And I think the House will exonerate me from any charge of having failed through lack of endeavour to do the best I could with the material I had, or through not having given time to gathering and selecting material. Now, as to the bonding privilege, I said that I disliked very much dealing with that question where I am to be followed by speakers, on this side of the House, such as I have referred to. But I have very strong convictions on this question of the bonding privilege. Let me tell the right hon. Prime Minister, that, when I find that the government have been in power for seven years, and when I remember that long before they got into power the accusation was made against hon. gentlemen opposite that they were too much hand-in-glove with our American neighbours; when I find that during their terms of power no intimation has been given of this matter; when I find that in the speech from the Throne this session, not one syllable of suggestion has been made that we had to grapple with what must be, should it arise, a very significant and important question; when I find that the ex-Minister of

Railways, who, above all, would be cognizant of the matter, declares that he has never heard a single syllable of suggestion, not only from the House, but even from the cabinet, or even from the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, that there was any danger in this respect; when I find that there is no evidence in the papers forthcoming that there has been negotiations or even communications between this government and the American government in recent times on this subject; and when I recognize that matters of this kind are matters of state record; and when I find, turning up the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the very document from which my right hon. friend quoted, that it is pointed out that the privileges are mutual, that there is advantage to the people of the United States as great as to the people of Canada, that this privilege is a mutual necessity and a necessity of commerce upon modern lines; when I find all this, I cannot help but conclude, even if I was not aided by this little book from which I have quoted, I cannot help concluding, reluctant as I am to do it, that this argument of the bonding privilege, is as I have said, an afterthought, a makeweight, for the purpose of trying to force through this measure, many features of which are, even as must appear to the ministry wholly indefensible. Now, what is the position of this question of the bonding privilege? Speaking from my own standpoint, I believe it is absolutely out of the range of possibility that there will be any trouble. I do not think it is consistent with the attitude of the United States or with the requirements of the United States. And I think that if it was not to be apprehended in years gone by, when there was a much less friendly feeling between the United States and Great Britain, and a much less friendly feeling between Canada and the United States, than there is today, we need not begin to apprehend trouble at this time. I have strong convictions upon this matter, and upon one aspect of the case I feel as competent to judge as the right hon. Prime Minister himself. And that is upon the expediency and propriety of introducing this matter into a discussion in this House. I think that no more disastrous statement could have been made by the leader of the government or a cabinet minister than was made by the Prime Minister on that occasion. It was an inviting of difficulties with the United States. And the only excuse that I can find, after thinking of it a good deal, is that the right hon. gentleman was so confident, beyond the possibility of doubt, that there was no danger of friction arising, that he thought it safe to mention it, as it would not do any harm anyhow. I said there were mutual interests involved. But there is more than that. We have built the Canadian Pacific Railway through the state of Maine. They have built their railways throughout our territory. We have built the Canadian Northern through the south of the Lake of the Woods, through American territory. There are other Canadian lines through American territories; and vast Canadian railway interests are centred in the United States, as there are vast railway interests of the Americans centred in Canada. Now, if the bonding privilege is abrogated, that abrogation works both ways. Supposing that we sent a despatch to Washington tomorrow saying that we suspended the bonding privilege, what would be the result? The result would be that after the American government remonstrated with us they would declare war against Canada, or we would have to back down or fight. Is there any hon. member of the House who doubts it? I take no lower ground for Canada. I say we have a just right to these privileges. We built the Canadian Pacific Railway through the state of Maine upon the implied condition of a continuance of these rights, as the Americans built their railways through our territory. And, although I am not slow to recognize the power of numbers in the United States, and the superior wealth of that country, yet Canada, like the little communities in Europe, the Swiss and others, is not to be gauged by numbers. While I throw out no defiant note, I say that Canadians should stand by their rights upon this northern half of the American continent. For my part, as a Canadian, I do not believe in acknowledging ourselves beaten until we are pretty nearly beaten. I am not going to tell the United States that we are afraid of them in respect of this question; I am going to say to the United States: We recognize in you people of the same race with ourselves; we recognize that you are engaged with us in building up a great community on this continent; we recognize that you and we are working together for the best interest of humanity, and we will expect from you just and neighbourly treatment. We cannot imagine that you would do such an act as was contemplated by the right hon. gentleman, if in fact he did contemplate it seriously.

As the clergymen sometimes say—I say in conclusion of this whole matter of the bonding privilege, and in conclusion of what I propose to say upon this railway question, that if there was any stage in the argument at which I recognized that the case of the government was absolutely weak—and you can hardly take up one argument in that case where weakness does not manifest itself—I say if there was a stage at which weakness was peculiarly manifest, it was in regard to the bonding privilege. Am I right in thinking that this is the opinion of many of the government supporters? It is a significant fact condemnatory of the action of the leader of the government, that so far as I can ascertain not one gentleman

who has spoken in support of the government yet has dared to deal with the bonding privilege, they drop it like a hot coal. They recognize that it was a mistake, a tactical blunder on the part of the right hon. gentleman. I sympathize with the right hon. gentleman, who has suffered from such momentous desertions in the past few months, in this additional evidence of the luke-warm support which he is receiving from his friends.

Mr. A. MORRISON (New Westminister). Mr. Speaker, I hope that I shall not take up anything like so long a time as the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has taken up in his speech. I shall not presume to refer to what is known as the eastern section of this Grand Trunk proposition, because that has been dealt with far more ably than I could pretend to deal with it. It has been covered fully by the able speeches of hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side of the House, culminating with the very excellent summary made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) on Friday night. After hearing that summary I would have concluded that the last word had been said in favour of this scheme, were it not that in my opinion there are one or two aspects of the case as regards British Columbia and the western portion of this proposed route that were not touched upon quite so fully as I would like. I listened with a great deal of patience to the speech which has just been delivered. The hon. gentleman, in his references to the route which it is intended this new transcontinental road shall take, reminded me very much of the character of the country, as he pictures it, which will be traversed by this road. The hon. gentleman, in his four and a half hour speech, travelled over mountains of distorted facts, he passed through canyons of ignorance of the facts of the present, he crossed plateaus of assurance, muskegs of plagarized statements of his political mentors, dreary wastes, not exactly of verbosity, but of reiteration, statements which were nothing else than parrot-like repetitions. He traversed lakes of the same old charges against the Liberal party, forests of the same old misstatements of existing conditions, and exhibited gusts of the same windy strain while he endeavoured to speak louder than his predecessors on that side. The whole was enveloped in a droning atmosphere of language which you would expect from a man who does not seem to realize the growth of a nation or the movement of events. Every unprejudiced, responsible person, having a knowledge of the facts surrounding this proposition, hold directly opposite opinions to those of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat and the gentleman who spoke before him from that side of the House. I repeat that every responsible and unprejudiced person having a personal knowledge of the route and of the facts connected with this proposition, state exactly the opposite of what these hon. gentlemen have stated. I shall not pretend to explain any of the absurd things that they allege as solemn truths, nor why knowing them to be untrue, they still continue to repeat them. I shall leave it to the public to decide whether their intelligence is at fault or whether it is their political honesty.

Now, a measure of opposition appears to have arisen in the province of British Columbia to this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. As might perhaps have been expected, that opposition emanates from the party of hon. gentlemen opposite—not from all of them, because, as I shall show presently, a very important element of the Conservative party in that province, and perhaps the most important element in it, are supporting this measure. But in reply to that element who are opposing this measure and raising a factious opposition to it, I crave the indulgence of the House for a short time while I refer to the terms of the contract which justify me in saying that it appears to have been drawn with a single eye to promoting the interests of the province of British Columbia, so far as this measure is concerned. The whole contract discloses the fact that the Liberal party have apparently, for the first time recognized a cardinal principle which seems to underlie our constitution, and one which heretofore has been ignored by hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, the subordination of transportation corporations to the sovereignty of parliament. We find that principle crystallized in this contract which is placed before the House and the country, and which is being delayed in its execution by efforts such as the one we have just listened to. Paragraph 10 of this contract reads as follows :

> The work of locating and constructing the said western division shall be commenced forthwith after the ratification of this agreement by the parliament of Canada, and shall proceed with the utmost despatch, and shall be completed within five years from the 1st day of December, 1903.

Now, that is a reply to the statement circulated by some of the Conservative papers of British Columbia that the road will not be commenced within seven years, and that probably it will never be completed, and that there are no terms obligatory upon the government even to commence it or complete it. Clause 11 reads :

> The company shall lay out, construct and equip the said western division of the said railway to a standard not inferior to the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada between Montreal and Toronto, so far as may be practicable in the case of a newly constructed line of railway, but this section shall not be held to oblige the company to construct a double track railway.

There is a clause compelling the company to construct the Pacific division from the Rocky mountains west to Port Simpson, or

whatever the port may be on the Pacific ocean, in as workmanlike and as efficient a manner as the excellent piece of road between Montreal and Toronto, perhaps one of the best pieces of road on the continent of America. Section 12 reads :

The company shall, within thirty days after the passing of the Act confirming this agreement and of the Act incorporating the company hereinafter referred to, deposit with the government five million dollars in cash or approved government securities, or partly in cash and partly in such approved securities, at the company's option, as security for the construction of the western division.

13. The government shall return the said deposit to the company on the completion of the construction of the western division and the first equipment of the whole line of railway, according to the terms hereof.

Showing that not only are the terms put into the contract for the speedy and efficient construction of the road but that there is also a further inducement and incentive placed in the contract, nay, one of the terms of the contract, to urge the company to finish that portion of the road by the return of this $5,000,000 deposit upon completion.

18. The cost of construction of the western division shall include the like classes of expenditure as in the case of the construction of the eastern division.

Again, showing that no stone has been left unturned to have the western part of the road properly constructed.

22. The company shall equip both divisions of the said line of railway with modern and complete rolling stock suitable and amply sufficient for efficient operation and the handling of all classes of traffic to the satisfaction of the government.

24 (d). Securing to any railway company, desiring to make use of the same, running powers and haulage rights over the said western division, or any portion thereof, upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the companies, or, in case of their failure to agree, then upon such terms as may be deemed reasonable and just by the government.

28. For the purpose of aiding the company in the construction of the western division, the government shall guarantee payment of the principal and interest of an issue of bonds to be made by the company for a principal amount equal to seventy-five per centum of the cost of construction of the said division, as defined and ascertained in accordance with the provisions of paragraph eighteen hereof ; but such principal amount shall not, in any case, exceed thirteen thousand dollars per mile of the mileage of the prairie section, nor thirty thousand dollars per mile of the mileage of the mountain section, although seventy-five per centum of such cost of construction may have exceeded the said respective sums per mile.

34. Inasmuch as the bonds to be guaranteed by the government only make provision for a part of the cost of construction of the western division, the company hereby agrees that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall guarantee bonds of the company for the balance required for the construction of the said western division, exclusive of the said twenty million dollars required for first equipment, which the company is required to provide under paragraph twenty-two of this agreement, and the company may issue a second series of bonds, to be guaranteed as aforesaid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada to be a second charge upon the property described in paragraph twenty-five (b) hereof, and to be subject to, and to rank upon, the said property next after the said bonds so to be issued and guaranteed by the government.

37. The company shall purchase all material and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers, when the same are produced in Canada and when such material and supplies can be purchased in desired quantities and of equal quality suitable for the purpose required, and for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere.

39. The rates and tolls to be levied and taken by the company upon any part of the said railway shall be under the control of the Governor in Council, or of such authority, commission or tribunal as is designated or constituted under any Act of the parliament of Canada for the regulation or control of the business of railways.

41. At all times during the terms of the said lease, the company shall continuously and efficiently operate both divisions of the said railway, giving due and sufficient service for the accommodation of all traffic to the satisfaction of the government.

42. It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels.

43. The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely,—the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

46. The government shall procure to be granted to the company, in so far as the same are vested in His Majesty in right of the Dominion of Canada, such lands as may be required for the right-of-way of the western division, and for all stations, station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and appurtenances required for the construction and working thereof, and shall also procure to be granted to the company, upon such terms as may be agreed upon, in so far as the same are so vested in His Majesty, such lands fronting upon and covered by navigable waters touched by the line of the railway as, in the judgment of the government, may reasonably be required for the use of the company in connection with its operations. The right of the company to obtain such lands without compensation shall cease when the said division is constructed and equipped as required by paragraph twenty-nine hereof.

Mr. Speaker, reading that contract, it is impossible for any fair minded critic to allege that regard has not been had to the interests of the extreme western province of British Columbia. In addition to that and in order to reply to the criticisms from

the Pacific coast, I beg to refer to the 'News-Advertiser' of Vancouver of July 31, and I am quite sure that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) will feel like modifying if not withdrawing the categorical statement which he made during the course of his speech the other day that the province of British Columbia did not want this road when he reads what the ablest Conservative writer west of the city of Toronto has to say on this matter. I refer to Mr. Carter Cotton, of the 'News-Advertiser' of Vancouver. In that paper on July 31st, he says :

The ramifications and connections with the Grand Trunk Company make it the most desirable railway organization that could undertake such an enterprise as far as the interests of this section of the Dominion are concerned, and it is fortunate for British Columbia that this particular corporation should have put forth its proposition at the time it did otherwise there is no knowing to what a reckless government and an incapable legislature might not have come into the province.

That refers to the crass and plantigrade policy of the late premier of the province of British Columbia and of his administration.

We must await the arrival of the Bill itself before we can be certain of all the conditions of the proposed agreement. It seems, however, that the government has taken rasonable precautions to secure the fulfilment of its contract by the company. While it may be quite true that a large part of the region to be traversed by the line between Moncton and Winnipeg may be of such a character that it will not be likely to yield much local traffic, the through traffic must pass over that section of the railway, and if the views held as to the probable future development of central and western Canada are sound, that implies a large traffic. Besides the history of the last twenty years should make any one cautious in declaring that any part of the Dominion possesses no natural resources capable of sustaining a population and of becoming the scene of industrial activity. Furthermore, if that part of the line is built under proper supervision and at the moderate cost at which such work on the Canadian Pacific road was done its capitalization should be low. As the railway will have to pay interest on the cost of the Moncton-Winnipeg section, it will be likely to scrutinize closely every item of cost. Assuming that the road will be built under thoroughly businesslike arrangements, securing full value for the money expended, and the fact that the company will only have to pay three per cent interest on the capital, we are inclined to think that fixed charges on this section will not be more than half what they are on a corresponding mileage on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Also in the same paper of the 7th August, Mr. Cotton again deals with this proposition. The article which I am about to quote is in reply to an agitation that has been attempted to be raised against the extension of the road to Port Simpson by people in the southern part of British Columbia on the ground that it will create a rival city and destroy to a certain extent the progress of Victoria and Vancouver. Here is what Mr. Cotton, whose paper is published in Vancouver, says in reply to that :

That this will prove to be a very important factor in the opening up and development of the northern section of this province there can be no doubt. The foundation of another important seaport several hundred miles north of Vancouver will not, in our opinion, be at all detrimental to the progress and prosperity of this city. The new town and port will not only develop business for itself, but it will create new business and traffic with Vancouver and other coast towns. The Grand Trunk Pacific management will reach out for business, and there is no doubt that that of the Canadian Pacific will not be found napping in regard to the operations of its influential and aggressive rival. Although the coast termini of the two roads will be several hundred miles apart, the distance between them can be covered by the cheapest of all systems of transportation—that of water carriage. In the cost of carrying freight across the continent by railways, the charge for the carriage by water from Vancouver to Port Simpson (or wherever the northern railway's terminus may be), and vice versa, will be a comparatively small item. We are familiar with similar traffic methods in American freight from San Francisco brought from there by steamer to Vancouver, and then carried from here over the Canadian Pacific Railway to its destination in cities in the eastern states.

This, I submit, ought to be at present a sufficient answer to the objections to this proposition, so far as the Pacific coast is concerned.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was referring to the statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that there was no demand for the projected transcontinental railway from any of the provinces. Well, it may be that none of the provinces wanted the road in the sense of clamouring for it in the hysterical way in which some of the papers in the country and some of the hon. gentlemen opposite imagine that enterprises of this kind should be asked for ; but the fact is incontestable that every province of the Dominion of Canada requires this road, and perhaps more than this road. The province of British Columbia certainly not only wants it, but requires it. The value of any country to its inhabitants depends largely upon certain well-recognized conditions. The province of British Columbia, the western terminus of this road, has to a very great extent one of these conditions which are so essential to the progress of a nation, namely, a producing capacity. The capacity of the province of British Columbia to produce for the requirements of the people is very well known. The province is the largest province in area in the Dominion of Canada. The Dominion of Canada has a superficial

area of some 3,750,574 square miles. The province of British Columbia has one-tenth of that—372,630 square miles. There are 640 acres in a square mile, so that we can see by a ready computation that British Columbia contains some 300,000,000 acres of land, with a population that gives us something less than one person to the square mile. These figures show the vast territory that is there to be peopled, and the necessity that exists for something being done to give a larger population to that part of the Dominion. In this vast acreage, which is not by any means all mountains, as some people would like to have us believe, we have unexcelled water power—perhaps the most valuable water powers in the whole Dominion of Canada if not in the whole continent of America. We have limitless tracts of timber lands. We have millions of acres of rich agricultural land requiring no artificial treatment to make it produce abundantly. We have large water stretches abounding in edible fish and game. We have undeveloped mining regions. We have a variety of climate suitable for every condition of life. To satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite, who think there is a paucity of information about that country, I would refer to the numerous explorations that have been made from the remotest times in the history of this country. One of the most valuable reports pertaining to that country is the report of Mr. Marcus Smith, so well known as a surveyor and engineer. Then, we have the reports of Mr. Macoun, of the Geological Survey, particularly those made in 1877. We have the reports of exploratory and colonization surveys made by Mr. Gauvreau, Mr. Poudrier, Mr. Strathern, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Going, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Jennett, Mr. Corrigan, and numbers of others. All these reports are available. I will make simply a short summary of the reports of these men upon the very land which will be traversed by the proposed railway, showing beyond doubt that the country has not only been well known for many years, but is one of the most productive parts of the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Gauvreau and Mr. Poudrier, in their reports on this part of British Columbia, say :

In the immense district lying between the Cascade range and the Rockies, to the north of the Fraser, to which the name of New Caledonia has been given, immense opportunities exist for profitable settlement, there being large areas of good agricultural and, as well as immense reaches of grazing country. The district would supply a growing home market among the miners of the district, which district is rapidly opening up, as well as having open to it, as soon as a railway is built, the larger markets of the world.

Referring to one of the valleys along which this road will pass, they say :

The valley of the Skeena—,—

Which is practically the terminus of this railway on the Pacific coast——

—the benches above Quatsalix near Hazelton, the valley of the Kispyox, the upper branches, without counting the valley of Watsonka, and the part included in Mr. Gauvreau's field of exploration, after very careful computation, would give 300,000 acres of farming land, more or less wooded.

Then he goes on to say :

One of the half million acres would be about the correct estimate of the grazing land available.

Further on speaking of the other opportunities of that district to be traversed by this road, he says :

The Bulkley valley is wide and open, well watered by several mountain streams and well adapted for stock-raising or dairy farming down to the 66th-mile station. . . . A very large proportion is open prairie with luxuriant grass, and where there is timber it will be easy to clear. The soil is good and vegetables of all sorts and all serials except wheat could be grown. As grazing land, the district's areas cannot be surpassed, and where timber has been burnt the numerous varieties of grasses growing show that areas of pasture could be largely increased. . . . Along the river are good hay meadows which the Indians have utilized for years. Tremblay lake, of which Middle river is a principal feeder, offers very rich open lands, with good pastures. The soil is clay loam, covered with vegetable matter, while there are bluffs of poplar, small birch and willow ; from Tremblay to the small lake above, the country is open and grassy ; above that lake the land is thickly timbered with Douglas fir, balsam, spruce, cottonwood and poplar.

Then he goes on to describe the very important district of Omenica. Referring to that district, he said :

Mining is the industry of the district, and no doubt when mining operations shall have gained larger proportions, extensive tracts will be utilized for the growing of hardy grains and vegetables, and cattle-raising will become an important industry.

These reports date all the way from 1877 down to about 1897. Mr. Bell, who made his susvey in 1895, said :

The eastern flank of the coast range he pronounces to be pastoral land of exceptional excellence, the winter feed giving it a highly favourable character. This feed can be cut on the extensive natural meadows. Some of the land in this section only requires irrigation to make it admirable for farming purposes, and there are streams at hand to supply the water. Mr. Bell thinks that it is the lack of means of communication which keeps this section from being immediately occupied by settlers. . . . These observations cover the whole country between the coast range and the Fraser.

* * * * * * * * *

In the valley of the Klena-klena river, in the vicinity of Port Neville, considerable exploratory survey work was done in 1894 by Mr. A. F. Cotton, P.L.S., who found on his arrival at Knight's inlet on the sixth of June that oats and potatoes were already up and the season much further advanced than even in the Fraser valley.

In addition to that we have the fact that in 1866 the Western Union Telegraph Company,

in its attempt to extend its line of telegraph up the coast of British Columbia to Behring Strait to meet the Siberian line which was being projected across Asia, got as far as Skeena near the present terminus, when as you know, it got news of the successful laying of the Pacific cable and suspended operations. We have also the surveys of Gauvreau and Poudrier, made in the interests of colonization, and these gentlemen report that the foothills and the country generally were exceptionally rich and fertile. We have further advantage of the surveys and examination made by several local lines, which were projected in British Columbia, for instance the road known as the British Pacific which had explorations made in the early part of 1890, also the Pacific Northern and the Omenica Railway, another corporation, which made a survey of its own.

In addition to all these extensive tracts of productive arable land, the province of British Columbia has another justification for having this road extended through it, which perhaps would be sufficient if there were no other arguments in favour of the projected line. Take the fisheries of that province. The Fort Simpson, Skeena and Naas rivers are the great grounds of the fishing industry outside of the Fraser river in that province. This road will tap directly those important fishing grounds. As far as the deep sea fisheries of the province are concerned, those are the grounds, and they are practically unexploited to-day. It is estimated that the deep sea fisheries of the British Columbia coast are the most valuable in the world, and none the less valuable because they have not been exploited. You may be surprised to know that the capital invested in the British Columbia fisheries, exceeds that invested in Nova Scotia, which province, up to the present, took the lead in that respect by a long way of the other provinces. The total value of the vessels, gear and appliances of various kind in 1901, according to the report of the Marine and Fisheries Department in British Columbia, amounted to $3,360,000 in that province, whereas the value of the same property in Nova Scotia was but $3,319,334. The salmon fisheries which are the great fisheries of British Columbia, and which are to be touched by this road, are the most valuable fisheries, according to the same report, in the Dominion. That industry last year employed in our province 18,541 persons and preserved 59,000,000 cans of fish. The seal fleet of that province, consisting of 39 schooners, 139 boats and some 236 canoes, is valued at $370,000 and gives employment to some 900 sailors and hunters. The total value of all kinds of fish from the province of British Columbia, according to the same report, in 1902, was $7,942,000, as against $7,989,000 in the province of Nova Scotia. We are creeping up to the province of Nova Scotia. A few years ago we were milllions behind in the value of our fishing industry, but to-day we are within a few hundred thousands.

I wish, without being invidious, to refer to the fact that in some quarters it is claimed that the extension of transportation facilities to the Pacific coast will have to be done at the expense of the eastern provinces. We frequently hear, I am sorry to say, from the great province of Ontario, that the expenditure of federal money in British Columbia is mainly borne by that province, because that province is the greatest contributor to the federal exchequer. That, Mr. Speaker, is not according to the facts. In the one matter of fisheries alone, the revenue derived from the province of British Columbia in 1902, was some $42,000, whereas the expenditure by the Dominion on that industry was only $18,000. The revenue derived from the province of Nova Scotia for the same industry was only $6,000, whereas the expenditure was $32,000, showing an inexplicable difference between the revenue from and the expenditure in that province as regards this industry. As far as the general expenditures in the province of British Columbia are concerned, I find that from 1885 to about the time when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the excess of revenue from British Columbia to the federal exchequer over expenditure by the federal government, amounted to some $16,000,000, or on an average, to over $1,000,000 a year, and that excesssive revenue over expenditure has been increasing every year since, until now we have an excess of revenue derived by the federal government for the province of British Columbia over expenditure, of some $2,709,000.

From 1872 up to 1901 the Dominion government received $42,375,000, and paid back to us in the various expenditures I have referred to only $28,968,000, leaving a balance in our favour of about $13,500,000. When you are told here by the right hon. leader of the government and by other hon. gentlemen on this side that the Grand Trunk Pacific will cost this country only $13,300,000, we can see that the surplus revenue paid into the exchequer from the province of British Columbia will a little more than cover the amount. Therefore, it is not true to say, if hon. gentlemen are disposed to say it that the province of British Columbia is to get this extension of the great trunk line at the expense of the eastern provinces, and, incidentally I may say that this great increase of revenue from 1885 up to the present time is perhaps, directly attributable to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the incidental development of mines and lumbering since that date. Therefore, I can fairly argue that that great development and increase of revenue to the federal government arising since 1885 being attributable to the extension there of the Canadian Pacific Railway, our revenue will be doubled and perhaps trebled within ten years in consequence of the con-

struction of this new line, so that it is quite justifiable so far as this province is concerned. Our conditions in justifying the extension of this road are not confined to the two elements I have referred to. We have the lumber industry. With as accurate an estimate as can be made by reputable authorities, it is clear that British Columbia has the largest compact area of merchantable timber on the North American continent. One feature of that resource is its density. As high as 500,000 feet of lumber have been taken from a single acre. Those not familiar with the lumber industry will be surprised to know that in Ontario and the eastern provinces generally 20,000 feet to an acre is a good average. It is estimated that there is in sight in British Columbia from 40,000,000,000 to 50,000,000,000 feet of lumber. Now these are not idle figures. As I stated, it is a matter that can be estimated with almost a mathematical exactness. When you consider that only 1,175 square miles of timber is under lease and that, according to the Dominion returns there remain 285,554 square miles, you can fancy what a tremendous source of revenue and what a tremendous opportunity for development remain in the timber of that province. In order to get out that tremendous wealth which we have at our door you can see the absolute necessity for at once furnishing even more facilities than are proposed in this measure. Then, I come to the great industry of the province, and the one that is always associated with the name of British Columbia, the mining industry. We have that yet practically undeveloped. The province has gone through a severe test; it has been the vicarious victim of stupid inexperienced speculators from eastern Canada and the old country. We have had the misfortune of not having the attention of reputable investors directed to the province up to this time to the extent we deserve. The fault was not with the province, but with those who have attempted to take advantage of the great mineral wealth there. And I refer, of course, in these remarks, to the gold mining side of the industry. We have great coal areas in that province second to none in the Dominion. The two companies operating on the coast of British Columbia have a monthly pay-roll of $230,000, or an annual pay-roll of $2,760,000; I do not include in this the Crow's Nest and Fernie coal mines. The value of gold, silver, copper and lead mined in British Columbia in 1901 was $13,500,000. So again I am justified in saying that this development is mainly attributable to the transportation facilities we have been afforded up to the present time. Generally, apart from these sources of wealth in British Columbia we have every evidence of tremendous resources west from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast. I will refer particularly to a few statements made by independent and unprejudiced parties concerning the prairie country and British Columbia. One authority says:

> If I were a young man, with such opportunities within my reach as are offered in the Canadian North-west, I would make all possible haste to get a plough into the rich soil of these fertile prairies and would soon be reaping the fruition of my labours in 40-bushel-to-the-acre wheat and in herds of the finest cattle the world ever saw. I believe that region is the very acme of God's best gifts to man in the soil and climate, and in health, wealth, and comfort-giving opportunities, upon the face of the earth to-day.

That, Mr. Speaker, has reference to a part of the country through which this Grand Trunk Pacific will pass. Sir Richard Cartwright, in a speech he made in 1901 stated:

> The Red River valley, the Saskatchewan valley, the Assiniboine valley, and the Peace River valley are realities, and the progress Western Canada has made is a reality, too. We have room for a population of at least 50,000,000. We have marvellous water power, the value of which we are just beginning to realize; we have immense mineral resources; all we need is men. I believe that the record of the next five years will surpass that of the last five years, good as it has been, as fully as the record of the last five years has surpassed that of the last fifteen years.

Sir Richard Cartwright in making these statements made them with the full knowledge of the facts. That hon. gentleman is Minister of Trade and Commerce and was in council when this Grand Trunk Pacific was being discussed. That being the case, the accusation of hon. gentlemen opposite that the members of the cabinet rushed into this with lack of knowledge, without knowing what they did, apparently falls to the ground. Another authority is quoted as saying:

> One who has not studied the matter can have no conception of the great natural wealth of the Canadian North-west and of British Columbia. Almost everything ministering to the comforts and necessities of mankind is found there—some of the finest forests in the world; inexhaustible sources of iron and coal; gold and silver, and, in addition to all this, the finest grain-growing district in the world is in Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Assiniboia, while the whole of the Canadian North-west is adapted for small farms and cattle ranches. In fact, the capabilities of the Canadian North-west with its magnificent pastures and unlimited quantities of natural hay, to produce the very highest type of animal life—horses, cattle, and sheep—are practically unlimited.

A prominent American authority says:

> Canada has resources equalling, if not exceeding, those of the United States, in agricultural and mineral wealth and in industrial possibilities. It has millions of acres of fertile farming land, rich mineral deposits, and transportation possibilities far ahead of ours. . . It does one good to see the crops they are raising up there. Wheat, barley, and oats are raised in immense quantities, and occasional patches of good corn. . . . Canada will develop pro rata the same way as the United States has grown.

Then we have the authority of the Department of the Interior for the following :

Wheat has been successfully raised at Fort Simpson in latitude 62 degrees north, which is as far north-west of Winnipeg as Winnipeg is north-west of New York. Rye and oats are grown 200 miles farther north, and 200 miles still farther north barley and potatoes are successfully produced.

I stated that one of the conditions for the welfare of the inhabitants of the country is the producing capacity of the country. Another is its exporting capacity. The province of British Columbia has that capacity to a very large extent. Not only has it large exporting capacity, but it has great facilities as regards foreign commerce. The ports of Vancouver, Victoria, New Westminster, Port Simpson, and whatever other ports may be opened by the extension of this road have advantages far in excess of those of Puget Sound ports, Oregon and San Francisco. When I show you the extent of the exports from Puget Sound and the Oregon and the California ports, which are not so favourably situated so far as the wheat belts are concerned as are our Pacific coast ports, you will readily see the tremendous advantage to the western ports of Manitoba and the North-west Territories which will be conferred by the Grand Trunk Pacific road. The wheat exports from the Pacific coast ports in 1901 amounted to some 36,000,000 bushels; the flour exports from Puget Sound and from Seattle and Tacoma amounted to some 2,000,000 barrels. Full particulars of these exports can be found in the American Trade and Navigation Returns of this year. From Montreal, Portland and St. John during the same period, 30,941,000 bushels of wheat were exported. From San Francisco alone there were 14,000,000 bushels exported. Those of you who are familiar with the geography of the western part of the continent will recollect that the Coast and the Cascade ranges of the Rocky mountains are further removed from the American coast than they are from the Canadian Pacific coast. As you go north the range converges to the Pacific coast, not only converges to the Pacific coast when it gets into the province of British Columbia, but it gets lower in altitude, affording an easy access across and low grades, and it comes within a few hundred miles of Port Simpson. So that the great wheat belt of the North-west Territories extends to within a few hundred miles of Port Simpson as against a distance of some thousands of miles from the western wheat belts which are tributary to the ports of San Francisco and Puget Sound and Oregon. It is therefore obvious that the great cost of the exports of western wheat of the United States to the Pacific coast ports is far in excess of the cost of the export of wheat of the Canadian belt to the Pacific coast and from there to the foreign ports. The competition that will be afforded by the Grand Trunk Pacific in rates will enable the great wheat belt of the North-west Territories to be tapped. The wheat and grain belt of Canada will be within easy and cheap distance of the markets of the world. The Asiatic market we all know is growing in importance. The Puget Sound ports export large quantities of produce raised in territory similar to that of British Columbia and along which this road will traverse. They are exporting large quantities of their products to China, Japan and other ports of Asia. The port of San Francisco last year sent to China products of the value of $16,703,000, and to Japan, valued at $4,000,000. China, Japan and the Asiatic ports are five or six hundred miles perhaps a thousand miles nearer us than they are to the American ports which have this splendid export trade already. All we want is some cheaper means of getting our wheat to the Pacific coast. It is absurd to say that by the Canadian Pacific Railway, great as are the advantages which it affords to the coast, you can haul wheat across the Rocky mountains and over the grades which characterize this road in competition with the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific roads. There is no question that an impetus will be given to the exports of wheat by way of the Pacific ocean that is almost inconceivable at the present time. In addition to all the other advantages to which I have referred, we have open ports the year round; so that I am not over sanguine in expecting that within ten years the bulk of the export of grain from the Dominion of Canada, and perhaps from the American continent, will be by way of the Pacific coast and by our own Pacific ports.

Mr. BROCK. In what way will the building of a road from Winnipeg to Moncton decrease the expense of sending wheat from the wheat belt to the Pacific ocean?

Mr. MORRISON. As I stated in my opening remarks, I am quite satisfied to leave the justification of the action of the government respecting the Moncton and Winnipeg branch to the gentlemen who have preceded me. It would be a work of supererogation on my part to add one word to what has been so ably said by the gentlemen who have treated that point. There is still another justification for the extension of the road to the Pacific coast and that is the matter of freight rates. The province of British Columbia is suffering at the present time, and unless this Grand Trunk Pacific road is extended or we have some other line to the coast, we will continue to suffer from excessive freight rates. To-day you can send farm implements or any other products to the Antipodes cheaper than you can send them to Vancouver or to Edmonton. That is a condition of affairs that ought not to exist, and the present administration are proceeding to remedy that grievance. The passenger rate in British Columbia from station to station is five cents, while east of

Manitoba and as far as Nova Scotia, passenger rates are only three and two cents.

Mr. BROCK. Did the hon. gentleman vote for a two cent passenger rate to the Pacific coast that was moved here the other night ?

Mr. MORRISON. I have always had regard, in a matter of that kind, to the methods by which a thing is introduced into the House, and particularly to the individual who introduced it. So, having regard to both those circumstances, I thought it was not incumbent upon me seriously to consider the proposition made by the hon. gentleman at that time. Now, in addition to these considerations to which I have referred, there is another very important element in our favour, and that is the climate. Between latitude 49 and 59, which embraces pretty nearly the whole province of British Columbia, we find Great Britain, the Northwest of France, Belgium, Holland, North Germany, Prussia, Denmark, South Sweden, the Baltic provinces, the coast of Russia and the Gulf of Finland. I suppose there is no man in this House but knows what that means, that within these latitudes on the continent of Europe is contained what is said to be the cradle of civilization, producing the sturdiest types of humanity. There is no reason in the world why, with the influx of people which the Minister of the Interior is assuring us in that province, and the facilities afforded by the government of which this project is merely an earnest, we will have in that province the most populous and most prosperous part of the Dominion of Canada within a very short period.

Generally speaking, we will not only render assistance by the construction of this line in the development of that important part of Canada, but by the development throughout the whole of Canada which will result from the adoption of this proposition we will bring back some if not all of the 1,183,225 Canadians who are in the United States to-day, according to the census returns of the United States of last year. There are 1,183,225 Canadians in the United States, 787,798 of whom come from provinces outside of the province of Quebec, while 395,427 are from the province of Quebec. There are 1,183,225 stalwart, worthy Canadians who want to return to Canada and who will return if the resources of this country are made known and facilities are provided for their development. I shall not take up the time of the House any farther. I should like extremely to dilate upon the very alluring topic of the position of the province of British Columbia in relation to the other provinces in the Dominion of Canada, but in view of the long speeches that we have already heard and in view of the fact that there are a number of hon. gentlemen who wish to speak, I will conclude by reciting a piece of advice that was given many years ago by that eminent philosopher Bacon. He said :

> That which is past is gone and irrevocable and wise men have enough to do with things present and to come ; therefore they do but trifle with themselves that labour in past matters.

I, therefore, trust that hon. gentlemen on the other side who may see fit to address the House will let bygones be bygones, and devote a little more time to present conditions, and to the future.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) who has just addressed the House, like a number of his predecessors, seems to make a point of discussing everything except the resolution before the House. He has given us a very beautiful description, in part, of British Columbia. Other hon. gentlemen have portrayed in choice language the beauties of parts of the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec. Extracts have been read from clergymen's essays and reports have been presented covering the ground all the way from Labrador coast to James bay, and hon. gentlemen have discussed everything but the merits of their measure. These hon. gentlemen seem to take it for granted that they have discovered there is a climate in Canada, that there is soil, and that there is an opportunity of building another transcontinental road. I am not surprised at the language we now find them indulging in. These hon. gentlemen have for many a long year been engaged in belittling this country, and in providing speeches to be used by our friends in Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas and other southwestern states to deter emigrants from going to Canada, and it is, therefore, difficult even yet for some of their own friends to have faith in Canada. I want to point out to these hon. gentlemen, however, that it is quite unnecessary for them to speak to the country upon this topic as far as the Liberal-Conservative party is concerned. I am merely one member of the Liberal-Conservative party, but I want our hon. friends to recall to mind what they must well know, that the Conservative party have always pointed out the advantages of Canada, that they have always had faith in our great North-west, that they have always recognized that there is a large tract of fairly settleable country in the northern parts of Ontario and Quebec, and that it is possible to get a line—I will not say a short line—of railway from Lévis south-westerly or easterly down through the province of New Brunswick. These hon. gentlemen are very far behind the times. If they go up to the Railway Committee room and look at the map they will see that there are at least a dozen charters authorizing the construction of railways by routes which are marked across the continent of North America, showing that for many a long year there are men in Canada who

have had faith in the country, and who recognized the fact that at some future date there will be another transcontinental line running across the Dominion. My hon. friend from British Columbia, as I said, has devoted himself chiefly to a description of his adopted province, and I must congratulate him upon his effort. But, how the southern part of British Columbia will be benefited by the construction of a railway three or four hundred miles north is something that I fail to see. I also fail to see what his quotation from the Vancouver newspaper edited by Mr. Cotton has to do with this matter. Mr. Cotton, as he himself says, had not read the contract and practically knew nothing about it. What Mr. Cotton speaks of is what every man in Canada who is cognizant of the advantages of this country should welcome and that is a proper scheme of opening up our own country. But, Sir, in discussing the development of the country we are not at all endorsing the iniquitous contract which is now before the House. The last speaker remarked that this contract was drawn with an eye single to promote the interests of British Columbia. I regret that he did not show where the single eye was, but I am glad that there is one part of the Dominion of Canada that the contract is drawn with the object of benefiting. It certainly is not the province of Nova Scotia, it is not the province of New Brunswick, it undoubtedly is not Quebec nor Ontario, it cannot be the North-west Territories ; therefore, as our hon. friend says, it is singly drawn for the benefit of British Columbia, and he regrets the delay in the execution of the terms of the contract by speeches such as that which has been delivered by my hon. friend for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I do not think that my hon. friend from South Simcoe has occupied any more of the time of this House than the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) or the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) on the other side of the House. One of these hon. gentlemen took about two days of the time of the House, and the other a day and a half, and I am satisfied to leave the country to judge between the speeches of these three hon. gentlemen. If there is not more solid logic, more fact and more criticism in the speech of my hon. friend from South Simcoe than in the defence of the measure contained in the two speeches of these hon. gentlemen, I will let the hon. gentleman's remarks pass unchallenged. My hon. friend from British Columbia took up the contract and he read a few paragraphs from it. One section of which he spoke particularly was section 10, and he also referred to the deposit of $5,000,000. However, as I propose to take this matter up as I proceed, I will not now refer to his remarks upon that point at any further length. I want to point out to our hon. friends opposite that the Liberal-Conservative party is not criticising the route of this railway. The Liberal-Conservative party has long been upholding the advantages of the Dominion of Canada and the various advantages both of the east and the west. It is not the question of route, but it is the question of the terms of the contract and the effect this contract will have upon the finances and the development of the country that we are basing our criticism upon, or at least I am criticising that feature of the proposition, and I think in that I voice the general sentiment of the friends of the Liberal-Conservative party, both in the House and out of it. We are not belittling the soil of the province of New Brunswick, of Quebec, or of Ontario—very far from it. On the contrary, the Liberal-Conservative party has been the leader in this House in drawing attention to the advantages of this country. For many long years our hon. friends opposite were unfortunately engaged in belittling Canada. We are not criticising the climate of this country. I myself took the liberty last year and the year before of pointing out why I thought the North-west Territories and the northern part of British Columbia were well adapted for settlement, and I have on other occasions pointed out why I think that northern Ontario, in future, when opened up from the colonization view point, will afford homes and employment for many thousands of people. Nor have we criticised the people of the country as some hon. gentlemen have endeavoured to do. We recognize that the people of the maritime provinces and of Quebec as well as of the whole of Canada are amongst the best that the world has produced with rare exceptions from the immigration view point in recent years, which I shall not refer to here. Therefore, I shall proceed to show the objections that we have to this scheme.

Nine months or a year ago an item appeared in a Minneapolis paper—and I think it was telegraphed to some of the Canadian papers—to the effect that the Senator referred to by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was about to exploit a new scheme. It was stated that he had attempted to become a member of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and that, having failed in that attempt, he was going to launch a scheme which involved the extension of the Grand Trunk Railway from its connections with St. Paul and Minneapolis into Winnipeg, from which point it would carry its main line to the Pacific coast, with branches all over Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Application was made to the legislature of Manitoba, and the newspapers in the city of Winnipeg, one with its whole front page, I remember, showed the plan of this great railway scheme ; and the name of the Hon. George Cox was mentioned publicly in the press and on the streets as being prominently connected with it. The reasons why that gentleman had

formed an alliance with the Grand Trunk and was pressing forward this scheme were almost semi-officially given. The plan was that the railway was to be entirely independent of either of the great western Canadian roads, the Canadian Northern or the Canadian Pacific. It was to extend from the Grand Trunk terminus in Chicago to Minneapolis, by controlling one of the American roads ; and, if the facts were known, I have no doubt that it would be found that the Grand Trunk Railway has to-day control of a line into the city of Minneapolis and into the city of St. Louis. It would not be politic to let it be known, however, that the Grand Trunk is so near the Canadian border in the North-west until this Bill is passed. There was to be a branch built from the line between Minneapolis and Winnipeg to Duluth, to connect by a fleet of steamers with the Midland system of the Grand Trunk, and become their principal grain line. It was announced at that time that the project was to have the endorsation of the Canadian parliament, almost identical with the endorsation this scheme is receiving here to-day. I want to say that I regard that as a very good scheme. I have no objection to it whatever. If the Grand Trunk Company would be content to accept a fair endorsation of a scheme which is only partly Canadian, I am not one to oppose it. I do not think, however, that such a scheme should get anything like the support that would be due to a scheme which would to a greater extent develop the Dominion of Canada. Some said that the object of all that demonstration was merely to force the Canadian Northern Railway Company to surrender.

Mr. CLARKE. No surrender !

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No surrender was their motto, I believe, and I understand that no surrender is their motto to-day. Hon. members know that during this session items appeared in papers in the United States and also in the Montreal papers, to the effect that the Canadian Northern was about to surrender ; and this rumour was kept constantly before the public until only a few weeks ago. But, Sir, they came to the conclusion that the Canadian Northern Company could not be got to surrender, and they tacked on the patriotic end of the scheme, and the next move was that the Grand Trunk Company were going to extend their line from North Bay or Gravenhurst, paralleling the proposed line of the Canadian Northern to Winnipeg, and proceeding thence across the country to the coast. Still the coon did not come down. I presume that the hon. Minister of Justice happened to get wind of what was going on ; and, not content with the line from North Bay to Winnipeg, he saw a chance to secure some benefit for the friends of the Quebec bridge and some little encouragement for the province of Quebec ; and the next proposition was that the line should run from the city of Quebec, through northern Quebec and Northern Ontario, to Winnipeg. Still another move was made, and our friends the enemy from the maritime provinces took a hand in, with the result that we now have the proposition for a road from Moncton to the city of Winnipeg, and thence onward to the coast. This is called the short line extension to Moncton. I regret that the right hon. First Minister is not in his place. I have always had the highest respect for that right hon. gentleman, both as a citizen and as a member of the House of Commons ; and when I heard that some transcontinental railway scheme was being evolved, I had perfect confidence in my own mind that the right hon. gentleman, in whose patriotism I have always had faith, though I never knew what his business capacity was, would produce a scheme that would at all events have a few clauses in it to commend it to this House and the country. I regret, Sir, that I have been disappointed. So far as the Grand Trunk Railway is concerned, I am not opposing that company. I regard Mr. Hays, its general manager, as one of the greatest railway men in the world ; I regard our old friend Mr. Wainwright as one of the most genial of men ; I regard Mr. McGuigan as one of the ablest railway construction men in North America ; and the venerable Senator is a life-long friend of mine. So that if my personal feelings were to decide the matter, they would certainly lead me to support any scheme with which these gentlemen were connected. But I find in this scheme a pretense to build up our Canadian seaports, when I will show before I get through that its traffic will go to Portland, Boston and other American centres. They profess to reduce rates, when I venture to say that those who live ten or fifteen years hence will bear out my statement that not one cent per bushel will be taken from the cost of the transportation of wheat through this proposal. They profess to solve the transportation problem, when they only confuse it. They profess to serve the interests of Canada, when they will load the people down with a burden which our children's children will not be free from, and which will tie the country up for many a long year to come. Many see in this scheme all sorts of jobs. It undoubtedly means the ruin of the Intercolonial as a national work. It means the burdening of this country with many hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for the maintenance of that road, because its earning power will be greatly diminished as soon as this new line is constructed. We see in this proposed line an attempt to make the Quebec bridge profitable ; and, if I am informed aright, that bridge has already cost as much money as the plans and specifications indicated that the whole bridge would cost, although the

piers are scarcely above the water yet. I wonder what the upshot will be when the government blow a few more millions into it. It will undoubtedly be well watered. By this scheme they are side-tracking the city of Toronto in the province of Ontario, as well as the city of Montreal and all the southern part of the province of Quebec; and yet, when the facts of the case are known, the city of Quebec will not receive from it so much benefit as the gentlemen would have us believe. The question naturally arises, who has perpetrated this job? Who has delivered this gold brick to the Prime Minister? There is undoubtedly a certain clamour about the transcontinental road, but I do not think that alone would be sufficient to justify the celerity displayed by the right hon. the Prime Minister and a number of his colleagues, in whom many of us have had every confidence. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) said that the fact of the matter was that Senator Cox could not wait. Well, where was our friend the Minister of Labour and Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock)? Some suppose that he, rising above postage stamps and dabbling in labour problems, looks about for a vaster field in which to exercise his great genius, and has visions of being the leader of the great Liberal party in Canada in the near future. Some suppose that he is endeavouring to supplant the Minister of Finance and is really the father of this scheme. Others maintain that it is the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) who, with the energy of his race, wishes not only to be the leader in his native province, but the leader of the party in the Dominion. Certainly we have not yet any precise knowledge as to who the father of the scheme really is.

The scheme, at all events, is devoid of merit. It consists of two branches. The branch to the east from Winnipeg will not be constructed for at least ten years. It will not benefit Ontario or the city of Montreal or the maritime provinces, and I would, therefore, appeal to the Postmaster General to take the first minister in hand—if the hon. gentleman is not endorsing the scheme as its father—and induce the right hon. gentleman to withdraw it before the country is irrevocably committed to it. What are the details of the scheme? There is to be nominally a government road from Moncton, in the province of New Brunswick, to Winnipeg, passing by the St. John valley, crossing at Quebec, onward through the northern part of Quebec and the northern part of Ontario, as far as Winnipeg. This section is to be built and owned by the government, but leased to the Grand Trunk Railway. It will pass 250 miles north of Montreal, over 400 miles north of Toronto, and from 120 to 180 miles north of Port Arthur and Fort William. That part of the road will be 1,900 miles long, and it will cost anywhere from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 to construct. Then the next division, from Winnipeg to the Rockies to be assisted to the extent of $13,000 per mile, and through the Rockies to the coast to the extent of $30,000 a mile, and the government is to pay all the interest for a period of ten years, and give the company all the station lands, frontage, ports and harbours and terminals it requires. This section from Winnipeg to the coast will be absolutely the property of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

After fifty years the lease of the eastern part terminates, and supposing this to be the honest scheme, hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe it is, at the end of fifty years the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will find themselves with a line stopping at Winnipeg. But the fact is that this is only a pretense, and the real scheme is as I shall show. The Grand Trunk Railway is now in the city of Chicago, and undoubtedly has arrangements made whereby it can readily get entrance into Minneapolis. It will then only be 470 miles from Winnipeg. It purposes building into Winnipeg, and will own a through-line from Portland, in Maine, to Port Simpson, on the Pacific coast. It will have a branch to Duluth, and that branch will connect with the Port of Midland, as a lake and rail route for grain. Now, the distance is not so very terrible after all, and it will be a magnificent road with a perfect road-bed, and I doubt whether it would be possible to get a finer transcontinental road. From Portland to Montreal the distance is 298 miles, thence to Chicago 840 miles, thence to Minneapolis, 420 miles, on to Winnipeg, 471 miles, and thence to Port Simpson, 1,600, making a total mileage from Portland to Winnipeg of 2,029, from Montreal to Winnipeg, of 1,731, and from Portland to Fort Simpson, of 3,600 odd miles. There is the transcontinental Grand Trunk Railway scheme. It is a scheme that I would heartily endorse, were it not that I object to the price we are paying for it. The North Shore line is absolutely not in the mind of the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway do not care a farthing about it. That company may put up its little guarantee, but it never intends running a line north of the lakes. Our hon. friend who preceded me pointed out, as one of the grand clauses of this contract, section 10, which provides as follows:

> The work of locating and constructing the said western division shall be commenced forthwith after the ratification of this agreement by the parliament of Canada and shall proceed with the utmost despatch and be completed within five years from the first day of December, 1903.

What does that mean? One year from that date, or one year from the passage of this Bill, the Grand Trunk Railway will have a certain number of miles of its own road built. What will it do with its freight?

Store it in Winnipeg? At the end of two years, it will be a good way on to Edmundston. What will it do with its freight? In three years it will be over the mountains. What will it do with its freight? And in five years, when it will have reached the Pacific ocean, what will it then do with its freight? As regards the road north of the lakes, from Moncton to Winnipeg, the surveys will not be completed at the end of the five years, much less the road constructed, and in the meantime where are you going to deliver all the freight that will have gathered along the line in the west? The grain freight will simply go down by the Grand Trunk Railway to Duluth, and the passenger and ordinary traffic will go via Chicago to Portland. That is the plan of the Grand Trunk Railway. The only thing I object to is that these men have not the honesty to tell the House that that is their plan. I am surprised the Grand Trunk Railway do not come up and let us know that that is their honest plan. The advantages of this route are many. In winter time, from one end to the other, with the exception of a very few miles at this end and in the mountains of British Columbia, it will be free from snow. From one end of that road to the other, by the time Mr. McGuigan gets his grades completed throughout the province of Ontario—and he is about done with them now—the Grand Trunk Railway will have a small grade of about one-half per cent, and the finest road-bed in the world. From one end of the road to the other, there will be local traffic passing from Boston and the other cities on the sea coast and the cities and towns of Ontario and the interior of the United States—especially the great city of Chicago—and with its lines to St. Louis, the Grand Trunk Railway transcontinental system will be able to originate at local points more traffic for a through-line than any other transcontinental road on the continent? It will also be a through-route, and there is no other route crossing the Rocky mountains in the United States which could begin to compare with it in distance and speed on account of the magnificent road-bed which it will have. More than that, from one end of that road to the other, coal and other necessary railway supplies would be found close by, and that, Sir, is a matter of great importance to a railway company crossing the continent. There is the scheme. No man who knows anything about the business believes, for one second, that anything else is the scheme; and the government need not attempt to befool us into believing that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would commit themselves to such a job as the general tenor of the resolutions would lead us to suppose. That is really estimating the intelligence of this House at too low a standard. If the Grand Trunk Railway, instead of building its line to Duluth, would build it to Port Arthur or Fort William, I would be willing it should be liberally assisted. If the Grand Trunk Railway wanted assistance for a line from Wininpeg to Port Simpson, even a line that would not be looked upon as a national road, I do not believe that this country would object to giving it legitimate assistance.

Of course, I presume that the promoter of the road, the master mind, the genius, whoever he may be, who is behind this whole business, whether it is the senator or one of the ministers, or the man in control of the Grand Trunk, will be quite willing to accept a railway 1,900 miles long, built by the people of Canada, and maintained by them for fifty years, as a little gift. But that is not the main scheme. To show what their intention is, I have referred to section 10 to show that the western end must be built in five years and they must find an outlet for their traffic. I will now turn to section 42 to show that in it these gentleman show their hand to some extent. Section 42 says:

> It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accept the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of railway or its branches——

Mind you this line originates in Canada and does not touch foreign soil from Port Simpson to the Atlantic seaboard.

> —not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined to points in Canada be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

Will you tell me, Mr. Speaker, how they are going to carry it any other way if they do not intend to have a route through the States. How are they going to get it there any other way or how are they going to get it to any other port unless they intend to have a route through the United States? Undoubtedly, clause 10 and clause 42 together show clearly as the sun that they intend to have an American road. And it is equally clear that the government lawyers or the cabinet must have been very dense in making this contract, or else they are a party to it all. I have already pointed out the time it will take to construct this eastern road. I venture to say it will be ten years before it will be constructed, after which they have it free for seven years, and after that for three years, the amount they are to be charged for interest will be added to the capital account. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that you and I will be taking a perpendicular look at the business by the

time they are ready to begin paying anything.

Mr. CARGILL. Up or down ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Down, always down. I shall not at the present time refer to the clause respecting running rights other than to say that any one who knows anything about railroading sees through it and smiles at it. But I will venture to say that, in case the northern line is constructed, and the Grand Trunk Pacific operates it—I am at liberty to put in these provisos, because one of the chief clauses of the contract I find punctured with provisos—the charges for freight in Grand Trunk cars and Grand Trunk Pacific cars running over the government section will more than pay the rental that would be charged against the company. Section 37 was pointed out by my predecessor, who said this was a specially strong clause in the contract. I would like my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) as a Canadian manufacturer to consider, and I want all Canadian producers to consider, how they are going to be benefited by this clause.

The company shall purchase all material and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers——

And when the hon. gentleman had read that far, he looked around as though to say, ' This is the place for you to cheer me.' And then he read the rest :

—when the same are produced in Canada and where such material and supplies can be purchased in desired quantities and of equal quality suitable for the purpose required, and for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere.

How much are our Canadian producers going to sell on that western section if it does not suit these gentlemen to buy ? But that point has been handled before. I shall not take it up. Now as to the clause guaranteeing the running rights. Is it to be supposed for a second that the Grand Trunk owning a line absolutely from Portland to Winnipeg, and owning a line of the Grand Trunk Pacific from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, are going to ruin their property or cause its deterioration by running a pound of freight over the road owned by the government and in which they have no interest, sending the freight to Moncton, and thence under a separate agreement to the sea ? It passes my comprehension how any ministry in this enlightened period of the world's history can bring down such a measure and lay it before the people and expect them to be bamboozled by it even for a moment. I would again suggest to the government that they should withdraw this scheme in the best interest of the country. They make a great pretense that this scheme is in order to get out wheat from the west to the seaboard. As I shall show you in a little while the distance from Winnipeg to Moncton, which is not the seaboard, is 1,900 miles. Let us assume that that is the distance to St. John. On the other hand from Winnipeg to Port Simpson the distance is 1,600 miles. If the railway is to be a grain-hauling institution why not haul to the Pacific ocean. And I can tell you that the freights from Pacific ocean ports, San Francisco and Puget Sound ports vary from $4.50 to $8 per ton. Wheat going in large quantities can be profitably carried from Port Simpson around Cape Horn to English markets, as it is now carried every year from American ports to Great Britain. But, Sir, it will be a very few years before there is a road constructed to Hudson's bay, and then the grain from our prairies and that of the American west will be sent by that route to Liverpool by the time it would reach the city of Montreal coming down this way. Now, in order to put the figures before the House, I shall give the mileages computed as carefully as possible from the statistics available. In giving the distance from Quebec to Winnipeg I have taken the great circle distance which is by all odds the shortest, as any one acquainted with geography knows. I have allowed only from ten to twelve per cent—depending upon the section of the road—for loss of distance occasioned by curves in avoiding obstacles. The usual percentage through a country like that is fifteen per cent. I shall take the Grand Trunk Railway scheme before the House, which is from Portland to Winnipeg. I wish to treat the House fairly, and undoubtedly that is the scheme before it. Well, from Portland to Winnipeg by Chicago and Minneapolis is 2,029 miles. From Montreal to Winnipeg via Chicago is 1,731 miles, I take Winnipeg as a common point. The Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Winnipeg by the north shore of Lake Superior is 1,424 miles. Here let me point out that in the long haul the question of the difference of mileage of even 300 or 400 miles counts for nothing at all. If that statement is disputed, I can show you that the rates from Chicago to the seaboard on the same identical grain hauled in the same cars—the long-haul grain—are just the same whether it is taken to Montreal, Quebec, Portland or Boston. These four cities constitute one group, and cars by the hundreds are hauled weekly to Montreal and on through to Boston, the rate being exactly the same whether they go through to Boston or whether they are stopped at Montreal. It is 1,424 miles from Montreal to Winnipeg via the Canadian Pacific Railway, by the same road from Montreal to Halifax, 756 miles. From Montreal to St. John is 481 miles ; therefore from Winnipeg to Halifax via the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Intercolonial is 2,180 miles, and from Winnipeg to St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway is 1,905 miles. The new line through the north of Quebec and Ontario, supposing

it should ever be built, will be 1,450 miles long from Quebec to Winnipeg, or nearer 1,500 miles when it is constructed, and allowing 12 per cent for curvatures. From Quebec to St. John by the new line I am allowing 450 miles. So the total from Winnipeg to the city of St. John via the city of Quebec and this new line all through, is 1,900 miles. From Winnipeg to Quebec by the new line is 1,450 miles, from Quebec to St. John by the Intercolonial, 577 miles, making a total of 2,027 miles, within two miles of what it is from Portland to Winnipeg by the Grand Trunk and Chicago.

The next route I will take is from Winnipeg to Quebec by the new line, 1,450 miles; from Quebec to Halifax via the Intercolonial, 673 miles, total 2,123 miles. The next route is from Winnipeg to Quebec via the new line, 1,450 miles; to Halifax by the new line and the Intercolonial, 636 miles, total 2,086 miles from Winnipeg to Quebec via the new line. But there is an alternative route, the Grand Trunk has in case they should find it convenient to operate that North Shore road. Portland is over 100 miles nearer than St. John. From Winnipeg to Quebec via the new line is 1,450 miles; from Quebec to Portland over the Grand Trunk's own line, making the shortest road from Winnipeg to Portland, is 1,767 miles. From Quebec to Portland, 96 miles to Richmond, and from Richmond to Portland 221 miles, total 317 miles. Therefore, by this new road the distance will be nearly 150 miles less to Portland than to St. John. Supposing they build the road, is any one simple enough to think they are going to depreciate their millions' worth of property in the city of Portland for a fifty years lease, for a moonshine scheme like this? No, Sir. The nearest route is to St. John, 1,900 miles via the North Shore, that is taking the new road to Quebec and any road to St. John; the shortest distance is to Portland, 1,767 miles; therefore Portland is 133 miles nearer by their own pet scheme than is St. John, and 200 miles nearer than Halifax. Yet we are asked to swallow a scheme like this.

Now, the Finance Minister pointed out that this new route was the 'central route.' He said that Sir Sanford Fleming had designated three routes. I will read what the hon. gentleman said. His speech was a marvellous production. I knew the Minister of the Interior could fix the thing up about right, but I never dreamed the Finance Minister was possessed of ingenuity sufficient to make such a fair presentation of so abominable a scheme. He says:

> I may say that there are three routes described—the southern route near the State of Maine, the central route, which is the subject of the present discussion, and the route along the Baie des Chaleurs, which was afterwards adopted for the Intercolonial Railway.

Then he goes on and tells us what Sir Sanford Fleming said. Now, I will show you what this 'central route' of his is like. It starts from a point eight miles south of Trois Pistoles on the Intercolonial and runs to a place called Apohaqui on the St. John river, fifty miles from Moncton. The distance is 337½ miles from the point of starting. Add the eight miles, and you have 345½ miles via this great central route, and plus 50 miles, makes it 395 miles to Moncton. But by the old Intercolonial it is only 346 miles from Trois Pistoles to Moncton, a saving by the present Intercolonial of 49½ miles. The present Intercolonial is 49½ miles shorter than the line that the Finance Minister calls the great central route. I want to point out that the central route as surveyed and referred to in the report of Sir Sanford Fleming, if the figures that are given here are correct——

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman is not at all following the route that this proposed scheme is going to follow.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know who is the boss, whether the Finance Minister or the member for Bellechasse. I know where the proposed route is. I presume there is not a parish, either in Bellechase, Dorchester, Temiscouata, Kamouraska, L'Islet in any of the counties along the border of Maine, that will not have a road running right through it. But I am here stating what the Finance Minister said himself, speaking as a member of the government, and the hon. gentleman will find it on page 8549 of 'Hansard,' revised edition. The hon. gentleman must not blame me, he must blame the Finance Minister of the Liberal party. And what is that central route? It is 50 odd miles longer than the present Intercolonial. On this famous central route, these are some of the grades which will be found: It rises 1,575 feet, goes down to 1,105, goes up to 1,533, and down to 465; a few miles further it rises to 1,105, goes down to 415, then up to 1,100 and so on—a beautiful road. It would almost do for a bucksaw. I am reading from the official report, page 105, of the altitudes in Canada, taken from the official surveys in the Department of Railways and Canals. Now the grades on the Intercolonial from Halifax to Quebec reach only 700 feet at two points. But this central route climbs up mountains and down again a hundred times; at a hundred points on that road it will be higher than at any point on the old Intercolonial from Lévis to the seacoast. Yet they tell us this is a fast short line railway.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Would not the track be all down hill?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not know which track the hon. gentleman refers to. I have not the slightest doubt that these hon. gentlemen will endeavour to make it appear to the people that the track will run down hill both ways. Those two points that are 700 feet high are in the Matapedia val-

ley. Now, will the hon. member for Bellechasse himself tell me that it was not the central route that they had in mind.

Mr. TALBOT. It was fifty miles from there.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. member for Bellechasse himself corrected the hon. Minister of Finance and told him he did not know his business.

Mr. TALBOT. The hon. Minister of Finance never said that; he never alluded to it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am merely stating the facts from the hon. gentleman's remarks. The hon. Minister of Finance said: We are taking the central route. There is his speech and the hon. member for Bellechasse can find it in 'Hansard.' The hon. member for Bellechasse does not occupy any ministerial position, but he gets up and tells us that the hon. Minister of Finance does not know his business and that the road is going by way of the Maine border route. Well, we will deal with the Maine border route. The Maine border route traverses the counties of Lévis, Dorchester, Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska, in Quebec. Then it turns into the province of New Brunswick, and follows the valley of the St. John river. Any one who has ever been at Lévis knows what the country is like in that neighbourhood. The people of Canada know what it cost to construct a little line eight or ten miles long to connect the Lévis station with the Intercolonial Railway at St. Charles Junction a few years ago. We know what it cost to construct that little line through the hills to St. Charles Junction. I want to call the attention of the House to the topography of the country. The highlands between the waters flowing into the Atlantic and the Bay of Fundy and the waters flowing into the St. Lawrence——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not mind. These hon. gentlemen are squirming because they are hurt. The topography of the country is this: The rivers some distance east of Lévis flowing into the St. Lawrence flow in a north-easterly direction from the mountain range such as the Rivière du Loup, River Ouelle, and all those other streams flowing in a north-easterly direction. They do not flow north or north-westerly. The trend of the valleys is north-east and south-west. All you have to do is to look at the map to see that. The rivers on the other side of the mountain range flow in a converse direction. They flow almost due southerly until you reach the border of New Brunswick, when they flow southerly. What that means is that if the railway travels in a south-easterly direction it will have to cross at right angles the valley of every stream. As I have pointed out, the route runs from Quebec not in an air-line at all, as our hon. friends try to locate it. It will run southerly from Lévis thence it trends off south-easterly and thence trends off easterly, thence north-easterly until it gets round the point of Maine and thence easterly again. The Geological Survey reports state that the mountains are very rough, that hills are cigar-shaped and piled in irregular heaps. Even the eloquence of my hon. friend from Westmoreland cannot take the tops off these mountains and place them in the valleys. As this is rather an important discussion, I shall take an opportunity of placing on record from official reports of the surveys of the United States survey department a statement as to the topography of the country. Unlike the British and Canadian governments, the United States is alive to this question, and at the present time I venture to say they have a topographical map of Canada. We know that the Canadian government and the British government never do get anything except they get it from some other source. The American government, many years ago, made a very accurate topographical survey of the northern part of Maine and of the province of Quebec north of Maine right up to the shores of the St. Lawrence. I will take Kamouraska county first, and deal with it by townships. I will deal with the counties by townships and will give the passes and elevations in each case:

	Elevation feet.
Kamouraska—	
Parke tp., near pass of River Verte..	2,231
Pohenagamook, north-west corner small lake. This is near extreme end corner of Maine..	1,662
Chabot tp., south of pass and mountains north-east corner..	1,849
Woodbridge tp., north of pass, south-east corner..	1,878
Painchaud centre, Manix River pass..	1,936
Chapais tp., near Lake Ste. Anne, pass..	1,868
L'Islet—	
Lafontaine tp., north-west part River du Gue pass..	1,600
Garneau tp., north-east corner over pass..	1,898
Fournier tp., south-west corner, eight miles from St. Lawrence..	1,440
Arago tp., north-east corner over mountains..	1,410
Arago tp., east of Lac d'Apique over mountains..	1,567
Arago tp., west of Lac d'Apique, pass	1,664
Montmagny—	
Patton tp., over mountains..	1,403-1,720
Montmagny tp., east part, pass.. ..	1,727
Bellechasse—	
Roux tp., north-east part..	2,358
Roux tp., lot 35, concession B..	1,972
Dorchester—	
Ware tp., lot 5, concession XIV.. ..	1,995
Lake Etchemin, surface..	1,213

From Lake Etchemin and River Ouelle, minimum 1,306, maximum 2,854.

I may point out that there is a good deal of farming land in the townships just north of the Maine border. The mountain range

runs through the Canadian counties and the settlers are shut off entirely by the mountain ranges from the Canadian railways. If we had a colonization road by taking a circuitous route we could reach that part of the country and could even get a freight route through there. There is no reason why such a road should not be built, but it is not going to be an air-line. No engineer will tell me that you can get a railway through a country like that and construct an air-line reaching to the sea. That is the point I am making. These hon. gentlemen are trying to bunco the country by telling them that they are going to save 200 miles, or 140 miles, or 100 miles, or even 90 miles, between Quebec and Halifax by constructing this road. The Temiscouata Railway from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston makes an ascent of 1,324 feet. In the early days the British government had a route from Halifax via St. John up through Fredericton and passing by way of Edmundston and they tried all the passes that I have mentioned and found that the only feasible route was that through the Temiscouata pass. They also followed the border of the State of Maine until they struck the Etchemin river and then came down that stream and also the Chaudière. This was an old military road and the only route which they found at all feasible was through the Temiscouata pass, which is 1,324 feet high. This fact is reported in books in the library, and these reports show that this is the only pass at all available in the entire route.

Coming to New Brunswick, I will take the liberty of pointing out that the country north of the Miramichi and the Nashwaak is very rough. Here is a description of it, at page 160 of the official report, which gives the cross-section of the country running north in the direction which this proposed road will run. Starting at Pickard's Mill, twenty-five miles further up the height of land between a branch of the Nashwaak and Tay rivers is 1,133 feet, then down to 640 feet, up to 1,550 feet, down to 760 feet, up to 1,660 feet, down to 1,000 feet, up to 1,540 feet, down to 316 feet, up to 1,000 feet, and so on, then down to 400 feet at Fall river.

What we want to get are the facts of the case; and when hon. gentlemen stand up in the House, as did the right hon. First Minister and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), and tell us that this line is going to save 140 miles as compared with the Intercolonial Railway, I tell them that they are talking nonsense, and there is no use of attempting to deceive the public. Here is what the report of the Geological Survey, volume 12, for 1902, says of that country :

The areas of Lower Carboniferous rocks in the Becaguimice and Tobique valleys exhibit surface features which are less diversified than those in the localities just described, but at the northern limits of the latter the Blue mountains rise upwards of 1,720 feet above the sea—a prominent mass of eruptive rocks.

The third area which presents a different topography and has a different elevation from those above referred to, is that occupied by rocks mapped by geological survey as Silurian and Cambro-Silurian which underlie a large portion of the country within the western and north-western limits of the two maps-sheets. The general surface of this area may also be characterized as rolling, though sometimes rising into ridges and mountains. The average height, in and near the St. John valley and west of it, is from 400 to 500 feet, but towards the north and north-east it is from 800 to 1,000 feet or more. The most noteworthy of the higher elevations are Hainsville ridge, Howland ridge, Pole hill, Golden ridge, Kincardine and Birch ridges east of the St. John and Magundy and Blaney ridges, Dorrington hill, Carroll and Pocowogamis ridges and Oak mountain on the west. The soils over a large part of this area are good.

Traversing this area in the north-east and south-west direction are wide belts of granite and pre-Cambrian rocks which usually have a greater elevation than the formations on either side. Hills and ridges, lake basins, boulder-strewn moraines, and a coarse stony soil are the prevailing characteristics of these granite areas. The country through which they extend is mostly in a forest-clad, widerness condition and unfit for settlement. The northern part of the region embraced in the two map-sheet is largely occupied by these granite and pre-Cambrian rocks and rises into rugged broken plateau from 1,000 to 1,500 feet high or more, the elevation of which increases northward beyond the limits of the Andover sheet. No well defined range of mountains exists in this part of the province, but denuded remnants of that spur or lateral extension of the Appalachian system across it in the north-western part and are to be seen in Mars hill, just west of the International boundary, 1,688 feet above sea level according to the boundary survey, and Moose mountain, east of the St. John, 1,490 feet in height, with other hills about the sources of Munquart river and to the east. At and beyond the northern limits of the Andover sheet (No. 2 S.W.) we reach the south-westerly extension of the interior high lands of the province which trend from here away to the north-east in an irregular range or series of elevations to the headwaters of the Tête-à-Gauche and Jacquet rivers, attaining altitudes in some parts of 2,500 to 2,700 feet above the sea.

The northern part of the Andover sheet covers an area which is still under forest and to a large extent a terra ignota. The south-west Miramichi river and its tributaries drain the north-eastern part, while the Tobique drains the north-western. The country here is, generally speaking, broken and elevated, with an average height of 800 to 1,000 feet above the sea, but a number of hills and ridges reach an elevation of 1,200 to 1,500 feet. Mr. Wilson, who examined the south-west Miramichi valley along some of the lumbermen's portage route, says : 'The north branch of the south-west Miramichi flows through a broken, wilderness country, with high hills bordering its banks. The average elevation of the country about the head waters of Burnt Hill and Clearwater brooks is from 800 to 1,000 feet, with hills rising 200 or 300 feet higher, and the height along the portage road from Pleasant ridge settlement to the

Dungarvon is 800 to 900 feet. Along the main river the banks are comparatively low in many places, but there are numerous high peaks which stand out conspicuously above the surrounding land such as Louis, Otterslide and Todds mountain. At the junction of the north and south branches the elevation is about 800 feet, where the portage road from Green hill crosses it about 700 feet, and at Boiestown, 195 feet.' A large part of the area drained by the south-west Miramichi and the Upper Tobique is unfit for settlement. Beaufort and Golden ridge, which were at one time supposed to be thriving settlements, have of late been nearly deserted.

I do not point this out for any purpose except to meet the absurd statement from hon. gentlemen opposite that this road is going to save 140 miles. I have seen the saving put at 170 miles by some of their papers. I am free to say that a road leaving Levis and running south-easterly, and crossing the corner of Bellechasse near Dorchester, and by the best route that can be found through the passes, would strike the valley of the St. John river just north of Maine, which is practically cut off from the Intercolonial Railway by the mountains. But it would have to cross every river almost at right angles. In order to maintain a grade sufficiently low to make the road a good, fast freight road, it will have to be increased in length at least 15 per cent beyond the air-line distance; and that being the case, the length of the road from Lévis to Moncton will be from 453 to 455 miles. The hon. member for Westmoreland controverted the statement made by my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) in reference to this matter. The hon. member for Westmoreland stated that the road from Chipman to St. John via Norton was the shortest route to that city. The contention of the hon. member for King's was that the shortest route was down the valley of the St. John river. The distance from Fredericton to Chipman is 42 miles; from Chipman to Norton is 44 miles, and from Norton to St. John is 33 miles, a total of 119 miles, whereas the route from Fredericton to St. John direct is 65 miles, making a distance of 54 miles in favour of the contention of my hon. friend from King's as against that of the hon. member for Westmoreland. So that if this road goes down that valley it cannot be regarded as a short air line route. In order to have grades over which heavy freight trains can be hauled economically, its length must be increased in order to decrease its grades. From Quebec to Moncton by the Intercolonial Railway is 489 miles, whereas the shortest route that can be found for the new line is from 453 to 455 miles, a gain of only 36 miles, and in two or three places it will have to climb from 1,300 to 1,900 feet to get over the mountains; and every time you send a train over a grade so high, you have to use so much extra steam. Under these circumstances, this line, as compared with the Intercolonial, cannot be claimed to be a fast freight line in any sense of the term. The central route referred to by the Finance Minister makes the distance 538 miles, making a saving in favour of the Intercolonial of 49 miles.

Now, we will transfer our attention to the west. We are told that the west is up in arms for this transcontinental road. What is the agitation about ? We had good crops for the last two or three years in the Northwest, a great many new farmers went into the country, and very few of them had granaries. The railways and the grain buyers had very few elevators at the stations, and as a consequence there was a glut in getting the grain out, and there was a great outcry in the country. I think it is a good advertisement for the country in that way, and perhaps those who are interested in the development of the west may not be sorry for it. However, the chief causes of difficulty were that we had abundant crops and the farmers who had more recently settled had not granaries built for its accommodation, so that they had to market the grain in the fall and the railway facilities were not sufficient to get it out in a rush. These grievances have to a large extent been removed. Many of the farmers have in the last two or three years improved their facilities for warehousing grain, and the elevator men have built elevators all over the country sufficient to accommodate many million more bushels of wheat than was formerly the case. It is also a fact that the railways have greatly improved their transport facilities, as well as their facilities for handling grain at Lake Superior ports. In consequence there will not be any great difficulty in handling grain in the future. There is another condition of things which bears to an important extent on the question of the marketing of our grain. I find from the United States report of the Bureau of Industries that in the year 1900 they produced 522,000,000 bushels of wheat, and yet on the first of March, 1901, the farmers held in their granaries out of that crop 128,000,000 bushels, which shows that the farmers in the United States do not rush out their grain in the fall, or in the winter, or even in the early spring, but that they keep it and watch for a rise in the market to sell it to advantage. At the date I have mentioned there were 87,000,000 bushels of grain only in the elevators east of the Rocky mountains, and in this calculation I do not include the 36,000,000 that are raised west of the Rocky mountains. Another point in connection with the shipment of grain is this. There is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that grain does not ripen in Manitoba or the North-west as early as it does in Kansas, and consequently the people of Kansas are able to market their grain ahead of us. I maintain that it would be to the advantage of our grain dealers in the North-west, and of the farmers as well, that they should hold the grain until after the

period when the market is glutted with grain from the countries in which it ripens earlier than in Canada. Taking one period with another, there may not be much difference, but if you take one year with another, especially in years of abundant harvests, the price of wheat is depreciated just about the time that our farmers would be selling their grain if they marketed it immediately after the harvest. The following countries have their grain ready for the markets of the world previous to the month of June in each year: Mexico, producing 9,000,000 bushels; South America, 87,000,000; Asiatic Turkey, 30,000,000; Cyprus, 2,000,000 bushels; Persia, 15,000,000; British India, 245,000,000 bushels; Africa, 45,000,000 bushels; Australia and New Zealand, 67,000,000 bushels; total, 500,000,000 bushels. I am quoting these figures for the year 1901. Now, the countries that market their grain in the month of June are: Roumania, 72,000,000 bushels; Bulgaria, 24,000,000 bushels; Servia, 10,000,000 bushels; Greece and Montenegro, 3,000,000 bushels; Turkey in Europe, 22,000,000 bushels; California, 35,000,000 bushels; Spain, 108,000,000 bushels; Portugal, 8,000,000 bushels; Italy, 146,000,000 bushels; Oregon, 18,000,000 bushels; Alabama, 1,000,000 bushels; Georgia, 3,000,000 bushels; Kansas, 99,000,000 bushels; Colorado, 8,000,000 bushels; Missouri, 31,000,000 bushels; total of grain marketed in June, 588,000,000 bushels. The countries that market their grain in July are: France, 304,000,000 bushels; Asiatic Hungary, 184,000,000 bushels; Southern Russia, 402,000,000 bushels; Nebraska, 42,000,000 bushels; total marketed in July, 932,000,000 bushels. The rest of the world markets its grain during the latter part of August and September and the last months of the year. I know that merchants have to be paid and that the farmers have to meet their obligations, but I believe that our North-west farmers should, as far as possible, hold their grain until a favourable market; and, generally speaking, it would be to their interest to go in for a system of storing their grain rather than to rush it out when the markets are unfavourable.

Now, a word in connection with the question of rates, and let me draw the attention of the House and of the country to the policy that has been inaugurated recently by the Conservative government of Manitoba, led by the Hon. Mr. Roblin, in controlling, not owning railways—controlling railways, mind you. If I were to have an option as between government ownership on the one hand and government control on the other with private ownership, I would go for the government control. The result in Manitoba demonstrates that private ownership of railways with government control is what the people of Canada should have. Last year there was left in the pockets of the farmers of Manitoba, on account of the reduced rates on the grain carried by the Canadian Northern Railway alone, a sum of $400,000. This was the beneficent result of government control of that railroad. I had a conversation with Mr. Roblin a few days ago, and owing to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been obliged on account of the competition to reduce their rates—the result of this government control over this Canadian Northern Railway will mean, on the estimated crop, that the farmers of Manitoba will be the gainers by $1,500,000 on account of the reduced rates secured by the Roblin government. I take the Duluth rate, and if our country develops as we expect it will develop, that rate should prevail in Canada; I find that the rate from Winnipeg to Port Arthur is 10 cents a hundred pounds, or 6 cents a bushel; from Port Arthur to Buffalo 2 cents; from Buffalo to New York, via the Erie canal, 4 cents, which makes a total of 12 cents from Winnipeg to the city of New York. The ocean rate varies from 2 to 7 cents, depending on the season of the year; but, at all events, if you take the ocean rate of 4 or 4½ cents, you have your grain transported from Winnipeg to Liverpool for 16 cents a bushel, and the people of the town of Lindsay pay very nearly that for the grain which they ship to the city of Montreal. The point I want to make is that freight rates are not controlled by railways, but that the water routes are the controlling influences in connection with freight rates. The rate from Chicago to Buffalo, all rail, in 1902, was 11½ cents per 100 pounds, or 7⅕ cents per bushel. Compare that with the all-water route from Chicago to Buffalo, one and three-fifths to two and three-eights, or an average of one and a half cents a bushel, and you find that the grain by the water haul is five and seven-tenths cents per bushel from Chicago to Buffalo. Take the all-rail route from Chicago to New York during 1902, which was from seventeen and a half to twenty cents per hundred pounds. The exact figure for that year, as given by the Chicago Board of Trade, was 10·62 cents per bushel. That is the exact cost by the all-rail route from Chicago to New York. Take the water route, and I want to point out that the low figure is brought about by competition with the Lake Erie canal. The lake route from Chicago to Buffalo and the rail route from Buffalo to New York make an average of 5·89 cents per bushel. That was the rate from Chicago by water to Buffalo and by rail thence to New York. Now I will take the water all the way. From Chicago to Buffalo, and thence by Erie canal to New York was 5·26 or just about half a cent less than the water and rail route. The lake and canal route was a half a cent a bushel less in round numbers than the lake and rail route, and the reason is this, that the railways were forced to come down owing to competition with the Erie canal. It is pointed out that

the Erie canal only hauls 7,000,000 bushels, and the train for Buffalo hauls some 14,000,000 bushels. But all that western grain comes into Chicago before navigation closes, and is carried to Buffalo by those large steamers, and there placed in the elevators. One hundred and thirty-two million bushels of grain were placed in the elevators at Buffalo last year. All that has to be hauled by rail in the winter when the canal is frozen. But in summer the canals haul infinitely more than the railways.

Take the all-rail route from Chicago to Montreal, its rate is the same as to New York or Portland or Boston or Quebec. They are all classed in the one grade, and they will haul a train clear through to Boston from the city of Montreal, over Victoria bridge, and they will not get one farthing for hauling it all the distance from Montreal to Boston. In addition to the lakes and canals, what other factors are at work to cut down the freight rates in winter? From St. Louis to New Orleans by steamer the rate for carrying grain is ten cents a hundred pounds for grain in sacks. For grain loaded in bulk it is four and a quarter cents a bushel to the Gulf of Mexico, and the rates from the gulf ports to the markets of the world are very little more than from the port of New York.

I have here the reports of the industrial commission of 1900. I find on page 578, the evidence of a prominent merchant of Chicago, by the name of Carter. On being questioned by representative Lorimer, he said :

Q. (By Representative Lorimer.) (Interrupting.) Just state them in your own way.—A. As to our water transportation I would say this, first of all, that the future growth of the industries of this country, I believe, and the opportunities for our people to compete successfully in a fair race for the commerce of the world, requires that they should have the best and cheapest methods of transportation throughout this country; and I think I can place before you a few facts which bear directly on this question, and which show conclusively that water transportation furnishes great advantages to the people of this country over the best that the railroads are able to furnish. I find in the records of the annual report of the secretary of the Board of Trade of the city of Chicago these figures : For the year 1897 the average rate of freight on corn from Chicago to New York city, via lake and canal, including the charges at Buffalo, was 4·53 cents per bushel. That was the average rate during the season of navigation ; and the average of rail rate for the year, taken from the public schedules, was 11·43 cents per bushel from Chicago to New York. The average rate by lake and canal on wheat for that year 1897, including the charges at Buffalo, was 12·5 cents per bushel. In 1898 we were not able to obtain the charges at Buffalo. They were very irregular, running from three-quarters of a cent to nothing, so I have to exclude that in the calculation of the carrying charges. The charge by lake and canal for the year 1898 was 3·81 cents per bushel on corn and 4·45 cents per bushel on wheat all the way. The all-rail charge that I have for 1898 was 9·8 cents, and on wheat 12 cents. From these statistics it is very easy to deduct these facts, that on the grain that was exported by the producers of this country in the year 1898 the difference between the charges for carrying by rail and water would approximate $25,000,000 in favour of water carriage.

To show the benefit of the New Orleans and the Galveston rates, I might point out that all through the report you can see the influence which the Mississippi steamers and the railway route to Galveston, but especially the Mississippi river, exert on grain freights :

Q. You say that the rates to New Orleans and the Gulf ports affect the Atlantic sea-board rates. To what extent do they affect them?—A. The largest grain-producing states are Nebraska and Kansas, I believe, Iowa, Nebraska and Kansas, particularly of corn. The rates on grain from Illinois south to Kankakee and New Orleans at the present time is 12 cents per hundred for export. That would naturally make the rate from the same territory to the South Atlantic ports. The average difference in the ocean rate is about 4 and a half cents per hundred ; that is, the ocean rates are four and a half cents lower at Atlantic ports than at New Orleans and Galveston under natural conditions. Of course, this varies with the demand for tonnage. Every rate from the west of the Mississippi river up to the Platte river, to a certain extent the north line of Nebraska, is affected by Gulf competition ; that is, more or less of all grain that originates west of the Missouri river and south of the north Nebraska line, and in Iowa west of Des Moines and south. The Chicago, Burlington and Quincey, leading from Des Moines to Omaha, is affected by Gulf competition, and all of Illinois on the line of the Illinois Central only ; that is, I mean it is the only business which does actually move south from Illinois that affects other territory to a very great degree. Prior to the [illegible] of the Gulf ports, prior to 1889, immediately at the close of navigation at Chicago, the rate on corn to the eastern seaboard was advanced to 25 cents per hundred pounds. The rate I have just given you for export is considerably less, and the rate has not advanced to the eastern seaboard within the last five years after the close of navigation.

Q. By reason of Gulf competition ?—A. By reason of Gulf competition.

Q. Has business through the Gulf ports increased to your knowledge during the last five years ?—A. Very greatly. Galveston has increased in grain more than 1,000 per cent in the last five years.

So that we find that the old Mississippi river boats perform an important part. And when my hon. friend the hon. Minister of the Interior quoted a rate of 5 cents from Kansas City to Chicago, I want to tell that hon. gentleman that I hunted every book on transportation rates in the library and in the city of Ottawa, and I cannot find any such rate. But I can point out to him that the Transportation Committee in the Interstate Commerce Report in 1902, No. 480, page 141, on appeal to the Interstate Commerce Commissison, their ruling is :

The charge of twenty cents on the one hundred pounds of corn and oats from the Missouri river to Chicago——

—that would include Kansas city, because Kansas city is on the border—

—and five cents less to the Mississippi, is excessive——

—that 5 cents is to catch the steamers going down the river—

—is excessive, and to be reasonable should not exceed seventeen cents to Chicago and twelve cents to the Mississippi river, east side.

No. 483 would look as if they want a little more than 5 cents a bushel on grain from Kansas City to Chicago, because, on the haul there of 240 miles they charged 46 cents per hundred. In the same book, No. 483 :

The rates of forty-six cents per one hundred pounds on grain and fifty-one cents on flour and meal between the grain region in Kansas and a large district in Texas are the same for distances shorter than 250 and longer than 800 miles, and are unreasonably high for the longer and grossly excessive and extortionate for the shorter distances.

So it will be seen that these 5-cent rates are not known in that part of the world. Now, the reports of the Chicago board of trade and the Buffalo board of trade, both of which I have here, show that the export rate is considerably less than the local rate in shipping to New York. We find that by rail and ocean, that is, by rail and then by steamer to Liverpool, the rate was 20 85-100th cents per hundred, or 12 51-100th cents per bushel. From Chicago to Glasgow the rate is 21 75-100th cents per hundred, or 13 5-100th per bushel. The same rate is quoted from London. And when we find that the rate from Winnipeg to Liverpool is 16 cents per bushel, we find that our good friends in the North-west have nothing like the reason to complain that the farmers have in the province of Ontario. If our farmers in the North-west had a little better transportation facilities—and undoubtedly they will have them in a year or two—if they had more granaries and elevators at the stations, and if there was not the same need for selling the grain in the winter time, this rate of 16 cents from Winnipeg to Liverpool—I am not speaking of the rate from country points to Winnipeg—compares very favourably with the rate from Chicago to Liverpool, and is far more favourable, considering the distance, than the farmers in my own county of Victoria or in any part of western Ontario can get on their grain by Toronto or Montreal. I claim, mark you, that this is where government action should come in. With every road the government assist, they should make a hard and fast agreement under which they would have the right to reduce rates as in their judgment may be deemed necessary, subject to certain appeal. As was pointed out before, through action of this kind on the part of Premier Roblin and the Conservatives of Manitoba, the farmers of that country last year saved $450,000. And this year the Canadian Pacific Railway, in sympathy with the lower rates of the Canadian Northern, has been forced to reduce its rates from 7½ cents on grain to Fort William, which will save to the farmers of that country this year no less than $1,500,000. Now, another reason why this northern route, in case it is ever constructed, cannot compete with the Grand Trunk and other routes all-rail to Chicago is this: Observe a freight train going out of any of the eastern centres for the west, and you will see that it is laden with merchandise of one kind or another. The cars come east loaded and they go west loaded. If they cannot carry anything else, they haul coal and commodities of that nature. Where will our northern road have return freights ? They may undoubtedly have, in time, and I hope they will have, freights from the old land to the west. But for many years they cannot depend on any local freight west. They will not be able to haul a ton of coal from the far east of Canada to our western centres, for the coal can be got more cheaply from the west. Therefore, this is another reason why it is absolutely impossible for this great transcontinental road which these people are talking of constructing, becoming a great freight-hauling road at reduced rates. They may haul the freight, but not at reduced rates. When the Minister of the Interior spoke of a rate of 15 cents from Winnipeg to the seaboard, to use a vulgarism, he was talking through his hat. Now, to show him that he is not posted on the question of rates, I will point out to him the rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission with reference to rates to points on a number of great roads, and the names will show at a glance that they are important roads : Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, Chicago and North-western, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul and Omaha. Burlington, Cedar Rapids and Northern, Minneapolis and St. Louis, and Illinois Central. These are the rates that were determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission as applicable to the freight lines leading to Chicago, Milwaukee and Minneapolis. I may say that the Illinois Central was generally from 2 to 4 cents lower :

For the first 160 miles 15½ cents ; up to 200 miles, 17½ cents ; 240 miles, 18½ cents ; 280 miles, 19½ cents ; 320 miles, 20½ cents ; 360 miles, 21½ cents ; 400 miles, 22½ cents ; 440 miles, 23½ cents ; 480 miles, 24½ cents ; 520 miles 25½ cents.

These are the rates which the hon. gentleman will find at page 497 of the Interstate Commerce Report, volume 8, from September, 1896, to May, 1898.

Now, reference has been made to the abrogation of the bonding privilege. And I wish to say a word on that. I am not

one of those who sit up at nights worrying about what our neighbours to the south are going to do. But I know from association with gentlemen in the United States of America, particularly in western centres, that if the United States government abrogated the bonding privilege or attempted to do so, I do not say that they would go in for annexation to Canada, but I do say they would raise such a row with the authorities of that country as has not been heard since the days of the civil war. More than that, the Chicago board of trade alone would not tolerate it a minute, and that is one of the most powerful organizations on the continent of America. The city of Boston would not tolerate it for a moment, because a large portion of its traffic goes through Canadian channels. I will show you what the report of the Buffalo Merchants' Exchange says on a kindred question :

While at the present time trade conditions with our neighbours to the north are exceedingly favourable to this country——

'Exceedingly favourable to this country.' I wish some of the lieutenants of the right hon. gentleman would make a note of this.

—there is a growing sentiment in Canada that present conditions should not continue and that the sentiment of 'Canada for the Canadian manufacturers' by the adoption of a protective tariff, is rapidly growing. In view of the fact that Canada is the third best customer of the United States and that our exports to Canada are more than our combined exports to all the countries of South America, it would seem to be a good reason that the United States should adopt a policy more friendly to our neighbour, and that negotiations should be opened through the Joint High Commission for a treaty that would continue friendly and promote better commercial relations between Canada and the United States.

Similar resolutions would be the mandate of every commercial city north of the 42nd parallel of latitude on the continent of North America. Last year the city of Buffalo alone exported to Canada some $15,000,000 worth of goods. Such a hold has the transportation question upon that city that the state of New York had an appropriation Bill to improve the waterways of the state, that is the Erie canal, the Oswego canal and the Champlain canal. The Erie canal connects with Lake Champlain, and they had an appropriation to give that a thousand ton barge capacity and they were willing to vote $31,000,000 to improve the waterways of that state, that is the Erie canal, the Champlain canal and a little slip into Oswego. None of these canals are open any longer than ours. These people have learned by hard experience the value of waterways, and they know that the only controlling influence you can exert over the railways is to improve the waterways and keep them in good order. Let me show you what they are doing. The city of Buffalo alone last year imported by lake 124,626,000 bushels of grain. Of flour—I wish the Minister of the Interior were here—he said only 4,000,000 barrels of flour were shipped by lake routes last year—the city of Buffalo alone brought in by lake last year 12,026,616 barrels of flour; of iron ore, 2,386,767 tons; of lumber, 216,842,573 ft. Buffalo exported 641,071 tons of coal; 642,040 barrels of salt; 3,492,000 barrels of cement; and 2,451,000 barrels of sugar. The exports to Canada from Buffalo in the year 1902 amounted to $15,874,453. Yet they tell us that the lake traffic amounts to nothing. I want to point out still further that the people of Buffalo value their waterways and are improving them all the time as this extract will show :

The committee, realizing that by securing an improvement at the head of the Niagara river so as to accommodate the modern, deep draught vessels navigating the great lakes upwards of fifty miles of water front along the Niagara frontier could be opened to such industries, secured in the River and Harbour Bill in 1902 an appropriation for a preliminary survey.

A survey of their harbours is now being made, and I want to point out to the Minister of Militia and Defence that all the harbour service and improvements in the United States are controlled by the Militia Department. Therefore I trust he will assert himself, and bring his department to the front, and see that when these harbours are constructed they are laid out with military skill and intelligence.

Now, it has been pointed out that this expenditure proposed by the government will exceed $100,000,000. A few millions here and there are nothing with these gentlemen, so I will put the expenditure at the round figure of $100,000,000. I want to point out to these gentlemen that by good business management they could accomplish all that they are seeking to accomplish and a great deal more, by one-half that money, or at most two-thirds of it. In the first place, I make the suggestion that the roads in Ontario, for instance, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and any other road now running, should be given the option of reducing its rates in return for assistance in reducing its grades. They should make a contract with the government to reduce the rates in return for money assistance. The government could assist the roads to purchase rolling stock, as my hon. friend from South Simcoe pointed out this afternoon in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern. These roads as well as others are short of rolling stock and terminal facilities. They are improving them as fast as they can, but money is tight, and one can understand how these things are not progressing as rapidly as might be desired. I would suggest that a part of this money, in place of being squandered as it is proposed to do, should be utilized in improving railway facilities between Winnipeg and the east, and in two or three years you will have a control of rates similar

to that obtained by the Manitoba government. If the railways would not do it, then it would behoove this government to consider whether they should not extend their own line as a freight controller into the great west. They could also extend the Intercolonial up to the Georgian Bay, and thus bring through our own channels the grain of the west, and it would hardly make a hole in this hundred million dollars that they are going to blow into the rocks away to the north of us. I would give existing roads a fair show in a proposition to reduce the rates, and if they would not do it, if they would not come to terms as the Canadian Northern was brought to terms by the Roblin government, then the government would have the whip in its own hands and could compel them. Years ago I suggested in this House that the grades and curves on the old Intercolonial should be improved. When that road was first built it had one of the best roadbeds on the continent. I venture to say that less than $5,000,000 of the $100,000,000 they are going to hand over to the Grand Trunk Pacific, would place the Intercolonial roadbed in such a condition that it would be second to none on the continent, so that trains of 2,000 and 2,500 tons could be hauled by one powerful locomotive from one end of it to the other.

What is fifty miles when you have a good road-bed as compared with a road with heavy grades on it? Who among us has not seen in the old days a locomotive struggling up a grade with six or eight cars, whereas, with a level road it could readily have hauled five times as many cars and could have made time and money. Then, I would be in favour of opening up, if it is at all possible, that section of country on the south-easterly side of the mountains near the state of Maine, provided it was demonstrated by a survey that you could get a road-bed sufficient to haul your trains, and thus afford our friends there and in the St. John valley the opportunity of striking the sea at the nearest point. I am not saying that I would go into building this as a government road, because I require a little more training to convince me that national ownership of railways on such a large scale as this is advisable. The Intercolonial Railway stops half way. It should go to some central point where it could tap the grain trade of the great lakes. I believe it would be a good proposition to carry the Intercolonial Rail way to some place where it would have an opportunity of competing with the other railways and getting a share of the grain traffic. At the present time it cannot do so. I am satisfied that there are companies that would be delighted to have an opportunity of building a road down the St John valley, if they got a guarantee of their bonds that would never cost this country one cent. I would like to call attention to a fact pointed out by Mr. Roblin the other day, that the province of Manitoba has reduced the grain rates to the farmers of that province, and has put $450,000 in their pockets last year without it costing the province one farthing. The government might take a little of the money proposed to be expended on this scheme instead of squandering it away up north, and continue the Intercolonial Railway westward from Quebec and Lévis, with branches to Montreal and Toronto, because I am satisfied that if the road were properly built, if it were built without so much rush as that which is characterizing this scheme, you would save half the expenditure; or even better still, you might have government control and individual ownership, the same as the government of Mr. Roblin has in the province of Manitoba, and the country would not have to pay one single dollar for it. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite have not turned their attention to the water-ways of the country. I have shown the effect that the water-ways of the United States and those along the Canadian border have in the control of freight rates. I am surprised at these hon. gentlemen going into such a scheme when they might better have devoted some of these millions to the improvement of the Welland canal route. I pointed out that the state of New York last year passed a Bill providing for the expenditure of $31,000,000 for the improvement of the canals of that state, and that the United States government are spending $4,000,000 for the construction of a break-water at Buffalo. Four million dollars. That is all I ask for the Trent canal, which would shorten the route from Georgian Bay to Montreal as against the route by the Detroit river by nearly 300 miles. I would like to see the right hon. leader of the government use $3,500,000 of this hundred millions they are squandering so as to complete the Trent canal, so that it could carry thousand ton barges.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). I am afraid the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) does not endorse that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have converted my hon. friend from Centre Toronto. I am delighted to be able to announce to the House and to the country that I have a convert in my hon. friend from Centre Toronto, as to the virtues and benefits of the Trent valley canal. In addition to that, I would say that when hon. gentlemen are squandering this money, I cannot see why they should blow it in in one place, where it could do the country no good. I cannot see why they do not take part of it to build the Ottawa and Georgian Bay canal, and in place of making it a twenty-foot channel, what is wrong with making it a fourteen-foot channel, and making long locks? A barge 300 feet long and drawing 14 feet of water will handle a lot of grain. I do not see why

they do not do something in that way and thus reduce the freight rate to the farmers, and in this way also assist to build up the eastern part of the country. I do not see why they do not take a little slice of this hundred million of dollars that they are squandering and construct the St. Andrews locks below Winnipeg. This would benefit the city of Winnipeg a great deal. They could then have free access to the extreme end of Lake Winnipeg. At the same time the government might take some of this money and improve the Assiniboia river, so as to give steamers an opportunity of competing with the railways for 300 or 400 miles away up this magnificent old stream. Then another little touch of it might be taken for constructing locks from the Saskatchewan river in the rapids near where the Saskatchewan river enters Lake Winnipeg. Then steamers could start from the foothills of the Rocky Mountains and bring grain down the north and south Saskatchewan rivers, Edmonton and Medicine Hat. The Saskatchewan river is navigable for 50 or 60 miles above Edmonton, and the farmers could send their grain by way of the river, land it at Winnipeg and thus compete with the railways from the west. I cannot see why they are handing the cash all over to the Senator. We can hardly pick up a newspaper at the present time in which we do not see that a steamer is aground in Montreal harbour, or on the end of Anticosti island, or in the Straits of Belle Isle. Steamers are going aground every day in Canadian waters and this is a lovely advertisement for Canada in the eyes of the world. I do not see why the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) and the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) do not take hold of this question and see that the Canadian waterway from Montreal to the sea is made such that we are not a disgrace in shipping matters to the commerce of the world. Instead of wasting all this money as they are wasting it, I would like to see a little of this hundred millions diverted for this purpose. I think it would do no harm if a school for the instruction of pilots were established in this country I remember once coming up the St. Lawrence. It was at the time that the right hon. leader of the government was returning from the old country. We were out in the channel, and we expected to meet the mail steamer. I was a little anxious because I wanted to catch the train. We waited for hours and no steamer came. We could hear them firing cannon on shore, and we noticed the flash from each gun, we took the time between the flash of each gun and figured out the distance, and I remember drawing the attention of the right hon. first minister to the fact that the pilot was seven miles out of his course in the middle of the St. Lawrence river. I think it would do no harm if we had a school for instructing pilots who are employed upon the St. Lawrence. Therefore, a slice of that hundred millions could be expended in that way to the benefit of the Dominion of Canada generally. Then, it has been my privilege to visit the maritime provinces, and I am proud of the magnificent harbours we have there and the future prospects of that country. I would like to see not only the grades of the Intercolonial Railway improved, but I would like to see the docking and shipping facilities of St. John, Halifax, St. Andrews, Sydney, and all those other magnificent ports improved so as to assist in the development of the maritime provinces. Now is our time to start, and instead of spending money at the order of a man that cannot wait—for a Senator who cannot wait—in place of obeying his order, let the government assert its authority and power, withdraw this Bill and bring in a measure that will be of benefit to the people of Canada.

One point more and I have done. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) referred to the Hon. Mr. Blair in very uncomplimentary terms. He said, speaking of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals :

> He puts me in mind of a story I read a few years ago as to a riot in Chicago. A United States regiment of regulars who had been engaged in a campaign under General Miles against the Sioux Indians, were on their way to quarters in the east where they were to be granted a respite from their labours. They were ragged and toil-worn but they were veterans evidently, and as they were drawn up in line a person on the side-walk said to the soldier nearest to him : you would not shoot us fellows would you ? He replied : I would not unless the captain told me to.

I want the Postmaster General to note this :

> Now, the difficulty with the ex-Minister of Railways is that he did not shoot when the captain told him to. It is necessary to have discipline in an army, it is necessary to have discipline in a party.

Remember that, those back-benchers, please :

> Individual men may have very strong individual opinions—I belong to that category myself—but it is unreasonable for an individual to suppose that a party must accept his opinions and act upon them, and it is in the highest degree injudicious for that individual to kick over the traces because he cannot govern the party, for, in doing that, he destroys what little influence he might otherwise possess.

The hon. member for North Norfolk was as dumb as an oyster for 18 years, and he voted steadily in this House against his own convictions. He obeyed the party lash; he showed the servile spirit that is in him. Let me read this extract from Dicey, the famous author, on the English constitution, and I trust that the rank and file of the Liberal party will see from it what is the spirit permeating British mili-

tary law. I see the legal light from Hants smiling.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had no intention of smiling at you.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I trust that the spirit that permeates British military law may actuate these gentlemen over there in their civil capacity as representatives of a free people. Dicey at page 295 says :

Every subject, whether a civilian or a soldier, whether what is called a 'servant of the government' (such for example as a policeman) or a person in no way connected with the administration not only has the right, but is, as a matter of legal duty, bound to assist in putting down breaches of the peace. No doubt policemen or soldiers are the persons who, as being specially employed in the maintenance of order, are most generally called upon to suppress a riot, but it is clear that all loyal subjects are bound to take their part in the suppression of riots. It is also clear that a soldier has, as such, no exemption from liability to the law for his conduct in restoring order. Officers, magistrates, soldiers, policemen, ordinary citizens, all occupy in the eye of the law the same position ; they are, each and all of them, bound to withstand and put down breaches of the peace, such as riots and other disturbances ; they are, each and all of them, authorized to employ so much force, even to the taking of life, as may be necessary for that purpose, and they are none of them entitled to use more ; they are, each and all of them, liable to be called to account before a jury for the use of excessive that is, of unnecessary force.

I would like this to sink into the mind of the hon. member for North Norfolk, and I would like to remind him of this further extract from Dicey, page 308.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What has this got to do with the subject ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I will explain to the Postmaster General what it has to do with it if he has the patience to wait. I dare say that he has got the hon. member for North Norfolk under his thumb, so that he cringes and bows under the rule of the government, but I trust that there are men sitting behind the Postmaster Genereal who will not be so servile. I trust that there are men sitting behind the government who will assert their right of citizenship and manhood, and who will teach the government that they will not stand such an iniquitous proposition as that placed before them. Dicey at page 308 says :

When a soldier is put on trial on a charge of crime, obedience to superior orders is not of itself a defence.

This is a matter which requires explanation. A soldier is bound to obey any lawful order which he receives from his military superior. But a soldier cannot any more than a civilian avoid responsibility for breach of the law by pleading that he broke the law in bona fide obedience to the orders (say) of the commander-in-chief. Hence the position of a soldier may be, both in theory and practice, a difficult one. He may, as it has been well said, be liable to be shot by a court martial if he disobeys an order, and to be hanged by a judge and jury if he obeys it.

I am afraid the member for North Norfolk would be hanged. I dare say many an honester man has escaped the gallows.

His situation and the line of his duty may be seen by considering how soldiers ought to act in the following cases.

An officer orders his oldiers in a time of political excitement then and there to arrest and shoot without trial a popular leader against whom no crime has been proved, but who is suspected of treasonable designs. In such a case there is (it is conceived) no doubt that the soldiers who obey, no less than the officer who gives the command, are guilty of murder and liable to be hanged for it when convicted in due course of law. In such an extreme instance as this the duty of soldiers is, even at the risk of disobeying their superior, to obey the law of the land.

An officer orders his men to fire on a crowd whom he thinks could not be dispersed without the use of firearms. As a matter of fact the amount of force which he wishes to employ is excessive, and order could be kept by a mere threat that force would be used. The order, therefore, to fire is not itself a lawful order, that is, the colonel or other officer who gives it is not legally justified in giving it, and will himself be held criminally responsible for the death of any person killed by the discharge of firearms.

Soldiers might reasonably think that their officers had good grounds for ordering them to fire into a disorderly crowd which to them might not appear to be at that moment engaged in acts of dangerous violence, but soldiers could hardly suppose that their officer could have any good grounds for ordering them to fire a volley down a crowded street when no disturbance of any kind was either in progress or apprehended. The doctrine that a soldier is bound under all circumstances whatever to obey his superior officer would be fatal to military discipline itself, for it would justify the private in shooting the colonel by the orders of the captain, or in deserting to the enemy on the field of battle on the order of his immediate superior. I think it is not less monstrous to suppose that superior orders would justify a soldier in the massacre of unoffending civilians in time of peace, or in the exercise of inhuman cruelties, such as the slaughter of women and children, during a rebellion.

So much for the argument of our hon. friend from North Norfolk. I do not think it is necessary even to order him into line. I have noticed for some time that that hon. gentleman has kicked over the traces very frequently; but as soon as he sees a little notice in the papers that the Joint High Commission is about to meet in the course of a few weeks, he forthwith comes back and we see him crawling at the feet of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour. He does not wait to be told to shoot, but he goes off at half cock.

Mr. Speaker, the question is a large one, and I could dwell upon it at a greater length; but I hope that before the matter proceeds much further the House and the country

will be treated by the Prime Minister in the proper way, by his coming forward and apologizing for having placed such a proposition before them, and withdrawing it like a man.

Mr. BENJAMIN RUSSELL (Hants). Mr. Speaker, I have read somewhere or heard the story of Douglas Jerrold who was at one time recovering from a severe fit of fever. A volume of Browning's 'Sordello' was put into his hands to interest him while in a convalescent state. He began reading it; but as he could not understand a word of it, he had terrible apprehensions as to his mental condition. Great beads of perspiration stood out on his forehead. At last he passed the book to his wife who was sitting at the head of his bed and asked her to read it. She read a few lines, and then threw the book away in disgust, saying, 'It is perfect and absolute nonsense.' 'Thank God,' said he; 'then I am not mad.' I must confess that I passed through a somewhat similar experience when I was trying to discover what connection there was between my hon. friend's quotation from Dicey on martial law and the subject of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Not being, like my hon. friend opposite, a man of military aspirations or martial tendency, I turned to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence, and asked him if he could explain it to me. 'No,' he said, 'I cannot see any connection whatever.' 'Thank God,' said I to myself, 'then I am not mad.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as ithers see us.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the hon. gentleman sees me in that light, I will accept it as conclusive evidence of my sanity. I must confess that I rise with some degree of trepidation and alarm to measure swords with the hon. gentleman, because I have read an autobiographical sketch of the hon. gentleman, from which I learn that he has in his veins the blood of the two great martial races of the world, of which this great nation of ours is composed—the blood of the old courageous gentlemen of Enniskillen and the Boyne, and also the blood of some French ancestor who served under Napoleon Bonaparte.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Nothing diminutive about that crowd.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, nothing diminutive, but the fact is calculated to inspire a small person with a great degree of alarm and terror,and I am sure that nothing should be added to that terror and alarm that one feels by the hon. gentleman's interruptions. I have illustrations of the hon. gentleman's prowess in various lines, gathered from his autobiography. Among these he gives the following :—

As athlete, victory almost ever followed any team I led or played with. As one chronicler of Canadian athletics wrote, in speaking of my 'inspiring influence' on the men, the cry was :

Hughes, Sam Hughes, the war cry rattles,
As rang 'Old Fritz' in Europe's battles.

As a rifleman the hon. gentleman has his record, and also as a politician. As a man of learning and science he has his record too. But most of all, as a miracle-worker he stands so high that it would be almost profane to institute any comparison. He says :

On two occasions I received within an hour and despatched within the same period of time in the evening, by trains and boats, upwards of twenty-five thousand persons.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Orangemen, too.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not know that; that should have been mentioned.

There was no hitch, no accident. These vast crowds too, were fed within a period of two hours without confusion in a town of less than seven thousand.

I am sure nothing of that sort has ever happened since the time when I do not know how many loaves and the two small fishes were used to feed a great crowd.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Keep it up. Don't go back on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not, and I hope my hon. friend will not feel the slightest temptation to go back on it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all; I am not ashamed of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hon. gentleman is a great teacher as well. He is able to teach the farmers of this country how to harvest their wheat, how to gather it into barns, how to garner it, how to deliver it on the market. I am a very humble sort of person, and I am willing to take my lesson from him as to the proper time of the year for the farmers to deliver their grain on the market, and I learn from him that the proper time is somewhere about March or April. In those months, the lakes are closed to navigation, and if the grain is to be carried to the markets of the world, the right way and the only possible way to carry it is over a railroad. And I suppose that if the grain of those farmers of ours in the North-west is to be carried over a railroad, the only question for us to consider is whether it is to be carried over Canadian or over American railroads. The policy of the government, I understand, is that we shall have our Canadian grain carried over Canadian railroads, and the hon. gentleman admits that this is a good policy. I should not forget to say that the hon. gentleman is by his own account the father of this policy. I have his own word for it, and if it is necessary I can give it. He says :

Among the many plans originated by me and carried, or being now carried, into successful execution may be named : The introduction of

military drill in schools; the second great transcontinental Canadian railway to the Pacific.

This is the railway we are talking about, because it is the second great transcontinental Canadian railway to the Pacific. He also tells us in the same paragraph that he originated 'the policy of upbuilding Canadian ports instead of foreign ones;' and that is the sole purpose for which the present measure is brought before the House. Therefore I have a right to claim the hon. gentleman as the father of this measure for the securing of a second great transcontinental line to the Pacific and the upbuilding of Canadian ports instead of foreign ones.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not call this a great transcontinental system at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is big enough for us. We are quite satisfied with the size of it. The hon. gentleman said, in the course of his opening remarks—although his later comments belied rather what he started out with—that he had no objection to make to the line, no objection to the route, no objection to the soil—all these were all right; and he threw overboard, as he went on, nearly every hon. gentleman on the other side who had opened his mouth with reference to this matter. He destroyed at one fell blow, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). He left no argument to that hon. gentleman, for that hon. gentleman's whole argument was based on the defective character of the soil, the route and the line. But to none of these things has the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) any objection. All that he objects to is the iniquitous contract, and on the iniquity of it he did not give us one scintilla of light.

He has given us, however, the evolution, according to his idea, of this great contract. He said it began in a Minneapolis paper. It began with something concerning the Canadian Northern Railway, for which, I suppose, he holds a brief. Then he said it expanded from North Bay to Winnipeg. Then it went a little easterly, and the Quebec bridge was drawn in, and it was going from Quebec over to Winnipeg and the west. Later on, the maritime provinces were brought in, and now it is a transcontinental railway from the maritime provinces over the bridge to Quebec, and from Quebec to Winnipeg, and from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast. So that by the process of evolution the hon. gentleman has proved conclusively to himself the origin of this project. Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not make very much difference where it comes from. Modern science teaches us that the greatest results ever achieved in the world have come from the minutest possible origins; and I do not care from what minute origin in a Minneapolis newspaper the hon. gentleman evolves this scheme. Here we have it, and we are not going to cavil at its origin. If it is going to be a great Canadian and all-British railway, I care not whence it comes or how small its origin.

The hon. gentleman told us that he was going to criticise this contract. Well, how did he carry out his promise? He did not complain of one thing in the contract. I listened carefully to the hon. gentleman, and I could not gather from his remarks what iniquity there was on this contract on which he based his opposition to it. He read two passages of it, and only two, clauses 37 and 42. Let me refer, first, to clause 37. He seemed to discover that in clause 37 there was no security for the Canadian purchasers of goods; and the hilarity of my hon. friends on his right and left as he made this discovery was something very delightful indeed. Well, will he be surprised to learn—I do not know whether he ought to be surprised, because I am sure it has already been pointed out in this House—that the very section in this Bill which has excited the hon. gentleman's criticisms and his friends' hilarity, is exactly the section which was moved by the hon. member for Cornwall as an amendment to the Bill incorporating the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I shall read the two sections side by side, and I give my hon. friend the benefit of the comparison; and if he can show anything in this Bill, which is more of a limitation than what is contained in the resolution of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle), then I will do what he himself offered to do a moment ago, and resign my seat and let him come and have it, if he wants it.

An hon. MEMBER. And can get it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, always subject to that limitation. Clause 37 of the contract reads:

> The company shall purchase all material and supplies for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers, when the same are produced in Canada——

I want to know if the hon. gentleman thinks the company should be obliged to purchase them in Canada if they are not produced in Canada.

> —and when such materials and supplies can be purchased in desired quantities and of equal quality suitable for the purposes required——

I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman would want to have the railway company bound to purchase materials and supplies from Canadian producers when they are not produced in Canada, and when they are not suitable for the purposes required. No one is going to consent that goods, whether Canadian or American or from any other part of the world, may be put into the railway unless suitable for the purposes required:

> —and for prices and upon terms equally advantageous to those procurable elsewhere.

Would it be reasonable to ask this company, which is putting its money into the building of 3,000 or 4,000 miles of railway, that they should purchase their supplies in Canada when such supplies were not suitable for the purposes required and could not be got for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere? Surely those are entirely reasonable and proper qualifications on which to impose on the company the obligation of purchasing goods in the Canadian market. But if there be anything wrong in this clause it is taken directly and absolutely from the resolution moved by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle.)

Mr. BROCK. Read the resolution of the hon. member for Cornwall.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am about to read it. It is as follows:

In the event of any subsidies being granted to the said company, they shall be subject to the conditions that the company shall, as far as practicable——

Now, if the shoe were on the other foot, how we could ring the changes on that. You can take any meaning you like out of it. What is the meaning of 'as far as practicable'?

—construct, equip and operate their line or lines of railway with railway supplies, structural iron and steel, railway fastenings and cement and rolling stock of Canadian manufacture, whenever such railway supplies and rolling stock can be procured as cheaply and upon as good terms in Canada as elsewhere, having regard to quality and price among other things.

Which is the most hazy and indefinite? This one leaves the decision to the arbitrary discretion of the company, and I do not hesitate to say that clause 37 leaves less open to the company than this clause 40, which was to be added to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill.

Mr. BROCK. In one of them the articles are defined and not in the other.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true; I was forgetting to mention it. This proposition of the hon. member for Cornwall only relates to particular articles, but the clause we have put in the contract applies to any articles of any kind. That distinction was in my mind, but I forgot to mention it, and I am very grateful to my hon. friend for having reminded me of it. It certainly shows that the clause we have inserted is more comprehensive than the other.

There is another section of this Bill to which the hon. gentleman refers, and that is the one which, of all others, he says shows the cloven hoof. That is section 42:

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement, that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shippers, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory or between Canadian inland ports.

Ha, ha, the hon. members say. Just look at that, does not that show the cloven hoof? If they were not intending to have the control of roads on the American territory, why would they have put that there? It is a circumstance of the greatest possible suspicion that they have it there. But then it would have been cited as a circumstanc of the greatest possible suspicion if they did not have it there; so, it does not make much difference, so far as that is concerned, whether they have it there or not. If we had said nothing about sending it over Canadian territory, the hon. gentleman would hav said: Why do you not have a clause providing that this traffic is to be carried al together over Canadian territory? The Minister of Justice properly and naturally put it there, and now it is regarded as terribly suspicious that it is there. I have never heard or read of an argument of thi character since Sergeant Buzfuzz showed the unutterable things that were concealed in the message about chops and tomato sauce. Now, just one word more on this point. I want to know why the hon. gentleman did not finish the reading of that clause. It would have been fair and just that he should have read the two lines at the end of the section:

—that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper shall be carried by Canadian ocean ports.

I think that if the hon. gentleman had been desirous of making a fair and just statement of the contract, if he had not been desirous of quibbling and endeavouring to pervert the meaning, if he had not desired to find some faults that did not exist, he would not have failed to go on, as he easily might, to show how clear and manifest the intention of the government was to compel them to make this road what it is destined to be, an all-Canadian route for the purpose of building up Canadian ports. And he would have read another section immediately after, which is to the effect that:

The company shall arrange for and provide, either by purchase, charter or otherwise, shipping connections upon both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans sufficient in tonnage and in number of sailings to take care of and transport all its traffic both inward and outward, at such ocean ports within Canada upon the said line of railway, or upon the line of the Intercolonial Railway, as may be agreed upon from time to time, and the company shall not divert, or, so far as it can lawfully prevent permit to be diverted, to ports outside of Canada any traffic

which it can lawfully influence or control, upon the ground that there is not a sufficient amount of shipping to transport such traffic from or to such Canadian ocean ports.

Now, I say that these two clauses taken together make it absolutely clear that this is to be a Canadian line to be worked in the interest of Canadian ports. And I say that all that is necessary to make it a truly Canadian line, and all that it is necessary for us to assume as existing to ensure its complete success are, in our eastern ports, some little degree of push, and in our western country some little degree of patriotism. With patriotism at the western end and push at the eastern end, it is absolutely certain that this will be a transcontinental line that must build up the ports of our country. Because the patriotic man in the west will route his traffic through Canadian ports, and the Canadian ports will provide the means and facilities to handle it, and in this way the line cannot fail to be a truly Canadian transcontinental railway, serving well the purpose which it is the intention of the government and of this House that it should serve.

But my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) says that they are not going to work this line at all. Apparently the hon. gentleman has not thought of the fact that they cannot help working it. He seems to think that this is something that they can take or leave at their own will. He evidently does not know any more about the terms of this contract than do some of his legal friends who criticise it. The company is bound under contract to take the lease of this road for fifty years—there is no option on their part. They are bound not only to take the road, but to work it. But he says that Mr. Hays is a far-seeing man, there is no limit to the amount of his brain and the length of his head ; and Mr. Hays has deliberately entered into an agreement looking ahead for fifty years, and at the end of that time, is going to throw up his road and then carry the grain to Minneapolis, or Chicago, or Philadelphia, or Portland, or wherever else it is the hon. gentleman suggests—somewhere that is not a Canadian port. Well, I knew that Mr. Hays was a pretty long-headed man. He certainly has that reputation. But if he is so long-headed that he is entering into this contract thinking of what he will do fifty years hence when most of us will be in our graves, he is longer-headed than even the greatest of admirers gave him credit for being. The hon. gentleman was even a little more imaginative, and told us he was not going to work this road. But the contract says they must take it and they must work it. Of course, one point I will concede to the hon gentleman—we do not expect the company to work this road until the road is ready We all must admit that. Nobody supposes that they can be called upon to run their trains over the road until the sleepers are down and the rails laid. But when the road is ready, the contract obliges the company to work it. And the hon. gentleman himself has shown in the most conclusive way that they can work it, because he has demonstrated that a matter of three or four hundred miles more or less in the length of a great railway does not make any difference in rates. That is the fact. Anybody who knows anything about railroads has had that fact brought to his attention. For instance, Portland is a northern port. It is further from the great centres of distribution than Boston. Farther still from those centres than New York, and farther still than Baltimore. Yet, an added distance of two or three hundred miles—the hon gentleman said three or four hundred miles—does not make any difference in the rates on the long haul. If that be the case—and it is the case when you come to continental distances, such as three or four thousand miles. That is exactly why this great transcontinental railway company would be able to carry this grain over the road we are going to build for them. Even if Halifax or St. John may be much farther away from Winnipeg or Port Simpson than Portland will be, yet it will be practically the same thing for them to carry to Halifax or St. John over the long distance as to carry to Portland. And we rely for the proof of that proposition upon the very demonstration which the hon. gentleman has made that this increased distance is a negligible quantity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Then why don't you use the Intercolonial ?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Intercolonial is a different thing altogether. It is a short piece of railway which does not connect with the grain centres of the west, and the principle does not apply to a short line as it does to a long line.

The hon. gentleman referred to the matter of running powers, but dealt with it with extreme lightness—as lightly as light could be. He said that so far as running powers were concerned, every body has read that provision, and every body smiles at it. But every body does not smile at it. Some people think it a matter of very great importance. Mr. Hudson wrote a book on railways to demonstrate the great inequality and difficulties and injustices connected with the administration of railway systems in the United States, and he said that the right method for removing these difficulties and extortions was to restore the original theory of a railway highway, as is being done, to a large extent, in this very Bill. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other day demonstrated from actual fact that the railway highway theory is not an impracticable idea ; he demonstrated that it is not only a workable theory, but a working theory. This writer shows why he had a working theory, and these are his words :

Manifestly, to let any one run engines or cars over any railway, free from supervision or direction, would produce hopeless wreck and disorder.

The Duke of Wellington said we must never forget the analogy of a highway. Railways in England were built upon the analogy of highways, and this argument is that if we are going to have a proper definition of a railroad, we must work back to the old theory of the highway.

Such a proposition would be presumptive of lunacy. But when we inquire whether a plan cannot be perfected which shall retain all needful precautions, and enforce by law the authority of the central officer over trains in motion, while giving to carriers the right to compete in the carriage of freight, the question assumes a very different aspect. What is there in these methods which cannot be preserved without the exclusive privilege of carrying freight over the track ? The maintenance of schedules need not interfere with the freedom of competition. The carrier wishing to run a train of his own could be required to run a regular train on schedule time, or to follow a regular train with an extra, just as extras are now run on every railroad in the country. The control of the trains in motion must be given to a train-despatcher ; but the trains thus controlled may be owned, loaded, and forwarded by different carriers.

He did not see anything impossible about it.

If the law secures implicit obedience to the orders of the train-despatcher, while the trains are on the railway, can it make any difference to the safety and speed of the service that one train is owned by A, another by B, and that both carry freight at such rates as are fixed by free competition ? Cannot the authority which controls the trains be made as absolute and unquestioned as now, or even more so, without vesting the monopoly of transportation in a single company ? Cannot the obedience of the men in charge of the trains, and their intelligence and care, be secured in as high a degree if competing carriers are allowed to use the same track ? And cannot the use of safe rolling-stock and its maintenance in good repair, by frequent inspections, be enforced just as well under a system of competition as under a system of monopoly ? These are the questions which must be answered, in order to determine whether the idea of competition in transportation over the same track is practicable.

This proposition does not contemplate sending a number of trains under conflicting control upon the same track. It simply proposes that the right of outside carriers to load their trains, at whatever rates they choose, and to send them over the tracks of the railway, shall be established, under whatever regulations are necessary for the preservation of speed and safety ; and asserts that all these regulations can be enforced consistently with the practice of free competition. The first condition that it assumes is, that all such competing trains would be started on schedule time, and run either as regular trains, or as extra trains following the regular ones. It next supposes, as a vital condition, that all trains will be under the control of the train-despatcher from the moment that they come upon the track until they reach their destination. All the details of reporting the progress of each train, at every telegraph station which it passes, of keeping the record of its location in the central office, and of governing its movements by telegraphic orders, can be enforced as well, whether the trains are owned by a single corporation or by a dozen. Let the law, or the rules of the railway company, provide absolute control by the train-despatcher, of trains in motion, and the efficiency of that officer need not be in any respect diminished by the fact that the trains are owned and laden by competing carriers.

Mr. Hudson goes the whole length of saying that any number of companies can run their cars over the same road, but his theory is that that road ought to be owned by the state. I do not press the theory that far, the government does not press it that far. All they are saying is that one or two companies can have the use of this road besides the Grand Trunk Company; that all the great companies that want to carry grain out of the North-west or anything else may feasibly and advantageously be allowed to use it on fair and equal terms, and that is what the government propose to do between Winnipeg and Moncton.

Mr. CLANCY. Have any great railway experts adopted those views ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Here is one who has adopted that view.

Mr. CLANCY. He is not a railway expert, he is a railway theorist.

Mr. RUSSELL. What are experts but theorists ? I will give my hon. friend another opinion, that of a gentleman who has considered the railroad question seriously and technically, and that is ex-Governor Larrabee of Iowa, who says :

The adoption of Mr. Hudson's plan would simply be a return to the first principle of railroad transportation. It has already been shown that the first English charters permitted the public to use their own vehicles and motive power upon the railroad track, but that shippers and independent carriers could not avail themselves of these provisions of the early charters because it was in the power of the railroad companies to make their tolls prohibitory. There is but little question as to the practicability of Mr. Hudson's plan from a purely technical standpoint, and its adoption might be advisable if it should be demonstrated that a monopoly of the track is inconsistent with the operation of the railways for the public good.

That is to say, ex-Governor Larrabee sees no technical difficulty in the matter at all, he considers it feasible but doubts if it would have the beneficial effect which Mr. Hudson anticipated from its operation. Now, I give the opinions of these two authorities. I do not think that railway experts would go the length of saying that it would be desirable or safe that everybody should be allowed to pass a train upon the track and at a fixed toll. I do not think that would feasible. But in the estimation of two such eminent authorities as Mr. Hudson and ex-Governor Larrabee, what the hon. member for North Norfolk said is

amply justified when he showed from actual experience that it is feasible for more than one railway authority to send its cars over the same line of road, as we know it is.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has quoted the member for North Norfolk as making a statement about the Wabash Railway, a statement which I deny.

Mr. RUSSELL. It does not make any difference if the hon. gentleman does deny it, I am reasserting it. I have just as much faith in the hon. member for North Norfolk as I have in the hon. gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. I may further state——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. INGRAM. I am asking the hon. gentleman's permission to make a statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is worth while for us both to try to speak at the same time. There is one other matter that I wish to refer to, and that is the information the hon. gentleman gave us about the central route in the province of New Brunswick. Now, he has absolutely misunderstood, I think, the speech which was made by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). My hon. friend from Westmoreland made it clear that the route which was being referred to in Sir Sandford Fleming's report was a route that went up to Rivière du Loup and over a chain of mountains, while the route that is proposed or contemplated by this Bill, is to be taken through the province of New Brunswick, and all the references that have been made to Sir Sandford Fleming's report and to the cross sections he mentions, are entirely beside the mark. It was made clear by my hon. friend from Westmoreland that the route which is contemplated runs from Quebec back of the mountains, which skirt the south shore of the St. Lawrence river, and passes around the border of the state of Maine and down through the central part of New Brunswick, which is an entirely different line from that which is criticised in Sir Sandford Fleming's report. I have some more observations to make about that subject, but in the meantime, lest hon. members should go away with a false impression, I want to point out the fact that there was always a contention between Mr. Wilkinson, the provincial engineer of the province of New Brunswick, and Major Robinson, on whose report, to a large extent, Sir Sandford Fleming relied when he gave his account of this central route which ran partly through the province of New Brunswick and partly through Quebec, where we do not propose to go in this Bill at all. This road takes an entirely different course. So that the evidence my hon. friend quoted he has quoted to no purpose at all, and he might just as well have quoted from a book of logarithms. Mr. Wilkinson, in criticising the circuitous route that the Intercolonial Railway takes around the northern part of New Brunswick, in his contest with Major Robinson says :

> Were a proposition now for the first time offered, that the intercourse between Halifax and Quebec should not pass through New Brunswick, except by the most circuitous route that could be made, it might justly be expected to be repugnant to both Nova Scotia and Canada. But it has, I trust, been shown, that such a proposition would be at least equally objectionable to New Brunswick, and that it is for the common interest that the inter-communication should be as direct as the natural facilities of the country will permit.

There is Mr. Wilkinson's evident impression. Mr. Wilkinson's impression and opinion which is evidently the opinion of the people in New Brunswick shows that the route which Major Robinson had recommended and along which the Intercolonial Railway now goes was a circuitous route, was too long a route, was longer than need be and that a route through the central part of New Brunswick was one which would give us as direct a route as the natural facilities of the country would permit. Now, Mr. Speaker, with this reference to the question of the location of the Intercolonial Railway and the saving to be effected by running it through the centre of the province of New Brunswick I have no further remark to make in regard to the speech of the hon. member for North Victoria and with the permission of the House I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Postmaster General, House adjourned at 12 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, August 18, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WILSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask if there has been a sufficient number of copies of this Bill printed with reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, so that members may distribute them in their various constituencies. I sent up the other day for half a dozen and only got one. I think it is desirable that we should have sufficient quantities printed so that it may be freely distributed.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The usual number of copies of this Bill have been printed. I am not aware that the government has any authority over this question, though I am not sure. I think the House itself is the party to manage that.

Mr. WILSON. I want to say another word, I do not want to cast any reflection upon the gentleman who is at the head of that department, for I have always found him courteous and willing to do what he could to accommodate members, but I do think we should have a sufficient number of these Bills, so that we may distribute them among our constituents.

Mr. SPROULE. The House ought to take it up, because we have had several applications for copies of this Bill that we could not supply. It seems to me the House ought to give its consideration to this matter, and order an additional number printed. It would not be very expensive.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into Committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a national transcontinental railway.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants, N.S.). I referred last night to the views of Mr. Hudson, an authority on railway questions, who had advanced the theory of the railway highway as a remedy for the difficulties which have been experienced by shippers to the United States. I took care in doing so, to say that I was not prepared to agree with his proposition to the whole extent to which Mr. Hudson carried it. I did not put it forward for the purpose of expressing agreement with it, but for the purpose of saying that this view had been seriously adopted by a man who had given a great deal of thought to the subject, and his views had been confirmed by ex-Governor Larrabee, another high authority, so that it can no longer be considered as a mere crotchet, but as a subject that is worthy of fair consideration. Now the government in this Bill do not go anything like so far as Mr. Hudson proposes, and as ex-Governor Larrabee endorses. We do not profess to say that this railway should be a highway for all the roads in the Dominion, but that it will be possible for several lines to use it if necessary for them to do so. There cannot be at the utmost more than two or three railroads that will require to use it, perhaps in the fifty years which is the lifetime of the lease which is to be made.

When you go into a depot such as the Fitchburg in Boston, before the consolidation of the northern depots, or into any of the great depots in England and find trains going out from these depots in rapid succession, almost like bullets out of a rifle, and when you come down to the proposition of two or three freight trains creeping along a road 1,800 or 1,900 miles in length, perhaps 25 miles apart, you cannot say that there is anything remarkable or unsafe or impracticable about that. I could easily conceive that a short line of railway, such as the portion of the Intercolonial Railway running into Halifax, where two distinct systems of trains are accommodated, might be a more dangerous contrivance than a railway 1,800 miles long built for the accommodation of through freight. I think this is all I have to say in reference to that subject and I only mention it because incidentally it came up in connection with the remarks I made last night.

A question was put to me last night, which at the time I did not apprehend the meaning of. I was emphasizing the point made by the hon. gentleman who preceded me, that that which appears in a smaller distance to be a large quantity, appears in a greater distance to be a disproportionately smaller quantity, and that what may be, speaking of the railway system as we have it in the maritime provinces, a matter of importance as affecting a railway some hundreds of miles long, when you get down to the question of a transcontinental railway 4,000 miles long, is practically a negligible quantity. The question was put to me, which I did not at the moment apprehend the meaning of: Why not then use the Intercolonial Railway. I thought the question was the one which has often been agitated in Halifax. Why do we not have western cargoes coming over the Intercolonial Railway, and the answer which has often been made by the Halifax Board of Trade to the suggestion is that as long as the Intercolonial Railway is destitute of western connections it is impossible for it to be a through road, and the very thing that is necessary to make it a through road is to afford it a connection with a western system of railways. It has been suggested that this was not the question that was asked me, but the question was, why, if a hundred miles is a negligible quantity, is it necessary to decrease the mileage of the Intercolonial Railway by constructing another railway through the central part of the province of New Brunswick? That is a fair question, but the hon. gentleman who asked it, and I do not know who it was, will see that it is a question that applies equally well to the American railways of the present day. Why is it, if the railway line to Baltimore is shorter than the railway line to New York, and if by virtue of the principle that in a long haul such a difference in distance between the two lines of railway is a negligible quantity, that the New York Central straightens out its curves and reduces its grades? It is because of that which has been pointed out by one of the highest railway authorities on the continent—I refer to Mr. Fink, who is cited by all the railway authorities who discuss this question—the rate on through-freight is made up not merely to the sea-board, but the through-rate is made from the source of supply to the markets of the old world. It is because the through-rate is made from Chicago to Liverpool by way of New York, Baltimore or Portland, and not from Chicago to New York and New York to Liverpool, and the ocean rates adjust themselves to the land freights. If the hon. member takes that into consideration,

he will see why it is we want the Intercolonial Railway to be a through-road, to be in a position to carry traffic from Winnipeg to the Atlantic ocean. It is because we want to put our maritime ports on the same footing as the ports of Portland, Boston, New York, Baltimore and other American ports ; it is because we want to enable our ports to get the benefit of their natural advantages for ocean traffic ; it is because we want our roads in so far as we possibly can secure it, to get the land carriage in order that our superior ports, as we conceive them to be in the long run, will have the benefit of the ocean carriage, and in order that we may be able to give a rate from the ports of the Dominion of Canada, and particularly from the Atlantic ports, which will enable us to obtain the business in competition with the great arteries of commerce which flow through United States to Liverpool and the old country. If any hon. gentleman will take section 45 of this contract which I read last night and which I will not repeat this morning, he will see that this company undertakes to provide ocean tonnage upon both the Atlantic and Pacific oceans for the purpose of taking care of and transporting all its traffic both inward and outward at such ocean ports in Canada, and if he will read that in connection with section 42, which was not read in full last night by the hon. member who preceded me, and who very carefully abstained from reading it in full, he will see that the contract makes ample provision for safeguarding the interests of Canada in this matter. The full purport of this section has not even been grasped by a great many hon. members on this side of the House who are the warmest partisans and the most earnest advocates of this contract. The company agrees :

> That the through-rate on export traffic from point of origin to point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

That means that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will not be able to make a rate from Winnipeg to Liverpool through Canadian ports higher than it makes the rate from Winnipeg to Liverpool via Portland or any other port. What on earth any contract could do more than that, and what any government could do more than to stipulate that when the freight is carried through Canadian channels across the ocean and to the ultimate point of destination the rate shall be the same by Canadian ports as by American ports, even though the haul may be longer through Canadian ports than American ports is something that I cannot understand. I do not see what else could be done to secure to our maritime ports the benefit of the natural advantages which they possess, or to secure to the people of this country the commerce that now flows through the United States and across the ocean to the markets of the world.

Now, I am not sure that I should have considered it necessary or desirable to delay the vote on the question before the House with another speech, if I had not some few years ago advocated a proposition which has been mentioned in the course of the discussion as a possible alternative to the policy propounded by the government. Shortly after the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway, a report obtained currency that the government was about to purchase the Parry Sound road for the purpose of still further extending the Intercolonial Railway, and pushing it forward in the direction of the grain fields of the west. It seemed to me at the time that this was a logical sequence of the steps already taken in the extension of the road to Montreal, and I publicly advocated the adoption of the policy in the interest of the maritime provinces and of the city which I then had the honour, in conjunction with the hon. leader of the opposition, to represent in parliament, and in the interest also of the Intercolonial Railway itself. If it were not for the immeasurable superiority of the proposals now before the House, I suppose I might still be advocating the extension of the road to Parry Sound, but I am sure that I would do so with some very great misgivings.

In the first place I should be inclined to despair of ever securing the assent to such a proposal of the other provinces of the Dominion. The construction of the Intercolonial Railway was a fundamental condition upon which the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick entered into union with their sister provinces, and without which there could have been no such political unit as the Dominion of Canada. The other provinces, and especially I speak of the province of Ontario which had least to gain from the construction of the Intercolonial road, have accepted that condition in good faith, and there is no man in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick who can lift up his voice to say that the terms of that compact have not been lived up to in a fair and honourable spirit by all the parties to the arrangement.

Mr. EMMERSON. They get a greater benefit from it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not say whether Ontario gets a greater benefit than Quebec. it is immaterial ; at all events I would think it extremely doubtful if the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec which have faithfully and loyally lived up to the terms of that compact under which the Intercolonial Railway was built for the benefit of all the colonies and more particularly for the benefit of the maritime provinces ; I would not think it very singular if the provinces of Ontario and Quebec were willing to enter upon a further experiment in the operation of a government

road. We of the maritime provinces might have considered it desirable, and we should have been within our rights in urging every argument, by which such a proposition could be supported. But how would the argument have stood? If it be true as the hon. member for South Lanark has informed the House that the Intercolonial Railway is responsible for a capital expenditure of $43,000,000, if there is any semblance of truth in his further statement that during the past six years the road has been run at a loss to the people of Canada of $2,500,000 a year; if we regard this statement as misleading and extravagantly pessimistic, and strike off fifty per cent of the deficit as stated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart); if we go still further and accept the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that the road during the term of the present administration has not only held its own from year to year, but has been earning a substantial surplus, but bear in mind that these may be years of exceptional prosperity, that the road may have been having the benefit of an exceptionally prudent and progressive management, and that it is entirely beyond dispute that in former years and under other management the road was being run with annual deficits of a quite substantial not to say serious and alarming character, I ask, Sir, taking all these circumstances into our consideration, and putting ourselves in the position of hon. gentlemen who are not primarily interested in the maritime provinces, whether it would have been reasonable to complain if the other sections of the Dominion, which had honourably redeemed every obligation resting upon them in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, had been unwilling to take upon themselves the burden of another extension by the government road with all the risks that such an undertaking would involve, of a further series of deficits, differing from those they had been accustomed to only in the greater scale upon which they must be reckoned. Will the hon. leader of the opposition be prepared to present such a proposal for the acceptance of his friends in number 6 as an alternative to the proposals of the government? If so he will be met by all the cogent and, I fear, controlling considerations to which I have referred, but he will also have the still further objection to dispose of which I may have to refer to more fully in another connection. He will have to deal with an objection based upon a proposition which I venture to put in the forefront of this discussion as one that cannot be controverted and one that controls the situation in which we find ourselves to-day. My proposition is this: That there is not now, there never was, and until the nature of human beings and of human society undergoes a miraculous change, there never will be in any democratic state a case of a line of railway owned and operated by a government in successful competition with a railway owned and operated by private capital. If we had extended the Intercolonial Railway to Parry Sound; if we had made the best bargain imaginable with the owners of the Parry Sound road, a better bargain by far than any that was ever made by any government with any individual for the purchase of a piece of property; if we had been able to operate the system with entire freedom from the waste and leakage that everybody except the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) regards as the inseparable accompaniment of government operation; if all these impossibilities had been concurrently accomplished in the case of the Parry Sound purchase, we should yet have been obliged to compete with other lines of railway operating in the same field with ourselves and competing for the same traffic. Now the right hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill has given in a most strikingly familiar and convincing manner one of the reasons why a government cannot enter into competition with a private individual or company in the operation of a railroad system. I will not repeat his words for they were altogether too striking and vivid and convincing to need restatement. But I refer to them by way of noticing that a very zealous advocate and champion of government ownership affects to make merry with what he pretends to consider the simplicity of the view presented by the Premier upon this aspect of the question. The versatile editor of the Toronto 'World' writes:

> It was pitiable in the extreme. He stood on the shore of Parry Sound and after Mr. Booth had shown him his new road to that point, the thought came to him that not only had Mr. Booth to build the road but he would have to find traffic for it and perhaps have to build hotels for travellers over it, and even to send envoys to other lands to seek commerce for the project.

Now whenever anything of this kind appears in the columns of the 'World' we may rest in the confident assurance that we will sooner or later have it all over again from the place of an hon. member in this House. A traveller in Europe who went to see the miracle-play at Ober Ammergau once gave a very interesting account of the performance, mentioning among other drolleries the circumstance of Adam crossing the stage preparatory to being created. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in like manner in his capacity of statesman and economist makes his daily appearance on the stage of the Toronto 'World' preparatory to the miracles of creative genius that he displays from time to time to the wonder and admiration of the House of Commons. Now, I do not know whether to refer to him as the

honourable editor of the Toronto 'World' or the hon. member for East York.

Mr. GALLIHER. The editor of the honourable Toronto 'World.'

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, I could hardly put it that way either. However, the hon. gentleman in his capacity of economist continually rehearses his performances in the columns of the Toronto 'Globe'——

Some hon. MEMBERS. The 'World.'

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, of course; God forbid he should have anything to do with the editorship of the 'Globe.'

It was no surprise then to hear in the course of the speech of which the hon. member was in such a hurry to disburden himself that he pumped it into the House under a motion to adjourn, when he could not ask us to receive it in the usual way under any of the regular methods of procedure, the very same line of criticism with which we had been favoured through the columns of the Toronto 'World' and the very same ridicule of the Prime Minister's illustration. It was no surprise, let me repeat, as coming from the hon. member for East York, but it was certainly a very great surprise to hear his hollow laugh re-echoed by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, who is usually a sensible person, and this in a serious speech delivered under most serious circumstances as a serious indictment of the policy of the government. There is a kind of laughter that a wise man has said is like the crackling of thorns under the pot, and the laughter of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals at this point will help the House to appreciate the importance of his sneers at the expense of his former leader in connection with other aspects, as well as this of the argument presented to the House on the introduction of the measure. We do not need in this House or in this country any proof of the political genius of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House and who for many years to come is destined to lead this country. But if any illustration were needed, I would not ask for a better one than the fact that the very same idea that flashed itself upon his mind in a moment of insight is reduced to the form and terms of a definite economical proposition by one of the most luminous economic writers of the present day. I refer to a work on 'l'Etat moderne et ses fonctions,' by Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, a member of the Institute and professor in the College of France. In the chapter in which he states the arguments pro and con on the question of the operation of railways by the government of the country, he points out the difference between the operation of a railway and the conduct of those undertakings such as the post office and the telegraph, which may be hopefully undertaken by the state. His words might almost have been taken for those of the Premier himself. The idea and the argument is exactly that of the right hon. gentleman. He shows how necessary it is for the railway manager to cater to the variety of tastes that he finds in the community which he attempts to serve, how entirely different is the operation of a line of railway from the uniform and routine services performed by the telegraph or the post office and how absolutely essential it is that there should be an individual and personal initiative such as it is entirely unreasonable to expect from a government official. 'It is not sufficient for the road to wait for traffic. It must hunt it up, must create it, must attract it. Experience proves that the profits of a line of railway depend on all these conditions.'

The 'young lions' of the Conservative press may find amusement in the convincing illustrations of the Premier, and the hon. ex-Minister of Railways may display his ignorance by joining them in their fool's laughter; but I can assure them one and all that the men who know what they are talking about and who have had experience or profited by the learning of those who have had experience will be struck with its appositeness and cogency.

The ex-Minister of Railways really has no excuse for joining in the laugh, for he has himself had experience of the very difficulties connected with the administration of a government road to which the premier has called attention. How often have I heard him bewailing his impotence in this very matter of commanding freight for his road? Has he forgotten the speech he delivered in the immigration building in Halifax a few years ago, when the organs of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition were denouncing him as the bitter and malignant enemy of Halifax who spent his days and his nights devising means to compass our destruction; when his picture appeared in the 'Morning Herald' as the destroyer of the city, and his name was coupled with the name of Judas Iscariot. He will recall with what painful conclusiveness he demonstrated the impossibility of the Intercolonial Railway ever, under its present conditions, handling any considerable portion of the traffic of the west. The Canadian Pacific, he told us, would not give him any freight. They would carry their freight by their own road over the short line to St. John. The Grand Trunk would give him none. They would carry theirs all to Portland. And I remember well how amusingly and graphically he pictured himself in the absurd performance of climbing into a tree at the western terminus of his road, and shouting over the land for freight to swell the receipts of the Intercolonial. Now the question that presents itself is whether he would have been any better off if he had secured the road to Parry Sound. Suppose he had bought this road from Mr. Booth; suppose he had gone further, and built or

purchased elevators at Parry Sound to operate in connection with the road, would he not still have been left open to the proposal to climb into a tree, if there are trees upon the barren shore of the Georgian Bay, and send out his imploring cries over the blue waters of Lake Huron ? He might indeed in this way seek to call spirits from the vasty deep ; but we may be permitted to be as skeptical as Hotspur as to the prospects of their coming when he called them. He would find that he must have his line of steamers in connection with the road ; and after all this had been done, which is surely the farthest limit to which by any conceivable possibility public opinion would have permitted him to go, the question still remains whether he would have been in a position to compete with a company like the Canadian Pacific for example which can swell its receipts by promoting the construction of mills as at Lake of the Woods, by the erection of palatial hotels, as at Quebec, Vancouver and Banff, and which can enter into almost any line of business that it finds conducive to the creation of a freight or passenger traffic for its line. I greatly fear that we never could have successfully competed, that the acquisition of the Parry Sound Road, strongly as I was inclined to favour it with my own natural bias in favour of my own city and province, might have proved a failure, might have resulted in continuous and increasing deficits, might have subjected the maritime provinces to the criticism of the other members of the union and created a feeling of hostility towards them which must have materially militated against their comfort and self respect as consistent members of confederation.

I am very glad that the experiment has not been tried, and that the undertaking in a wiser and a better form has been unloaded upon the company that is to operate this national transcontinental line. I regard this portion of the scheme as one of the strongest features by which it is recommended to the favourable consideration of the House. When this subject was first discussed in connection with the resignation of the Minister of Railways, a letter from that hon. gentleman was read in which he described the government measure as a scheme by which the government was to build and own the lean section of the railway and provide a company with government credit to enable them to build and operate the fat section. It was a striking and a plausible statement of the case, and it was at once picked up by every unthinking critic and every Tory newspaper in the country. With his habitual shiftiness, the hon. gentleman had no sooner got them all committed to this view of the situation than he threw them all overboard, and he now presents the argument that neither the western nor the eastern section affords assurance of a paying traffic. Possibly he may have discovered on reflection the obvious fallacy of the way he was presenting the case in his letter. But this was the way he stated it, and the Tory papers have been ringing the changes ever since on the text that he has given them. Why, it has been asked, should the government give the Grand Trunk Pacific Company the end of the pudding containing all the plums, and reserve to itself the end containing nothing but the dough ? Well, Sir, if the government had proposed under this Bill to operate the road from Winnipeg to Moncton, as the hon. Minister of Railways now argues that they ought to have done, it is quite possible that the criticism would be just. In the hands of the government, I am very much afraid the line from Moncton to Winnipeg would have proved a far from profitable line to run. In the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific, I believe that it will easily be made to pay. The reasons for this belief would not be relevant at this point or to the course of argument that I am now pursuing. On the contrary, I am taking the opponents of the measure on their own ground with respect to this eastern section of the road, and I so far agree with them in their opinion as to quite freely and fully concede that it is not this section of the road that would offer any inducements or attractions to a company. If there is a burdensome section of this great transcontinental project, it is the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, and not the end from Winnipeg to the western coast. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways in his letters assumed this to be the fact, the opponents of the measure take it for granted that it is the fact, the hon. member for South Lanark goes even farther than the rest, and demonstrates to his own satisfaction that the road from Winnipeg to Moncton will not and cannot be made to pay a profit but must result in continually recurring deficits. He has discovered that the whole country through which this railroad is to run consists of nothing but mountains and muskegs. But the men who have been over the country and know it best, the missionaries and hunters and surveyors, all tell a different story from that of the hon. member whose accuracy in such matters has never been regarded as one of his strong points. In this case he has certainly excelled himself in discovering impassable mountains and fathomless muskegs, where the officers of the Geological Survey find arable and cultivable land sufficient to support a large population, and furnish an abundant traffic. It is in this way that history always repeats itself. When George Stephenson projected his road from Liverpool to Manchester, it was the same old story, not so old then as it is now. It can be read in Fanny Kemble's introduction to the book in which she has recorded her impressions. There were the same sort of 'parliament men' in those days as the two ex-Ministers of Railways, with their

mountains and muskegs to prove the utter absurdity and impossibility of a railway from Liverpool to Manchester. 'There is a rock to be excavated to a depth of more than sixty feet, there are embankments to be made nearly to the same height, there is a swamp of five miles in length to be traversed, in which, if you drop an iron rod, it sinks and disappears. How will you to do this ?' Well, if the parliament men had had their way, it would not have been done at all. But it was done, as this will be done, in spite of all the gloomy pictures and dismal prophecies of the member for South Lanark.

But for the purpose of my present argument, I take him at his word and accept his demonstration that the road will be so expensive a one to build and so unprofitable to operate that it cannot ever be expected to be run without a loss. What, then, in view of his demonstration, is the proposition we are called upon to consider ? Is it a proposal by which, as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has most unfairly, uncandidly and perversely represented, we are handing over to a company the fat end of the road and retaining the lean end in the hands of the government ? Surely it is nothing of the kind. It is a scheme by which the government, in consideration of the support that they are giving to this company in the construction of the road from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, and which they might well have given without any consideration whatever, as they have this very session given similar aid to another company, and as the French government has given similar aid to all its great railway companies, has loaded the company down with an obligation to operate, for the benefit of the older provinces, the eastern and more burdensome section of the road. The hon. member for South Lanark has very frankly admitted this to be the nature of the scheme. Whether he made the admission intentionally or in a moment of unconscious frankness, I have no means of determining. But, that there may be no mistake about the matter, I take his words as reported in the official record :

> The Grand Trunk Pacific want the road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean ; they want also the road from Winnipeg to Lake Superior, and they may arrange for connection with their North Bay or Montreal system of roads. But it is no interest to them, it is a drag and a load upon them to compel them to accept the road from Winnipeg to Quebec and from Quebec to Moncton.

These are the words of the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). What is it that they prove ? Do they prove the proposition upon the strength of which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals surrendered his portfolio, or do they not prove the very opposite of his proposition ? Surely, if the hon. member is correct and the acceptance of the line from Winnipeg to Moncton is a drag and a burden upon the Grand Trunk Pacific, it is a drag and a burden which the government have imposed upon them and compelled them to accept as the consideration for the valuable franchises and substantial pecuniary assistance which they secure from the government under the provisions of this Bill.

There is only one possible answer to this presentation of the case. It may be argued that the road will be so unprofitable that it will not pay the company to operate it, and that the contract is so weak that the government will not be in a position to compel its operation. If both these propositions can be shown to be well founded, the bargain is indefensible. Even should the last of them alone be true, the bargain is not as good a one as it should have been. What then are the guarantees that the country will hold for the efficient operation of the road ? Well, Sir, there are two distinct and separate kinds of guarantee, the one intentional and express, the other undesigned entirely as a matter of guarantee, but to my mind more effectual, if that were possible, than the one that is expressly 'nominated in the bond.' To my mind the best possible guarantee and the all-sufficient guarantee for the continuous and satisfactory operation of the road is the fact that it is in the covenants under which the company takes its franchise, and subject to the performance of which it will hold every mile of its road and every right that under this measure it will possess. This contract has been represented to the country as one of enormous value to the company. The government, we are told, has been gold-bricked into making such an improvident and thriftless bargain wih the promoters of the scheme. The concessions to the company were, in the judgment of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals when he was preparing the statement of his reasons for surrendering his portfolio, so enormously valuable that he would compel the company to hand over perhaps a half, at all events, not less than a third of the net earnings of the enterprise as the price of the concessions. He appears to have changed his mind since then, or to have two minds upon the subject. In fact he has not been of one mind on any point connected with the subject for twenty-four hours together since he delivered his ultimatum. What his mind may be at this date as to the value of the franchise, it would be useless for me to conjecture ; but, everybody who has attacked this measure has agreed that it is enormously valuable and, we are told that it is to give us a new crop of millionaires.

Now, Sir, I should like to have it pointed out to me by what method of manipulation the company will be able to hold its franchise and realize all this affluence without continuously and efficiently performing its covenants for the operation of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. Breach of cov-

enant results in debt, debts ripen into judgments, and judgments are followed by delivery into the hands of the receiver. The breach of the covenants in the lease does not merely operate a forfeiture of the lease. The company has no option to surrender its lease and be excused from the performance of the covenants. It is under covenant to continuously and effectively operate the road, and if it fails to do so it must also abandon the hope of earning the dividends which are the sole object of the company in entering upon the undertaking. It cannot continue to earn its dividends from its western traffic without continuously performing its covenant for the operation of the eastern end. In the nature of things, what better guarantee could the country ask for, and what more effective guarantee could possibly be given? Is it not clear beyond controversy that the company will be obliged to operate effectively every mile of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton in exact accordance with the standard efficiency demanded by the contract?

Now, what follows from the performance of this obligation? I venture to say that the exacting of this requirement is pregnant with consequences of the greatest possible importance to the seaports of the lower provinces. The hon. leader of the opposition said a very wise thing in connection with this matter; or if he did not quite say it, he came so near the mark that it would be a pity to deprive him of the credit of having hit the nail upon the head. He virtually admitted that no mere stipulations in a contract or a statute could divert the course of traffic from one channel to another. Be it so, you cannot by legislation or by contract make Halifax, for instance, the terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway in place of Portland. But what you can do is to locate your great arterial lines of transportation in such a way that it will be natural for their traffic to seek its outlet in your own ports, and that is what the government have done in the location of this road. They have kept it well to the north, they have by its means sought to broaden and deepen the area of the eastern provinces. This road, when once its traffic is established, and its local trade developed, will turn as naturally to Quebec in summer and to the Atlantic ports in winter as the Grand Trunk now turns to Portland in winter and summer alike.

They have obliged this company to operate the road throughout its whole extent continuously and efficiently. It cannot afford to run empty cars. It is driven by every impulse that can be brought to bear upon a company to find traffic for its road. It must and will see that the forests are felled, that farms are settled, that industries are established throughout this new Quebec and new Ontario, so that its traffic may be developed and improved. The local traffic originating in these new centres of industry will make a through-traffic profitable that could not otherwise be made to pay. I am no expert in railway economics, but, I think it is a matter of common knowledge that a through-traffic and local traffic over the same line may both be made to pay where either through or local traffic standing by itself would make a loss. In conversation with one of the officials of the Intercolonial some years ago as to the prospects of that road, he assured me that if he were free to handle the road according to his own ideas it would not be impossible for him to carry grain to Halifax for nothing. It seemed to me to be a paradox, but he elaborated his view in such a way as to make it seem entirely plausible. The present trains he said are running at a profit. Increase the power of your locomotives, double or treble the carrying capacity of your trains, and you add somewhat, of course, to the expense for fuel and to the wages of your men, but you gradually approximate the point at which the ratio between the increase in the expense and the improvement in the returns is so small that the increased expense account becomes a negligible quantity. All this was given me in good faith and seriousness by a former official of the road, who is one of the brightest and most clear-headed railway men in this country. I do not pass judgment on his views. It is not my business to understand railway administration. But when I hear the hon. gentlemen opposite, whose knowledge is not better than my own, predicting with brazen confidence that this road can never carry its through freights across the continent, I bethink me of the equally confident and pessimistic 'parliament men' that tried the soul of George Stephenson, the equally confident and pessimistic prophets of the early failure and ruin of the Canadian Pacific, and all the long and dismal succession of croakers and groaners who have stood in the way of every progressive movement that has ever been inaugurated.

If the opponents of this Bill are right in their predictions, if this policy does what the hon. leader of the opposition says that statutes and contracts cannot in themselves accomplish, then it is because no policy that can be adopted by this parliament can ever accomplish the task. It is a counsel of despair that our opponents offer us. The task is beyond the resources of statesmanship. Our dream of a national life realizing itself in conscious and genuine community of interests is destined to remain forever unfulfilled, and the soooner we acknowledge that our confederation is a failure and a blunder, the better will we be able to reconcile ourselves to the inevitable alternative. Now, I am not ready to adopt such a conclusion as this. I have said already, it is a counsel of despair. It is of a piece with the dreary pessimism of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

It has no place in the new life and the new hopes that are springing in the heart and soul of this young Canadian commonwealth. I believe the day is bound to come when the cities of Halifax and St. John, each with its own peculiar advantages, and contending in friendly rivalry, will hold the same relation to the Grand Trunk Pacific that Portland now holds in relation to the old Grand Trunk, and that this will be brought about in good part by, if it is not almost wholly dependent upon, those provisions of the measure which I am next called upon to discuss.

The extension of the road beyond Quebec, eastward into the maritime provinces and to connect with the city of Moncton, has been attacked by the opponents of the measure as an unnecessary and improvident expenditure. As to this contention, let me point out, in the first place, how preposterously the relative importance of this expenditure has been overstated by the opponents of the Bill. If you will look at the map of Canada, you will see that the line from Moncton to Quebec is, roughly speaking, about one-fifth of the whole distance from Moncton to Winnipeg. (I rely upon dimensions as measured on the map.) It is about one-tenth of the whole distance from Moncton to Port Simpson, the western terminus of the road. Now, does it not appear to the House to be a question of small potatoes, when you are providing for a great transcontinental line from ocean to ocean, and there is a distinct national object to be served, a great national hope to be realized, a clear and strong national aspiration to be gratified, by the undertaking—does it not, I ask, seem to the House, and will it not, on due reflection, seem to the people of this country, to be a very small matter indeed, to cavil over the question whether we shall or shall not extend the railway a tenth part further than in the opinion of some of us it may be absolutely necessary. It is a matter of three hundred and fifty or four hundred miles of railway out of three or four thousand miles in all. It may involve an expenditure of perhaps ten million dollars. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals even does not state it at more than $15,000,000, and his figures are extravagantly high. It may impose an outlay in interest of $300,000 or $450,000 a year. The government will have to pay this interest for seven years, when the load will be lifted from its shoulders by the company. The present value of these deferred payments may be less at the completion of the road than two million dollars, and cannot be more than three millions. And it is this expenditure of two or three million dollars that is going to bring ruin and disaster to the Dominion of Canada. The farm of every man in this country our opposition friends may be conceived as saying, is going to be mortgaged from this date; while grass grows and water runs, for the sum of fifty cents for the building of this road from Quebec to Moncton. Is it not a terrible outlook? Why the whole expenditure is less than we have made upon the mere terminal facilities that have been provided at Halifax and St. John. This expenditure is to be made, as the Premier has well shown, to redeem the faith of parliament pledged to the people of this country. The people of the maritime provinces have always held, the people of Halifax more particularly have been persistent in the contention, that the abandonment of the Harvey-Salisbury link of the short line railway was a clear breach of faith with the people who were interested in its construction. Now, surely, it will not be said that two or three million dollars of the money of Canada, a sum equal to from thirty-three to fifty cents a head of the population is an exorbitant sum to pay to redeem the honour of this parliament, and surely it is not an unreasonable sum for this House to vote, even if there were no question of honour in the matter, and the only question at stake was the hope of making the maritime provinces in fact, what they are now largely in form alone, an integral portion of the Dominion of Canada. Sir, if there were but one chance in twenty that this expenditure might result in giving the cities of St. John and Halifax the same position in this Dominion that Boston, New York and Philadelphia hold in the community of states that constitutes the American republic, there is no Canadian worthy of the name who would begrudge his portion of the outlay, and I fail to understand how any hon. gentleman from the provinces beside the sea can oppose this portion of the scheme without being untrue to the interests of the people that he represents.

But the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has objected to this part of the arrangement because it is proposed to parallel the Intercolonial Railway. Now, I do not wish to repeat any part of the argument that has already been addressed to the House; but I cannot refrain from referring in this connection to the exceedingly sensible and apposite comment on this part of the hon. gentleman's argument on the morning after the ministerial explanations were given to the House. The Morning 'Citizen,' speaking of the reasons given by the ex-minister for his procedure, said:

> The ostensible reason given is the objection of the minister to the clause in the Grand Trunk scheme which provides for the paralleling of the Intercolonial from Moncton north. Nobody who knows the Minister of Railways well would take seriously the report that he would object to the national expenditure of money entailed by the building of another government road from one end of his province to the other. There has been a good deal of talk of double-tracking the Intercolonial to increase its capacity so as to enable it to handle a transcontinental traffic. But the financial difference between double-tracking an existing

road and building a new line is not of such an extent that it may not be justified on the ground that a separate line will afford additional facilities for the province through which it operates.

I do not quote these words for the purpose, with which they were written, of prying into the motives of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, or discrediting the account that he has given to the House of the actual reasons for the steps that he has taken. I have no doubt that he has given us a truthful statement on that matter. We know, however, that he was smarting under a sense of the slight that he imagined had been put upon him. He felt this keenly enough to place it in the forefront of his letter to the Premier, when every possible consideration of policy would have counselled him to leave the facts to be revealed, if at all, by his biographer. We may well discount the value of a political judgment on a great national question when the mind of the judge was obscured by such a cloud as this. One of the greatest of poets has given us the picture of the wrath that can animate even a celestial mind under the sting of a wounded self-admiration; and the whole demeanour of the hon. gentleman since he abandoned his colleagues has been such as to confirm the skepticism of the 'Morning Citizen' as to the simplicity and singleness of the motive by which the hon. gentleman has been impelled. It may well be that no mere differences of opinion could have inspired the ferocity of his attack upon his former leader, or betrayed him into the mistake of sneering at the man whom this country delights to honour, and whose shoes' latchets the hon. gentleman might well consider himself honoured in being permitted to unloose. Nevertheless, I do not quote these words for the purpose of throwing doubt upon his motives; I quote them for their intrinsic value, for their great significance, having regard to the source from which they come, and for the sagacious view that they present, as to the comparative unimportance of the difference between the proposals of the government and proposals which it is understood the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would not have been unwilling to entertain. They show that even to the mind of a convinced opponent of the scheme, the point on which the ex-minister has staked his political existence is not a vital point, nay, more, that it is in fact a meritorious element in the arrangement. Surely nobody in this country would have been thrown into convulsions of terror and alarm if the proposal had been made to double-track the Intercolonial as part of a scheme for a national transcontinental line of railway. Then, as this writer very properly points out, the difference between the cost of double-tracking and the cost of building an additional line of railway may well be compensated by the additional facilities afforded for local traffic to the portions of the country through which the road will be constructed.

But this is by no means all that can be said for the proposal. Everybody knows that when the Intercolonial road was built there were serious differences of opinion as to the proper line for its location. A writer in the 'Morning Chronicle' of Halifax, who is vouched for as a railway expert, and who certainly writes from copious and exact information on the subject, has given us the history of the dispute between Mr. Wilkinson, the government engineer of the province of New Brunswick, and Major Robinson, who was appointed by the imperial government to report upon the route. Mr. Wilkinson recommended a route through the centre of New Brunswick. Major Robinson favoured the present location of the road. Now, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has told us that the road recommended by Mr. Wilkinson was and is impracticable. He has read from the report of Sir Sandford Fleming to that effect. But as the hon. member for Westmoreland has clearly established, he has, I do not assume intentionally, distorted utterly the effect of that report. Moreover, even if this had not been shown, the hon. member should have noticed that Sir Sandford Fleming's report is largely based upon the surveys of Major Robinson, and Major Robinson was expressly commissioned to locate a military road. Mr. Wilkinson, who was the government engineer of the province of New Brunswick, never concurred in Major Robinson's opinion, and never ceased to contend for the central as against the northern road, which eventually, for military rather than for either commercial or engineering reasons, was the one adopted. Now, let us imagine that the views of Mr. Wilkinson had, in fact, prevailed, and that the line had been constructed through the centre of New Brunswick as he had recommended that it should be. Does any hon. member believe that we would have endured to this day without another line of railway running along the north shore of New Brunswick and the south shore of the River St. Lawrence? Does any hon. member imagine that the prosperous and thriving settlements along the present line of the Intercolonial Railway would have given this parliament any rest until they were afforded the same railway accommodation that other sections of the community were enjoying? A line of railway would certainly have been constructed corresponding substantially with the present line of the Intercolonial. It would have been constructed without criticism and with universal concurrence, and the condition of things would have become precisely such as will be brought about under the operation of this Bill. Why, then, the alarm and clamour? Why all these groans and lamentations over a proposal to bring about a condition of affairs

which would have been established with universal acquiescence if the course of history had only been a little different from that which it actually happened to pursue?

There is still another method of testing the propriety of this expenditure. Study the maps of New Brunswick and of the lower portion of the province of Quebec. This section of country will compare favourably in soil, in climate, in natural resources, and in everything that goes to make the home of a happy and contented population, with any of the New England states. Apart from the greater density of population, there is no reason why it should not furnish traffic for a railway mileage equal to that of any of the New England states. Now, what do you find to be the fact? Outside of the state of Maine, I believe you could not travel in a direct line in any of the New England states for more than twenty miles without crossing a railroad track, and in many places you would cross a number of them. How is it in New Brunswick? From the line of the Intercolonial on the north shore of New Brunswick across the province to the state of Maine, there is an immense area of country, from eighty to a hundred miles in width, without a single mile of railway. Why should this country not be opened up by a railway, even if the construction of such a road were not in the least degree essential as a link in a transcontinental road from ocean to ocean? I consider that this is a most important aspect of the question. Standing alone it might not, in the estimation of some hon. gentlemen, be sufficient, as it certainly would be in the minds of others, to justify the expenditure. But, taken as part of the consideration for the outlay, it is surely a most important element in the case. The older provinces of the Dominion have done much for the development of our national heritage in the west. We have voted our millions, not only without a murmur, but with unfailing cheerfulness and alacrity. The lower provinces in particular have derived hardly any material benefit from the heavy expenditures that they have been called upon to make for these great undertakings. With them it has been very largely a matter of patriotism and national sentiment alone. They have cheerfully seen their sons go forth from their midst for the peopling of the western lands, though the movement of population should leave their own fields untilled that once laughed with the harvest, and result in the reversion to forest of lands that were cleared a hundred years ago. These results of the opening up of the west were clearly foreseen, and there was a time when even Sir John A. Macdonald himself looked upon the movement with misgivings and apprehensions as to its effects upon the older provinces. But we have, all of us, outgrown these views.

Nobody in these days regrets what has happened in this respect or would wish that the course of events had been other than it has been. But it is not for the interest of the country as a whole that this movement of population should go beyond what is reasonable. We of the lower provinces desire most keenly to retain our relative position in the Dominion as long as it is possible to maintain it. It is in the interest of the country as a whole that the balance should not be needlessly or greatly disturbed. We desire to retain a strong, a vigorous and a continually increasing population within our borders, and it is certainly to the interest of the Dominion as a whole that we should do so. To my mind nothing in the whole history of the United States is more pathetic, and few things are more lamentable, than the extent to which the descendants of the original population of New England have given place to the children of alien races. The statues of the old Puritan founders are in their parks and gardens, their streets and market places. Their memorial tablets are in their churches and public halls, and their names are immortalized in towns and villages and hamlets throughout the old colonies. But the descendants of these men are, many of them, no longer there, and those that are there no longer control the destinies or direct the spirit of New England. Another race has come to fill the tenantless houses and occupy the abandoned farms, a people that, as Matthew Arnold says, does not strike its roots down lovingly into the soil and that has little in common with the ideals on which the New England commonwealths were founded. Now, if we can do anything to prevent the history of New England from repeating itself in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, I am sure it is well worth while to make the effort. The construction of this road will be a step in this direction, and a step of the very greatest importance. Every railroad that is constructed, every new industry that establishes itself along its line, every new mail route that is opened up, every new church and school house that are built, help to make the country more attractive and more habitable, more likely to retain in our midst the population, without which we cannot hold the position which it is in the interest of the country as a whole that we should occupy as members of the confederation.

I think, moreover, that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways has been unduly alarmed as to the extent to which the building of this road will militate against the interests of the Intercolonial. Not that I concede for a moment that if it should have that effect it would be any the less our duty to proceed with the undertaking. The hon. gentleman has watched over the Intercolonial so long and, I may concede, so tenderly and efficiently as well, that it may have become a hobby with him, or, like golf or billiards, it has developed into a passion. Indeed, in his particular case, it seems almost to have assumed the appearance of a

new kind of disease, and certainly it has assailed him in a particularly acute and aggravated form. He naturally would be inclined to look with fear and suspicion upon anything that would threaten the sources of its trade. But for the rest of us the Intercolonial must not be a fetish. The railroads, as the Premier well said, are made for man and not man for the railroads. The Intercolonial, I suppose, was built to serve the country. The country was not formed primarily for the purpose of feeding the Intercolonial. Therefore, even if it had to be conceded that the Intercolonial was to be destroyed by the Grand Trunk Pacific, we would be only pursuing the policy that has, we are told, been the secret of the immense and marvellous progress of the manufacturing industries of the United States. When their actual machinery and appliances were not up to the highest standard of perfection they pitched them into the junk heap, no matter how recently purchased or installed, no matter how expensive. If the Intercolonial Railway is over a hundred miles longer than it need be, if its use involves unprofitable expense and unnecessary delay, if a shorter and better route can be adopted, then we must insist on its adoption, even if it should make scrap iron of the present road.

But on this point, as on others, the hon. gentleman has altered his views essentially since he stated the excuses for his desertion of his colleagues. If I understood his speech at all, he demonstrated that the superiority of the Intercolonial Railway was so great over the Canadian Pacific short line to begin with, and over any possible line that could be constructed through the province of New Brunswick, that no matter what the Grand Trunk Pacific might do it could not take away its traffic from the Intercolonial. Why then, under these conditions, he should have shed such bitter, scalding tears as he did and drop them in such profusion over the fate of the people along the line of the Intercolonial, because its traffic was going to be destroyed and the road dismantled, perhaps he would explain some other day when he experiences another of those sudden and incomprehensible changes of opinion that he has been so frequently undergoing ever since he left the safe anchorage of his position as a loyal minister of the Crown. I agree as to the merits and position of the Intercolonial more nearly with the opinions in his speech than with those of his letters. When he left the government because of his fears for the Intercolonial I believe he was unduly alarmed. He failed to consider, as he has since been evidently led to consider, that the Intercolonial will still have some resources left with which to meet the competition of the proposed new road. That road will simply cross the Intercolonial at Quebec. It will come to Quebec on the west through a wholly different territory from that traversed by the Intercolonial, and it will proceed eastward through a wholly different country. What reason is there for assuming that it will take any part of the traffic of the Intercolonial beyond that which originates in the vicinity of Quebec and Lévis? All the conditions of the situation as they exist to-day will remain unchanged, with the exception of this transcontinental road crossing the Intercolonial at a single point and reaching out both east and west through a country that the Intercolonial does not touch. Now, the traffic originating in Lévis and its vicinity and the traffic from the maritime provinces destined for Lévis and vicinity yields the Intercolonial Railway a very small proportion of its actual earnings, and whatever will be lost from this source of income to the Intercolonial will be more than compensated, will be compensated ten times over, by the traffic developed over the new line both west of and east of Quebec which must be carried over the Intercolonial to seek its outlet at the Atlantic ports.

Before I leave the subject of the Moncton section there is just one further remark I wish to make, because of the diversion which some hon. gentlemen in this House, and some very wise newspapers in the country, have derived from the argument of the Prime Minister with reference to the bonding privilege. I must, in all candour, say that there is hardly any other branch of this case on which the opponents of this measure, including the hon. ex-minister, who certainly is capable of better things, have talked more nonsense than they have on this phase of the question. The hon. leader of the opposition quoted from an old speech of his former leader to show that the bonding privilege could not be cancelled, because it was held under a treaty. But he had, just a few moments before he read this passage, been listening to the reading of a message of President Cleveland, in which he recommended that Congress should pass legislation for the express purpose of placing this matter in the arbitrium of the executive. And if ever a man was in earnest it was President Cleveland that was in earnest when he made this recommendation to Congress. My hon. friend was not leader of the opposition in those days. He was not then in parliament. He was, like myself, in his political short-clothes. I know not whether he read the newspapers then or not. But if he ever did, and if he took any interest whatever in the public affairs of the country, he must remember the apprehensions that existed throughout this country lest the threat of President Cleveland should be carried into execution.

The hon. gentleman, who has been followed in this contention by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways, has argued that the bonding privilege will never be cancelled, because it is in the interest of the United States as much as it is to our advantage that it should be retained. Sancta simplici-

tas ! Did anybody ever hear such an answer to a suggestion of grave national peril ? As if nations, when their blood is up, ever pause to consider their material interests. Was it in the material interest of the United States a few years ago to plunge into a war with England for the delimitation of a boundary line in Venezuela ; yet we were about as near to a war as nations ever go without the actual exchange of blows. Was it in the interest of the Boer republics to go to war with England over the question of the Uitlanders' franchise ? What is true in this respect of wars that are waged with rifle and bayonet thrust, is equally true of those that are fought with tariffs and trade privileges. Men do not 'pause on passion's fiery wheel to count the measure of their pulse.' The hon. ex-Minister of Railways did not pause to consider the tangled web of self-contradiction and self-stultification in which he was about to involve himself when in a moment, whether of keen resentment or of high conviction, it is not for me to judge, he threw up his portfolio, turned his back upon his colleagues and slammed the door in their faces. And nations are no wiser than individuals are. They do not pause to weigh the question of material or pecuniary interest when the national spirit is aroused over some real or imaginary grievance. If we had stopped to consider our pecuniary and material interests, I am not sure that we would have imposed the surcharge on the goods of Germany. But we did impose it. The national spirit called for the measure, and the national spirit will sustain the government, no matter whether it is conducive to our material interests or not.

Should the day come when the national spirit of the United States is aroused over any real or supposed unfairness in the conduct of this country, the bonding privilege may be cancelled with as little regard to questions of material and pecuniary interest as there was when the reciprocity treaty was abrogated. No truer note was ever sounded in this House than that in which the Premier asked this House to sanction this measure for this, among other reasons : to secure the independence of the country and render it indifferent to the whims and caprices of our neighbours. True enough, we are not absolutely at their mercy as it is ; we have the Intercolonial Railway. But every hon. member must have reflected that the Intercolonial Railway, under present conditions and in such an emergency would simply be a raft in a shipwreck. I well remember in a general way, what those to whom this line of reading and study is a specialty, will recall with fuller accuracy, the discussions that took place when the Intercolonial Railway was about to be constructed, and how it was even at that day represented by wise and high authorities that its chief use would be, not as a road for actual traffic purposes, but rather as a lever to keep the road open to Portland for the service of the people of this country. This very idea finds expression in the report of Sir Sandford Fleming, which has already been more than once referred to in this debate. The suggestions of the opposition on this subject are in accord with this line of policy. But we have reached a more advanced stage of public opinion and a more truly national conception of the proper attitude of this country. We do not simply want a little bit of national road with no effective connections and no continental trade. So long as we continue under those conditions the fear of the dislocations of business and the infinite loss and suffering that must follow the cancellation of the bonding privilege will for ever be a handicap to the government of this country, no matter of what its political complexion, in any contest for the rights of this country where their assertion may threaten the cancellation of the privilege. Neither the friends nor the enemies of this measure will do it justice if they fail to recognize it as a bona fide effort, a heroic effort, let it be conceded, but a well-meant effort, and one that is full of promise, to make this national transcontinental railway a main artery of commerce between the inland and the sea, and to build up within our own borders the cities through which the commerce of the nation shall flow to the great markets of the world.

I am afraid that I have dealt at somewhat inordinate length with the questions that I have been discussing. I have certainly done so, if the views are correct which are expressed by the editor of the Toronto 'World.' In his judgment all these questions that I have been considering are mere trifles. He has given us a description of a kind of criticism which nobody can read without realizing that it was meant for a summary of the reply delivered by his leader to the speech of the right hon. leader of the House in introducing the Bill, and he says that this sort of criticism is of no value. This, he says, is a great proposal and the criticism of it must be on big lines. The picayune criticisms of the hon. leader of the opposition he pronounces a failure. The opposition, he says, must discover an alternative to the government proposal, and that alternative is government ownership of the road. The hon. member for South Lanark appears to agree with him, and the hon. ex-Minister of Railways has told us that his first choice would have been as to this matter at all events to row in the same boat with the hon. member for East York and the hon. member for South Lanark. The hon. leader of the opposition has not quite made up his mind about the matter. He has heard a good deal of irresponsible chatter about government ownership of railways just as he has heard of free silver and faith healing and innumerable other fads and crotchets. But he is a prosaic and common-

sense sort of person with little imagination and no sentiment, and while these imaginative enthusiasts, like the two ex-Ministers of Railways and the hon. member for East York, are ready to put to sea, he shrinks into himself. He 'lingers shivering on the brink and fears to launch away.' I must confess that I am with him in his misgivings. When I heard the hon. ex-Minister of Railways read from his letter to the Premier the passage in which he expressed his first preference for 'a government-owned and government-operated railway' based upon the exploded theory of its 'equalizing and regulating influence upon all the other railways' with which it would come into competiaion, I must confess that his words produced the effect of a sudden shock. If they had been spoken by some raw young person like the former member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), I would not have been surprised. If they had come from the light-hearted visionary from East York who elaborates his theories of state policy on the wing, in the course of his hitherings and thitherings between his seat in parliament and his desk in Toronto, there would have been nothing in the circumstance to astonish the House of Commons. It would simply have been another illustration of what Mr. Ackworth has said that the movement for government operation is like the scarlet fever. It is liable to attack any community and at irregular intervals to become epidemic, but its attacks as a rule are severe, only in the case of the younger and more impressionable portion of the population. But when a hard-headed and practical person such as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways, who has had seven years' experience of government ownership and operation, and who must be presumed to have given some serious consideration to the subject, concurs in the views of the hon. member for East York and seems to be supported by the hon. member for South Lanark, the time has surely arrived for a calm and careful consideration of the question.

Now, I must admit at the outset, that I have a great degree of sympathy with the views those hon. gentlemen have presented to the House. I have been at times seriously threatened with the symptoms of the disease with which they are afflicted. When the theory of government ownership was broached in the Railway Committee by some hon. gentlemen in the discussion of the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill, my heart went out towards them, and if I had been able to dispose to my own satisfaction of the very serious difficulties and objections by which the proposition is beset, I certainly would have been pleased to find that I was able to join them in the advocacy of such a measure. I started with a very strong bias in favour of the proposition and I have on more than one occasion indicated my preference for some such solution of the railway question if it could be safely brought about. But I am compelled to admit that the authoritative voices are for the most part opposed to the proposal for which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways has expressed his preference. I have quoted parenthetically the views of Mr. Ackworth, whose position and authority will be recognized by everyone who has read the literature of the question. A more scientific writer is the one I have already mentioned, M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu. In his work on 'the modern state and its functions' he has a chapter devoted wholly to the presentation of the arguments for and against the proposition under discussion. He shows that the two countries in which a moderate and qualified success has been achieved in the state operation of railways are not really modern states at all. They are not moulded on the democratic model. In Prussia the central power is practically independent of parliament, if not absolutely so, in the general direction of political affairs, at least it is so in the choice and conduct of the personnel of the administration. Even Belgium, although it approaches more nearly to the democratic model, differs in two essential particulars from a real democracy, namely, in the narrowness of its suffrage, and in the relative permanence of its administration. The political conditions in both countries are so entirely different from those prevailing, as he suggests, in France and the United States, and let me add, so entirely different from those prevailing in the Dominion of Canada, that it is utterly impossible to argue from the partial and qualified success of government operation in Germany and Belgium, that we would enjoy any similar exemption from failure and disaster here.

The analogy of the post office and the telegraph, he rejects as being inapplicable. The post and telegraph system in France represents a receipt of 180,000,000 francs. The corresponding figure for the railways in France is ten or twelve hundred million francs. In Great Britain and Ireland he states the gross receipts of the post office and telegraph system as a little over nine million pounds sterling, while the receipts of the railways amount to over seventy-one millions. Because in the narrow and restricted sphere of the post office and the telegraph the government has successfully taken possession, it does not follow that a staff of state officials would be found competent to conduct a business infinitely more extended. But this is not the only difference between the cases. The service of the post office and the telegraph is of a simple and elementary character. That of a railway is complex and difficult in the extreme. The question of tariffs, as we all know, is an exceedingly complicated one, requiring the highest quality of expert knowledge and experience. It is so difficult that the House will remember one occasion when the ex-Minister of Railways could not make his

predecessor, the hon. member for South Lanark, understand even the meaning of the terms used in the Railway Commission Bill to define the different classes of tariffs, with which the commission will have to deal. Whether it was from want of lucidity in the explanations or from defectiveness in the 'uptake,' it would be invidious to say. Possibly there was a little of both ; but out of respect for such high authorities we will assume that the trouble was due to the intrinsic difficulty of the subject.

The expenditures for material of every kind required for a railway call for a business knowledge that a political department cannot be expected to possess, and expose the minister to the constant suspicion of the country on the score of favouritism and boodling. Every political party when in opposition believes its opponents on the treasury benches to be guilty of these offences, and a large percentage of the common people believe both parties guilty. Even the high character and lofty integrity of Alexander Mackenzie did not exempt him from charges of this nature in connection with his purchases of rails for the road that was afterwards handed over to the Canadian Pacific. And if charges of this nature could be brought against Mackenzie, and be believed for a time by one-half of the people of Canada, what must be the suspicions that will rest upon public men whose reputations do not stand so clearly out as his, beyond the reach of any reasonable suspicion ?

The writer next refers to the enormous army of employees which under the system of government operation must be subject to the control of the administration of the day. In Great Britain, at the date of his writing, there were three hundred thousand of these employees ; in France about two hundred thousand, 'of whom the number is bound to be increased.' The smaller the number of state functionaries, the better the chance of preserving the precious boon of political liberty.

> When the number of employees of the state goes beyond five or six per cent of the electoral body political liberty is greatly endangered. When the state functionaries form ten per cent of the electors it ceases to exist.

Nothing could be better than his statement of the injurious political consequences that must flow from the great extension of political power which the government ownership of railways would involve. Let me quote his very words, or at least present a fair translation of them :

> The modern state, which belongs in a precarious fashion to a party, the personnel of which is changed from time to time as the chances of the ballot may determine, would be strongly tempted to transform the operation of the railways into an instrument of electoral corruption. It would have no power to resist the multiplication of trains, the increase in the number of employees, the removal of political opponents and their replacement by others. The modern state is almost completely delivered over to considerations of political expediency. This is a condition that applies to every branch of the public service, and for this reason it is well that the sphere of government operation should be as restricted as possible.

Such are some of the considerations, altogether apart from those derived from actual experience which he presents in opposition to the system of government operation. Coming down to actual experience, his demonstration is equally if not more cogent. Taking the system of government operation as he finds it at its best, in Germany and Belgium, he affirms it as a proposition not even open to debate that the system of government operation is more costly, less punctual, and more liable to accident than the system of company roads. Convincing statistics are presented on these points which it would be tedious to quote, and the author supports his argument in many of its details by citations from the reports of M. LeHardy de Beaulieu to the Belgian Chamber of Representatives.

I know that a question of this kind is not going to be determined by the marshalling of authorities, but I cannot forbear to cite the words of another writer who has made a more comprehensive presentation of the science of railroading than any other that I know of. I refer to Marshall J. Kirkman. I do not know how his authority is appraised by those who do not know, but he is described as one of the foremost railway men of the world, having spent his whole life in the service, besides having been, throughout his life, a diligent student of the railway question in its every phase. It should be a sufficient testimony to the value of his work that it has gone through at least five editions. How many more there may have been I do not know. He has presented the question in no less than twelve volumes, covering the whole service from the organization of the companies down to the coupling and uncoupling of the cars. His general remarks on the subject of state ownership are as wise as they are witty :

> When anything goes wrong in the world or seems to go wrong, the ignorant and thoughtless everywhere rise up and call upon the government to interfere, as if a perfunctory body made up of agents loosely selected at best were more trustworthy than the mass from which it derives its life. Government interference is 'the sine qua non' of young people, the hopeful, confiding and simple. It is the fancy of cranks and schemers.

I cannot undertake to assign to these several classes the hon. members who have advocated the policy in this House. They include the young and confiding, the cranks and the schemers. The ex-Minister of Railways will not be included among the young and confiding, and he has not heretofore been counted as a crank. Yet I will not draw the conclusion. Let me, rather, proceed with the quotation :

> It is never fully adequate. It lacks in intelligent interest, energy and adaptability. It more-

over has the effect of weakening personal interest and individual effort. Its substitute for private effort is to trade off the practical experience and enthusiasm of the nation for the service of hired men. Government management lacks the spirit of alertness and desire to please. It is at once meddlesome, slow, cumbrous and bumptious. In no case has the train service of railroads managed by governments kept pace with that of lines operated by private corporations either as regards safety or efficiency.

These I am aware are only opinions, and I freely concede that the ex-Minister of Railways could confidently present his management of the Intercolonial Railway as a set-off to some of the accusations that have been brought against this system of state ownership and operation. He has given us a brilliant illustration of the capacity of the governent road to compete with a company road in the case of the cattle that went over the Intercolonial after the embargo prevented them from going through the United States. It shows what intellectual paralysis may come upon even a clever person when he gets on the wrong track. Did it never suggest itself to the hon. gentleman that it was not very conclusive as to the competing capacity of the Intercolonial that it should be able to beat the Canadian Pacific when its hands were tied behind its back by an embargo? The fighting must usually take place under normal conditions, and under normal conditions the ex-minister, as I have said, has time and again bewailed his impotence.

I will refer to this point more fully in another connection, but in the meantime let me deal for a moment with the proposal that has been made by way of obviating the very palpable objections to the proposition that the roads should be operated directly by the government through a minister responsible to this House. Some hon. gentlemen have advocated the idea that the government should own the roads, but should not directly operate them. Let them be built by the government, they say, and operated by a commission. In this manner we secure the rights of the public, and at the same time avoid the political dangers resulting from the direct control of the roads by the administration. I am afraid that even this proposal offers no satisfactory solution of the question. We have had the suggestion made that we should place this continental road in the charge of Mr. Hays, or Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, or some railroad man of equally eminent position and ability. But the question immediately occurs, what money would we have to pay to secure the services of an efficient manager? The companies pay without compunction and without wincing, salaries as large as forty or fifty thousand dollars. Do you think the sovereign people would ever consent to install such a nabob as that, and pay for his services at such a figure? Every editor of a paper in this country, who gets one or two thousand dollars a year, would lift up his voice against the outrage. Every barnstormer in the back country would inveigh against the extravagance of the provision for the luxury of such a railway dictator. Fancy the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the back concessions of his riding, with such a theme as this to dilate upon? What hurricanes of vacuous eloquence would he not bring to bear upon the devoted head of the unfortunate official? Would he not demand, with much show of reason, that his salary should at the highest not exceed that of the Premier? How long would a democracy, that thinks its first minister well paid at ten thousand dollars and its judges overpaid at salaries ranging from two to seven thousand, be willing to pay forty or fifty thousand dollars for the services of a railway magnate? We may be well assured that such an official would speedily become the most unpopular person in the country. His position would become intolerable. His powers would be assailed as an encroachment on the rights of the people, and the demand for direct and immediate ministerial control would become as clamorous and insistent as it was in Victoria, and would be followed by the same disastrous consequences here as there. We should pass through a period of wild and senseless experiments such as have brought disaster and virtual bankruptcy upon some of the Australian colonies until we were ready to call in the railway commissioner again, as Victoria has done within the past few months.

I have referred in passing to the railway question, as it has presented itself in the Australian colonies. Let me deal a little more fully with the history of the matter on the continent of Europe. I do so for the purpose of establishing two propositions:—first, that while government operation may not be feasible, government ownership is feasible, and the best method of managing the business, under a system of government ownership, is the method that has been adopted in the measure now before the House; secondly, that, as to government operation of the railroads, no matter what conclusion we may come to on the general question, it is well established that no system of government operation can be successfully undertaken excepting under two conditions, neither of which exists in the Dominion of Canada. The first condition is that the government must not simply possess itself of a single line of road to be run in competition with a number of other roads; it must have the whole or none. The second condition is that there must be a complete and perfect organization of the civil service, making it absolutely independent of political parties and absolutely free from the dictation of the government of the day.

Let me discuss these propositions briefly,

in the light of the actual railway experiences through which the European countries have passed. It will be no information to those who have made a study of this question, that in 1844 Mr. Gladstone secured the passing of an Act, under which the railways of the country might be acquired after the expiration of twenty-one years from the date of the enactment, under the conditions and by means of methods fully set out in the Act of parliament. In 1865 the time arrived when the option of the government could be exercised, but public opinion was not ripe for the adoption of the plan, and a commission of inquiry was appointed, under the headship of the Duke of Devonshire. It sat for many months and examined many witnesses. Its report is embodied in no less than seven huge volumes, which may be found in the library of parliament. I do not suppose that any hon. member of this House has ever read the whole of this report, and I doubt if life would not be too short to warrant one in undertaking such a task. But happily it would not be necessary, for the whole matter is summed up with the utmost lucidity in the conclusions arrived at by the commission. The argument against the proposal is embodied in the report of the majority. The argument in favour is presented in the strongest possible form by Sir Rowland Hill in a minority report. I do not propose to refer to either class of arguments. My purpose, in mentioning the matter, is to refer to the striking and convincing fact that neither the majority nor the minority of the commission ever dreamed, apparently, of any kind of government operation beyond such as is provided for in the measure now before the House. They do not seem to have considered it thinkable that the government should itself directly enter upon the experiment of running a system of state railways. I suppose it would have seemed to Sir Rowland Hill to be the wildest sort of midsummer madness to propose, as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals seems, from his own statement, to have proposed to his colleagues in the cabinet, that the government should own and operate this transcontinental road. They assumed that what the government would do would be to acquire the railways just as we are building the road from Winnipeg to Moncton and lease them to companies, as we are leasing this road to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

The experience of Italy is full of instruction also on this part of the question. It is nowhere better presented than by Mr. Hendrick in his essay on the subject of 'Railway Control by Commissions,' a monograph published by the Putnams, of New York, in their series of economical studies on questions of the day. Mr. Hendrick is described as a Ricardo Prize Fellow of Harvard University, and nobody can read his book without appreciating its lucidity and sobriety of statement.

> No country, he well says, has had an experience with railroads more worthy of study than Italy. . . . The working of government control in Italy has not only been clear but it has been brought into relief by the contrasts of the various systems she has tried one with another. She has tried the method of private enterprise with aid from the government, then the guarantee of interest to private companies in imitation of the system still prevailing in France, together with state construction of roads to compete with the private lines it was supporting——

This is the method submitted as his preference over all others by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

> —then for a period of five or six years, from 1879 to 1885, the state owned and operated all the roads, when this system in turn was abandoned in favour of the system now in operation.

While the roads were being operated by the state, a commission was sitting which had been appointed by the Italian government for the express purpose of determining what was best to be done for the settlement of a difficult problem. It was composed of fifteen members, six being senators, seven deputies, and the remaining two engineers. Its work, as Mr. Hendrick says, was without a parallel in railway history. The commissioners began by circulating throughout Italy among all classes who had any interest in railways, a series of nearly two hundred printed questions. Answers, oral and written, were invited to any or all of these questions, and they were made so explicit and precise that each who had a special bit of information might find a category for it. The commission sat in every large city of the peninsula, took oral testimony and invited essays from all who had, or claimed to have, any understanding of the question. So bulky was the information obtained by the commission that it was not until 1881 that it was ready to report. The gist of its report is given by this writer in the following words :

> That it was well for the state to own the railways but unwise for the state to operate them ; that it was wise to leave the whole railway system to private corporations. Their arguments were that this was the best way to strengthen the finances of the government and insure efficient public service, that by this arrangement two great evils would be done away with, the first, the demoralization caused by the appointment and control of an army of railway officials, the second, the centralization of the vast power of appointment and the burden of constant supervision to prevent its abuse.

The evils of government operation, as they developed themselves in Italy, are presented by Mr. Hendrick in striking colours. 'The railway system, according to the commissioners, had become a sort of general hospital for friends, relatives and hangers-on of the local deputies, and in the matter of rates there was the same situation. Annually a general scramble took place to fix the tariffs to suit local and special in-

terests. The rates came to resemble a congressional river and harbour appropriation.'

I will not go so far as to say that we have had a taste of these very evils in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. It is a comparatively small piece of government road. It has the exclusive attention of an able minister of the Crown, and unlimited liberty to call upon the taxpayers of Canada when it is in difficulties. It might be hoped that it would be administered with comparative freedom from the pressure of localities for concessions, of hangers-on for employment, and of political supporters for the privilege of furnishing supplies. We know, however, that every party that is in opposition believes the actual administration of the road for the time being to be characterized by all the evils described by Mr. Hendrick as attending the management of the state railways in Italy. Small as it is comparatively, it seems to have been impossible for the minister to secure a manager to his satisfaction or to retain the services of a manager once he has been selected. One after another they have come and gone, the Harrises and the Russells, and I know not how many others. They have come to the task with high personal hopes and large public expectations, but one after the other they have gone their way, leaving the old reliables in undisputed possession of the field; and I certainly have no fault to find with the present heads of the official staff or the present administration of the road. But let its proportions be extended to embrace a transcontinental system instead of a comparatively small piece of road connecting the maritime and inland provinces, and I fear it would require more than all the energy and ability of even the outgoing Minister of Railways and Canals to save it from the fate that has befallen other government roads in other countries. Even under the present conditions great resistance is required to keep up the staff. There is not a man who has broken down in other walks of life or proved his complete incapacity for effective work of any kind who does not look upon the Intercolonial Railway as the heaven-ordained sphere for his activities. 'The blind, the lame and the lazy' are all applicants for the privilege of serving the country in one capacity or other in connection with the government road. They may be resisted for a time, as I believe they have been effectually resisted by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and the staff may be kept, as I believe it is at present, a competent and efficient staff. But the pressure is there and it will continue. Eternal vigilance is the price of safety. It is a good deal to hope that this vigilance will always be continued, even under present conditions. With the area enlarged, as I have suggested, I must confess I should despair of the situation. It would not be within the possibilities of human nature to resist the importunities of members, each in turn under pressure from his constituents, for employment for which the applicant was unfitted, for patronage to which the applicant was not entitled, for concessions which were opposed to the interests of the community at large. The road would become 'a general hospital,' not perhaps as in Italy, 'for the friends and relatives and hangers-on of the local deputy,' but certainly for all manner and degrees of official incompetency, backed up by political pressure upon the local representatives. No wonder that the Italian commissioners rejected this proposal, and adopted in lieu of it the method which the government has adopted in the present Bill for the management of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton.

This branch of the government proposal then, let me conclude as to this part of the case, is in line with the only system of government ownership regarded as worthy of consideration by the Duke of Devonshire's commission, the only system that seems to have been thought feasible by Sir Rowland Hill, who was a sincere and able advocate of government ownership. It is the very system hit upon by the Italian commissioners after the most uniquely thorough and comprehensive inquiry instituted by the Italian commission, and I may say that it is the system which I understand to have been recommended by a railway authority in this country, who has given a great deal of study and consideration to this question, who has been pronounced by the late leader of the opposition a profound and thorough student of the subject, and whose writings on this question, although not widely known, are known to some hon. members of this House as constituting a very careful, learned and thorough study of the problem. I refer to Mr. Powell, of Sackville, New Brunswick, who represented Westmoreland in the last parliament, and who, it was generally assumed, was to be the Minister of Railways and Canals in the cabinet to be formed by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) in 1900, had it not been for the little accident that befel him in his county and the greater accident that befel his party in the general elections. I believe that the former member for Westmoreland is almost the only public man in Canada who has ever made a serious study of this question, and I understand that his conclusions are in line with those adopted by the Italian commission, which, in turn, are exactly in line with the plan adopted by the government for the operation of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. I will certainly have a right to be surprised if that gentleman is not an enthusiastic supporter of this portion at all events, of the measure now before the House.

The question has been very fairly asked by some hon. gentlemen: If this is a government system for the section from Win-

nipeg to Moncton, why is it not equally applicable to the road from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast ? Nothing could be easier than the answer to this inquiry. It is conceded on all hands, that there is not at present business, and there may not for years be business, for more than one new line from Winnipeg to Moncton. The whole stress of the argument of hon. members opposite is that there is not business for even one new line. West of Winnipeg the conditions are altogether different. It is almost universally conceded that there is practically no limit to the number of lines that will be wanted. The fertility of the western lands and the swelling tide of business in the western country warrant the government in two assumptions ; first, that private enterprise, at all events when aided with the usual modicum of government assistance, will be found sufficient to secure all the railroads that are required ; and, secondly that business will be found for all the railroads that are likely to be built. In the eastern section, the conditions are notoriously and admittedly different. If the government were to hold aloof, it may be that no company would be willing to undertake the task, and, in any case, as one road is sufficient for all the business, it is more economical that there should be but one line, with adequate provision for its use by all the others that may require an outlet. It does not in the least advance the argument to speak of this combination of methods as a hybrid scheme. It was a saying of Lord Beaconsfield's that the English people were governed by phrases, and the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals seems to labour under the delusion that he is making an argument when he invents a nickname. He might as well call his costume a hybrid costume, because he puts a coat on his back and a pair of trousers on his legs. He adapts his garments to the purposes they are to serve, and we adapt our systems of administration to the different conditions and circumstances of the sections to which they are to be applied.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am almost ashamed of having occupied so much time in discussing the motion before the House, and I will promise not to be long in presenting the remainder of my remarks. Let me proceed with the consideration of my second proposition. I have said that the government cannot successfully operate a road in competition with a system of company roads, and that if it is determined to go into the railway business it must possess itself of the whole of the roads in the region in which it operates. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has presented a most attractive theory which I presume he has borrowed for the occasion from the repertory of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), as to the great utility of a government owned and government operated road in the way of equalizing the freight rates on the company roads with which it would come in competition. Perhaps I do him an injustice. Perhaps he has had in mind the railroad history of the kingdom of Belgium in which this theory controlled for a time the railway policy of the country. Great praise has been given by almost every railroad authority to the wisdom and sagacity of Leopold I, who happened to be an exile in England at the time when George Stephenson was successfully accomplishing his great undertaking of making his railroad float upon Chat Moss. King Leopold was able to study the conditions of railroad enterprise in Britain, and apply the lessons that he learned to the situation in Belgium. He rejected the policy of private construction and was able to secure for the state at the very inception, the control of all the best paying territory in the kingdom. Undoubtedly his policy was brilliantly successful for a time, and it was exactly the policy described by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals of having one central line of railways owned and operated by the state in such manner as to secure a controlling effect upon all the other railways of the country. If we had begun in this way there might have been some hope for the success of such a programme. If we had adhered to the policy of Alexander Mackenzie, I suppose this would have been the actual condition of affairs to-day. But I lay no stress on this, for I am well satisfied that next to the occupation in which the two hon. ex-Ministers of Railways and Canals have been engaged, of predicting the probable effect of a policy to which neither of them is capable of doing justice, there is no more futile occupation for the human mind than that of endeavouring to conjecture how things might have been if they had been otherwise than as they are. So many occult and incalculable factors enter into the case that it would require omniscience to determine what would have been the result if a different course had been adopted in any important particular from that which actually was pursued. We know what has happened. As to what would have happened under other than the actual conditions it is perhaps not easy to conjecture. In Belgium, as I have said, the policy which Mr. Mackenzie was working out for us was brilliantly successful. So enamoured of its success was Mr. Adams, the great railway commissioner of Massachusetts, that he at one time desired the state of Massachusetts to purchase the Fitchburg road for the purpose of running it in competition with the company roads of that state. But his proposal never was adopted, and Mr. Hadley tells us that he had good reason later to reverse his earlier opinion on the subject. The fact of the matter is, as Mr. Hendrick puts it, that whenever the state attempts to enter into

competition with the companies it is bound to get the worse of the competition. The time would fail me to refer to all the authorities that might be cited as to this contention. There are many of them, and so far as I am able to recall, they all speak with one voice. I will content myself with the remarks of Mr. Hadley, because he is the most fair-minded and the best informed of all the really competent authorities who have endeavoured to deal with railway problems in an unbiassed and scientific spirit. His testimony on this point is clear and conclusive :

> It is a curious fact, that in any such competition the State is not stronger than private companies, but weaker. Theoretically, it may have power to forbid private companies engaging in such competition. Practically, public opinion will not allow it to exercise that power. Nor can the State railroads exercise a dignified reserve. If the private railroads are run to make money, and succeed in doing so, the State railroads must be run to make money too, or else the authorities will have to face the criticisms of an indignant public. And in this money-making race it is impossible for the government to have the same quick elasticity of action as a private company. Thus it happened that in Belgium the competition was not quite even. The State had somewhat better routes, but the advantages possessed by private companies in a business fight just about offset this difference.

In another place, the same author, referring to this very proposition of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says :

> The idea of government ownership of one among several competing lines attracted undue attention, owing to its supposed success in Belgium. The earlier reports of the Massachusetts commission, deservedly high authority, favoured the idea, but it was never carried to a successful conclusion in Massachusetts, and it was abandoned in Belgium, the government purchasing a large part of the private railroads. The competition with the private lines had been too onerous for the Belgian government, and had left it too little independence of action. The private lines regulated those of the government rather more than the government regulated the private lines. Experience is against the probability of success in the attempt on the part of the government to regulate either railroads or telegraphs in this way. To do anything efficient it must control not a few lines, but the whole system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if even in Belgium, where everybody agrees that this system advocated by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and his leader in this matter, the hon. member for East York, could be tried with better prospects of success than in almost any other country in the world, in which the wise foresight of King Leopold secured for the government all the best paying territory and enabled it to enter into the competition with all the chances of the game in its favour, with a restricted suffrage and a government acting in comparative independence of the whims and caprices of the multitude and even the deliberate criticisms of those who knew, if, I repeat, even in Belgium it was found that instead of the government regulating the company railways, the company railways regulated those of the state, and the experiment had to be abandoned by the state taking to itself the whole system, as it was also found to be necessary to do in Prussia when the same influences operated to bring about the same results, I ask what hope would there be for us with our line of railway planted in the midst of keen competitors such as the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern, with the greater elasticity and plasticity of their management, with their far more carefully selected staff, with their better paid officials, and with alert and active agents in all parts of the country, with all the immense advantages that a private company has already been shown to have in such a competition, and all the handicaps under which it is necessary for a government railroad to enter upon the race ? Does it need any very great acumen or anything more than a little modicum of common sense which was one of the distinguishing characteristics of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals before he surrendered his judgment to the control of the hon. member for East York, to see that the result of the competition here would be ten-fold more disastrous than it was in Belgium or in Prussia. In both those countries the testimony is complete that the government found it impossible to compete successfully with the private companies and was obliged in consequence to take over practically all the railroads of the state. If we are prepared for that issue, we may hopefully adopt the proposals of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. If we are not ready for so desperate a plunge let us adopt the sound and rational and truly conservative policy that is now before us for our acceptance.

It only remains to me to consider some views which I honestly believed before I heard the speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) had no representatives in this House. I knew that those views, although I never had heard them voiced within these walls, had nevertheless obtained some currency throughout the country, for besides the hon. member for Jacques Cartier there are some people in the country who are opposed to the idea of government assistance in any shape or form. They do not oppose the present measure merely because of its particular provisions, but because they consider that the business of railway construction should be dealt with in the same way as every other line of business and left to shift for itself as best it may. They oppose this measure as they would oppose any other measure or any possible measure involving the assistance of the government because they object to the principle of state aid

to railway construction in any form whatever, whether by land-grants, or money subsidies, or guarantees of interest. It may well be that this class of objectors is not numerically important, but it is a class whose reasoning is not to be despised and whose contentions are not to be disposed of with a sneer. Its views are presented with great energy, with very considerable ability, with infinite pertinacity and with every appearance of deep and sincere conviction. I have seen these views from time to time presented in substance in an ably conducted journal, which I believe is mainly supported by the farming industry of Ontario, a journal which must be of very great utility to that industry, and which were it not for its prevailing note of pessimism and its occasional devotion to fads and crotchets, would be one of the most readable of Canadian organs of opinion. It seems to have imposed upon itself the mission of persuading, if possible, the farmers of this country that whatever may be the actual condition of their minds, they ought to be profoundly miserable, because, although they may delude themselves into the belief that they are among the most happy and comfortable people on the face of the earth, they are in reality an exceedingly oppressed and down-trodden portion of the community who are being put upon by every variety of imposition that the malice and craft of their representatives in parliament are able to devise for their destruction.

Hardly a single number of this able and influential journal comes from the press, in which we are not invited to contrast the policy of this country with respect to railway bonuses and railway taxation with the policy of the United States. Here, it is said, we bonus the construction of railways, sometimes with land, sometimes with money, and sometimes with land and money both. There they allow the roads to get along as best they can upon their own resources. Here our railways are for the most part exempt from taxation. There the taxation of the roads affords a substantial relief to the ordinary ratepayer. The contrast is certainly a striking one and I do not see how it can fail to make a strong appeal to the readers of the 'Farmers' Sun' who must, I should think, be among the most intelligent and influential members of the farming community of the province in which it circulates. If there were nothing to be said on the other side of the question it would certainly seem that we in this country have been pursuing an indefensible policy and that we should reverse it at the earliest opportunity.

But it is only fair to ask at the outset whether the comparison is just. Are the circumstances of the two cases at all to be compared? Is the problem of railway construction and railway extension in this country the same as in the American republic? Now, I venture to affirm that no such comparison can justly be presented. It is the comparison between the growing boy and the grown-up man. If the United States were in the circumstances in which we find ourselves to-day their policy would be the same as ours. It was the same as ours long after they had reached the stage in their national development at which we have arrived and I venture to predict that this country will have given its last subsidy for railroad construction, its last land-grant if it has not already done so, and its last guarantee of bonds long before we have secured either the population, or the wealth, or the condition of national development to which our neighbours had attained before they abandoned the policy of government assistance to their roads.

When this country is inhabited by seventy millions of people, when Quebec and Montreal are cities like New York and Philadelphia, when Winnipeg has the wealth and population of Chicago, when our fertile valleys and expanding plains are peopled to such a degree that we shall discourage instead of welcoming the immigration on which we now expend so liberally, when in other words our wealth and population are the same as those of the United States are now, our policy will be the same as theirs. Instead of running after the railway-builder or seeking to attract him to our projects with bonuses or grants of land as the United States did long after they had reached the present condition of this country, we may be demanding payment for our railway franchises or subjecting the exercise of them to taxation for the support of local and municipal burdens. The United States, as the right hon. Prime Minister well said, are in this position to-day. But they were not always so. Would anybody who reads the 'Farmers' Sun' believe that in 1850 when the population of the United States was—not barely six millions, as ours is now—but a shade over twenty-three millions of inhabitants, congress granted to the state of Illinois for the Illinois Central Railway, 2,595,000 acres of land. Ex-Governor Larrabee, of Iowa, in his work on the railway question, states that the total number of acres of land granted by congress to aid the construction of the Iowa roads was 4,069,942, and he estimates the total value of the gifts made to the roads of Iowa state, including railroad taxes voted by the counties, townships and municipalities, grants of right of way and depot sites, and public and private gifts of money at $50,000,000, or enough to build forty per cent of all the railways of the state. Between 1850 and 1871 there were granted for railway construction 197,000,000 acres of land, of which 35,000,000 were forfeited by subsequent legislation, leaving 162,000,000 acres, equal to 253,000 square miles, which is more than the area of the whole province of Ontario. The value of these lands has

been estimated by competent authority at $300,000,000 at the time when they were granted. What amounts they yielded to the companies at their improved values it is impossible to say, but the late Mr. Blaine estimated the total amount of advances to the United States railway companies, including gifts by towns, counties, states and the United States at $1,000,000,000. When we reflect for a moment upon these tremendous figures, so large that we can form no real conception of their meaning, which are in fact almost as bewildering to the ordinary intellect as astronomical magnitudes, and when we still further remind ourselves that the United States did not abandon the policy of making land-grants in aid of railway construction until after they had three great transcontinental railways assured, I think it will occur to most of us that we have not much to reproach ourselves with from this point of view and that no very powerful argument against the policy of aiding the construction of railroads with the capital or credit of the country can be drawn from the example of the United States. Having assured with national assistance the construction of three great continental roads, having secured a population of thirty or forty millions, the people of the United States might very well abandon the policy of government assistance and leave the railroads for the rest to work out their own salvation; but the comparisons in which the 'Farmers' Sun' indulges between the United States and Canada and which I have no doubt have made many converts to its views on this question, are none the less, for the reasons I have mentioned, the shallowest of fallacies. The doctrine of laissez-faire in the matter of railway construction may be a good one for the United States to-day, or for a densely populated country like England, with its teeming millions to afford a passenger traffic and its vast and diversified industries to swell the freight receipts. One would have supposed that the same thing would be true for France and that private enterprise without the assistance of the state would have been found sufficient to secure an adequate system of roads. But even in France, private enterprise was not found sufficient to cope with the situation. When France began effectively to enter upon the work of railway construction its population was six times as large as the present population of Canada, while as to the territory over which our present population is spread, which constitutes the very essence of the problem to be solved, there is absolutely no comparison whatever to be made. Yet Mr. Ackworth, whose name will be familiar to, and whose authority will be recognized by every one who has ever seriously studied the railway question, states that the French government has paid nearly two hundred million pounds sterling, equal to about $1,000,000,000 in capital outlay and is continuing to pay some millions annually in the form of guaranteed interest for the railway companies, and Mr. Hendrick writing at a later date says that up to 1895 the great companies had received from the state 22,800,000,000 francs. Mr. Ackworth's figure is the same as that stated by Mr. Blaine as the contribution of the United States to the railroads owned and operated by the railway companies. True enough, there is a difference between the two cases. The French policy contemplates a term of years, after which the roads are to become the property of the state. But the period is remote and no human being can pretend to say how much the government will still be called upon to pay before the reversionary interest of the state will become an estate in possession.

Now, if it be the case that a great and flourishing state like France with its compact and fertile territory and its population of thirty or forty millions, in the years of its great railroad activity, was unable to secure a satisfactory system without contributing in one form or another a thousand million dollars, if even the United Kingdom found itself compelled to subsidize the construction of railroads in Ireland, if the United States, down to the time when its population was in the neighbourhood of forty millions, continued the policy of aiding the construction of railways with the grant of lands and its people expended for this purpose in one form or another, as Mr. Blaine has stated, $1,000,000,000, I do not think it need be very surprising that we in Canada, with a population less than six millions, spread over half a continent, should have found that we could not have the roads that were demanded as the indispensible prerequisite to natural unification and the continuously progressive development of the country without either a liberal subsidy from the public treasury, or a generous tender of the public credit. Our government has chosen the latter alternative and I believe it has chosen wisely. We give this Grand Trunk Pacific Company a guarantee which costs us nothing but our good-will, and saves the company a large amount of money that must otherwise be wasted so far as this country is concerned in the payment of interest to foreign investors and capitalists. We enable them in this way to build their road on the most advantageous terms, we place its whole undertaking as we do all other railroads that we are allowed to control, under the regulation of a commission which has the power to prevent all unfairness and extortion; we avoid the difficulties and the perils that have been encountered in other countries by daring and dangerous experiments, we widen and enlarge the boundaries of old Canada, we relieve the congestion of traffic in our western country, we open up a new hope of enlargement to the maritime cities of the Atlantic seaboard, we bind the lower prov-

inces to the inland and the western to the eastern by the new and stronger tie of material interest and interprovincial trade, and we open up to the whole Dominion unlimited possibilities of expansion which the most sanguine among us could not find it possible to exaggerate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker. Let me in the first place thank the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) for bringing to my attention an unintentional misstatement which I made to the House in speaking very hurriedly after the Prime Minister, a few days ago. I then said, that only 2,500,000 bushels of grain had been carried out during the past year by the all-rail route from Fort William and Port Arthur. I made that statement on the authority of a gentleman who was in possession of the facts. Since the error was pointed out to me by the Minister of the Interior, I communicated with that gentleman to whom I had written for information in the first instance, and he sends me in reply the following letter :

> We have been asked by several different members as to the all-rail shipments eastbound from Fort William ; in some cases the inquiries applied to wheat only, and in other cases to grain of all kinds. I may say that this led to some confusion, and that the figures given to you by me were not entirely correct. Our records show that during last year the all-rail shipments of grain of all kinds amounted to 5,697,695 bushels. Of this quantity about 3,100,000 were for export, and the balance went to local points in Canada. I intended to give you the quantity shipped for export, because local shipments play no part in determining the practicability of an all-rail route to the sea for grain. The expansion, if there is to be any, must be in the carrying by rail of grain for export. Apparently, I gave you the local figures, instead of the export figures, so that your statement was about 600,000 bushels under the mark. You may use this letter to correct error, if you choose to do so.

It is desirable that any statement of facts in the House should be correct, and therefore I am obliged to the Minister of the Interior for attracting my attention to this, and I take the earliest possible opportunity of correcting the statement which I then made.

Let me say further, that I am also informed that the circumstances under which some 5,600,000 bushels of grain went out last winter were altogether exceptional. The Canadian Pacific Railway required stiffening cargoes for their vessels, and there was also a pressure that the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William should be cleared out, and in consequence grain went out last winter by the all-rail route which we could not reasonably expect would go out in that way under other conditions.

I would also like to say, that while I am thankful to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior for correcting me in this respect, I am not particularly thankful to him for the manner in which he quoted my remarks of the 30th of July. He attempted to make it appear that in some way I misled the House as to the meaning of section 12 of the contract. I read that section to the House at the time and I made some observations which the Minister of the Interior quoted only in part. I corrected him as to one mistake he made—or one oversight—in regard to my remarks of the 26th of May, and I desire now to correct him with regard to his misquotation, no doubt unintentional, of my remarks of the 30th of July. I quoted section 12 on that occasion and I followed that quotation up by these words :

> Therefore, the company guarantees by the deposit of $5,000,000 to do something without which its enterprise would be of absolutely no moment at all.

That is to say, having built the line, of course the company might naturally be expected to equip it, and as the guarantee of $5,000,000 is for the building of the line and the equipping of the line, you are not very far from the mark when you say that it is practically a guarantee to do something without which the enterprise of the company would be of no moment at all. Then I continued :

> In other words, the company guarantees to build a railway as to which it receives a guarantee of $13,000 a mile for one portion of it, and $30,000 a mile for the rest, and it deposits with the government $5,000,000 as security that it will use for the construction of the railway the moneys derived from the bonds guaranteed by this government.

And practically, that is all that this guarantee amounts to; and I did not observe then what has been noted in this debate: that this very sum of $5,000,000 can be paid out to this company practically on progress estimates from time to time as it proceeds with the work. Then I continued :

> That is certainly a most remarkable piece of statesmanship, and I am not surprised at the plaudits with which the announcement of this clause was greeted by the right hon. gentleman's supporters. It is quite evident that they were kept as much in ignorance of the real nature of this clause as were the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Permit me to say, before I go further, and before I forget it, that I would like to reassure my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior with regard to the people of the maritime provinces. That gentleman, in the course of his remarks, was good enough to say, in effect, that the people of the maritime provinces were a mean spirited and a weak-kneed people, or they would have had a railway through the centre of New Brunswick long ago. He told us in effect that if they had the spirit of the men of the west, we might have expected that they would have arisen in their might and demanded this railway years ago. I want to tell my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, who of all men has the least cause to complain of plain speaking from the people of the

maritime provinces, that his own department has been somewhat in question down there, not only among the Liberal-Conservative papers, but among Liberal papers as well. There is a newspaper published in the city of Halifax called the 'Morning Chronicle,' which is owned by three gentlemen, of whom one is the agent of the Deputy Minister of Justice at Halifax, a very prominent Liberal, another is the Liberal member for the county of Colchester in the provincial legislature, and the third is president of the Liberal Association of the county of Halifax; and I have before me some plain speaking from that paper in regard to the hon. Minister of the Interior, so forcible and so personal in its character that I will not read it to the House to-day; but if any hon. gentleman wants to see whether the people of the maritime provinces are incapable of speaking out plainly and forcibly, let him consult the columns of the 'Morning Chronicle,' of September 27, 1902. If the hon. Minister of the Interior consults the editorial columns of that paper of that day, he will find something that suits even his craving for strong language in regard to the conduct of the government.

I must apologize to my hon. friend the member for Hants (Mr. Russell), because I shall not be able, I fear, to give very special attention to his remarks. I was unfortunate enough not to hear the whole of them. A greater part of what I did hear consisted of a personal attack upon my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), which consumed about an hour of the three hours and a half in which the hon. gentleman condensed the remarks he made to this House. The other portion consisted very largely in somewhat slighting remarks with reference to his late leader the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), and the imputation of unworthy motives to that hon. gentleman for his resignation from the government. But, in passing, let me ask my hon. friend why he is so extremely optimistic in regard to the prospects of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and so extremely pessimistic in regard to the prospects of the Intercolonial Railway? I was under the impression, until I heard the hon. gentleman speak, that he was one of those who had voted for an expenditure of some $15,000,000—that is what in the end it amounted to—to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. We have been treated this afternoon to a long lecture, a long historical review of every country which has attempted the state operation of railways. The hon. gentleman, in dealing with the question, does not seem to realize for one moment that it is not a question of theory in Canada at all; it is a question of what we are going to do with the Intercolonial Railway. We have 1,600 miles of state-owned railway in Canada; what does my hon. friend propose to do with it? What does he mean by asking whether or not we shall enter into the state ownership of railways in Canada? Let me read, for his information, if he is not aware of it, a portion of a folder which is issued by the government which he supports, through good report and ill, and which points out that there is government ownership of railways in Canada at the present time; and that, to use a common expression, it is a condition and not a theory that we have to deal with in this regard:

> Perfect travel means good road-bed, good equipment, good secenery, which you have on your own line. The Intercolonial Railway of Canada is, in more senses than one, the people's line. As a government road, it is owned by the people, and in the operating of the line this principle is ever kept in view, so that the best available service will be given. In another sense it is the people's line, because it is popular as the great all-Canadian system and the only all-rail line from Montreal to the extreme points of the maritime provinces. It is equally popular as the great tourist and sportsman's route, and that by which the desirable places in the provinces by the sea can be most conveniently reached.

What is the logical outcome of the argument of my hon. friend from Hants? The logical and the only inference you can draw from his argument is that we should sell or give away the Intercolonial Railway at once. He has made a long-drawn out argument against undertaking government ownership in this country, when in fact we have government ownership now. I would like my hon. friend to go back to the people of Nova Scotia and tell them whether or not his argument means that the Intercolonial Railway is to be given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or to some other railway company, and is to be no more the people's railway, and that state ownership in Canada is no longer to exist. It was somewhat amusing in this connection to hear my hon. friend giving a lecture to the 'Farmers' Sun' because it opposes the granting of subsidies to railways. Was not the song of hon. gentlemen opposite, of whom my hon. friend was one, through many weary years in opposition, that no railway subsidies should be given? To have my hon. friend stand in the House and discuss editorial articles in the 'Farmers' Sun,' and endeavour to bring that paper back from the supposed error into which it has fallen, an error in which the hon. gentleman himself participated and believed in in days gone by, is a spectacle that would have been more refreshing than it is if fortunately during this summer session we were not blessed with cool weather.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to deal any more in detail with the argument of my hon. friend from Hants; but I think I shall, during the course of my remarks, answer two or three of the arguments which he, in common with other hon. gentlemen on

the other side of the House, have put forward in regard to this scheme. I do not know that we might expect that a policy such as this is, evolved by the government, as we are told by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, without any assistance from experts, without any assistance or advice from the officers of the Intercolonial Railway, would be likely to commend itself to the country at first blush. The record of the government in the past with regard to these matters is not a very striking one in point of success. We know their proposals with regard to the fast Atlantic service. We know the story that was told throughout the country at that time, a story quite as glowing as that which was presented to the House by the Prime Minister the other day. We were told that the fast Atlantic service was absolutely accomplished. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister received a telegram at Toronto in the nick of time, for the purpose of reading it to a Toronto audience, stating that the fast Atlantic service was a fait accompli at last. Month after month and year after year have gone by, and we are no nearer the accomplishment of a fast Atlantic service than we were on the day he read that telegram. If you look at the record of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, you would not be inspired with any confidence in any project they may bring before the House, without advice, particularly when you realize that the policy they are bringing down is one that has led to the resignation and retirement from the government of the only man among them who during the last seven years has been studying this transportation problem, the man who during the past seven years they have been hailing as the ablest railway administrator that ever presided over the department. It is amusing—it is more than amusing, it is delicious—to see these hon. gentlemen, after cheering the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals for his administration of the Intercolonial Railway for seven years past, after supporting him by vote and speech on every occasion, now standing up in the House and belittling him as a statesman, and imputing unworthy motives to him; and when the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches do not care to do that themselves, they put up some one like the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) or the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), the pupil in political life, if I am rightly informed, of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, to show that that hon. gentleman never was a statesman, never was a man of broad views or a man of courage, and that he had not resigned from the cabinet on a question of policy, but really because he was subjected to some personal slight. Well, as I have said before, there have been rumours in this House that there were other gentlemen in the cabinet who were not one whit better pleased with this project than the Minister of Railways and Canals, the only difference between them being that he had the courage of his opinions and they had not.

The transportation problem of Canada beyond doubt is a very complex problem. Having had to give some special attention to this subject during the past four or five weeks, I have realized, more than ever I did before, the very great complexity which surrounds this question in Canada and the very great importance indeed of our not acting too hastily or not taking any leap in the dark, but procuring, before taking any action, the very best expert advice and assistance that can be obtained. In speaking on this subject in the city of Winnipeg, in October last, I used this laguage :

> It is the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party to grapple with this transportation problem from a national standpoint. We would not do it hastily, but would do it after taking the advice of experts and others familiar with railway problems and after fully investigating as to what would be the best course to pursue. In this the party should commend itself to the people, for railway transportation and other matters of this kind require the very best expert advice and assitance that can be secured.

I am glad to know that the Winnipeg Board of Trade endorsed that opinion by resolution during the past year in this language :

> That a thoroughly qualified expert in the management of railways be appointed to make a report on existing conditions, and what in his opinion would make the Intercolonial a paying concern and of the greatest benefit to the country, and also to study and make recommendations on the following alternative schemes for the consideration of the government and the people.

At the beginning of the session, a policy of that kind was promised by the government. It was not necessary that an announcement of that kind should have been delayed until the opening of this session. During last autumn, or immediately after the closing of last session, the government should have appointed that commission which they proposed this year in the speech from the Throne, and should have had the report of that commission ready for this House when it began to sit this year. If this government had, during the past year, taken the best advice which this continent can afford, we might have had a very different proposal submitted by the government this session; but this so-called businesslike government, with its unbusinesslike methods, procrastinated and dallied with this question until the session opened and then came down with a speech from the Throne, in which they used the following language—good, sensible, rational language. The only fault to be found with the government, in that respect, is their delay in taking the step which, in

the speech from the Throne, they promised to take :

The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

A good, sensible, proper view to take of the question, considering that it involves problems in Canada of a most complex character.

Well, Sir, the session opened on the 12th of March. Nothing was done from that time until the 19th of May, when an Order in Council was passed, which was subsequently brought down to this House, and which contains language startling in its character, when contrasted with the speech of the Prime Minister made on the 30th of July. Let us observe what that language is. This is the language of the government, affirmed by His Excellency, and put in the shape of an Order in Council brought down to this House, declaring the policy of the government on the 19th of May last :

That the development of North-western Canada has manifested the inability of existing Canadian transportation agencies to take care of Canadian products.

That our agricultural exports can only command the prices over seas to which their natural excellence entitles them when they cease to be confounded and confused with the inferior and often adulterated articles produced elsewhere ; and to preserve their separate identity they must go through Canadian channels.

The minister further states that the questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.

This involves the consideration of their transportation :—

From place of production to Canadian seaports.

From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.

From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.

From Canadian seaports to Europe.

From place of production through Canadian ports on the Pacific.

As it affects the products of the eastern provinces of Canada it involves their movement:—

To the seaports.

From the seaports to Europe.

I call the attention of the House and country to these words :

It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding :—

The conditions of original shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding such shipments.

The storage requirements of lake, river and ocean ports.

The harbour facilities of the inland lakes, rivers and Atlantic and Pacific ports.

The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally, any improvement, enlargements, or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.

Taking in, by those comprehensive words, the whole system of transportation in Canada :

The minister further states that in making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

The forces operating against the attainment of all Canadian transport, namely :—

Competition by United States railways ;

Competition by United States vessels from Lake Superior ports ;

Diversion of Canadian products through eastern outlets to Boston, Portland and other United States ports, should be investigated, and the best and most economical methods used by our competitors should be carefully studied and reported upon.

The minister apprehends that in these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its own products, and it is thought that the most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts who may be appointed and authorized under the provisions of chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

That was the attitude, the carefully thought out, well considered attitude of the government on the transportation question on the 19th of May. It was also the attitude of the government later than that, because there was no recession from that attitude, when I brought the matter to the attention of the House on the 26th of May. I would like the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is to follow me in this debate, to tell me what occurred which altered the opinion of the government on that point between the 26th of May and that day in June, when the government press, for the first time, announced that the government would bring down a policy of its own and that the reasons for the appointment of any such commission as I have referred to, had ceased to exist. What was the reason which caused this change of policy ?

On the 19th day of May, this question is one which requires the most careful consideration and deliberation. Words of caution are used by the government with regard to this subject. On the 30th day of July, the Prime Minister speaks in a tone of panic, telling us that a crisis has developed. What crisis developed, Mr. Speaker, between the 19th day of May and the 30th day of July ? Was there any crisis with regard to the bonding privilege on the 30th of July that did not exist on the 19th day of May ? It is true the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) came home in the

latter part of May, and it may be suggested that he had something to do with the crisis —brought it with him, perhaps. But there has been no suggestion of that kind up to the present time. Now, a grave change of attitude on the part of the government with regard to a question of such transcendent importance to this country as the transportation question requires some better explanation than any that has been given up to the present time. I will endeavour to examine, later on, the reasons which the Prime Minister gave on the introduction of this measure. In the meantime, if my right hon. friend, or the hon. gentleman who is to follow me, can tell me what crisis existed on the 30th day of July with regard to the transportation question that did not exist on the 19th day of May, it is only right and proper, and it certainly is desirable that the House and the country should be informed with regard to it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no use wasting words about it. We know that no such crisis did exist. We know that the Prime Minister, when he came down to this House on the 30th day of July, knew of no crisis before this country. He knew that the conditions were exactly the same on the 30th day of July as they were on the 19th day of May. He came down to this House with a bogey with which he might frighten some people with regard to the bonding privilege, and might appeal to certain national sentiment in Canada, which he was wont to condemn very much in days gone by, when he used to speak—I do not know whether on this side of the line or on the other—of his preference for the American dollar over the British shilling, and to point out to the people of this country that their natural interest would lead them to trade with the people of the United States rather than with the people of Great Britain.

The Prime Minister, in introducing this measure, rested his case mainly on three grounds, which I want to state fairly before the House. The first was that a transcontinental railway such as this is required to save Canada from the effect of the repeal by the United States of the bonding arrangement; second, it will have the effect of diverting to Canadian channels traffic which now passes through American channels and to American ports, particularly to Portland; third, a road built in the manner and along the route proposed is necessary for the development of the country. Now, I want to take up these grounds one by one and examine them.

First, let us deal with the question of the bonding privilege. I observe that, as this debate has proceeded, my right hon. friend has not received very much support from any of his colleagues who have spoken with regard to the bogey he raised before the House. In answering the right hon. gentleman on the spur of the moment after he had spoken, I took the ground, which I still believe to be the true ground, that the people of the United States are as much concerned and interested in the bonding arrangement as are the people of this country.

Mr. CLARKE. More so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). An hon. gentleman near me says that they are more interested, and I would be inclined to go even to the length of that hon. gentleman's opinion, and say that the people of the United States are even more interested in this bonding arrangement than are the people of Canada. And I pointed out, as I still desire to point out to the people of this country, that it is an undignified thing for the Prime Minister of Canada to stand in his place in this House and practically tell, not only the people of Canada, but the people of the United States, that we are at the mercy of the United States in this matter. I say again, as I said then, that we are not at the mercy of the people of the United States. We can do without this privilege if need be, as well as can the people of the United States, and we can work out our destiny and our political future even if the United States should go so far as to commit the unfriendly act of repealing this bonding privilege. But how does the right hon. gentleman propose to save us from the effect of the repeal of this privilege? By building a line from Lévis to Moncton which passes within two or three miles of the American boundary. This will save, according to the right hon. gentleman, a distance of from 120 to 140 miles. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who has evidently not made much of a study of the question, went a little beyond that—he saw the right hon. Premier, and went a little better—saying that it would save 200 miles, I believe. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says it will save 110 miles. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says it will save 96 miles. Other hon. gentlemen say it will save from 50 to 70 miles. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), after having studied the reports of Sir Sandford Fleming, and after having discussed the subject with that gentleman, who is well informed on the question, say that it will save nothing at all if you build the road in such a fashion as to give the grades which are required for economical hauling. That is the way in which the right hon. gentleman proposes to save the people of this country. My hon. friend the Finance Minister does not go quite so far as the Prime Minister. He says that we shall build it—well, as an object lesson. Practically, that is what he says. We shall build this line so that the people of the United States, when they look across the border to ascertain the effect of repealing the bonding privilege, will say: Alas! it is too late; it is no use to repeal the bonding privilege; the Canadians have built

a short line from Lévis to Moncton, and we might as well leave the bonding privilege where it is. But, Sir, the Minister of the Interior really excelled himself with regard to this subject; and, in order that I may not do injustice to that hon. gentleman—whose absence to-day I very much regret—let me quote his mode of supporting the right hon. Prime Minister with regard to this point. I think that my right hon. friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who has, even with regard to matters that are controversial in this House, a very excellent sense of humour, will enjoy this very much:

> The Grand Trunk Railway has a line from the city of Montreal to the city of Portland. It is a magnificent line of railway, well equipped in the best modern style, and it has terminal facilities which I am credibly told have cost from $20,000,000 to $25,000,000.

By the way, this is the line that the Minister of Finance proposes to nationalize in some not very easily understood way.

> We are told by the Grand Trunk people that the facilities which they have for doing business between Montreal and Portland are not sufficient now to cope with it.
>
> Now what is the proposition of the member for Hamilton. It is that the Intercolonial, with its barely sufficient equipment to do the business which it has now, shall take the three or four times as great business of the Grand Trunk, that it shall take the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the business of these three railways shall be suddenly precipitated upon the Intercolonial Railway, and that that railway shall be expected, with its insufficient facilities, to do the business of the whole three. And my hon. friend says that that is a consummation to be desired. He says we should not be alarmed at a prospect of that kind, that it is something which will help the Intercolonial and which does not at all call for any action upon the part of this government for the purpose of preventing the consequences which might flow from it. Why, Mr. Speaker, has he considered for half a moment what would happen in such a case as that? Why, we would have in the traffic of Canada confusion worse confounded, we would have a blockade which would throw into the shade the wheat blockade which took place during the last couple of years in the Northwest; we would have the railway business of the country disorganized, because the business of Canada depends upon its export trade, and we would have millions upon millions of money of the people of Canada annually wasted on account of our inability to do the business which ought to be done over these railways. That, Mr. Speaker, is the contribution to the discussion of the railway question which is made by the railway expert of the Conservative party.

Well, how opposite are the views of the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of the Interior? The right hon. gentleman wants to divert the trade of Canada into Canadian channels, and the Minister of the Interior pictures the horror and dismay which would overtake Canada if the trade from Portland should be diverted to the Intercolonial. Why, Sir, imagine the people of the United States considering whether or not they should repeal the bonding privilege. They would look over into Canada and they would say: There are some idle, good-for-nothing railways in Canada which are hardly employed at all; there is the Intercolonial Railway, which according to the statement of the gentleman who has been operating for seven years, could do four times the traffic which it does at present. Here we have railways which are actually overloaded, let us relieve our railways and send our surplus traffic over to the Canadians, and so punish them in that way, by means of repealing the bonding privilege, we will send all this traffic over to Canada.' But my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, I suppose, had more particularly regard to the question of congestion. We would all deprecate any congestion of business in Canada. And what would be the logical way of dealing with this question if we were confronted with any such difficulty as that? Would it be to build more railways? No, but to equip the Intercolonial so that it could do four times the business it is doing at present, a business which the officials of that railway say it is easily capable of handling.

But when the Minister of the Interior gets as far as Moncton, I do not know how he would relieve the situation there. In the first place, how would he relieve the situation before he got to Moncton? Is he to keep the present Intercolonial up to the standard of a through railway, and is he to have two such railways from Lévis to Moncton? If so, he is going to run this country into a pretty big expenditure; if he does not do that, he has just one railway to Moncton as we have to-day, and after he gets to Moncton, what about the congestion? Is there any duplication of the line from Moncton to St. John? Is there any duplication of the line from Moncton to Halifax? None whatever. So the congestion so alarmingly pointed out by the Minister of the Interior would only be transferred from Lévis, or Quebec, to Moncton. There is one possible explanation, and that is that the Minister of the Interior, being misled by the Minister of Finance, thinks of equipping Moncton as an ocean port. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, with great gravity, stood up in this House and stated that this was a true transcontinental railway, because it extended from the Pacific coast to Moncton; and he pictured the great number of passengers that were going to travel over that railway for the purpose of viewing the celebrated 'bore' of Moncton. Now, I know that the town of Moncton is an enterprising, active and progressive town inhabited by splendid, enterprising, progressive and industrious people; but I do not think the town of Moncton has ever claimed to be capable of doing business as an ocean port. Cer-

tainly, if it is to be equipped as an ocean port, I would expect my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) to put in a similar claim for Amherst, and my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) to put in a similar claim for Truro. As a matter of fact, this bogey about the repeal of the bonding privilege does not amount to anything at all. There is no danger of it, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). The very men who stand as the backbone of this undertaking, the men who are controlling the destinies of the Grand Trunk Railway to-day, are the men who are putting their money into enterprises which depend to a great extent for success upon the existence of these very bonding privileges.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was somewhat exercised with regard to my attitude concerning the Quebec-Moncton line. He had evidently been somewhat misinformed with regard to the condition of affairs in the maritime provinces, because he seemed to think that I was in a somewhat embarrassing position concerning that line. Let me assure my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior and the House, that I feel no embarrassment on this subject whatever. As he has invited me to state my view with regard to that, I will state it at once, though I might have left it to a later period in my speech, where it would more properly belong. But I will say at once what my attitude is with regard to that line. I say that if there is to be found a better and shorter line between Rivière du Loup, or any other point on the Intercolonial, and Moncton, a line the construction of which will give to Halifax and St. John and the Maritime Provinces generally a better fighting chance for western traffic than that which they have at present, I will support the construction of that line. But I will not support it with the object for which this Bill provides. I will tell my hon. friend how I will support it. I will support the construction of that line as part of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not believe in constructing that better and shorter line for the purpose of handing it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other railway company; but I do believe in constructing it and keeping it for the people's railway. That is my position and it is a position which I am ready to discuss in the maritime provinces or anywhere else, with either the Minister of the Interior or any other hon. gentleman in this House. For what reason should we, having found a better route through the province of New Brunswick, having found a route by means of which another railway might compete with the Intercolonial, as the Intercolonial exists at present, for what reason should we construct another railway there and hand it over to a competing company for the purpose of destroying the Intercolonial Railway which belongs to the people of Canada? Build a railway, if it will give to the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick a fighting chance for the trade of the west, and when you have built it, keep it for the people of Canada, as part of that system which we have at present, and which I hope to see some day extended further west than at present. In all this, act reasonably, survey your country, consider the grades to be secured, consider the distance to be saved, consider the cost of haulage to be saved. Do not plunge into the thing rashly, do not undertake to build it upon a survey made 30 or 40 years ago when railway conditions were different from what they are at present. Go into the enterprise sanely, and after having obtained information which would justify you in believing that it would give a better chance for trade to the people of the maritime provinces, and to the cities of Halifax and St. John; build it, as I said before, by the people of Canada, for the people of Canada, and for the people's railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGAN. Why don't all the hon. gentleman's supporters cheer?

Mr. COCHRANE. Why didn't the hon. gentleman cheer himself ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend is very curious. What would he think of the proposition which I suggest?

Mr. LOGAN. If I followed the hon. gentleman's argument, and if such a line would parallel the Intercolonial, I would be opposed to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad that I have elicited for my right hon. friend a very frank expression of opinion from the hon. member for Cumberland in opposition to the very project which he has brought down here. I assure my right hon. friend that it was quite unintentional. I was not aware before I spoke that the hon. member for Cumberland was on strike. There are, of course, many other things which would have to be considered in the expenditure of this money. Do not let any hon. gentleman in this House suppose for one moment that there is no room for the expenditure of more money in the maritime provinces for improving the Intercolonial Railway. The terminals at Halifax should be improved, the line between Truro and Moncton should be improved and there should be a better passenger service than there is at the present time between the maritime provinces and Montreal. I passed over the Grand Trunk Railway two years ago between Hamilton and Toronto, and I found that if the Intercolonial Railway could operate their express trains at the same rate of speed between Montreal and Halifax we would reach Halifax in twenty-one hours from Montreal instead of twenty-eight hours as at present. The train creeps along, stopping at every

station and makes very poor time for an express train. In many other matters there is room for expending money on the Intercolonial Railway, but notwithstanding that if the construction of this line through New Brunswick will give our maritime cities a better fighting chance I would be prepared to support an expenditure of money for that purpose. What are to be the grades of the proposed line from Moncton to Lévis ? Does any hon. gentleman know ? Is the maximum to be a grade of twenty-one feet in the mile, or is it to be a grade of forty-two feet in the mile, a grade of one per cent, or is it to be a grade of four-teenths of one per cent in the mile ? As has been pointed out by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) before we plunge into the building of a railway we should understand that thoroughly ; and I am glad that I have the support of that hon. gentleman who said that it would be of no use to build this railway unless we can get grades not exceeding four-tenths of one per cent, or not exceeding at most one-half per cent which, if I remember his remarks correctly, he said to be the highest possible grade over which any railway can haul grain successfully under modern conditions. Now, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) justifies the haste in connection with this railway because he says companies often get charters before they commence to build. There is no analogy between that and this. They do not make a charter to build. This is not a charter to build but it is a contract to build. Did you ever hear of a railway company contracting to build a line through a country about which it had no more information than the government have about this country ? Did you ever hear of a contractor undertaking to build a line through a country of which he had no more knowledge than we have about this country ? All that the opposition have said about this is that the government are not in possession at the present time of sufficient information to justify them in proceeding with the scheme without further surveys, and I am prepared to say further than that, that if a line is built it should be retained as part of the Intercolonial Railway.

My hon. friends the hon. Minister of the Interior and the hon. Minister of Finance both referred to the question of the paralleling of railways. The hon. member for Cumberland is troubled about this paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway. I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen and I would like to ask the hon. member for Cumberland, assuming that the building of this line through central New Brunswick means the paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway, means a better line, a line over which through freight will go, is it better to have the Intercolonial Railway paralleling itself by this better line or is it better to give that better line over to a company which will compete with the Intercolonial Railway ? If you are going to parallel the Intercolonial Railway by a better line surely the Intercolonial Railway had better parallel itself and use that better line for the traffic which otherwise would be carried over the railway competing with the people's railway.

Mr. LOGAN. No hon. member can make any such assumption. It would be an impossible assumption. You could no more parallel the Intercolonial Railway by building a line from Lévis to Moncton than you could parallel the two sides of a triangle by building across the base.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad my hon. friend has come back to the fold. A moment ago I thought he would not return, but now he says that the road does not parallel the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. LOGAN. I do not think my hon. friend wishes to misrepresent me. What I said before was assuming that the arguments put forward by the followers of the hon. gentleman were correct, therefore I drew certain conclusions, but I make no such assumption and deny that they are correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I accept at once the statement of my hon. friend. I regret, I am sure, that I misunderstood him in any way. I certainly understood when he spoke a moment ago that he was opposed to any line which would parallel the Intercolonial Railway, and that he thought a line through New Brunswick would parallel it. I am glad that he and I are of the same opinion in regard to that and as that difficulty is out of his way now I would ask him again what he thinks of the people of this country owning the proposed shorter line through New Brunswick.

Mr. LOGAN. I will answer the hon. gentleman's question later on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) came to the rescue of my hon. friend from Cumberland but it was too late to help him. The hon. Minister of Justice says they own it now. I suppose he means that they will own it under the conditions of the present proposed Bill ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They will own it under the proposed Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, that is a perfectly fair answer. They will own it, but what will they do with it ? They will take that better line and hand it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I see that the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) is also going to interfere. Perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will deal with this matter later on and we are better not to have any more cross firing than is absolutely necessary.

The next point in the speech of my right hon. friend that I desire to deal with is that this road will bring and keep Can-

adian trade within Canadian channels. Well, there is no man on this side of the House who will not support the right hon. gentleman most heartily and most earnestly if he will bring forward a scheme that is likely to accomplish that result. In Canada to-day we are all at one in regard to that. No one doubts its desirability, but this is in contrast with the idea which was to be observed in certain of the right hon. gentleman's utterances years ago. Now, the trend of trade, according to his views, should be from west to east and across the ocean to the mother country, but in the old days it was to be from north to south, it was continental free trade, it was unrestricted reciprocity, it was commercial union, which the right hon. gentleman desired, and, I am sure no one congratulates the right hon. gentleman more heartily than the Conservative party upon the fact that he has come round to their view upon this question. However, I suppose it is a matter of legitimate inquiry to know how the right hon. gentleman proposes to accomplish that object. He proposes it by a clause in this agreement which provides that unrouted traffic shall be carried by Canadian ports. Let us read the clause and let us see to what extent it is likely, particularly in view of the utterances of my right hon. friend, to accomplish the desired object :

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

In section 43 the company further agrees :

The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely,—the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I took the point in my remarks on the 26th of May last, that I doubted very much the efficacy of a provision of that kind. After having submitted to the attention of the House a memorial from the Halifax Board of Trade, I said :

I must confess, that, having regard to the conditions as they are in Canada at the present time in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, I have not been able to reach a conclusion that such guarantees as have been spoken of in the press and in these resolutions, can be very easily enforced or carried out. I should be glad indeed to see the Grand Trunk Railway taking its part in the solution of Canadian transportation problems, and I hope it will be able to do so, but we have to consider conditions as they are and we know that the interests of the Grand Trunk Railway to a very considerable extent are, of course, centred in a winter port in the United States in which it has expended a very large amount of money in terminals and shipping facilities.

I want to say with regard to this that it all depends, in the first place on what enforcement you can have of this contract ; and in the second place, on how much unrouted traffic there will be in Canada, and particularly in connection with the export grain trade of Canada. I will give later on some information which I have gathered to that which will indicate to the House that so far as grain is concerned, a covenant that unrouted traffic shall go to Canadian ports simply amounts to nothing at all.

Some remarks of mine were referred to to-day, by my hon. friend from Hants. I desire to declare to this House and to the people of this country my sincere belief and solemn conviction, that the only way to send Canadian traffic through Canadian channels and through Canadian ocean ports, is to make transportation by that means at least as economical, as expeditious and as advantageous to the shippers of Canada as any other means of communication. There is one way and only one way to accomplish that object, and that is the way I have stated to the House just now. I may be wrong with regard to that ; I do not claim to be infallible ; I may not meet the views of the majority of the people of this country—I do not know anything about that, but I declare it to be my most solemn faith and conviction, that the only means by which you can send Canadian trade through Canadian channels is by means of accomplishing a result such as that. Trade and commerce, and transportation as well, will flow along the line of least resistance, and I do not believe that by all the Acts of parliament in the world you ever can accomplish the result in any other way.

Now, let us see to what extent we shall have accomplished anything by means of these covenants upon which the Prime Minister and his supporters rely. This particular covenant, obviously will be of no value at all unless the products are to be carried by rail to Montreal, Quebec, Halifax or St. John. The Minister of the Interior argues that grain would be so carried, and he cites a rate in the United States from Kansas city to Chicago to establish a rate of 11½ cents a bushel to St. John, New Brunswick. If you take the rate from Winnipeg to Fort William and base thereon the rate from Fort William to Quebec or Montreal, you will find that from Fort William to Quebec, say 1,000 miles, the rate would be 23·3 per

hundred pounds, or 13·98 cents per bushel; from Fort William to St. John the rate would be 34·97 cents per hundred pounds, or 20·97 cents per bushel, and from Fort William to Halifax the rate would be 37 cents per hundred pounds or 22 cents per bushel. a railway carry grain for any such sum mer, Wolvin & Company are carrying grain from Duluth to Quebec for three cents and a half cents a bushel, and it has been as low as three cents. Can a railway carry grain for any sum as that? The rate from Fort William on the Canadian Pacific Railway is 20 cents per 100 pounds or 12 cents per bushel to Montreal as well as to St. John I believe, and they are not anxious for business at that rate, and they carry this grain out only for the purpose of providing stiffening cargoes for their vessels at the port of St. John. We must remember that in all these matters you cannot judge by any particular rate at any given time. A railway company may have ships chartered at a point on the Atlantic coast, and it may be absolutely necessary to make such an extremely low rate as to astonish one, simply for the reason that the railway must supply cargo for that vessel which it has chartered to carry cargo across the Atlantic. The hon. Minister of the Interior referred to the rates from Depot Harbour to Montreal giving the maximum rate of four and a half cents, and the minimum at two and a quarter cents per bushel. This would give a rate from Fort William to Quebec of about 12 cents maximum, and six cents minimum, but, as I have pointed out it has been carried by water from Duluth to Quebec, a greater distance, for three cents per bushel. Grain is now being forwarded from Fort William to Montreal via Depot Harbour for three and three-quarter cents per bushel. Over that Georgian bay route and by the Canada Atlantic Railway grain has been hauled this summer for three and three-quarter cents per bushel, and I ask whether it can reasonably be expected that grain would be carried that distance over an all-rail route north of Lake Superior for anything like the same sum? The railways have some chance of competing with canal transportation, because canal vessels take small cargoes, but when railways come to compete for 500 miles along Lake Superior with boats that will carry 300,000 bushels each, you cannot reasonably expect real competition by the railway against the water route. I am also informed that by developing our water ways, by providing proper elevators at Port Colborne and other lake ports, grain can be carried by lake, river and canal, from Fort William to Montreal for three cents a bushel and earn a fair, moderate profit. I am informed of that by a gentleman who has made a study of the subject and who I believe will probably engage in that business before very long. Let us remember in this connection that the lake and river route, and the all-water route of this country serve two distinct purposes; they are both necessary, and therefore we should look to the development of both. The canal navigation closes about the middle of November, and the Georgian bay does not close for navigation until the 15th of December, and those who are familiar with the navigation of the Georgian bay tell me that there is not the slightest difficulty in keeping up the navigation later than the 15th of December, up to the 1st of January and even the middle of January, if assistance were given in the shape of breaking the ice which forms near the shore. You would thus have the lake and canal routes operating up to some time early in November, and after that the railway and lake routes operating up to the 15th of January. These are complementary to each other, all serving a common purpose; because it is necessary that we should get a very considerable portion of the grain of the Northwest, not only to Fort William and Port Arthur, but to the eastern side of Georgian Bay, before the close of navigation, so that it may be transmitted to Atlantic ports by rail as soon as possible.

Now, let us compare the grain rates in the United States. Let us take some of the rail rates which have been established in the United States by the Grand Trunk Railway itself. The all-rail rate in cents per hundred pounds from Chicago and Chicago junctions to Boston is 20·3 cents; to New York, 18·3 cents; to Philadelphia, 16·3 cents; and the rate from Minneapolis and St. Paul to Boston is 29½ cents; to Now York, 27½ cents; and to Philadelphia, 25½ cents. Compare these rates with the quotations to which I have just been referring to, and consider, if you will, whether or not profitable rates can be established over this railway running to the north of Lake Superior. These railways in the United States are charging these rates in the presence of fierce competition, not only with other railways, but with the all-water route and the lake and railway routes as well. They are railways established in a thickly settled country, with heavy traffic in both directions, and largely supported by local traffic. Do you imagine that a railway running north of Lake Superior can make even as fair rates as those to which I have referred; and even so, are these rates which can compete with the lake rate or with the lake and rail rate which I have given to the House? Let us apply some common sense to this question, and consider for a moment whether or not a railway north of the height of land, having among other disadvantages to carry its coal a thousand miles into that country, having to compete for five hundred miles with vessels carrying 300,000 bushels, can make as good rates as the United States roads. If it can, it cannot possibly compete with the all-water routes or with

routes part rail and part water. Let us see what is said in the United States Industrial Commission report of 1900 in this regard. A very competent witness, whose evidence is cited in the report, gives the rates in the United States as follows :

For the year 1897 the average all-rail rate from Chicago to New York on corn (Indian corn, maize) was 11·43 cents per bushel. During the season of navigation of that year the average rate by lake and canal, including the charge at Buffalo, was 4·53 cents per bushel. For 1898 the average all-rail charge on corn was 9·8 cents, and on wheat twelve cents. The average charge by lake and canal, exclusive of charges at Buffalo, was 3·81 cents on corn, and 4·45 cents on wheat.

Now, compare the two rates in 1897, 11·43 cents per bushel on corn by rail, 4·53 cents per bushel by lake and canal ; in 1898, 9·8 cents per bushel by rail, 3·81 cents per bushel by lake and canal. On wheat in 1898 the rates were : By rail 12 cents, by lake and canal 4·45 cents. Then he says, further on :

On the amount of grain exported during the year 1898, the difference between the all-rail charges and the lake and canal charges would be about $25,000,000.

We have a report on this very subject ourselves. I do not know whether the members of the government, in dealing with this question, have thought fit to consult their own reports. If they did, they might find conclusive evidence on this point. Let them turn to the report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the present year, and compare the rates given in that authoritative volume for these different modes of transportation. I will give only the rates of wheat, although the rates on corn are given as well. The rates on wheat per hundred-weight by lake and canal have been as follows : In 1881, 8·67 cents ; in 1882, 7·23 cents ; in 1883, 9 cents; in 1884, 7 cents ; in 1885, 6·5 cents ; in 1886, 9·1 cents ; in 1887, 9·5 cents ; in 1888, 7 cents ; in 1889, 6·9 cents ; in 1890, 6·7 cents; in 1891, 6·9 cents ; in 1892, 6·4 cents ; in 1893, 7·6 cents ; in 1894, 5·1 cents ; in 1895, 4·8 cents ; in 1896, 6·2 cents ; in 1897, 5·2 cents ; in 1898, 4·4 cents ; in 1899, 5·8 cents ; in 1900, 4·5 cents ; and in 1901, 5·11 cents. So that you see a reduction in the cost of carrying wheat by lake and canal from 8·67 cents in 1881, to 5·11 cents in 1901, a period of twenty years. The rate on wheat per bushel from Chicago to New York by lake and rail was reduced from 10·49 cents in 1881 to 5·54 cents in 1901. In 1881 the all-rail rate from Chicago to New York was 14·4 cents per bushel, and in 1901, 9·88 cents per bushel. In the year 1901 the cost in the United States of carrying a bushel of wheat from Chicago to New York by these three different modes of transportation, was as follows : By lake and canal, 5·11 cents per bushel ; by lake and rail, 5·54 cents per bushel ; and by all-rail, 9·88 cents per bushel. If you look at the decrease in cost, you will find that the lake and canal and the lake and rail rates have decreased proportionately quite as much as the all-rail rate. This is a very significant circumstance, particularly when we consider that the people who are anxious that the state of New York shall undertake the deepening of the Erie canal to a depth of 14 feet, estimate that when that work is completed, it will be possible to have wheat carried from Chicago to New York for 2½ cents a bushel. They estimate that in this way : They say that the average cost of transportation from Chicago to Buffalo last year was 1½ cents per bushel, and that when the deepening of the Erie canal is completed, it will be possible to take wheat from Buffalo to New York for eight-tenths of a cent per bushel, thus making the rate from Chicago to New York practically 2½ cents per bushel. In view of these facts it is very difficult for us to believe that this project can be very successful, as regards the carrying of grain, and upon that the success of the whole project depends. Let us take the evidence given by an officer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, given before a committee of the House in 1898. It is to be found in sessional papers, volume 33, appendix one, page 149. It is the evidence of Mr. Wainwright, a very able man, who was giving evidence on the question of railway transportation :

Q. As a railway expert what on ordinary freight is the charge per ton per mile that would pay expenses ?

A. That is a difficult thing to answer. It depends a good deal on the description of freight, the quantity you can carry and the distance of haul. In carrying coal for instance we do not calculate on a rate per ton per mile, we calculate what we can carry a train load at. It is carried in train loads and we can afford to carry it very much cheaper per ton per mile than in the case of other classes of freight.

Q. Take hauls of 400, 500 or 1,000 miles for instance, what would you regard as a satisfactory charge ?

A. We look upon a rate of ½ to ⅝ of a cent per ton per mile as satisfactory.

Q. That is a satisfactory rate ?

A. It is a covering rate if carried some distance in train loads.

Mr. Haggart :

Q. It is according to distance ?

A. Yes, entirely.

Mr. Powell :

Q. I am asking about long distance train loads. As a supplementary question, what proportion would be profit and what expense ?

A. That goes into the question entirely of working.

Q. Take a fairly economically managed road, take the Intercolonial for instance, what do you think would be a fair charge per ton per mile over that for long hauls under favourable conditions ?

A. I could not tell you as to the Intercolonial. On our own road at half cent per ton per mile under most favourable conditions we should not make more than one-tenth of a cent per ton per mile.

Further on he said three-tenths of a cent might cover the actual cost on a perfectly level road.

Coal, labour and materials have all increased in price since above evidence was given and consequently cost of haulage must have increased also.

In dealing with freight of this character, he puts down coal as freight which is carried cheaper than anything else. That would equal a rate from Fort William to Quebec of $4 per ton, or 11 cents per bushel, and from Winnipeg to Quebec of 16½ cents per bushel. There is more than that. I would like to read to the House a short memo. as to the relative merits of rail and water routes which I have obtained from a transportation expert. It is in these words :

The average all-rail cost from Fort William to Montreal during the past five years has been twenty cents per 100—twelve cents per bushel.

The average all-water, and lake and rail rate for the present year from Fort William to Montreal is five cents per bushel. The nominal lake and rail rate to-day is less than four cents, and grain is actually being carried at less than this. The rate via Midland to-day would be a little higher, about 4½ cents.

The Wolvin Company is at present carrying grain from Duluth to Quebec for 3½ cents per bushel.

By the all-water route from Fort William to Montreal, grain has been carried in large quantities during the present season at five cents less ¼ cent for elevating charges—4¾c.

By carrying in large steamers from Fort William to Port Colborne, there unloaded into elevators, reloaded into craft of the size suitable for Welland canal and forwarded to Montreal, the cost of transportation would not exceed three cents per bushel. Not more than ten per cent of the wheat is carried by the rail route and it is so carried only in times of necessity when it is absolutely necessary to bring the grain forward at almost any cost. In the United States the rail and water routes carry over seventy-five per cent of the grain of the United States and it must be remembered that the rail competition there is over railroads which run through a thickly populated country having large commercial interests and supported by very large local traffic. The conditions connected with the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific from Fort William to Montreal would be absolutely different.

I have other statements here comparing the cost of transportation in the western states with that in Canada. For example, from Earling, a town west of Chicago, 44 miles distant, the rate is 20 cents per hundred pounds and 12 cents per bushel. From Chicago to the sea-board, 908 miles, the rate is 14 cents per hundred pounds and 8·4 cents per bushel. The total distance is 1,349 miles, and the rate per hundred pounds is 34 cents, and per bushel 20·4 cents. That about corresponds with the distance from Winnipeg to Quebec. From White Earth to Duluth, a distance of 602 miles, the rate is 20 cents per hundred pounds and 12 cents per bushel. From Duluth to New York, 1,387 miles, the rate is about 20 cents per hundred pounds and about 12 cents per bushel. The total distance is 1,989 miles, and the rate about 40 cents per hundred pounds and about 24 cents per bushel. And so on, with many other illustrations of a similar character, with which I will not weary the House, as I fear I am taking up too much time. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior referred to a rate of 5 cents per hundred pounds between Kansas city and Chicago, a distance of 488 miles, but that was obviously a cut-rate during a period of severe competition. I find that the rate between these two points has been as high as 19 cents, and to-day it is 14 cents ; the standard rate is 12 to 14 cents per hundred pounds, or nearly three times greater than the rate my hon. friend gave. My hon. friend quoted this rate of 5 cents to show that freight could be carried at 11½ cents per bushel from Winnipeg to St. John. But take the lowest standard rate between these two points, and you have a rate of 47 cents per hundred pounds from Winnipeg to St. John, or 28 cents per bushel. And, as I have said, these American rates are on roads running through thickly settled country with large local traffic, subject to control by commissions and to fierce competition, not only by other railways, but by water routes.

The provision in this contract regarding unrouted freight is of no importance unless there should be a considerable quantity of such freight. But what is the practice with regard to unrouted freight in the United States and Canada ? Have the government stopped to inquire ? Can any one on the government benches tell me how much unrouted freight is sent forward from Fort William ? It all goes to Fort William as unrouted. But thence to the coast, it is routed by men who know much more about this question than any member of the government—men who make this question of transportation an every day study, men who know ten times as much on the subject as nine-tenths, at any rate of the members of this House. Unrouted freight goes to Fort William just as it goes to Minneapolis, Duluth, and Chicago, and is routed thence for export to Europe. How is that done ? It is done in this way. The shipper, who has made a study of all possible routes, wires to one line and to the other, inquires as to rates, and when he has got the rates, he selects his own route. Does the government know that one man in Canada last year controlled the routing of 10,000,000 bushels of grain ? What does that provision regarding unrouted freight amount to unless you can show me that some considerable part of the grain of Canada will come within its scope ? What are the terms of the contract ? They are :

That all freight, not specifically routed otherwise by the shippers, shall when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely in Cana-

dian territory, or between Canadian inland ports.

Where does that bring it to? To Fort William as it is at present. What happens then? It is routed for export. Will any hon. member point to one provision in this contract which will prevent the Grand Trunk Railway from competing at Fort William or Port Arthur or Midland or any of those ports on the Georgian Bay and securing that freight and carrying it to Portland? If there is I would like to know where it is. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior would seem not to have read this contract, although he was put up in the House to defend it. Let me quote some of his language with regard to it. Referring to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) he said:

My hon. friend then proceeded to show that the result would be that the Grand Trunk Railway, long before the government line to Winnipeg was built, would be hauling out wheat from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and bringing it down to the lakes and sending it to the markets of the world. I may be excused if I do not regard that as a very alarming proposition. If the proposition is that before we get the line built to Winnipeg the Grand Trunk Railway Company will be relieving the congestion and raising the blockage in the west by taking the grain out by way of the lakes, the way our hon. friends say it ought to go, that is not a very alarming criticism of the proposition before us. We trust that that will be the case. We trust that the prognostications of my hon. friend from Hamilton will come true that at an early date the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will to a considerable extent be able to relieve the congestion in the west.

Well, we shall be delighted to have the Grand Trunk Pacific, when it gets to the west, remedy the congestion. But let us not suppose that there is anything in this contract that will prevent the traffic going to Portland. It would be brought, as the Minister of the Interior says, to the lakes, and then the Grand Trunk Railway, controlling as it does the Grand Trunk Pacific, will see to it that that trade at the lakes goes to itself. And when that traffic gets out of the lakes, is there any contract which forbids it being carried to Portland instead of to Halifax or St. John? I have not found that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is a party to this contract. Is it a party to the contract? The hon. Minister of the Interior seems to think it is. Let us look at his language:

Are the opponents of this measure driven to such absurd reasons as these against a provision of this kind in a solemn contract made between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway?

Does my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) say that the Grand Trunk is a party to this contract? I have the document before me. It is not even a contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but is a contract made by certain gentlemen, Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and others, 'acting on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company'—not on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior is referring to some imaginary contract between the government of this country and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Where is that document? Why has it not been produced to the House? It is not a mistake, a slip of the tongue on the part of the Minister of the Interior, because he repeated it again and again. For instance, he says:

I would like to see my hon. friend the leader of the opposition or the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals sitting upon a bench, as the sole arbitrator between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway to adjudicate on a complaint that the contract was being violated under such circumstances.

And he says, later on:

But I go further, I would not consider it at all advisable to put in this contract a penal clause, a clause that would provide, for instance, that a fine in the ordinary sense should be levied against the Grand Trunk Railway for the violation of the clause. It would not, in my judgment, be an appropriate or proper way of arriving at the end we desire to reach.

How are you going to put a penalty against the Grand Trunk into a contract to which it is not a party? Then, later on:

If the Grand Trunk Railway carries out its contract, then there is no escape from the conclusion which was placed before this House by my hon. friend. You cannot get over it by laughing, you cannot meet the argument by jeering at it. There is only one way of meeting the argument that he presented to this House, and that is by showing that the Grand Trunk will not be able to carry out this contract. That is the only way you can meet it. If the Grand Trunk Company carries out its contract, then we will pay just what the Finance Minister said, not one dollar more or one dollar less.

And still later:

And yet, we are asked to believe that after a little while the Grand Trunk will fail to carry out its contract, and it won't go on. What does that argument amount to? What is the Grand Trunk going into this scheme for?

And so forth. Now, I respectfully point out to the House that the Grand Trunk is not a party to this contract. The Minister of the Interior is in error in supposing that it is a party; and the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Finance have no grounds for their supposition that you can come to this parliament and get parliament to punish the Grand Trunk for the violation of a contract by which it has never been bound. When I pointed out that there were no sanctions in this contract, what were we told? We were told: Parliament will create the sanctions after the offence has been committed. I think it would be better for parliament to create the sanctions before the offence comes. That would be the fairer way. These hon. gentlemen seem to think it would not interfere with

the sanctity of contracts in this country to say: We will not put a punishment or sanction in this contract, but when there is an attempt to evade it, parliament will come forward and provide the punishment and sanction. But surely you are not going to punish the Grand Trunk for violation of a contract they never entered into. That is the argument, nevertheless, of my hon. friends the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior.

The practice in Canada at the present time, the practice which has grown up in Canada as in the United States, is to route the freight from an interior point to a Lake Superior port, whence it will be routed by the best, most economical and expeditious line; and the Grand Trunk is at perfect liberty, under the terms of the contract, to carry to an American port every pound of freight which it thus secures at Lake Superior. In that way, has the government, by the expenditure of $100,000,000 attempted to secure the transport of Canadian products through Canadian ports. There is only one way to do that, as I said before, and I hope, before I sit down, to point out the means by which it can be accomplished in a somewhat surer way than that which the government have brought to the attention of the House.

The third point in the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister was that this road was necessary to develop the country for settlement. The opposition are ready to support any well-considered measure looking to that end. The Grand Trunk Pacific is entitled to build in the west. So far as subsidies are concerned, they should not be given where private enterprise will build all necessary railways. If we accept the statement of the Minister of the Interior, the government should never have granted assistance to the Grand Trunk Pacific. For that hon. gentleman pointed out that there was such a future before any railway building into that country that the enterprise would attract capital from all over the world. According to what the hon. gentleman says, railways will be built there without any assistance whatever. But I say, in respect to the development of the west, I would be willing to support the government in a measure for the building of further railways through that country for the purpose of opening up land for settlement and providing means of communication for the thousands of settlers who are going into that country. And I would not count the cost over-carefully in such a matter. But in the portion of the country where the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railway are stretching out their feeders, as they must do to supply their very important lines, I should think that private competition would do everything that was necessary. Therefore, I would think it the duty of the government to see to it that the Grand Trunk Pacific went north into the undeveloped country to provide means of communication for the people who are going in there and not send it through the country that is already served by rail. Now, so far as that part of the government scheme is concerned. I think that you might give to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, for some distance west at least, the assistance proposed by the government for the reasons I have mentioned, and for the further reason that you will, perhaps, by means of that—though I think you can do it in a better way which I shall point out later—bring the great railway systems of Ontario and Quebec into close and direct communication with the great railway systems of the west. What are the objects to be aimed at in dealing with the transportation question at this time?

1. To secure the lowest possible rate for transportation in order that our people may obtain a portion as large as possible of the price at which their products are sold in our domestic and foreign markets.

2. To secure the transportation of Canadian products through Canadian channels.

3. To promote trade and intercourse between the two great divisions of our country, the east with its great industrial future, its vast resources of the field. of the forest, of the mine and of the ocean, and the west with its vast plains capable of supplying the food not only of the empire, but the world, and beyond the province of British Columbia with its great mineral and other resources.

4. To take immediate steps for the relief of any congestion of traffic on Canadian lines of transportation.

5. To develop and utilize for transportation purposes our great national highway, the Intercolonial, on which we have expended more than seventy millions, as well as our great inland waterways, rivers and canals upon which we have expended quite as much. It is not possible to ignore this vast expenditure amounting to more than $150,000,000 in considering our future policy in regard to transportation.

6. To promote the development of our country by encouraging colonization and settlement in districts suitable for that purpose.

7. To firmly insist that any assistance given for the construction of railways shall be amply compensated for by equivalent advantages secured to the people of the country.

8. To act in concert with and not to restrain or discourage individual enterprise, but at the same time to prevent monopolies and to maintain effective control over great corporations.

9. In this connection it should be added that if, in the public interest, the whole or any portion of any great line of transportation can be more advantageously operated by the country than by a private corporation, then the same justification exists for

exercising the right of eminent domain, upon payment of due compensation, as that which permits the government of a great railway corporation to expropriate the business, or property, or undertaking of a farmer, of a merchant, or manufacturer.

My right hon. friend smiles, I do not know for what reason he would make any distinction between the two. The principle has been justified in the United States, in Great Britain and in this country, on the ground that it is in the public interest and in the interest of the whole country, and I say I know of no reason why it should not be exercised in the case I have mentioned with all due regard of course to private interests, because in such cases you must not only be fair, but you must be generous to the person whose property is taken against his will. But so far as the principle itself is concerned, I say that it supports action in the one case as well as in the other.

Now, taking these points which I have referred to, the government proposal, it seems to me, has nothing in it to ensure or even to render probable a reduction of rates, dealing with the first desideratum I have made. The present rates by lake and rail and by lake and river are much lower than those which can reasonably be expected from the line proposed by the government. The road in the west will be subject to less stringent control than that exercised over the Canadian Northern at present by reason of the agreement which has been made between that company and the Manitoba government.

Further than that, this company is to have a very large capitalization. I know there are many hon. gentlemen in this House, some of them on my own side, who do not agree with me that capitalization has anything at all to do with the control of rates. But the extent of capitalization has been raised in the western states, where it is relied on and made the basis of argument; and I feel that, taking human conditions as they are, dealing with human influences as they are exercised, you must come to the conclusion that over-capitalization will have some influence upon the fixing of rates. What is the capitalization of the line from Winnipeg to the coast?

Capital stock..	$45,000,000
Prairie section bonds $20,000 per mile for 1,100 miles..	22,000,000
Mountain section bonds $50,000 per mile for 600 miles..	30,000,000
	$97,000,000

$97,000,000 for 1,700 miles equals a little over $57,000 per mile. The $25,000,000 of common stock may be acquired by the Grand Trunk Railway Company for a consideration that cannot be regarded as more than nominal. Further than that, if the eastern section is built, with the grades which are referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk, is there any gentleman on either side of the House that can give us any estimate at all of what that road will cost? The hon. member for North Norfolk says you must have grades not exceeding one-half per cent. He says that economical haulage would probably call for grades of not over four-tenths per cent. Is there any hon. gentleman who can give us within $10,000,000 an estimate of what that road will cost with grades of that kind? There is no one capable of answering that question to-day—and I dare say I might increase the amount within which I could ask them to name a figure. But I venture to say that there is no one who can give us that amount within $10,000,000, and support it by any data which would be regarded for one moment by any company undertaking to construct a railway in Canada. Well, what will your rates be? They will depend altogether on the cost of this road, because the country is to pay 3 per cent of the cost of the road, and does any one suppose that great corporations like the Grand Trunk Company and the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will not be able to see to it that such rates shall be fixed as will enable them to pay that rental without loss to themselves, or else they will throw over the road upon the government and say that they cannot operate it at all. There are some peculiar provisions in this contract by which the government can stop the construction of this road at any time between sessions of parliament. I did not exactly understand the explanation given by the Minister of Finance with regard to that, but possibly some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House can give more detailed explanations of it.

Now, in the second place, as regards keeping the trade within Canadian channels, a majority of the grain, as I have said, will go to Thunder Bay ports, it will be carried by lake and rail, and eventually the greater part of it will be exported to Europe. The Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other road, can go there and compete for this grain without fear or favour. The Grand Trunk Railway is not any more bound by this contract than is the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as I can understand. Therefore, it is not bound in any way to carry it to Canadian ports. There is nothing in the present scheme specially calculated to promote trade between the east and the west. The greater portion of the heavy traffic will be carried as before.

Then what has been done to relieve the congestion of traffic. The present congestion is occasioned, not by lack of railways, but by lack of equipment. It is admitted and stated, not only by men who are concerned in this matter personally in the west, but by the newspapers all through the west, that there are plenty of railways, but a lack of equipment. I was astounded the other day on being told the amount of traffic

that the Great Northern Railway handles upon a single line. The two railways from Winnipeg to Fort William and Port Arthur can handle this traffic easily enough, there will be no congestion if they are only properly equipped, and the same thing, I have no doubt, might be said of the other lines from the west.

In the next place, if the scheme is successful, it is calculated to destroy the usefulness and opportunities of the Intercolonial. The Minister of the Interior took issue with regard to that, and I am prepared to take just as sharp issue with him. We spent more than $15,000,000 on the Intercolonial in bringing it to Montreal, and to improve it, and equip it after we brought it there. Now, is any one in this House prepared to say that that railway was not extended to Montreal for the purpose of capturing some portion of the trade of the west? The policy of the government with regard to that was announced at the time by the Minister of Railways, the mouthpiece of the government, and hearty cheers were evoked by the very language I am now about to read to the House, which was used by him on the 16th of June, 1897, and which is to be found on page 4286 of the 'Hansard' of that year:

> And, as I was saying a moment ago, if you examine the details of the contract which has been entered into between the government on the one hand and these companies on the other, you will perceive very clearly that we have been solicitous and careful, that every term and every condition should be introduced which would ensure us an opportunity to gain our share of the western trade. As you will see, we have engaged with the Grand Trunk to carry the freights for us from the west to Montreal and to deliver these freights to us when they get them there, not to take them around by the Richmond line or by Lévis, not to carry them off on the Grand Trunk, but to deliver them to us. So, when we send our canvassing agents through the west, as all railway companies do and ought to do, and those agents pick up traffic and make contracts, we may be sure that the business will fall into our hands when it reaches Montreal.

That was the policy of the government then. The right hon. gentleman had not then had the inspiration of his visit to Depot Harbour. He came to the conclusion that the government should send out agents to solicit business for the railway, and ask for the trade of the west, and it was on this ground that we extended the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal and on this ground almost alone, although of course, it was important that better communication should be in that way ensured to the maritime provinces. The great desideratum pointed out to the House and the country at that time was that the Intercolonial Railway should be prepared to reach out and obtain control of some of the trade of the west and for that purpose it should send canvassing agents through that territory. What happens now? According to the terms upon which my right hon. friend supports this scheme the grain trade of the west is to go over the eastern section of the Grand Trunk Pacific and is not to go near Montreal at all. Having expended $55,000,000 in the first place on the Intercolonial Railway and having expended $15,000,000 for the purpose of capturing some portion of the trade of the west we are now expending $100,000,000 in order that the Intercolonial Railway shall get no portion of that trade. Yet, the hon. Minister of the Interior stands up and says that it does not affect the agreement which was made in 1897. Does he not remember the elaborate traffic arrangments entered into between the government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company by which the trade secured by these canvassing agents and brought from the west by the Grand Trunk Railway would be delivered to the Intercolonial Railway for transport to Halifax—delivered to the Intercolonial Railway not at Lévis or Quebec, but delivered to it at Monreal? Now, these same bountiful products of the west are to be carried over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, over its eastern section to Moncton, by running powers to St. John and Halifax, and the Intercolonial Railway is not to carry one pound of that freight. Was my hon. friend the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals right or wrong when he said that I did not put this matter strongly enough? I said it was a reversal of the policy which the government had entered into in 1897. He says that it is a condemnation of the policy of 1897. I am prepared to admit that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was right because I do not think that even he used strong enough language to describe the conduct of the government as it affects the Intercolonial Railway. After spending $15,000,000 in 1897 to get a portion of the trade of the west, after having arranged to send out canvassing agents to secure it and to have it delivered to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal, they are now spending $100,000,000 to take it over this proposed railway away from Montreal and away from the Intercolonial Railway altogether. They add to the national debt $100,000,000 for the purpose of undoing that which they spent $15,000,000 to accomplish in 1897. Look at what we have on our hands in Montreal at the present time. What did we do for the purpose of securing the trade of the west? We rented half of the terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Montreal. There was an investigation in connection with the proposal, and one of the Grand Trunk officials was asked the question: Do you not think this is a pretty big thing for the Intercolonial Railway to undertake—the renting of half of these enormous terminals of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in Montreal? His answer was: It is pretty large, it is like a newly married couple hiring a very large house but they will have use for it in the future. Well we have our terminals in Montreal and we pay $140,000

a year for them and we also paid during this last year $168,000 as our share of the maintenance of these terminals ; making an expenditure of $308,000 a year for the terminals at Montreal alone. Now we are to spend $100,000,000 more to take all the traffic away from Montreal.

I want it to be remembered in this connection that in offering this criticism of this project I am not at all offering any criticism of the proposal that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the Grand Trunk Railway Company under that name shall get into the west. What I am criticising is the mode of doing it. It sems to me to be most extraordinary, most contradictory and a complete reversal and condemnation of the policy which the government adopted in 1897.

Then, what advantages are secured to the country for the assistance granted to this road ? The portion which the hon. minister says is a magnificent business proposition is the portion which is to be built with government assistance. There is no contract for the control of rates such as has been obtained in Manitoba. There is only the control that is exercised over railways generally. Are there any lower rates guaranteed ? None are guaranteed and how can you expect lower rates in view of the statistics which I have presented to the House and in view of the statistics of a similar character which have already been submitted. In addition to that there is, for the reasons that I have mentioned, no assurance that the trade shall be sent through Canadian channels. Further than that the Grand Trunk Pacific is given power to engage in almost every possible description of enterprise and in that way it may be possible in the future that individual enterprises may be dwarfed and curtailed when it may come into competition with this great corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition might well content itself with stating generally the objections to the policy of the government, but, in view of the importance of the question it is essential that an outline of our policy should at least be stated. In the first place I say that I believe this is a question upon which any political party in Canada should obtain the best possible expert assistance and advice and it would be our policy, by commission or otherwise in the speediest possible way to obtain that advice and assistance so as to be able to act upon broad lines, upon reasonable lines and with due inquiry, with due promptitude and at the same time with due caution and deliberation. Subject to that consideration the policy which I think should be adopted by the country is, in the first place, as follows :

Canada has expended on the Intercolonial Railway over $70,000,000 and of that expenditure $15,000,000 pointed to further development, to a further extension of the road to the west. As I said before in answer to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), you have the Intercolonial Railway and you have to do something with it. Are you going to sell it, or give it away ? Are you going to let it stand still or are you going to develop and extend it ? Is it alone of all the great railways in this country to stand still, because we must remember that stagnation means in the end ruin ? I say that I am not one of the pessimists such as the hon. member for Hants who are afraid of the future of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman talked about pessimists. Did you ever hear anything more pessimistic than the doleful account he gave of the prospects of the Intercolonial Railway and his expression of opinion that the people are not able to operate efficiently their own railway ? He spoke about croakers. I do not want to apply any terms of that kind even though they come from him, but I will ask when he is dealing with the Intercolonial Railway who the croaker is in this House to-day. What are we going to do with the Intercolonial Railway ? We are not going to give it away, I hope, we are not going to sell it, I hope, and we are not going to let it stand still, I hope. Other railways throughout the country are being developed and extended. Why not the Intercolonial Railway ? I say that I do not believe the Conservative party, the party which had the courage to build the Intercolonial Railway, the party which had the courage to build the Canadian Pacific Railway in the face of opposition of hon. gentlemen opposite, will shrink from extending the Intercolonial Railway to the shores of Georgian bay. That may be done either in the mode mentioned by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, or by some other way. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) spoke of, and the public press of this country have discussed, the question of acquiring the Canada Atlantic Railway. I have no doubt that that railway is a very valuable line. I have made some inquiries with regard to it and I may give to the House and to the country some information as to what it has accomplished in the way of solving transportation problems in this country during the past six or seven years. The Canada Atlantic Railway extends from Depot Harbour on the Georgian Bay to Coteau Junction, a distance of 342 miles. In addition to this they have a line 57 miles in length between Coteau Junction and Alburgh Junction in the state of Vermont, making in all about 400 miles.

In order to obtain access to Montreal a line would have to be built from Coteau Junction to Jacques Cartier Junction, or a similar point, to connect with the Intercolonial Railway.

During the last year for which we have a report, over 19,000,000 bushels of grain were carried over this road, over one-half a million barrels of flour, 12,700 tons of live stock,

over 500,000 tons of lumber and wood and about 500,000 tons of manufactured goods and other articles. The total tonnage amounted to 1,545,000 tons.

Running east from Depot Harbour to Madawaska, a distance of 133 miles, the grades are about one per cent, but from Madawaska to Coteau Junction in no place do they exceed one-quarter of one per cent. At the present time their engines are hauling from twenty to twenty-five cars of wheat from Depot Harbour to Madawaska and from Madawaska to Coteau Junction they haul from sixty to seventy cars of wheat.

At Depot Harbour the Canada Atlantic Railway has an elevator capacity of 1,250,000 bushels. They have two warehouses 700 feet long by 90 feet wide, and the docks form an aggregate length of 3,000 feet and are built in 22 feet of water.

The harbour is about half a mile in width, and the water is of sufficient depth to accommodate the largest lake going steamer and perfectly safe in all winds and weathers.

In connection with the Canada Atlantic Railway, there is a steamer service known as that of the Canada Atlantic Transit Company. They have several very large steel steamers of 4,000 to 7,000 tons burden each which have a capacity from 130,000 to 275,000 bushels of grain, equal to from 175 to 275 carloads. Those steamers make trips between Fort William and Depot Harbour. They also run to Chicago, Milwaukee and Duluth, where they obtain a large amount of freight to and from. During the past season they carried 19,000,000 bushels of grain, there being generally two or three million bushels in transit.

Large quantities of package freight are shipped every season between New England towns and places in Manitoba and the west over the Canada Atlantic Railway.

The gross earnings of the Canada Atlantic Railway last year were $1,816,946 and the net earnings were $569,000 or a little over $4,000 per mile. Their net earnings last year were sufficient to pay five per cent on their capitalization.

They have forty-five passenger cars, about 1,000 box cars, over 500 platform and coal cars, besides the ordinary snow ploughs and other equipment, and sixty engines.

The steamers are not owned by the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, but by the Canada Atlantic Transit Company, and while there may be some difficulty about the crown owning steamers which ply for commercial purposes to foreign countries, I should suppose, though I did not consider the question very carefully, that a difficulty of that kind could be overcome by maintaining the present organization; or in other words, the legal title to the steamers would remain vested in the company, and the government could own stock in the company in the same way that the British government own stock in the Suez canal. Let me point out to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) who talked about the advisability of carrying grain from Montreal or Quebec to Halifax for nothing, that this is the scheme that suits him exactly. Here are 19,000,000 bushels of grain that he can capture in this way and bring to Halifax; here are 31,660 cars of grain, or from 800 to 1,000 trains. According to the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) this could be carried to Halifax without appreciably increasing the cost of operating the Intercolonial Railway. Is not this a splendid opportunity to carry out the idea of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) who I am sure will be the first on the other side of the House to stand up and regret that this matter has escaped his attention, and to assure me that a scheme of this kind will receive his absolute and unqualified support? The Canada Atlantic Railway is thus referred to in the report I have already mentioned of the Industrial Commission of the United States:

> A new and very advantageous route has recently been established in what is known as the Canada Atlantic Railway. This route is from Chicago via water to great lake ports, say Parry Sound, Ont.; thence by rail through Canada to a place called Coteau Point, where grain is transferred into barges and taken alongside vessels at Montreal. This route was built two years ago and has handled an enormous amount of grain. It has had a tendency to regulate to a certain extent the rates via the American all-rail lines. . . . . At present the Canadian routes are the cheapest, and during last season they have had all the grain they could possibly take care of at Montreal, and the lack of ocean tonnage has been the only thing which prevented Montreal from doing a much larger business.

Any hon. gentleman who likes to investigate the subject can see the evidence of the witness who gives the evidence referred to at page 412 of this report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not wedded to the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway. I am only propounding a policy which I think ought be followed, namely, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to a Georgian Bay port. It may be that after expert advice has been obtained some other scheme may be found for carrying out that policy that would be better and more advantageous than the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway. So let it be. If, however, the Canada Atlantic Railway commends itself to the judgment of experts, and from what information I can obtain with regard to it, I should think it ought to so commend itself, and I would think that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from such a point as Jacques Cartier Junction to Coteau, and the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway to Depot Harbour, would place the Intercolonial Railway in a very much better position than it is at present.

What would be the advantages of this proposal? It would place in the hands of the government a means of bringing to the

Intercolonial Railway a very considerable portion of western traffic, and thus absolutely secure in the country, transportation of Canadian products through all Canadian channels to a very great extent. There would be no gainsaying the question of all Canadian channels then. Here is a railway that carries 19,000,000 bushels of grain alone, and an enormous freight traffic besides. Go and acquire this railway; go to a Georgian Bay port and you would at once most assuredly and certainly bring to Canadian channels all that traffic so secured. In the second place, it will render the present Intercolonial Railway more valuable by obtaining a share of the western traffic; it would render it more valuable by giving it that through traffic which is so important for the reasons that have been suggested to-day by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) in that cogent and forceful way in which he presents such matters to the House. In the third place, it will bring the people of the maritime provinces into close touch with the people of the west, and by this means the government railway—or as the Minister of Finance rightly described it, the people's railway—the people's railway will have taken one more step further to the west. It will connect directly at the Georgian Bay with the industrial life and increasing development of the great west. In the fourth place, this is the logical outcome of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. In the next place it is an advance step, not a retrograde step in the principle of government ownership. We should abandon government ownership altogether, or we should give to our system of government railways such extension and development as the business interests of the country demand. Is every other railway to advance, and the Intercolonial Railway to stand still? No, Mr. Speaker, I believe not; and I believe, that the Conservative party, having carried this railway to Lake Superior, as they will be in a position to carry it when they come to power at an early date; the Conservative party having thus extended this railway, will make it in the best sense the people's railway. The Conservative party which was not afraid to build the Canadian Pacific Railway and to bind together the scattered communities of Canada will not be afraid to carry this Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian Bay, and if the needs of the country demand it, to the distant shores of the far Pacific.

I do not expect my hon. friends on the other side of the House to be enthusiastic about this. I know how they were afraid of the Canadian Pacific Railway project in days gone by. I know that they will be afraid of this extension to the Georgian Bay. Let them have hope and confidence in the future of this country. Let them not be afraid that the people of this country will not know how to operate their own railway. Let them not be of that faint heart which showed itself so unpleasantly twenty years ago; let them come forward and adopt this principle of government ownership of railways as far as the Georgian Bay at least, with an extension some time in the future to the Pacific coast. Let them demonstrate to some extent that conversion which they claim from their faint heartedness, and lack of confidence of twenty years ago. Let there be no uprising of croakers or faint-hearts when this proposal is mentioned. Let us remember that this is the people's railway; let us remember that the people of Canada are capable of governing themselves; and let us remember that the people of Canada, if they are capable of governing themselves, are capable of operating this railway in a way which will free it from party political control, while maintaining over it political control in the broadest and best sense of the word. I know that strong men have failed in the past in dealing with this question, but I do not despair of dealing with it vigorously and efficiently and rightly in the future. I believe that some means can be found of freeing the management of the Intercolonial from that party political control which has done so much to keep it in the background in the past. Take away from it the party element, and retain in it the broad political element, namely, that it is the people's railway, operated by the government of this country for the people and under the control of the people. Taking our stand upon that broad principle, and not going upon theories of the King of Belgium or any one else, let us realize once and for all that we now have government ownership in Canada to the extent of 1,600 miles of railway.

The next proposal I desire to make—and I say again that it is a question on which I would ask the advice and assistance of experts—is this: There are in Canada two great natural divisions, the west and the east. These at present are in some respects two separate communities. They have business interests which, though different in some respects, should fit harmoniously into each other. These two great divisions of our country are connected in summer by a magnificent highway, the water-way of the great lakes; in winter they are separated by a thousand miles of uninhabited country, and there is some tendency, with excellent railway communication to the south of us, for the lines of trade to run north and south, instead of east and west, as they should. Now, we have in the west at the present time two great railway systems, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern. We have in the east three great railway systems—the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway. This great uninhabited country between the east and

the west—which I hope some day, so far as the northern part of it is concerned, may answer the expectations of hon. gentlemen on both sides who have addressed the House, and may become a prosperous and thickly settled country—is bridged over in the winter by the Canadian Pacific Railway. That railway, from Fort William to North Bay, is a line which doubtless could be improved, which has cost a great deal of money, and upon which some more money might advantageously be expended. The grades, I understand, are not bad; the curves are in many respects very favourable, but could be remedied at no very great expense. This railway undoubtedly is capable of carrying five times, or perhaps, with the improvements I have suggested, ten times the traffic which is carried over it at present. I say it would be a proper thing and a wise thing for this government to acquire that railway from North Bay to Fort William, and make it a national highway of Canada, and operate it by means of an independent commission, giving to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern and the Intercolonial as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway equal running powers over it. I say that for this reason, that to build two railways or three railways where one railway, with running rights over it, will answer the same purpose, is economic waste. By the acquisition of this railway you can put the Grand Trunk Railway, one of the great railway systems of Ontario, into direct touch with the commercial life and development of the west inside of six months. For the purpose which I have suggested, the government can acquire either full ownership of that railway or the absolute control of running powers over it.

It may be suggested by some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House that what I propose is impracticable. I say it is not impracticable; and I have talked this question over with many railway men who are more familiar with the subject, I think, than any gentleman in this House, with the possible exception of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who has given these subjects a great deal of attention. It is difficult to give to one railway effective running powers over a line which is under the control of another and competing railway. But if the government acquires this railway from North Bay to Fort William, it can establish and maintain an independent control over it and give to these three railways exactly equal running powers over it for which they shall pay in proportion to their user on a wheelage basis; and that object can be accomplished, as I have been informed by railway men, the highest in the country, without any difficulty and without any friction whatever.

I would not for one moment suggest that anything should be done that would break the continuity of a great transcontinental highway like the Canadian Pacific Railway. But this would not break the continuity of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company at the present time owns that road, which has only one-fifth or one-tenth of the traffic it can carry. If you give to the Caadian Northern and the Grand Trunk, in common with the Canadian Pacific, equal running powers over that line, you will increase its traffic to some extent, but for many years to come you will have an avenue for all the trade that will be carried from the east to the west by means of a railway. You will not only bring the Grand Trunk immediately into touch with the commercial life of the west, and with it every village and town of Ontario, but you will also bring the west, by means of the Canadian Northern, into direct touch with the villages and towns of Ontario. I regard the Canadian Northern as being as much entitled to the status of a transcontinental railway as the Grand Trunk Pacific. Its object and aim has been to reach the Pacific coast, and its object and aim must be also to reach the Atlantic coast; and having received running powers over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to North Bay, there is no reason why that railway should not at an early day be extended to the shores of the Atlantic. Already it has a line under construction to the town of Edmonton; and with regard to a line from there to some further point in the west, I will give you my views before I sit down.

I have suggested the extension of the Intercolonial to the Georgian Bay. If we should acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, we could build a line from that point or more probably from Scotia Junction to join the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Sudbury. That country has already been surveyed five or six times by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, once by the Canada Atlantic Company, and once by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. The cost of constructing a railway through that section is well known, or could be ascertained by the government in a few days. By that means the Intercolonial, besides being extended to the Georgian Bay, could be joined by a line about 105 miles in length to the Canadian Pacific Railway running north of Lake Superior.

The third proposal which I would submit to the consideration of the House, as a sound policy, is to assist in improving the grades of one or both lines from Winnipeg to Fort William, upon the condition that complete control of rates is obtained and that the Grand Trunk Railway, as well as the Intercolonial Railway shall have running powers from Fort William into Winnipeg. Such running powers might be exercised by joint operation; or if that were found unpracticable, owing to rival interests, then under an independent authority appointed for that purpose by the govern-

ment. This arrangement will bring the Grand Trunk Railway, with all its great system in Ontario and Quebec, into direct touch with the railway system and industrial life of the west, inside of six months or a year. What will be the advantages of this proposition ? In the first place, it will insure further competition with respect to rates in the west. In the second place, it places at the disposal of all our great railway systems the existing line from North Bay to Fort William, which can serve the requirements of all our great railways for many years to come. In the third place, it will give the people control over rates by the mere fact that the Intercolonial Railway has power to enter Winnipeg. It will place the people in a position to own and operate their own line through the west to the coast, in case of oppressive rates, or in case control of rates by the railway commission should not fulfil our expectations, or in case the development of the country, within a few years, may point to that as a desirable policy.

The fourth feature of the policy which I propose is this : I would assist the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on reasonable terms, to build a line north of the Canadian Northern Railway and as far west as Edmonton or some adjacent point. This assistance should be coupled with complete control of rates and with all the stipulations now contained in the proposed contract as to carriage through Canadian channels and ports. Furthermore, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, as well as the Grand Trunk Railway, should covenant that traffic, as far as possible, shall be carried through these ports. We should not only have such a covenant from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, but also from the Grand Trunk Railway, if it be of any value. I do not regard it as of any great value, but I do regard it as of the utmost possible value to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay and thus to secure a considerable portion of the products of the west for transportation upon the people's railway to our own ports of Quebec and Montreal and the ports in the maritime provinces.

As far as the line from Edmonton to the coast is concerned, I do not believe that at present there is in Canada any call for two railways. We know that the Canadian Northern Railway is looking for extension to the coast. It has its charter to the coast and it has its line partly built to Edmonton and from Edmonton west. I repeat that you must regard the Canadian Northern Railway as one of the great transcontinental systems of Canada. At some point on this side of the Rocky Mountains, there should be a common point, a junction between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. From that on to the coast, there should be one line. That line should be built by these companies, under such an arrangement as would give them joint control. Reasonable assistance should be given by the government by a guarantee of bonds in aid of construction. Should there be any difficulty in coming to such an arrangement, the government should build that line itself and maintain control and give these railways for a terms of years equal running powers over it. There is no reason why we should build competing lines through the Rocky Mountains, but there is reason why we should build the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway into the west because the west is developing rapidly. But from some point near Edmonton to the Pacific ocean, there should be one railway. If these two great corporations, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—or the Grand Trunk Railway, as it is in fact—had equal running powers over that line to the coast, under independent control, by that means you would have in fact three transcontinental railway lines in Canada, and I think you would have the transportation problem in Canada settled, as to its main features, for the next twenty-five years.

So far as the line from Quebec to Winnipeg is concerned, I am not disposed to minimize the possibility of that northern country. Looking at the history of the great west, there may be a great flood of settlement into that country north of Lake Superior, some day or other, at least up to a certain point west, but I do not think we know enough to justify us at present in saying that there will or will not be, because I do not know how far that country is capable of competing, in the early future, with the magnificent country we have in the North-west. I have some doubts as to whether or not that great northern country may compete as early as we would desire with the great western country. But I am not disposed to minimize its importance in any way, and to my mind the rational way of dealing with the proposed line from Quebec westward is this: First, thoroughly exploit and explore that northern country, realize and understand its capabilities and possibilities for settlement and colonization and build such railways as these conditions and requirements may demand. Build only after you have obtained the fullest possible information and obtain that information with the least possible delay. You may find curious conditions surrounding you when you get into that country. You may find that the road, which is the most direct line to the Pacific coast, will not be the road that will open that country for colonization. You may find it necessary to have a road running in one direction for colonization purposes while any future line to the coast must take a very different direction.

You may also find that lines running north from the settled portions of Ontario and Quebec will be required for the development of that country. You must go upon sufficient

information, upon sound and reasonable lines, and when you do that, give to that country all the development which the people require. Not only build that line, but operate it as a government line. A government line, it seems to me, would be peculiarly suitable to that country for colonization purposes, and I see no reason why the problem should not be solved in that way. If in the future the enormous development of the west should make another transcontinental line necessary and if through this northern country an economial and practicable route can be found, then extend that road to the Pacific coast? Build it as a government road from Quebec to the coast. Be not afraid to undertake that project, but do not undertake it until you have the information, the data and the necessity which will justify you to deal with it. I am not saying this for the purpose of unnecessary delay. I believe in going ahead with the work once you get the information and the data which are necessary and as soon as the development of the west justifies it.

The next feature to which I refer is one upon which I think there ought not to be two voices in this House or country. Thoroughly equip our Georgian bay ports, our national waterways, our St. Lawrence route, and our ports on the Atlantic coast. Give them the terminal facilities which shall enable them to compete with the American ports. Give them, if necessary to properly compete with the American ports, free terminals. Give them terminals on the Georgian bay, both on the east and west coasts, develop the waterways on the St. Lawrence route, develop the facilities at Port Colborne, exploit the harbour at Montreal and make that a national port, a free port in the true sense of the term. Do the same with regard to the port of Quebec, with regard to the port of St. John, with regard to the port of Halifax. The people of this country are not afraid of spending money, if it is spent in a sane and reasonable way. And I know of no better way in which the money of this country can be spent than by improving the great inland waterway, the St. Lawrence route, and our great national ports. And I am prepared to support this government, or any other government, that will spend money for this purpose, and spend it in such a way as will enable the people of this country to compete with the tremendous influences which affect this question of transportation to the south of us. There is no reason to be afraid of spending money. I am not afraid of spending money. And the country is not afraid of spending money. But let us spend it in a reasonable and proper way. And no saner or better way can be found of spending the money of this country than in providing these terminals on the lakes, developing the lake ports to which I have referred, improving the St. Lawrence waterway so as to make it as perfect as money can make it, and placing the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax and any other national ports on as good a basis as any American ports. I have already explained my position with regard to a shorter line for the Intercolonial through New Brunswick.

It is very near six o'clock, but, if it is not asking too much of the indulgence of the House, I would like to finish what I have to say before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

The elevator question in the west, in connection with these terminals, is a very important one, and it is one that will have to be dealt with by the government, and dealt with under the best possible expert advice. We know that in the western states a farmer, on putting his grain in the warehouse, gets a certificate which is guaranteed by the state, and which is practically so much money to the person for whose benefit it is given. He can go to any bank and draw the amount at once. This is a matter that I have not studied or carefully considered; but it seems to me it would be a proper subject for this government to fully investigate, with a view to deciding whether some similar system could not be adopted in this country, so that the farmer of the west, putting his grain into warehouse would receive such a certificate, would, if necessary, have the whole faith of the country pledged to the accuracy of the certificate, and be able to realize upon his grain at once. It is a question not without difficulties, not without complications. But there are dozens of questions as important to the people of this country as this one, which this government does not seem to have investigated at all, but which would have been investigated and placed before the House in suitable form if the government had proceeded with the policy they brought down at the opening of the session and repeated in the month of May last. Do not let any man in this House or out of it believe that he understands the question of transportation thoroughly. I do not believe there is any one man in Canada who understands that question completely in all its aspects. You would have to get a number of the best railway men in Canada together in order to understand the complexities and difficulties of the situation, so as to be able to meet them. For example the Canada Atlantic Railway is competing at Duluth and Chicago for western grain. Matters of this kind should be considered and weighed as they affect the problem in the east. All the questions affecting the right of the farmers of the west to store his grain practically at the expense of the country, without charge, except as afterwards included in the railway freight rate—because, I believe, that is what is done in the western states, where the elevator charge for a certain period is not paid in the first instance by the farmer but is absorbed in the railway

charge—all those things should be studied. It may be found necessary for this government to take steps to relieve the congestion in the west, and, for the purpose of relieving that congestion, to exercise the running rights I have referred to over the Intercolonial to Winnipeg, and provide in Winnipeg additional terminals to those I have suggested on the shores of Georgian bay. I think that is a great possibility, a very serious possibility, and perhaps in the not very distant future. Because we shall have enormous grain crops in the North-west, and it would be an economic waste, it seems to me, for 100,000 farmers to build 100,000 barns or warehouses, when, by means of proper transportation facilities, their grain could be stored for a merely nominal charge in elevators erected as a common enterprise.

Now, let me say in conclusion, that this that I have stated is in outline the policy I would be prepared to adopt. I would take the advice of the experts in the department of Railways and of the best experts in Canada, and, if necessary, of the best experts that this continent or any other continent can produce. But, subject to that advice, I would be prepared to proceed along the broad lines I have proposed. Consider my proposal, as contrasted with that of the government :

1. It combines prompt action with deliberation and caution.

2. It develops and does not throttle the Intercolonial.

3. It takes account of the expenditure upon the Intercolonial and upon the inland waterways, and brings those great national highways into harmony with our project. The lake route, the St. Lawrence, the canals and our great railway systems are joined by the policy I propose in one harmonious whole, whereas the policy of the government ignores the waterways, takes no account of the lake communication—cuts off the very Intercolonial Railway on which this country has spent $70,000,000 —and on which this government have spent $15,000,000 for the purpose of doing the very thing which I am advocating in this House.

4. It develops transportation along the lines of least resistance, that is to say, by water and by water and rail.

5. While connecting at the same time all the great railway systems in Canada, it controls in the only effective way the carriage of Canadian products through Canadian channels, by enabling the people's railway to compete for this traffic.

6. It affords immediate relief to the congestion of the west by bringing the Grand Trunk Railway into Winnipeg without delay. And

7. It insists that further railway development in the west shall not only give necessary competition in settled districts, but shall open and develop new country.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an outline of the policy which I would submit as an alternative to that proposed by the government. It is a policy based upon an abiding and abounding hope and confidence in the future of this country ; a policy which looks to an enormous development in Canada within the next few years ; a policy which, I trust, is not unworthy of the traditions of that great party which made the North-west a part of Canada, which bound together the scattered provinces of Canada by a railway stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and which, from first to last, has believed in and advocated a national policy, not only for the development of our industrial life, but also for the solution of the great transportation problems of this country.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Speaker, one of the most celebrated of modern French authors, I think it was Renan, when he wrote his first book, refused to hand over the manuscript to his publishers, because, he said, on reflection I have come to the conclusion that all I have written has been better said before I undertook to say it. Comparing small things with greater, that is to some extent the position in which I find myself to-night. I quite realize that it is almost impossible for me to contribute much that is useful to this debate. Having, however, been identified to some extent with the negotiations which led up to this agreement, and being technically, at all events, responsible for the form in which the contract comes before this House for consideration, I venture, Mr. Speaker, to claim your forbearance, upon the very solemn promise which I now give to you that I shall not trespass at too great length upon your patience.

I had intended at first to explain the scheme which is now submitted to the House ; but I think I may as well now deal briefly with some of the arguments put forward by the hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon. I shall venture to call his statement the alternative proposition put forward by the opposition. Why does that alternative proposition imply? First, government ownership in the abstract; then, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Parry Sound; the expropriation of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sudbury to Port Arthur; running rights over the road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg; and the extension by the government of the Intercolonial over the proposed route from Quebec to Edmundston, and thence to Moncton.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend will pardon me. I did not suggest the extension from Quebec, I suggested the extension from a point in the vicinity of Rivière du Loup. But, of course, I would

be guided in that regard by the opinion of experts.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understood that what my hon. friend had in view was the use of the Intercolonial from Quebec to Rivière du Loup, then its extension, probably by way of Lake Temiscouata, to Edmundston, and then from Edmundston to Moncton. Now, what does all this imply? Let us begin with the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway from here to Parry Sound for the purpose of extending the Intercolonial Railway. Some time ago an application was made by this company to the Railway Committee to obtain power, I think it was, to consolidate their bonding powers at all events, in connection with the application, the solicitor of the company appeared and told us that the Canada Atlantic Railway had up to the present time cost Mr. Booth $17,000,000. That is the expense in connection with the Parry Sound extension, and I apprehend my hon. friend does not assume that it will be possible for us to acquire this railway at less cost than the amount I have just mentioned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On the contrary, I said it could be acquired for about $12,000,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The sum I have mentioned was the actual cost, as stated by the solicitor, Mr. Chrysler. Now, let us realize what it would mean, if we did not buy the Canada Atlantic Railway, but if we undertook to extend the Intercolonial system from Ste. Rosalie up to Parry Sound, Ste. Rosalie being at the present time the western terminus of the Intercolonial. It is true that we have running rights over the Grand Trunk Railway into Montreal, but the western limit of the Intercolonial is at Ste. Rosalie. Now, you would have to build from Ste. Rosalie, I imagine, to some place in the vicinity of Coteau. That intervening distance must be covered in some way. If you have to do that, let us consider what it means. My hon. friend told us this afternoon that the extension of the Intercolonial from Point Lévis to Ste. Rosalie and thence into Montreal had cost this country $15,000,000. What would it cost us to extend that road up to the point of intersection with the Canada Atlantic Railway ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I included betterment and equipments in that sum.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Well, that is the estimated cost of the road in its present condition. Now, we could not afford to have an extension of that road up to the point of connection with the Canada Atlantic Railway that would be in any way inferior to the road we have got to Ste. Rosalie ; therefore, to secure that extension you would have to make an expenditure of $17,000,000 for the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway, that being the very least figure, I think. But that is not all. You would then require to extend the road from Parry Sound to Sudbury and then to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sudbury to Port Arthur, 500 odd miles. In addition to that, he proposes to acquire running rights over the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Arthur into Winnipeg. From Sudbury to Winnipeg I believe the distance is about 1,000 miles—from Port Arthur to Winnipeg the distance is 426 miles, and from Sudbury to Port Arthur, 555 miles. What does that imply in the way of expenditure? At least $75,000,000. It seems to me, after listening to my hon. friend this afternoon, that new blood has been infused into the opposition. I think that my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) must have had some forethought of what my hon. friend was going to say this afternoon——

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Would the hon. gentleman permit me? I am just back from Montreal.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let me finish the sentence. It seems to me that my hon. friend from St. Mary's must have had some forethought of what the leader of the opposition was going to say this afternoon, when he told us a year or two ago, 'Wait till you see us next year.' I am afraid that next year has come for the opposition. The leader of the opposition, I think, has not quite realized what all this means, or at all events, he has been more faithful to the enthusiasm of his early political convictions than to the mature opinions of his later years. He has entirely forgotten what used to be the view of the Conservative party with respect to the government ownership of railways; he has entirely forgotten what Sir John A. Macdonald said in answer to those who, in 1880, at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway was being extended to the west, proposed that it should be done by the government. Listen to what Sir John said at that time :

> The government had every right to use all their exertions in order to relieve themselves and the country of the obligation of building this road and the still greater obligation of running it. Let any one consider for a moment what these obligations are and how they press upon the government. We see this in the Intercolonial and every public work. Why, Sir, it is actually impossible, although my hon. friend has overcome many obstacles with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, for the government to run that railroad satisfactorily. It is made a political cause of complaint in every way ; the men that are put upon the railroad, from the porter upward, become civil servants. If one of these men are put on, from any cause whatever, he is said to be a political hack. If he is removed, it is said his removal was on account of his political opinions. If a cow is killed on the road, a motion is made in respect to it, by the member of the House who has the owner's vote and support. The responsibility of the worry and annoyance having charge of special work are such that for these causes alone it was considered advisable to get

out of the responsibility. We have enough of evidence of that in this House.

That was the doctrine preached by the Rt. Hon. Sir John Macdonald, in 1880. How have the mighty fallen. What a change has come over the spirit of the dream of hon. gentlemen opposite. How they have gone back in their belief, and how complete has been the change of heart that has come to them. It will be no doubt for the hon. gentleman who follows me to explain.

Mr. BROCK. How about your own change of heart ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The change of heart is in the right direction with us. To show that the Conservative party does not follow my hon. friend, let me read from the Montreal 'Gazette' of August 13, an expression of opinion on this question of government ownership. In concluding an article upon government ownership, and its results, it says :

> This gives one an idea of the actual detriment government ownership is to transportation inasmuch as it destroys almost every inducement leading to the improvement of rates of travel, whereas under private ownership competition constantly renders improvement imperative.

Passing now to the matter in hand, what is the object that the legislation which the government has submitted to the House is designed to promote ? Is the project one of immediate and urgent necessity ? Have proper precautions been taken to carry out the object in view with due regard to the public interests ? The object which this legislation is designed to promote is to procure at the lowest possible cost to this country a common railway highway from ocean to ocean wholly within Canadian territory. As a result of the construction of this railway we will open up for settlement enormous areas in New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and by opening up these territories, by giving this country breadth as well as length, we will give an answer to those who have said that Canada is a mere fringe of habitable territory on the northern frontier of the United States of America. It is not necessary for me to refer to the extent of country that will be benefited by the construction of this road, or to the resources with which nature has dowered this part of the Dominion. It would be an idle repetition for me to attempt to do anything of the sort after the exhaustive speech delivered by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) here a few days ago, and who has, we must agree, by that speech, established once more his right to speak with authority on the resources of this Dominion. In the words of the contract, it is our intention to construct a through-line of railway from the city of Moncton, in New Brunswick, to the navigable waters of the Pacific ocean. From Moncton to Edmundston the road runs through the centre of New Brunswick, and I was much struck the other day in listening to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) when he described Moncton as the natural railway centre for all the maritime provinces. A very superficial glance at the map shows that not only is it the railway centre for the province of New Brunswick, but also for the provinces of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. From Edmundston to Lévis the line is destined to serve a fertile country, partly settled, but which has been for years and years asking for additional railway facilities. It is within the knowledge of this House that the Intercolonial Railway skirts the shores of the St. Lawrence river, and that it is located on the old line of the Grand Trunk Railway, which location was first established over 40 years ago. Since that time settlement has gone on in many places between the line of the St. Lawrence river and the Maine boundary. There are settlements extending back, 40, 50, aye 60 miles, and these settlements back from the line of the Intercolonial Railway the distances which I have mentioned are to a large extent without railway communication. No man has lived in Quebec without realizing that the result of this has been to discourage settlement, and as a matter of fact that part of the province of Quebec has materially contributed to swell the tide of emigration that set in some years ago towards the United States. I can say that throughout the length and breadth of that portion of country, there is scarcely a single family that has not got one, two, three and even more members who are now residents of some of the manufacturing centres of New England. The people have cried out for a railway, and we have realized that it is a real grievance they complain of. To the best of my recollection, as far back as 1885 a discussion took place in the Quebec legislature, and at that time the Conservative government in power promised an investigation and give some assistance towards the construction of a line of railway through this country. The same thing occurred in 1890 when an exploration took place from Lévis to Edmundston, and as a result of that exploration it was ascertained that it is easy to build a line throughout that whole section of the country. Not only is that the case, but we in this House have incorporated a company to build a line from Lévis to Edmundston ; that company is known as the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company. Not only have we given a charter to the company, but we have subsidized the company to aid in the construction of the railway. That is not all. There is running from Quebec southward through the valley of the Chaudière, and thence by way of Thetford to Sherbrooke, a very important

railway, perhaps little known beyond the limits of the province of Quebec, which is known as the Quebec Central Railway. At the head of that railway is Mr. Grundy, one of the most competent railway men in this country, a man who is fully alive to the needs of his company, a man who has brought this railway to such a condition of perfection that at the present time it is looked upon as one of the best paying enterprises in the province. I have it from Mr. Grundy's own lips, that, having examined the conditions existing between Lévis and Edmundston, he is prepared, himself, with some measure of assistance from the government, to build a line of railway covering that part of the country. But, this is not all. Mr. Grundy has reason for his belief in the resources of that portion of the country which will be affected by this railway. For instance, the county of Beauce is one of the counties which is in the immediate vicinity of the projected line of railway. Mr. Grundy told me that last year his railway carried from the county of Beauce for export, ten million pounds of maple sugar. Now, there is one county of the five or six that will be affected by the construction of this road from Quebec to Edmundston. I do not mean to say that they are all equal in fertility or that they all possess the same resources as the county of Beauce, but they all in some measure at all events have the same resources as the county of Beauce. If one county has produced the results that I have mentioned what might you not expect from the six counties which extend from Quebec to Edmundston ?

When you come to Lévis you reach the harbour of Quebec. It is not necessary for me to enlarge upon the facilities for ocean trade which that port offers. Quebec possesses probably the finest harbour in the world, a harbour where the largest ships may float with safety, and we know today, the true solution of the question of transportation is to provide large freighters to carry our goods from this side of the water to the other. As it is necessary to have large freight cars for the purpose of carrying our freight upon our railways, so it is necessary for us to have large ships to carry our freight across the water. At the present time there are trading to the port of New York, vessels with a draught of 30 and 32 feet, and the harbour of New York is being dredged to a depth of 40 feet to provide for the vessels which are coming there. At Quebec nature has provided all these facilities, and it will not be necessary to make any expenditure for that purpose. All you have to do is to employ the facilities which nature has provided you with there.

In connection with this scheme, I have noticed some ill-natured references to the city of Quebec, which, however, were not made in this House, but which I think it necessary for me to answer. I say here and now, without fear of contradiction, that in recent years Quebec has been largely overlooked in the distribution of favours. What has happened ? The Intercolonial Railway, which had its terminus at Lévis opposite Quebec, has been extended to Montreal, and the result is that the goods are carried from Montreal to the maritime provinces at the same rate as they are carried from Quebec to the maritime provinces, although the distance is 180 miles greater. Here is another example. Coal is carried from the maritime provinces to the manufacturers of Montreal for the same rate as it is carried to the competing manufacturers in Quebec, but not only that, when the coal arrives at Lévis, it costs as much to freight it from Lévis to Quebec by the ferry as it does to send it around by Montreal and down over the railway, the ferry rate between Lévis and Quebec being four cents per 100 pounds. We do not complain, however. We accept the inevitable. We thought it was in the general interest of Canada that the Intercolonial Railway should be extended, and no complaining voice was heard in this House or outside of this House from the city of Quebec. We all know that the channel between Quebec and Montreal has been deepened at an enormous expense to the country, and that the deepening of the channel was done to carry the trade from the point where nature intended it should centre, up the river to Montreal. There has been no complaint from Quebec as to that. We did not make it a grievance, but let it not be said at the present time that because the dawn of the day of justice has come for Quebec, we are getting anything that we are not fairly entitled to, anything that is not justly our own, anything that we are not willing to give to any other section of Canada.

There is still more. Our canal system has cost Canada $83,000,000, and last year there was an expenditure for the staff of $317,838, and for repairs $263,768, so that we have to pay the interest on the $83,000,000 and in addition we have to pay something like $600,000 a year for the maintenance of our canals. Does that benefit Quebec ? Does that benefit any part of the eastern portion of Canada ? Sir, the result of that expenditure is to benefit Montreal, which is at the head of inland navigation, and to benefit the country that lies between Montreal and the great lakes. We did not complain. There was no voice of protest from Quebec when that scheme was launched. We accepted it because we thought it was in the interest of the country, and that which is in the interest of Canada is in the interest of Quebec.

Now, Sir, this proposed railway will extend from Winnipeg to Quebec, but does that imply that this road is intended exclusively for the benefit of the city of Quebec ? There must be connection with the

great lakes ; there must be connection with North Bay ; there must be connection with Montreal. We have no desire to prevent that ; we expect it. The interests of the country require it, and the people of Quebec hold up their hands for all these connections. All that we ask is that you should give us equal justice, and equal rights, and equal advantages, and let the result be what it may we shall abide by it. I am speaking now for the district of Quebec with which I am more particularly identified, and I say that we believe that the interchange of trade between Ontario and the west, must of necessity establish a community of interest which will tend to unite all parts of this country. Many of the settlers of the west come from Ontario, and we desire that they should keep in touch with their old home. We believe it is the work of patriotism to teach our young men when they go west, to keep their eyes turned towards eastern Canada ; to keep their trade for eastern Canada and as their sentiments will be affected by their interests, we want them to have their interests in Canada rather than in the republic to the south. We want this connection between Ontario and the west, because we know that good must come from it to Ontario, and that good must come from it to all Canada.

It was originally proposed that the Grand Trunk Railway should be extended from North Bay into Manitoba and the territories and if we may judge from the report of interviews with hon. gentlemen opposite, that scheme met with favour in their midst.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am glad to know that it met with the approval of the hon. member of Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). This was practically the scheme that was contended for by the leader of the opposition this afternoon—the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Parry Sound, the purchase of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sudbury to Port Arthur, the extension from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, would bring trade down by North Bay.

Mr. BROCK. It is a good scheme.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a good summer scheme. It is a scheme that brings our trade to North Bay, and to Toronto and from Toronto to Montreal. It is a good scheme for the summer, but where is your winter port ? It brings the trade to Montreal and the winter port for Montreal is Boston, or Portland, or New York. These are the winter ports for Montreal from the month of November to the month of April, both months inclusive. We take issue with hon. gentlemen opposite who say : Benefit Ontario, benefit the particular section we are interested in, and then let the trade drift southward if it may. We take issue with these hon. gentlemen, and we say : benefit Ontario, give equal advantages to Quebec, and let the maritime provinces not be forgotten.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have made light of the argument used by the right hon. the Prime Minister when he spoke of the bonding privilege as being a reason why we should be independent of the United States for an outlet for our commerce. What is our position getting to be ? Each day brings us more directly in competition with the United States in the British market. Our great competitor in the English market is the United States, and for six months in the year, yes, for seven monthe in the year, we are depending upon our chief competitor for an outlet to that market for our Canadian products. Is that wise or is it prudent? How can you get out from Montreal in winter except by way of Portland or Boston or New York ?

Mr. BROCK. By way of Halifax.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Halifax competing with Portland ? It is double the distance practically.

Mr. BROCK. What is the use of talking ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What is the use of talking ? Can we shut our eyes to geography ? Can we shut our eyes to facts ? How much of the trade of Montreal has gone to Halifax ? How much grain has gone from Montreal to Halifax or to St. John ? How much of our food products have gone that way ? Invariably they have gone to Portland or to Boston or to New York. As Portland is to the Grand Trunk Railway so Boston is going to be to the Canadian Pacific Railway. At all events, so long as we understand one another, and so long as the issue remains between us what it is—that is to say, an extension from North Bay into Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and then to let the trade drift where it likes after it leaves Ontario, as against our scheme to construct a line from Winnipeg to Quebec, giving opportunities to all the commercial centres in the intervening distance to connect with it, so long as we get equal opportunities to get the trade to Quebec in order that we may be able to compete there with Montreal or the other outlets—it is perfectly satisfactory. Let us see what the respective distances are. The distance from Winnipeg to Quebec by the Grand Trunk Pacific, taking the St. Maurice river as the outlet, is 1,364 miles. The distance from Winnipeg to the junction with the Temiscaming branch at Little Abitibi lake is 814 miles; from Little Abitibi lake to North Bay, 242 miles; and from North Bay to Quebec via Orillia, 662 miles; that is to say, the route which hon. gentlemen opposite favour covers 1,718 miles, whereas by the route proposed by us the distance is 1,364 miles, an advantage of practically 400 miles in favour of the route from Winnipeg to Quebec.

The scheme of the government means a Canadian national highway, with summer ports on the St. Lawrence and winter ports in the maritime provinces. We hold that the Canadian national highway is important, not only from the standpoint of mere carriers' profits, which are well worthy of consideration, but in order to keep for Canadians the handling of Canadian goods, whether travelling by land or water. In the language of the report recommending the appointment of the transportation commission, I say it is clearly impossible, so long as our grain, our fruit, our cheese, our butter and our bacon, are brought through American ports, that they shall preserve their separate identity in the markets of Great Britain. Our agricultural products will never command over seas that price which their natural excellence entitles them to, until they cease to be confused in the markets of the world with inferior and possibly adulterated articles produced elsewhere; and I add further, that I believe, in answer to what was said by the hon. leader of the opposition this afternoon with respect to water-borne freight, that for many years to come the river St. Lawrence will remain the great commercial highway of this country, and that Montreal will always be the head of river navigation.

And in this connection does my hon. friend realize what he means when he talks about extending the Intercolonial Railway to Parry Sound? This afternoon he showed us how the Intercolonial would be brought into direct competition with water routes. He told us that from Duluth, at the other end of Lake Superior, Mr. Wolvin was now carrying wheat to Quebec for 3½ cents a bushel. Where is the money to come from to pay for the extension of the Intercolonial when it will have such competition as that to face? We would be going right into the mouth of the lion. Can we pretend to be able to carry wheat from Parry Sound on the Georgian bay to the maritime provinces or even to Quebec, and to compete with such rates as that?

Further, when you get your line to Port Arthur, where are you going to get your freight for that line? My hon. friend this afternoon said that the Canada Atlantic Railway had carried last year 19,000,000 bushels of wheat from Parry Sound to Montreal. I venture to make the statement that not a bushel of that was Canadian wheat. The whole of it came from American points. If that be the case, how is this scheme to relieve the congestion in the west? And that freight was obtained by Mr. Booth under conditions which the government could not hope to imitate. The government could not possibly do for their railway what Mr. Booth did for his. The past is there to prove to us that private enterprise does more for the development of railways than government control can possibly do. A moment ago I gave Sir John Macdonald's view of government ownership and of the extension of our obligations with respect to the Intercolonial Railway. Not only did Sir John Macdonald express in 1880 the views which I read to the House, but in 1897, when the question of extending the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal was up for consideration in this House, Sir Charles Tupper spoke as follows:

> Sir, have we not sunk money enough already in connection with the Intercolonial? Is it not a sufficient burden upon the country already, without loading it down with a capital expenditure of $7,000,000 in addition to all that has already been expended upon it. I say that a more unwarrantable, a more unjustifiable project, it appears to me, could not well have been undertaken. . . . . .

Verily am I entitled to say that a new prophet has arisen in Israel. Sir Charles Tupper went further. He said:

> I do not hesitate to say that neither to the Intercolonial Railway nor to the people of any portion of this country is this undertaking of the slightest value whatever.

These were the views of Sir Charles Tupper in 1897. But we have more than that. We have the views expressed by Mr. Foster, who then was truly a prophet. Mr. Foster said:

> Now, I take this view, and I commend it to the House to be thought over, whether under these circumstances, it would not have been far better for the government to have the connection at Lévis with the Canadian Pacific Railway and with the Grand Trunk Railway, and that in view of the strong competition at Montreal that they knew they must have and always will have on account of the distance, whether there would not be a decided saving and a decided advantage by making a connection there at the cost of a million dollars or so, instead of pressing this scheme with an expenditure of $7,000,000 to which we are tied irrevocably.

These are the views that were held a few years ago by the leaders on the other side of the House.

Now, we have the Intercolonial Railway, with a mileage of 1,500 or 1,600 miles, which has cost this country about $70,000,000, with net deficits resulting from its operation of $5,281,000; and still hon. gentlemen opposite want us to go on extending it to Parry Sound. These figures speak for themselves, and furnish a complete answer to the suggestions of the hon. leader of the opposition.

I now come to the question as to whether or not this project is of immediate and urgent necessity. The argument put forward by the other side is that we are proceeding with undue haste, that we have not sufficiently considered this question, that we do not know where it is going to lead us and what the expenditure is going to be. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite do not hesitate to formulate a scheme, which would cost twenty times over the possible limit of any expenditure in connection with the scheme before the House.

Mr. BROCK. Twenty times ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, at the very least. When the hon. gentleman considers the scheme, he will realize that I am not exaggerating. Is this project now before the House of urgent importance ? In that connection, the first witness I have to call is the Hon. Mr. Blair, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He is now the prophet, from a railway standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite. He is the only one who knows anything about railway development. He has apparently taken the place of the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and superseded the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). And when this afternoon, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition told us that he was struck dumb with amazement, that he was horrified to notice the way in which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was received by hon. members on this side when he made his speech the other day, I think we can fairly retort by reminding these hon. gentlemen of the manner in which they received the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals in the beginning of this session when he addressed the House on another matter. He was greeted with the jeers, gibes and flouts of the opposition. What has come over the spirit of their dream ? What has caused this radical change ? Is the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to-day in a position to speak with greater authority than he has a few short weeks ago ?

Well, I was about to refer to what the Hon. Mr. Blair said less than a year ago, regarding the necessity for a transcontinental line. He said :

> We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line. I am ambitious myself to see another.

When ? To-morrow ? Next week ? Next years ? After pause, hesitancy and reflection ? No, he wanted it right away ; he wanted it that very evening. The needs of the country were so pressing that he could not wait. But we have another witness, who knows something about the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and whose authority no one will challenge. I refer to the high commissioner for Canada in London. The other day, when in attendance at the gathering of the Chambers of Commerce, he said : 'Such a road is now a necessity.' There is corroboration of the position taken by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and it will have great weight in this country.

With reference to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, it seems to me—and I regret he is not here to-night—that he might have found some better explanation of the course adopted by the government than to suggest that we were moving forward at the beck and call of Senator Cox. It seemed to me that the hon. gentleman, when he used these words, said either too much or too little. He said too much, if he did not intend to imply something improper on the part of the government. He said too little if he really meant what he said and did not go any further. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman owes it to himself, owes it to this country, owes it to the respect his ex-colleagues bear for him, and which he is presumed to bear for them, to explain what he meant. We should stop here now this cry which has gone forward throughout the country that this scheme is one propounded by Senator Cox for his personal benefit. We should stop the suggestion, the vile, contemptible insinuation, that we are acting from unworthy motives. If the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was serious, this is the place, and now is the time to make a charge, if he has one to make, and to prove it. It is unfair that that expression should be allowed to travel throughout this country and furnish a text for every Tory scribbler who wants to attack the Liberal party. I say now that I defy the hon. gentleman to make or successfully maintain any charge against the government in this connection, and I say that this is the place and now is the time to make good any charge if he has one to make. On the same day, when the hon. gentleman used the expression I have quoted in this House, in another place, under this same roof, a similar expression was used. One could understand that a gentleman, speaking at the time under the influence of the generous hospitality of the leader of the opposition, should so far forget himself in an after-dinner speech as to make use of an expression of that sort, but it is unpardonable on the part of an hon. gentleman who came here carefully prepared to deliver a speech, and in cold blood make such an unfounded insinuation. Let me remind the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals the position in which he was placed in this House at the time the Drummond County Railway bargain was up. He found it necessary then to use these words, speaking of the manner in which that bargain was attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite :

> It was called a flagrant job, and I am characterized as being a bold jobber and a corruptionist by reason of having made this proposition to parliament as a member of the administration.

Surely these words should have been remembered by him when he used the language I have referred to.

> Well, Sir, one would almost think that the experience which some gentlemen have had in the past with regard to charges of that description would have led them to exercise a little care, a little caution, and a little judgment before starting out on such accusations. We all know how very easy a thing it is for people to make charges of jobbery against governments, it does not require very much material to formulate these accusations, and it is very often by reason of the absence of any real solid objections against the proposals which are made.

I call upon the hon. gentleman to answer himself the charge he made, and I apply to himself the very words he used to others. But let us get back to this question as to whether or not this project is one of immediate necessity. All that is required, in order to realize how urgent it is, is to bear in one's mind the map of this country. You will find that there are about 750 miles of practically uninhabited country, which to-day separates Ontario and the other parts of eastern Canada from the west. You will find that in that country there are about 106,000 square miles, and that this territory has only a population of 100,000, or about one to every two square miles. On the other hand, we must bear in mind that the population from the south is pouring in and bringing with them the traditions of the country they come from and maintaining their business relations with the south. We must also bear in mind that these enterprising, intelligent men will become dominant factors in the centres in which they labour. Their natural inclination is to trade south, and we can see that from the south to the north, American railways are springing up and branching out like the fingers on a man's hand and to the east there is one single line. Now, it is time, it seems to me, that we should alter that condition of things. In January, 1881, Sir John Macdonald, speaking in connection with the contract of the syndicate of the Canadian Pacific Railway, said :

It was a great misfortune to the country that the bargain entered into in 1872 with Sir Hugh Allan to build the Canadian Pacific Railway had failed because of the Pacific scandal exposure. He said that the North-west instead of having but a small settlement in the east end of it would have been the happy home of hundreds of thousands—to use the smallest figure—by that time.

Then he went on to say :

Our Dominion is as big as all Europe, and we might as well say that the railways running from Paris to Moscow might supply the wants of all Europe as to say that this railway (the Canadian Pacific Railway) might supply the wants of the whole North-west. There will be room for as many railways in that country by and by as there are in Europe.

Now, the construction of this road will not only encourage immigration to the North-west, but it will also help us to settle the hinterland of Ontario and Quebec. Originally, as is well known, the lumbermen were the great colonizing force of this country, and the lumbermen rendered great service in opening up this country. The early settler wished to remain, as far as possible, within sound of the lumberman's axe. With the lumberman he got employment during the long winter months, and to the lumberman he sold the products of his farm in summer. The settler wanted to keep within sound of the lumberman's axe and within sight of running water. Now things have changed. The new settler desires to keep within sight of the railway engineer. The new country back of the height of land will support a large population. Explorations and surveys already made show this. And in this connection, I would draw attention to the report of those gentlemen who were sent out by the Ontario government in 1900 to learn the facts with regard to that country. The findings of these gentlemen were received with jeers and flouts by hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me, for the benefit of those who are willing to be informed, give the conditions under which these explorations took place : The report of the survey and exploration of northern Ontario shows that the work was in charge of ten licensed land surveyors, each at the head of a party of explorers. There were also twelve land and timber estimators and the same number of geologists employed in the work, each of whom made a report on the district assigned to him to the surveyor in charge, and attached to the report of each of those officers, excepting one land and timber estimator and two geologists, is an affidavit or solemn declaration attesting the statements made to be true and correct. Four of the surveyors made affidavits of like character, and one died before his report was completed. The other five surveyors do not appear to have sworn to the correctness of their reports, but they are all so well and favourably known throughout the province that their honesty and good faith will not be seriously questioned. They are Alexander Niven, of Haliburton; T. B. Speight, of Toronto; Walter S. Davidson, of Sarnia; H. B. Proudfoot, of Fort William, and David Beatty, of Parry Sound.

They tell us of the enormous resources of that country. They tell us how, north of the height of land, you find a country that will grow anything that can be grown in eastern Ontario. They tell us how, beyond the height of land, you find a soil in all respects similar to that in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and more than that, that this country is rich in forest wealth. And, in that connection, let me remind the House how the pulp industry of this country has grown until it has assumed large proportions. In the decade from 1891 to 1901, the number of pulp mills increased from four to thirty ; the number of employees from 1,025 to 4,550 ; the earnings of the employees from $292,000 to $1,587,000 ; the value of the product from $1,000,000 to $6,176,000. If it were merely for the purpose of giving Canada an opportunity to get that district settled the expenditure in connection with this railway would be well worth making. But we have more than that. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we are in a hurry about the construction of this road, that we have no information, that we move with reckless haste, without any regard to con-

sequences, without any idea of what the project involves. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that the journals of this House will show that, in 1872, parliament, by a deliberate vote and by a very large majority, placed at the service of the government the sum of $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land for the construction of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and an additional amount of 20,000 acres per mile for the Nepigon branch. Sir Charles Tupper said in 1880:

> At that time, Sir, I may remind the House that it was expected, as possibly may prove to be the case yet, that the line of the Pacific Railway from Nipissing westward would run to the north of Lake Nepigon; and provision was therefore made for a branch by a vote of 25,000 acres of land per mile for 120 miles to secure connection between Lake Superior and the main line.

But, more than that; speaking in 1872, thirty years ago, according to the official report.

> Sir Hector Langevin read from the report of survey to show that the best practicable line eastward from the head of Lake Superior was on the plateau north of the height of land.

A reference to the map shows that the height of land is north of Lake Nepigon. If we had that information in the public records then, are we to be blamed if, in this year of grace 1903, when we have become better informed, we are carrying out the project which was launched at that time? More than that, is it not important to this country to realize its obligations towards the west and Manitoba? Is it not important to realize how that country is growing? Take, for instance, some figures which enable us to compare that country as it was in 1901 with what it was ten years before. In 1891, the acreage under wheat was about 1,010,000 acres; in 1901, it was about 2,495,000. In 1891, the acreage under barley was about 64,000, and in 1901, 162,500. In the same time the acreage under oats had grown from 218,000 acres to 833,000 acres. Our surplus of wheat in 1901 was 45,000,000 bushels and in 1902, 50,000,000 bushels, we may expect that by 1906 it will have grown to 59,208,000 bushels, and in 1911 to 99,300,000 bushels. How are we to make provision for handling this surplus? This road will not be ready before 1908. Are we to allow these conditions to continue, are we to say to the people of our North-west: Keep your eyes turned southward; send your products to the south through the United States, for we will not offer you facilities to trade with eastern Canada.

I have now reached the agreement entered between the company, or those who represent the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and the government, which provides that this line is to be built from Winnipeg to Moncton, and the Grand Trunk Pacific undertakes to lease and operate the line when completed. In effect, what does that mean? It means that the eastern section of the road will be built at the lowest possible cost and of the highest possible effectiveness. Why? Because the money to construct the road will be found by the government under the most favourable conditions, and because effective control will be exercised over the specifications and over the work that is done in connection with these specifications. That effective control will be exercised under section 7 in the contract, which provides that the work is to be so done as to be acceptable to the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as well as to the engineer of the government. So you have this dual control, which will ensure the highest standard of efficiency at the lowest possible cost. More than that, you will have no promoters' profits, you will have no construction company to make millions out of the contract, you will have no watering of stock, you will have no sacrificing of bonds, you will have no sudden growth in wealth of individuals at the expense of the general public. Dealing now with the clauses of the contract which have reference to construction, I will first draw attention to section 5, which provides:

> The said eastern division shall be constructed by, and at the expense of the government, upon such location and according to such plans and specifications as it shall determine, having due regard to directness, easy gradients and favourable curves.

Clause 8, provides:

> The construction of the said eastern division shall be commenced so soon as the government has made the surveys and plans, and determined upon the location thereof, and shall be completed with all reasonable despatch.

Clause 7 provides for general control of the Grand Trunk Pacific and of the government over the specifications and the work to be done. Clause 6 provides:

> The company agrees to construct, maintain and operate the said western division, and to take a lease of, maintain and operate the said eastern division upon the terms and conditions and in the manner hereinafter set forth.

Now, do these clauses imply recklessness? Do they imply undue haste? Do they imply disregard of the public interest? In the first place, you have the location fixed according to the plans and specifications to be made by the government; that is all to be done so soon as the government has made the surveys and plans, and determined upon the location thereof, and should be completed within reasonable despatch. There is no time limit, the government will proceed deliberately, will make proper investigation, will make proper inquiry, will be in a position, when this contract is let, to have proper specifications in order to have proper control over the work. Then clause 7, which I consider to be one of the

most important clauses of this contract, provides for joint control of the Grand Trunk Pacific and of the government. That joint control must necessarily result in effective control and in cheap construction. It must result in effective control and cheap construction, because if the Grand Trunk Pacific undertakes to pay 3 per cent on every dollar expended in the construction, they are interested in seeing that every dollar is properly expended, and that it yields 100 cents to the dollar in benefits to the company. Furthermore, it was necessary to provide in this contract for the construction of the western division and for the operation of the eastern division, it was necessary to provide that both these things should be done at the same time. It was necessary to make a condition of the aid that was given to them in connection with their western division, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company should operate the eastern extension to Moncton. If the government did not construct that line from Winnipeg to Moncton, what would be the position with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific? It would have been necessary for us to allow them to build their line from North Bay to Winnipeg; it would have been necessary to allow them to build that line to Winnipeg, because it was impossible to expect that they would expend their money in that western country without having means of communication with their eastern system in Ontario.

My hon. friend said some time ago that it was inconceivable that the government should undertake to build what they are pleased to call the lean section from Winnipeg to Moncton, and allow the fat section west of Winnipeg to remain in the hands of a private corporation. But what did my hon. friend say this afternoon when he proposed to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior? How fat is that section? What profits are likely to be derived from the operation of that particular section of the Canadian Pacific Railway? What comes of the argument that we are building the lean section and leaving the fat section to the Grand Trunk Pacific? I submit that the contract by which the Grand Trunk Pacific secure aid for the construction of their line through Manitoba and the territories on the conditions set forth in the contract, and that they should operate the eastern end, is in the interest of the general public. In that connection let me draw attention to section 14, which defines the meaning of the word expenditure as applied to the eastern section. Section 15 defines the cost of construction, and section 16 defines betterments. Now, you will find that in the cost of construction is included the interest on the money expended as the work progresses, so that when this work is finished the interest in the interval is added to the capital account; and what we guarantee is three-fourths of the cost of construction, the interest during the course of construction being part of the cost. Section 16 provides for betterments, that is to say, that as the road is operated it may be discovered that it is desirable to make certain changes in the road-bed, or to make certain improvements, which are to be charged to capital account. In that connection it is provided that no such changes shall be made without the consent of the operating company, but when changes are made they shall form part of the capital account, and the company will pay three per cent interest on this expenditure as well as upon the general cost of construction.

Then with respect to operation. Section 20 provides that when completed the eastern division shall be leased and operated for 50 years. Section 23 provides—and that is important, and I draw attention to it because it appears to have escaped the consideration of those who have discussed this contract up to the present time. It is to the following effect:

> The lease of the said eastern division shall contain all necessary and proper provisions required by the government for securing, during the entire term of the said lease, the efficient maintenance and operation of the said division.

Now, doubt has been expressed as to whether this company would operate the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, doubt has been expressed as to whether, after the company is put in possession of this portion of the line, and if they find it unprofitable, they will continue on and comply with the terms of their lease. Let me draw attention to this fact, that you have this security in the first instance, that they are obliged to set aside and to assign to the eastern division $5,000,000 out of the $20,000,000 which they agree to expend for equipment. The equipment to the extent of $5,000,000 under the terms of this contract is a guarantee to us that the company will operate the line between Winnipeg and Moncton. If they fail to operate that line from Winnipeg to Moncton it will be in our power to take this equipment to the extent of $5,000,000 that we will have on the eastern section and use this equipment for the purposes of the road. But, we have better security than that. We have a security which is absolutely perfect and depending solely on the regard which parliament has in the future for the interests and rights of Canada and it is this: Winnipeg is the eastern limit of the western extension of the railway. The Grand Trunk Pacific build and operate the line from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean. The limit of the eastern connection in Ontario is North Bay. The intervening space which must be covered in order to operate these two systems together, the key of the whole situation, is in our own hands. We own the link which connects the two together, and if they cannot operate the line from Winnipeg to Moncton this parliament will see that they do not operate the line from Winnipeg to North Bay, so that we have the matter absolutely

in our own hands. The connecting link between the two systems is in our own hands, the key to the situation is under our control, and all parliament has to do in the future is to be true to the interests of Canada and this road must be operated.

Now, in his remarks this afternoon, the hon. leader of the opposition said that, of course, the grain would seek an outlet by the great lakes, and that after it reached Port Arthur it would go across the great lakes to Midland, Midland being a Grand Trunk Railway terminal, and from Midland to Montreal, and in that way the whole scheme of this contract would be defeated. Nothing of this sort will be the case. If the grain goes from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, as I believe it will go in the near future, thence across the great lakes to Midland and from Midland to Montreal, I have no complaint. There will be a literal compliance with the terms of this contract. Montreal is not a foreign port, Montreal is a Canadian port, Montreal is the commercial metropolis of this country. The prosperity of Montreal reflects the prosperity of Canada, and every pound of wheat from the North-west which finds an outlet by way of Montreal is so much done for Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I suggested was that when the grain came to the sea-board of the west, that is Lake Superior, it would be routed from there and it might be routed either by Montreal or Portland without the slightest breach of any condition of this contract.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will answer the question of routing later on, but let me say that there are not going to be any two routings of this grain. As soon as proper facilities are provided in the North-west, there will be one routing between the place of production and the place of destination. When the grain is put through the warehouse there will be a through bill of lading from the place of production to the place of destination, and the grain will be carried through Canadian territory and by Canadian ships through Canadian waters, and thence to Liverpool, if the terms of this contract is complied with.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice if he thinks there is going to be a through bill of lading for wheat that remains at Port Arthur all winter ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Wheat that remains at Port Arthur will go down across the great lakes to Midland and to Montreal, and we will be perfectly delighted if it does.

Mr. BARKER. It will be routed from Port Arthur.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If there are two routings, but if there is one shipment by way of Port Arthur, it will go as I have said. However, I will deal with that question later on, because I do not regard the opinions of amateur railway experts as being as important as those of men who have knowledge of the subject.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. Minister of Justice is an amateur railway expert, I assume.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, I am not an expert, not even an amateur.

Mr. OSLER. That will explain the hon. gentleman's statement.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When I come to the question of routing, I will have the opinions of men whose opinions will be valued by this House as highly as those of others who assume to speak with an authority they do not possess. I can assure my hon. friend that in respect to the operation of the eastern division, as I have already said, we have the remedy in our own hands. We have the security of the $5,000,000 equipment, and we have what is even better than that, the control of the ownership of the one connection between the Grand Trunk Railway in the east and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in the west, and that connection cannot be bridged over except with our consent.

From Winnipeg, or some point on the eastern division, the line is to be built to the Pacific ocean. There you have in connection with the western extension a division into mountain and prairie sections. The western division is to be constructed by the company according to plans and specifications which are to be subject to the approval of the government. The work is to be commenced forthwith, and is to be completed in five years from the 1st December, 1903. Then there is another provision that is one of the conditions of this contract, and that is that the standard of the railway from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean is to be equal to the Grand Trunk Railway from Montreal to Toronto. That is something that is worth considering, and in addition we have a provision that the railway throughout its entire length from Port Simpson to the Atlantic ocean shall be fully equipped so as to meet all the necessities of the traffic. To secure compliance with the conditions of the contract you will find that there is to be a deposit of $5,000,000 as provided for in section 12. I will refer to that at some length, because this afternoon my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said that that $5,000,000 to be deposited as security might be paid out by the government on progress estimates as the work went on. Let me quote from section 13 of the contract:

> The government shall return the said deposit to the company on the completion of the construction of the western division and the first equipment of the whole line of railway, according to the terms hereof, provided, however, that, when it is shown to the satisfaction of the government that the application of the same will enable such construction and equipment to be completed——

Not as the work progresses, but that the $5,000,000 can be paid out to secure the completion of the work.

—and that the same will be so applied, the said deposit shall be released by the government in such instalments as may be from time to time agreed upon, but, if the company shall make default in the performance of the obligations of the company for the construction of the said western division and for the first equipment of the whole line of railway, under the terms of this agreement, treating the same as entire, then the said sum of money shall be absolutely forfeited to the government for the use of His Majesty the King.

That is not quite advancing the money on progress estimates. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and I think the suggestion was one that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition acquiesced in, that this equipment of $20,000,000 might be leased or hired equipment, and that it would not be available as security for the government at all. I must confess that if that proposition had not been put forth by an hon. gentleman of the high legal attainments of the hon. member for Hamilton and concurred in, as I understand it, by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I would have made bold to say in this House that the point was not arguable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is that? I was not following.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That the $20,000,000 of equipment may be leased or hired and not be the property of the company at all, and therefore not available as security.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think I dealt with that point this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend did not, but he offered the suggestion in the course of the speech of the Minister of the Interior. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) did not argue it this afternoon, and he is too good a lawyer to take the responsibility of arguing that seriously. Section 11 provides :

The company shall lay out, construct and equip the said western division of the said railway to a standard not inferior to the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada between Montreal and Toronto.

That says that they shall equip the line of railway to a standard not inferior to the Grand Trunk Railway. Section 12 provides :

The company shall within thirty days after the passing of the Act confirming this agreement and of the Act incorporating the company hereinafter referred to, deposit with the government, five million dollars in cash or approved government securities, or partly in cash and partly in such approved securities, at the company's option as security for the construction of the western division and for the first equipment of the whole line of railway, as provided for in this agreemnt.

There is the security that they are to equip the whole line of railway to the extent of $20,000,000, and yet it has been argued that they could comply with that condition by leasing the rolling stock, and putting it on the line. Section 13 provides :

The government shall return the said deposit to the company on the completion of the construction of the western division and the first equipment of the whole line of railway, according to the terms hereof.

Section 19 provides :

For the purpose of enabling the government to determine the cost of construction of the said railway, or of any portion thereof, or the cost of the equipment supplied, the government shall have the right from time to time, and at all times, to inspect all the books of account, pay sheets, contracts, correspondence and all other books, papers and documents, the inspection of which may be considered necessary for the purpose of determining such cost.

Here the government have the right to make an investigation for the purpose of ascertaining what was the cost of the equipment supplied, and still it is suggested that this may be leased equipment. Section 22 provides :

The company shall equip both divisions of the said line of railway with modern and complete rolling stock suitable and amply sufficient for efficient operation and the handling of all classes of traffic to the satisfaction of the government, and the first equipment for the completed road shall be of the value of, at least, twenty million dollars, of which not less than five million dollars worth shall be supplied for the operation of the eastern division of the said railway, and the said five million dollars worth of rolling stock, together with all renewals thereof and additions thereto, shall be marked as assigned to the said eastern division and shall be held to be and form part of the equipment of the eastern division of the railway during the said period of fifty years and shall be used as the equipment appertaining thereto, according to the ordinary practice of railways during the said period of fifty years.

And yet the suggestion is made that they can comply with the provision to equip the line with an equipment of the value of $20,000,000 and that they can comply with that provision by hire. Then section 34 provides :

Inasmuch as the bonds to be guaranteed by the government only make provision for a part of the cost of construction of the western division, the company hereby agrees that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada shall guarantee bonds of the company for the balance required for the construction of the said western division, exclusive of the said twenty million dollars required for first equipment.

And then we have the final section 35 (a) :

(a.) A mortgage which shall be a first charge upon the railway, undertaking, equipment and property, tolls, rights and franchises of the company, including all equipment and property to be thereafter acquired by the company (but not including branch lines exceeding six miles in length or the revenues therefrom or

the franchises in connection therewith, or such additional rolling stock as may, with the assent of the government, be designated and marked by the company as constituting the equipment thereof, and not including ships or any municipal or provincial grants of land, by way of bonus or subsidy, to the said company other than for railway purposes) to secure the payment of the said issue of first mortgage bonds guaranteed by the government.

They bind themselves to give us a mortgage on the railway and the equipment of the company and the suggestion is that this provision may be complied with by having leased property. Section 35 (b) provides :

(b.) A mortgage which shall be a second charge upon the property covered by the mortgage provided for by paragraph thirty-five (a), save and except the rolling stock constituting the equipment of the eastern division, to secure the bonds to be guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada as aforesaid.

They take the precaution there of exempting the equipment of the eastern division from this mortgage, but if it did not belong to the company what is the use of dealing with it in that way. Then section 37 it seems to me places the matter beyond the possibility of doubt :

The company shall purchase all material and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers.

As I said, I should not have thought this point arguable had it not been suggested by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I took the trouble even to consult counsel about it. I had it in my mind when this contract was drawn, to provide that this equipment should be subject to the claim of the government ; that it should be real and effective security. It was so discussed by the parties who were present when the agreement was drawn, and it was so understood between us all. But when I heard my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) argue this point, I came to the conclusion that possibly I had failed to carry out what I intended and what both parties to this agreement intended. I consulted a man whose opinions are worth something in this country. I consulted Mr. Shepley, of Toronto, and he said he does not think that the question can be fairly argued.

Mr. BARKER. Might I ask the minister whether Mr. Shepley was not one of the counsel engaged in drawing up this agreement ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. On the other side ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no ; we are not quite so bad as that. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) really is too clever.

Mr. BARKER. That is so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When the contract was practically completed Mr. Shepley was asked to come in and advise, for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not we had overlooked anything, and we got the benefit of his advice.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He was called in by the government.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course called in by the government. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) would not imagine that I consulted the other side. Then I thought I would get the opinion of Mr. Chrysler who was also engaged in this matter, and I asked him whether we had failed entirely to carry out the expressed intention of both the contracting parties, and Mr. Chrysler expressed some surprise that the thought ever was suggested. I went further. I suspected that my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) might think that these two gentlemen having been consulted by the government in connection with this contract might perhaps have a leaning towards the government view of it, although I never thought he would suspect me of calling in counsel on the other side. What did I do ? I consulted Mr. Gormully, solicitor for the Bank of Montreal, one of the men who in this country is most competent to speak on such a subject, and Mr. Gormully expressed absolutely the same opinion as the other two gentlemen. And then, last but not least I thought I would take the judgment of a gentleman whose opinion stands high in this country, a gentleman whom I for one look upon as one of the best lawyers we have in this country, and whose opinion I highly value ; I refer to the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, and he concurred absolutely in the opinion expressed by the other counsel.

To assist the company in the construction of this western division it is provided that the government shall guarantee the payment of the principal and of the interest to the extent of $13,000 per mile on the prairie section, and to the extent of $30,000 per mile on the mountain section. That is the limit of our liability. If three-quarters of the cost of construction does not come up to the figures I have mentioned, then of course the government is not obliged to go beyond three-quarters of the cost of construction. If, however, as is anticipated, it may cost more than the amount estimated, the government's liability is fixed and limited with respect to the prairie section at $13,000 per mile and with respect to the mountain section at $30,000 per mile ; and, as I said a moment ago, interest during the course of construction is included in the cost of construction. If you look at sections 15 and 18 of the contract, you will find the words 'cost of construction' defined. They include almost everything that it is possible to imagine with respect to the eastern division, and they include, with respect to the

western division, 'the like classes of expenditure as in the case of the construction of the eastern division.'

Then it is important to know how the cost of construction is to be ascertained. Section 19 provides :

For the purpose of enabling the government to determine the cost of construction of the said railway, or of any portion thereof, or the cost of the equipment supplied, or the net earnings of the railway, or of any part or parts thereof, pursuant to this agreement, the government shall have the right, from time to time, and at all times, by and through such agents, engineers, accountants and inspectors as it may appoint for that purpose, to inspect all the books of account, pay sheets, contracts, correspondence and all other books, papers and documents, the inspection of which may be considered necessary for the purpose of determining such cost.

We have absolute control over their books of account and over their whole administration, for the purpose of ascertaining or controlling the cost of construction.

Another point to which I would like to draw the attention of the House is one of very considerable importance. You will remember that government is to guarantee the cost of construction of the western division to the extent of seventy-five per cent. It was important to know how to ascertain the cost of construction; but it is also important for the House and the country to know when the government is going to bind itself with respect to this guarantee. When is the guarantee to be given ?—immediately, or after the road is completed ? Let me draw your attention to section 29 of the agreement :

Such bonds may be issued in such denominations in the currency of the Dominion of Canada, or in sterling money of Great Britain, as may be agreed upon, and the principal of such bonds shall be payable in fifty years from the date of issue, and the said bonds shall be dated and issued, and the guarantee of the government endorsed thereon, so soon as the Western Division is constructed and equipped ready for operation.

They must construct the western division, equip it and have it all ready for operation before the government is under any obligation to endorse these bonds.

The government has absolute control over the whole work. Section 40 provides :

The company shall, before being entitled to the guarantee provided by this agreement, furnish evidence, satisfactory to the government, that all just claims of contractors and for materials, wages and supplies, and all just claims against contractors and sub-contractors for materials, wages and supplies entering into and supplied for the construction of the railway have been duly paid.

Not only have the company to build the road and equip it, but they have to furnish evidence to the government to the effect that they have liquidated all their liabilities here mentioned before being entitled to the government guarantee.

You will naturally ask me, how is the company to finance this enterprise during the course of construction ? Provision is made for that.

I draw the attention of the House to the wording of section 36, which provides for the issue of interim bonds :

Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this agreement, interim bonds of the company secured by first mortgages may from time to time, during, and for the purpose of the work of constructing the said Western Division, be issued by the company and guaranteed by the government, as may be agreed upon from time to time, subject to all the limitations and conditions imposed by this agreement.

There is no obligation on the part of the government to endorse a single bond until this road is finished and equipped, except so far as under this clause of the agreement the government may choose to do so. It is entirely optional with the government. With respect to the western division, the road is to be built by the company, equipped by the company, and our obligation as guarantors of their bonds begins only when the road is finished in its entirety from Winnipeg to the waters of the Pacific ocean.

Mr. HEYD. At that stage how much money will the company have invested in the western division ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. Not one penny.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The company will have invested at that stage the total cost of construction. That is estimated at $20,000 a mile for the prairie section of 1,200 miles, and $50,000 a mile for the mountain section of 480 miles. They will have invested all that money. That is a total of $48,000,000, and in addition $20,000,000 for equipment, making a total expenditure of $68,000,000 by the company. The property upon which that amount of money will have been expended will be security to the government for what ? For a guarantee to the extent of $13,000 a mile for the prairie section and $30,000 a mile for the mountain section. The result will be that we shall have guaranteed to the extent of $30,000,000, and shall have a security to the extent of $68,000,000.

There is more than that. Assuming now that we will be called upon to pay the interest during the seven years upon that mountain section, that interest would amount to $3,024,000, so that the extreme of our possible liabilities in connection with the western section is $33,024,000, and the result would be we will have a road costing $68,000,000 as our security. But we have even more than that. We have additional security in this respect, that the Grand Trunk Railway is bound by this agreement to guarantee the bonds issued to secure the money necessary to complete this road. What does that mean ? Should the prairie section cost $20,000 per mile, the Grand Trunk Railway will have to guarantee $8,-

400,000, being the balance required to complete that section. Should the mountain section cost $50,000 per mile, the Grand Trunk Railway will have to guarantee $9,600,000. That is to say, their guarantee will amount to $18,000,000, independent altogether of equipment. Then suppose there should be a default in the payment of interest on the bonds guaranteed by us, we will take the road and the equipment, and the holders of the second issue of bonds will be obliged to apply for payment to the Grand Trunk Railway. Hence, it can easily be seen that the Grand Trunk Railway will not be in a position to afford to allow any default to be made. They cannot make themselves liable to the extent of $18,000,000 and allow a default to occur, the result of which would be that they would have to take out of the funds of the company $18,000,000 and hand that over to the bondholders, and we would take the road. Therefore, in addition to the security of the road, we have that security, which results from the fact that the credit of the Grand Trunk Railway is pledged to the extent of $18,000,000.

What are the advantages, independently altogether of the opening up of that country, which will grow out of this contract? In the first place, we will have control of the rates and we will have running powers over the line. Section 39 provides:

> The rates and tolls to be levied and taken by the company upon any part of the said railway shall be under the control of the Governor in Council, or of such authority, commission or tribunal as may be designated or constituted under any Act of the parliament of Canada for the regulation or control of the business of railways.

Then we have the question of running rights. It seems to me that we are in a curious position to-day, after the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition. We remember how one gentleman connected with this side of the House (Hon. Mr. Blair), who is in a position to speak as an authority on railway matters, told us that the clause relating to running rights was absolutely ridiculous, did not mean anything, and could not be effective. But not only the new apostle of the opposition spoke in that sense, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who is a railway expert, took the same ground, and explained how impossible it was to effectually carry out the provisions of the agreement with respect to running rights. But how does the stand taken by these hon. gentlemen compare with the position now taken by the leader of the opposition? This afternoon he unfolded to us a project, according to which he was going to buy the railway from Sudbury to Port Arthur and give running rights over that line to all other railways. What did he mean this afternoon when he said that, with respect to that portion of the line from Port Arthur to Winnipeg he was going to acquire, by purchase from the Canadian Pacific Railway, the right of all railways to run over it? Surely there must be a mistake somewhere.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will my hon. friend pardon me if I explain? As far as the road to North Bay is concerned, the Canadian government, operating that line independently of other railways, can, in the judgment of railway experts, do so without contradicting in any way what has been said by my hon. friend from South Lanark or my hon. friend from Hamilton. The difference between that proposition and the one set out in the Bill is simply this. In the one case the Grand Trunk Railway controls the line, because it has a lease of that line, whereas in the other case the government, which is an independent body, operating by means of a commission, would control the line and give every railway company absolutely equal running rights over it. So far as the line from Port Arthur to Winnipeg is concerned, of course, my remarks were rather hurried, as I was trying to close at six o'clock, and perhaps I should have explained a little more definitely that a line of that kind between those two points must be worked and operated under joint arrangement. The remarks of my hon. friends from South Lanark and Hamilton do not conflict at all with the suggestion I made to the House, because in the one case there is an independent commission to operate the road, and the railway companies using it will have absolutely equal rights; whereas, in the other case, there seems to be neither joint operation nor operation un-

leader of the opposition?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Has my hon. friend forgotten the picture presented to the House by the ex-Minister of Railways, when he described the Intercolonial Railway arriving at Quebec and proceeding on its way west, stopping to get water or give food to the employees, until it reached Winnipeg? What is the difference between that picture and the one which would be presented by these different cars of different railway companies running over the same line proposed by the leader of the opposition

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will permit me, the answer is this. The right hon. the First Minister portrayed a train belonging to the Intercolonial Railway at Halifax and some official of the railway saying to the men in charge: You had better take a little jaunt across the continent; and the right hon. gentleman seemed to think that that would be perfectly feasible. But that is entirely different from the case where you have a road operated by an independent authority, under a commission, and the different railway companies using it subject to that authority.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let my hon. friend read the contract, and point out

the difference between the conditions we provide and those which he suggests himself. Our intention is to develop commerce through Canadian ports by constructing and operating a common highway across the Dominion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the recital in the contract in which both parties concur, to which both give their assent. Then, has my hon. friend forgotten that this road belongs to the government, and that we are leasing it to this company? We are the owners: the road is vested in the government

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Subject to the lease.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend has not read the lease accurately. This is our road, and we are renting it to the company, but what does section 24 say:

> The said lease shall also contain proper and usual provisions, (a) reserving to the government in respect of its ownership, present and future, of the Intercolonial Railway and any other line or lines of railway, running powers and haulage rights over the said eastern division upon equal terms with the lessees, subject to such reasonable restrictions as may be necessary.

That is what the contract said. Then my hon. friend says: 'Subject to the terms of the lease.' My hon. friend cannot have read the contract right. He will see that this provision is subject to the terms of the lease. When it comes to other railways, the government reserve power to grant running powers and haulage rights sufficient to enable any railway company desiring to use the said eastern division to do so upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the company or, in case of their failure to agree, then upon such terms as may be deemed reasonable and just by the government, having regard to the rights and obligations of the lessees. When you are dealing with the government road under the lease, we reserve the right to use the railroad ourselves. That is the answer, and he who runs may read. The reason of the distinction is obvious. With respect to government roads, we reserve the right to use it, on equal terms with the lessees, with regard to the other roads we provide they shall have the right to use the line subject to the conditions that they shall comply with the terms of the lease. There is the obvious distinction between the two. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition was evidently affected by what was said the other day with respect to the Wabash road. He evidently had not realized that in this country we do the very thing which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) said could not be done. I think my hon. friend from Hamilton said that Mr. Hays never would say that this was possible, he never would say that we could carry out the provisions of this agreement. My answer to that is that Mr. Hays and the Grand Trunk Pacific have said it, and more, have actually undertaken to do it. They have obligatel themselves to do it. It is not part of our business to find out how they are going to do it; it is their business to do it as one of the conditions of their contract. That ends it so far as the Grand Trunk is concerned. But I have taken the trouble to consult Grand Trunk officials on the subject, and here is the answer:

> In regard to trackage rights, it is customary for one company to give power to another company to run over its railway on a rental to be agreed upon with payment for maintenance computed on a wheelage basis.

That is with respect to another road, not our own, because we have equal rights with them over the road.

> This has been a common practice in England, and to-day is in operation in several instances. The statement made that whilst it may be applied for a short mileage it is not feasible over a railway of considerable length is a fallacy, inasmuch as to-day the Wabash has trackage rights over the Grand Trunk rails from Windsor to the Bridge, a distance of 229 miles. In this distance it is necessary to change engineers and crews, and to take fuel, and this is done without any difficulty whatever,—the regulations of the owning company being observed. What is done in this case can be extended to any length of railway by applying the same arrangements for round houses, fuel, &c., or by making satisfactory agreement with the owning company for stabling engines and supplying necessary materials, &c., required in working the trains.
>
> There can be no difficulty in two or more companies working over the same railway with one set of rules, so long as the traffic is not too heavy to be moved without delay.

This is all so obvious that it is hardly conceivable that it is necessary to state it. This is the answer of a railway expert. Now, what is the effect of this agreement? The effect of this agreement is that when this eastern extension is built by the government, with the reservation of the right to use it with respect to the Intercolonial and any other railway the government may own in the future, we have the right to use that railway on equal terms with the Grand Trunk, and, in effect, the Intercolonial is extended from Halifax to Winnipeg. Under the agreement the Intercolonial has the right to run over that road from end to end upon the same terms as the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is merely a question of providing the necessary facilities on the road, roundhouses and other things of that kind, as provided by the Wabash road in the case I have mentioned. The right to use the road exists with us, and the obligation is on the Grand Trunk to enable us to exercise the right which we have reserved to ourselves under the contract. It means, as I say, that the Intercolonial is extended from Halifax, the eastern limit of Canada, on the Atlantic ocean, or from Sydney or from any other point in the maritime provinces, to Winni-

peg. And the result is, on the other hand, in view of the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company has equal running rights over the Intercolonial, that the Grand Trunk Pacific is extended from the Pacific ocean to any point in the maritime provinces reached by the Intercolonial. That is the letter of the agreement; that is the effect of it; that is the way it can be worked out; and that is the way it will be worked out, if the parliament of Canada does its duty towards this country.

Now, I come to the last paragraph, with respect to the routing of the trade. I find considerable criticism on the other side with respect to that. There again it is said that it will be possible for the Grand Trunk Pacific, notwithstanding the solemn obligation entered into to send unrouted traffic to Canadian seaports on the same terms as to American ports, to virtually disregard the agreement. But the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals does not appear to have been of that opinion, according to his letter to the Prime Minister, which I find in 'Hansard,' and in which he says:

> As a means to achieve the same purpose which the Nova Scotia people appear to consider very essential—that is to say the obtaining of a share during the winter of the Grand Trunk Pacific through-traffic for Halifax—the company should be bound to carry all unrouted traffic over the whole of the Winnipeg section of a St. Lawrence seaport in summer, and in winter from Quebec to Halifax and St. John over the Intercolonial.

That is what the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) says we ought to provide for. And that is what we have provided for. Has he led us astray or do hon. gentlemen opposite think he is wrong when he said this is a proper provision to put in the contract? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that this may be evaded. Now, let us see what the conditions are. The shipper at the point of production in Manitoba or the North-west Territories or any other point covered by the contract, can go to the Grand Trunk Pacific and say: Under your contract with the government, you have bound yourselves to give me the same export rate to a Canadian port that you would give me if my goods go through Portland. I am entitled to have from you from this point—say Winnipeg—to Halifax or St. John the same rate as you would give me if these goods go by way of Portland, and you are obliged under contract to provide shipping facilities at Halifax or St. John to carry these goods to the port of destination. Now, is it conceivable that a Canadian, having the spirit of a Canadian in his bosom, and with these facilities and advantages afforded to him, would want to route that traffic to Portland rather than to a Canadian port, when he would receive no benefit from so doing? Is it conceivable? What would be the object of a Canadian shipper in so doing? That is the condition with routed freight; and, with respect to unrouted freight, the Grand Trunk becomes a party to the agreement in which there is a condition that, if we come to their assistance in the construction of this road, they shall honestly send all unrouted traffic through Canadian ports on the same conditions as through American ports. They have entered into that solemn contract, I say, a respectable corporation would not dare to violate such a condition as that. I say, moreover—and I say it notwithstanding what has fallen from the lips of the leader of the opposition this afternoon—that if the Grand Trunk Railway Company accept this aid on these conditions and do not intend to abide loyally by the conditions, it is a case of false pretenses on their part, a case of getting something from us under a representation which they do not intend to carry out. I say if they were guilty of anything of the sort there is no remedy that this parliament can exercise that it would not be justified in applying.

Now, in conclusion, let me read an extract from a political history of the United Kingdom, volume 2, page 403, by Goldwin Smith. He says:

> The geographical relations of the Canadian provinces, which are stretched in broken line across the continent, and separated from each other by great spaces or barriers of nature, so that there is not much natural trade or interchange of population, are a bar to the national over the federal element.

In 'Collier's Weekly' of May 23rd, 1903, I find an article, the concluding article of which is as follows:

> The great Canadian North-west is filling up rapidly with a more or less desirable class of immigrants. Farmers from all parts of the world are seeking the wheat lands now being so generously distributed. Although the development of the country is comparatively rapid, it will take some time for this development to have an appreciable effect upon the export trade of the world in breadstuffs.
>
> A future is opening for the Dominion, however, which is of great promise and full of strange possibilities to which the ablest men in Canadian public life are not indifferent. Eastern and western Canada have few ties in common, and are separated by 1,500 miles of almost uninhabitable country. Western Canada is more American and is in closer touch with the United States. If annexation is one of the possibilities of the future, the movement will start there, though the maritime provinces of the Atlantic coast would offer slight opposition. To keep eastern and western Canada together is the great problem of government at Ottawa. This idea prevails in the treatment of England, and is paramount in all trade negotiations elsewhere. From Western Canada is stretched out the hand which restrains the party in power from hostile action toward the exporters of the United States, even though the provocation be apparently great.

Now, what we desire to do is to open up our hinterland and give breadth as well as length to Canada, to connect the various portions of this country together, not merely by bonds of iron and steel, which are al-

ways liable to the corroding effects of time, but to draw them together by a tie that time does not affect except to strengthen, and the force of which increases as years roll by, and as generation succeeds to generation, I refer to that living healthy bond which is woven out of human flesh and blood. The hand stretched out to us from western Canada we grasp in all amity and friendship, because we desire that their trade, that their affections, that their political sympathy, should turn towards the east rather than towards the south.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, had I been a resident of the city of Quebec, with all my interests centered in that famous and classical city, my belief that the people of this Dominion were bound to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the better people of that city, would certainly have been satisfied fully by the arguments which have just been addressed to us by the Minister of Justice, on behalf, I cannot say of Canada, but of the city of Quebec. Almost the only omission that the hon. gentleman made was that, despite the full and exhaustive explanation that he made of this interesting contract, he did not tell us how we were going to cross the river at Quebec, and how much it was going to cost, and who was to make the profits out of that bridge. He was careful to tell us that Montreal, which was not much of a place at best, could be reached by river navigation. He was careful to tell us that Halifax could not compete with Portland, and that inasmuch as Halifax could not possibly compete with Portland, it was desirable that $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 of money should be spent in order to convince even those who were at this time sceptical, that this was a fact.

Now, before going into the various arguments advanced by the hon. gentleman, I would like to refer to one matter which has been brought before this House, not only by him but by one or two of his colleagues who have spoken in this debate. We have been, I might almost say, taunted on this side of the House because, when the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals addressed this House he received applause from hon. gentlemen on this side. Well, Sir, we are not ashamed to say that we did applaud that hon. gentleman; but we are ashamed and sorry to see that the fact that we could applaud him and they could not, perhaps illustrates one great difference between the two parties, which is to be made even more conspicuous in the progress of this debate and the probable passage of this Bill. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House know well, as we know and as the country knows, that in the years past they have been accustomed simply to applaud the man regardless of the arguments that might be advanced; we on this side of the House can applaud a man under certain circumstances, and when a gentleman who has been held up before the people of this country as one of its leading statesmen for years, a man who has been so honoured by the party in power that they placed him in charge of one of the principal departments for years, and when that gentleman feels it his duty to his country, and when a sense of his own personal honour is such that he must lay down the emoluments of office rather than support a scheme which he believes detrimental to the interests of his country, then I say that we on this side of the House are not ashamed to applaud a gentleman who has done that. If we applauded that hon. gentleman when he arose to address the House, as we are in the habit of doing on this side, we could applaud him as he spoke on account of the arguments that he advanced; and if all we have heard be true, not merely of his late colleagues but of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have discussed this matter in caucus, other hon. gentlemen opposite would, if they had been sincere, have joined with us in some of that applause.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat started off with asking a few very pertinent inquiries, but he carefully failed to answer them. His first inquiry, was : Is the project now before the House an urgent and immediate necessity; and I am sure that not one single word was said by him, good, bad or indifferent, to convince or convert even the most well disposed of his suporters behind him that there was any urgent or immediate necessity for the construction of this particular road. He also asked : Have proper means to secure information been adopted ? Here again, having made the inquiry, he thought he had done all that was necessary, for he certainly gave the House no information whatever to show us that any steps had been taken by the government to secure this proper information. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman did not give us some information, if it is so easy to procure the kind of information that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think possesses some value. When the right hon. the Premier introduced this measure to the House he gave us considerable valuable information as to the climate, and the timber, and the agricultural land in this favoured part of the country through which this road is to run. When the Minister of Finance came to address the House he too gave us some very valuable information; and when the Minister of the Interior came to address the House he too referred to the same sources of information which had been referred to by his two colleagues previously. But when we come to look at the report of which these gentlemen spoke, we find that while, as a matter of fact, a number of statements are made just such as they mentioned, and while, as a matter of fact, in that book are contained reports made by surveyors who went over that line, all the

alleged information given by hon. gentlemen opposite is information taken from the introduction, without the authority or sanction of any one's name, a report made out for the purpose of making the work interesting, or for the purpose of making the people of Ontario believe that they received some value for their money, and a report made up by some unknown persons, not signed by any name, and only professing to be an epitome of what is to be found in some of the succeeding pages of the book.

I do not wish to occupy the time of the House by reading from the pages of this work. I might be accused by some of my hon. friends on the other side of the House of doing that which they have been accused of doing, of raising a cry against the country which might some day do it ill. Therefore, I abstain from reading extracts which I might give referring to this country, but if any of these hon. gentlemen will take the trouble of reading a few of these not anonymous sentences from the actual reports of the surveyors who have gone through that land they will find that these reports do not bear out the statements made by the hon. Minister of the Interior. When the hon. Minister of the Interior came before the House he professed to come in the fulness of his good-will, with the latest and most perfect information obtainable. For the first time in the history of a great transcontinental railway all the surveys have been laid out by a clerk, sitting in his office, having before him all the reports he could find which had been made by the Geological Survey, and from these reports, as the hon. minister tells us, he was able to place upon the map a very accurate and practicable route from one part of this country to another. Would hon. gentlemen opposite sit in their seats and without shouts of derision—I might almost say without cries of disgust—allow hon. gentlemen of our shade of politics to attempt to pass before the judgment of the House a measure of the transcendent importance of this measure and have no more information than the hon. gentleman presented to the House? In view of the utter ignorance of these hon. gentlemen about the country and after all their professions, I think I may quote some of these anonymous remarks which were given by the First Minister and the hon. Minister of the Interior from that report, which were endorsed by the hon. Minister of Finance and therefore he cannot complain, the right hon. leader of the government cannot complain and the hon. Minister of the Interior cannot complain if I quote from some parts of this document to show what the author thinks of the kind of information upon which this map made by the clerk of the hon. Minister of the Interior was based. I shall read from the first page:

> Of course some information was at hand, but it was very vague. Parties had penetrated to James Bay from time to time, and these had seen good land and quantities of spruce along the streams which they had travelled, but at what distance from any known point and in what quantities they could not say. Mr. E. B. Borron as stipendiary magistrate of northern Nipissing, who had that immense region under his charge, had made several trips to James Bay by different canoe routes; and he, too, had seen and reported good land and quantities of spruce and other timber upon the different streams he had travelled, but as to quality and locality he was necessarily very indefinite, having only observed as he navigated or portaged in an entirely unsurveyed territory. The Geological Survey of Canada, too, had examined the geology and characteristics of the land adjacent to certain streams which they had ascended or descended, and some of our own surveyors in running a few base lines and the boundary line between the districts of Nipissing and Algoma, had passed through good land, and spruce timber; but after all, this sort of information was disjointed as well as limited, although of sufficiently favourable character to warrant the belief that when systematic exploration was made great sources of natural wealth would be discovered in that little known region.

That is about all the information that the government had on hand when they undertook this tremendous scheme which is at present engrossing the attention of the House. Before going into the details of this scheme perhaps it would not be out of place for a moment to call the attention of the House and the country to the extraordiary circumstances under which the government launched this scheme. In considering the magnitude of this proposition it is perhaps important that we should view the surrounding circumstances and see what lessons can be learned and what is the true purpose of it so that we will be enabled to judge whether the scheme is one which is entitled to receive the endorsation of parliament. Can those who are responsible for the presentation of this scheme to the House and to the country show that this tremendous expenditure for the building of the railway is necessary and justifiable at the present time? It seems to me that I need not waste time by going into all the preliminary details as to how this scheme originally was introduced when three or four capitalists, Senator Cox, Mr. Pellatt, Mr. Wood, Senator Gibson, and some Grand Trunk officials applied for a charter for a road from North Bay through the North-west Territories. I may say that there is nobody in this country but would be delighted to have that great company, with the capitalists whom I have named at its back, building a road at its own expense from North Bay through the North-west Territories and it is no wonder that when their intentions were first made known the gentlemen who were interviewed in all parts of the country expressed their approval of such a scheme precisely as every one of us in this House to-day would express his approval. It is in the memory of hon. members that day after day through the

sweltering days of the summer, because we had some sweltering days, we fought in the Railway Committee over the details of this Bill when it came before parliament, we in our innocence, thinking that we were doing our duty, that we were wresting something from this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and feeling gratified that Mr. Hays should graciously from time to time make concessions little knowing that at that very time the right hon. leader of the government and Mr. Hays at night were working out the practical details of the bargain which we were allowed to discuss by day. I can quite understand the surprise of the colleagues of the right hon. gentleman when for the first time he burst into the council chamber and brought this new creature of his brain with him, laying it at their feet and calling their attention to it, in the words of Touchstone :

A poor virgin, Sir, an ill-favoured thing, Sir, but mine own. A poor humour of mine, Sir, to take that that no man else will.

Perhaps it is not surprising that when the right hon. gentleman introduced this offspring of his brain to the one man of the ministry with experience in railway matters and who perhaps because he had experience in railway matters was not allowed to know of this precious contract—I say perhaps it is not surprising that the one gentleman who had sufficient experience in railway matters to know a curve from a grade, felt that the curve from the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill as originally introduced to the Grand Trunk Pacific contract was too steep a curve for him to take, and perhaps he thought that his grade of morality was too high and that the grade of patriotism suggested by this scheme was too low to enable him to give it his support and so we find that the one man in the ministry who knows a curve from a grade promptly repudiated the scheme and retired from the ministry. One would have thought that under these circumstances the government would have hesitated, that it would have had some consideration for the people of the country and one would have thought that the right hon. gentleman might have had some colleagues behind him of sufficient honesty and courage to go to the right hon. gentleman and point out that although they admired, as we admire, the many good qualities that he possesses, although they valued and appreciated his strong magnetic personality, although they admired his geniality and recognized his eloquence and the powers of his sunny smiles, they were also aware that when it came to transacting railway business his experience was somewhat limited, and it might occur even to the ordinary tax payer of this country, that, when a great scheme for the expenditure of a hundred million dollars in money was brought before this House, perhaps the interests of the people might have been protected in some better way than by the right hon. gentleman with his lack of business ability, despite all his other virtues, sitting down to make such a contract with one of the ablest, one of the shrewdest, one of the wiliest and most successful railway men in this or in any other land. Is it any wonder that a contract conceived under such circumstances bears some of the marks that the contract we are discussing to-night shows prominently on its face ? I would have thought that some gentleman sitting about the Prime Minister would have felt some regard for their reputation ; some regard for the honour of the Crown if they had none for their own. They cannot so soon have forgoten the words they put into the mouth of His Excellency at the opening of this session. They must have remembered that they caused the Crown to solemnly state to parliament :

The great influx of population into our North-western territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

This statement in the speech from the Throne was based, as the colleagues of the Prime Minister well know, on the Order in Council which has been read by the leader of the opposition this afternoon, which gives in detail the reasons which satisfied the colleagues of the Premier, which satisfied the Crown, and which was intended to satisfy this House and the country, that the pressing question of the hour was a transportation commission in order to investigate the complex and complicated subject which had been engrossing, and which was to continue to engross their attention. Surely, in the face of all that, we might have expected some one minister if not more, to have pointed out the extraordinary circumstances under which this Bill was conceived, and the slight probability there was that this country would secure its rights in such an agreement. Let me call attention to the fact that although this agreement was made between some gentlemen representing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the government, the agreement will be wholly inoperative, and we are wasting our time discussing it, unless the Grand Trunk Railway, which is in no way at present bound by it, will come forward and carry out the engagement which these gentlemen have made for it. What are we to think of the contract made by the Premier with gentlemen, one of whom stated to a meeting of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway in the motherland a few months ago, that they were about to enter into an undertaking which would

never in any respect cost them one dollar or jeopardize one dollar of their property? What are we to think of a bargain of such a character, that the government itself cannot be certain that the Grand Trunk Railway shareholders at their next meeting will ratify it and yet we are spending a month here discussing the matter, and relying solely on the Grand Trunk Railway Company being willing to carry out a contract to which at present they are not parties. No more conclusive evidence can be given of the one-sidedness of the bargain, of the advantage on one hand and the disadvantage on the other, (the country of course being at a disadvantage), than the simple fact that both the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the representatives of the government were perfectly satisfied without any guarantee except the inherent nature of the contract itself, that the Grand Trunk shareholders will ratify such a bargain. When we come to look at this contract, we on this side of the House, and I ought to be able to say, gentlemen supporting the treasury benches as well, are entitled to say to the government: Surely you had some reasons to justify such a contract as this.

Well, Sir, the Prime Minister did give his reasons. Far be it from me to say that in his long and eloquent speech no reasons were adduced. I have gone through the speech of the Prime Minister carefully and I have collated his reasons, and I shall state them to the House. I ask the House to say whether in a case such as this, we should not first consider whether the reasons given for such a measure are or are not founded in fact. If they are not founded in fact we are surely justified in refusing to support the measure, and if they are founded in fact then the next consideration would be: Will the effect of them be as represented? In looking over those reasons given by the Prime Minister, I think I can fairly ask of hon. gentlemen opposite if they honestly in their hearts believe that these reasons are sufficient justification for their supporting such a measure as this? These are the reasons given by the Prime Minister: That the construction of this road was a national and commercial necessity; that the construction must be immediate; that it must be from Moncton to the Pacific ocean; that it will not parallel the Intercolonial Railway; that you must keep control of the road; that we must be safe from the bonding privileges; that we used American ports because we had no railways to reach our own ports, and that we had to keep control so as to regulate the traffic. These were the reasons given by the right hon. gentleman, as those which led the government to introduce this measure. Now, let me in a few words take these reasons one by one. I have enumerated them together so that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity, if they see fit, to compare the Prime Minister's reasons as I have stated them, with the reasons set forth in his speech and I am sure they will not find one reason given in that speech beyond those I have mentioned. The first reason given is that this is a national and commercial necessity. I am free to admit that the expression 'national necessity' is rather a euphoneous phrase. One naturally feels an almost instinctive yearning for anything that is a national necessity, and so I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to jump at once to secure for themselves and their constituents in Quebec a national necessity. But after all, when we come down to facts; when we lay aside the gems of oratory and come down to the level of hard facts, does any one of the supporters of the Prime Minister believe that the construction of this road from Moncton to Winnipeg and from Winnipeg to the Pacific is a national necessity? Is there a gentleman in this House who does not know that we are a nation, that we have been a nation ever since the happy morning the Prime Minister awoke to find that somehow he had made us a nation. We have the best authority for knowing that we are a nation; but we have existed without this road so far. Is there a single man in this House or in this country to-night, so blind to all sense of reason, that he can face his fellowman and say honestly to him, that this road is such a national necessity that we cannot as a nation exist without it?

Then, if it is not a national necessity, is it a commercial necessity? In what possible sense can it be a commercial necessity? Why, Sir, if this road be a commercial necessity and a national necessity, heaven defend us, for we will not be a nation during the six or seven years that it is being built. We must cease to be a nation; we must be swallowed up by the adjoining republic or submerged beneath the waves; some dreadful fate must be ours if this is a national or commercial necessity, for we cannot have it for six or seven years. Does not every one know that when the right hon. the Prime Minister spoke of this as being a national and commercial necessity that he was merely using a high-sounding euphoneous expression which was not warranted by the facts.

Then the Prime Minister told us that the construction must be immediate; that there was no time to wait for surveys; that he had no time to wait for any more information than the government has on hand at the present moment. Why this extraordinary haste? There was a time years ago when the country was bound to build the Intercolonial Railway; there was a time when this country entered into an agreement also to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the right hon. gentleman when he said that this road should be built

immediately said that there was the same urgency and necessity now that there was in the case of the building of the Intercolonial and the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the right hon. gentleman has been a consistent follower of his party, and if he looks back to the records he will find that in his own speech made in 1884 in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, he quoted this resolution which was moved in this House by the Hon. Mr. Dorion when the Intercolonial Railway project was under discussion :

That it be an instruction to the committee to amend the Bill so as to provide that the location of the line of the Intercolonial Railway shall not be finally adopted without the previous assent of parliament.

And eloquent were the Liberals in those days in pointing out the rights of parliament, in pointing out the outrage of the government in assuming to locate a line of railway without parliament having ratified and adopted that line. But it may be said by hon. gentlemen opposite : Yes, but you have been inconsistent as well, because if it be true that the Prime Minister moved such a motion, it is also true that the Conservatives of that day voted it down. Well, there was a reason for it then that does not exist now. It was pointed out at that time that the imperial government had given a guarantee that work had to be commenced within six months and that if work were not commenced we forfeited the guarantee, and therefore it would not do to wait for parliament to ratify it, and under such circumstances it was necessary that the House should trust the government.

Then, Sir, later on a road was to be built—the short line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That came before the House first in 1884 on a resolution to make a grant of $170,000 a year for fifteen years to build the Canadian Pacific Railway over very nearly the same route as that of the proposed line through the province of New Brunswick. The Premier was alive to the interests of the country at that time, and he moved on the 14th of April, 1884 :

That the said resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with power to amend the same by providing that the route for the line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbours of St. John and Halifax, for which a subsidy of $170,000 a year for 15 years is provided, should be subject to the approval of parliament.

This was voted down, and the next year, in 1885, he brought the matter up again, making a precisely similar motion, that the matter should be referred back until the approval of parliament should be obtained. The Conservatives opposed the motion of the right hon. gentleman, but they did it for the reason that at that time an arrangement had been made by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was to complete its line by the year 1886, and they pointed out that if the right hon. gentleman insisted on his amendment, and if it were agreed to, it would be impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to complete its line by the time called for in the contract. So we find that on three previous occasions, on two the right hon. gentleman himself, and on the third his party, advocated the principle that before such a line of railway should be adopted parliament should ratify the route.

The right hon. gentleman's next reason was that the railway must be built from Moncton to the Pacific. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House in discussing that argument, for the simple reason that every member of this House knows full well at the present time we have a railway from Moncton to the Pacific and when we find the Premier laying it down as one of the reasons for this expensive measure that we must have such a railway, when we have it already, I think I would be doing injustice to the House if I were to occupy its time in dealing with such a reason.

Then, he said that the proposed line would not parallel the Intercolonial Railway. There has been a good deal of discussion throughout this debate as to the meaning of that expression. It occurred to me that it was like a great many other discussions, particularly of the kind that took place hundred of years ago, when the differences between people were largely differences about the meanings of words. Every one knows that in one sense the proposed road will not parallel the Intercolonial, if we use that term in a strict mathematical sense. It was never expected by any one that it would. But, if we take the term in the ordinary sense in which it is understood by railway men, that it will take away traffic from the Intercolonial Railway, I would ask if there is a single gentleman on the other side of the House who thinks that by any possibility the Intercolonial Railway could be benefited or could receive further trade because a rival road is to run over what is claimed to be a shorter route between the same terminal points ? Hon. gentlemen may have their preferences for this route or that route, according to their local situation in the province of New Brunswick but they must not forget that the Minister of Finance told us the other night that he was not one of those who blamed the location of the Intercolonial Railway where it is—that he believed it was located in the best position for the purposes it was intended to serve. When we find reports of surveys laid before the House showing the mountainous character of the country through which the proposed road is to run : and when we remember the statement made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that a year or two ago, when, owing to the embargo which was placed on our cattle

by the United States government, the Canadian Pacific Railway was unable to carry cattle through the state of Maine, and the Intercolonial was called into requisition, it was found that that railway could perform the service at less expense and in less time than the Canadian Pacific Railway; I think we are justified in following our leader in the position he took this afternoon, when he said: Take the road you have, and use it, but do not wreck it, and do not throw it away.

Then, the right hon. Premier said, we must keep the word of parliament. Far be it from me to utter one single syllable against the propriety of such a sentiment as that. But again, may I ask, is the reason founded on fact? Did parliament ever at any time pledge any word to any body to build another road any where under the sun, in such a way as to justify this present measure? Why, the right hon. the premier himself, when he lays aside hyperbole, and comes down to fact, says that the line he referred to was the line from Harvey to Salisbury. It was promised by the ministers of the Crown in those days, and they implemented their promise by bringing a measure before the House to grant $500,000 for that purpose. It was carried in this House, but thrown out in the Senate. Surely the right hon. the premier is too old a parliamentarian and too good a lawyer to talk about the word of parliament when only this one single body had expressed itself on the subject. Parliament is composed of two bodies, and if the right hon. the premier is so particular about keeping that pledge, I do not blame him, because, after studying the history of Canada since confederation, he has apparently found only one pledge of the Conservative party which they did not keep, and so many of his own party that they did not keep, that he considers that even if the Conservative party merely hinted at a pledge, that it is sacred and ought to be implemented by parliament. But if the right hon. the premier is so anxious to keep the word of parliament sacred, might I not appeal to him to have an equal loyalty to the Crown, and to see that when the Crown makes such a promise as that which was put into the mouth of His Majesty's representative at the opening of this session, that promise shall be kept? I would like to ask the hon. gentlemen who sit behind the premier—the Minister of Justice, who should be the fountain of justice in this House, from which honours and judicial appointments come—if it be correct, as the premier said, that the sacred word of parliament should be kept, is it not equally important that the pledge put into the mouth of the representative of the Crown at the opening of the parliament of this country should also be kept?

The next reason given by the right hon. the premier was that we must be saved from the danger of the abrogation of the bonding privilege. We heard a good deal about that in the early days of this debate. We have not heard much about it in the closing part of the debate. It seems to have dawned on hon. gentlemen opposite that there are two or three ways in which that subject could be viewed, and that the further they travel in discussing it the worse appears the position they occupy. Just think for a moment that an intelligent chamber like this is to be told that it is necessary to spend $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 for fear our American neighbours will some fine day shut off the bonding privilege. Suppose they did, what is the worst that could happen? If they did it before this new road was constructed, could we send our goods to any of our Atlantic seaports? Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House at any rate know that we could. They know that we have already a system of transportation on Canadian soil from the Pacific to the Atlantic. But I would not expect hon. gentlemen opposite to know—I would be surprised if they did—when we find the right hon. the premier himself saying that we have not—in his speech at page 7933 of 'Hansard,' in commenting on a statement made by Mr. Carnegie, who is no doubt a genius for acquiring money, and a prodigy in advertising himself. Mr. Carnegie, apparently knowing very little about Canadian sentiment or Canadian geography, made the statement that we could not use our ports for five months in the year, because during that time they were ice-bound. 'It was not,' said the premier, bubbling over with information for Mr. Carnegie—'It was not because our harbours were ice-bound in winter, but simply because we had no railway to reach them.' Now, I have come to the first genuine reason—I say it with all sincerity—that I have been able to discover among those enumerated by the right hon. the premier why this road should be built. I think, if I had been sitting behind the premier, I would myself have been convinced by that argument. When I heard him say that we could not reach our own harbours because we have not any railways running to them, I would have thought it was about time that something should be done. But that something should be to enlighten hon. gentlemen opposite, beginning with the premier, and to endeavour to instil into their minds the gratifying information that we have at the present time not only seaports, but railways running to them, and that the right hon. gentleman need not be alarmed over a difficulty which does not exist.

The last reason given by the Prime Minister was that the proposed line was acquired in order to regulate traffic. But the government have taken a most expensive way of regulating the traffic. The first thing they do is to secure a road over the western prairies that will stop at Winnipeg, and

which will be in Winnipeg from three to five years before the eastern section reaches that city. It is perfectly clear that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be in Winnipeg long before the eastern division reaches that spot. Had the agreement been drawn intelligently and in the interests of the country—and I am not blaming the Minister of Justice, because I presume he simply put the intentions of the parties in legal phraseology—it would have provided for the building of a line from Winipeg east from which a branch could be built to North Bay or to Port Arthur or Fort William and thus secured the transportation of the products of the west by the lakes through our eastern ports. But instead we find the government making an arrangement which lays before the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the temptation for years to come to send their wheat south from Winnipeg across the border, through to Chicago and Duluth, and we know that it is one of the hardest things in the world, once traffic has taken a certain route, to divert it to another. Had the government been more eager to look after the interests of the country and less anxious to make a bargain, we would have had a totally different arrangement submitted to us.

When my hon. friend the Minister of Finance came to discuss the question, he added very little to the reasons advanced by the First Minister. He pleaded that the Conservative party did not require surveys in 1871 before entering into a contract for building the Intercolonial Railway, nor did they require surveys before contracting to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the circumstances in these cases were entirely different from those which exist today. What were the facts when the Intercolonial Railway contract was entered into? That road, Sir, was a national necessity. Every one knows that the old provinces had been getting along so unhappily, every one knows that there was so much friction between them, owing to unhappy religious and racial difficulties, not fomented by the Conservative party, that it became necessary to do something; and so the statesmen on both sides of politics agreed that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should be added to the original Canadas and thus restore harmony by forming a confederation. There was therefore a national necessity for the building of the Intercolonial Railway. The lower provinces would not have come in unless they were promised a railway to connect with the upper provinces. Surely, if ever there was a case of national necessity which justified the conduct of the government, it was that one. But will anybody pretend that such a necessity now exists? Then, when the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway was entered upon, the question of building that road had been before the country for years. This country had pledged itself to British Columbia to build the road, and again there was a national necessity. We had purchased the prairies of the west and we knew that extension to the Pacific was absolutely necessary for the Dominion. It was necessary for our national existence that we should build a railway across the prairies to connect with British Columbia; and that being the case, we entered into the contract to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. But is there anything in the circumstances to-day which, in the most remote degree, resembles the circumstances of those days, when a real, true national necessity existed?

A great deal of capital was sought to be made by the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) out of the charge that we had attacked, year after year, the management of the Intercolonial Railway. They stigmatized us as not being friends of the Intercolonial Railway. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have never attacked the Intercolonial Railway itself from this side, but have attacked, and will continue to attack, the management of that noble public work; and when hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance actually deride us because we oppose grants for the construction of elevators at St. John and Halifax, we can easily turn the tables on them by pointing to the fact that not a single bushel of grain has gone through the Halifax elevator and but one cargo and that at an expense to the country of $10,000, through the elevator at St. John, so that these two institutions are standing as costly monuments of the lavish expenditure of this government.

My hon. friend the Finance Minister, whose honesty every one on this side, I am sure, admits, has said—and I am certain he said it in all sincerity—that he had looked carefully through the Bill and thought it was an honest Bill, because he could not find anything in it for the promoters. I am quite willing to accept the assurance of the hon. gentleman. I think that about as near as he could get to finding out where the money was to be made would be to look through the pages of the Bill, and if he did not see dollar bills sticking out he would be unable to find anything in it for the promoters. But there are perhaps other people who have better ideas on that point. Just look at the position of the road. If hon. gentlemen opposite would lay aside their party prejudices and view the question upon its merits, I am perfectly certain that a mere statement of the position of the road would prevent the Bill being discussed five minutes. Just think of the position in which the country is to be placed. The country is to guarantee 75 per cent of the western section, and I shall say nothing of the ease with which a company could put in the whole cost under cover of the 75 per cent guarantee. The country bears all the cost, in the meantime, of the construction of the eastern division, so that when the road is completed, it is

perfectly clear that this country will owe $50,000,000 or $60,000,000 for the construction of the eastern division and will have guaranteed three-quarters the cost of the construction of the western division. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have obtained their charter. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Heyd) asked me what the promoters of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway put into the road up to the time of its completion, and I told him that they did not put in one dollar, as I shall prove. Let us see whence the money comes. From Moncton to Winnipeg the government bear all the expense of construction. West of Winnipeg the government bears 75 per cent. That only leaves 25 per cent to be raised by the company. Whence does that come ? I confess it will be a little hard, from reading the Bill, to be perfectly certain just whence it does come. The language is so artfully changed in the clause providing for the 25 per cent to be guaranteed by the Grand Trunk as compared with the government guarantee of 75 per cent, that it is very hard to say what the meaning of the words may be. But the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior both agree as to the meaning of that clause, and both say that the Grand Trunk Railway has to provide 25 per cent by guaranteeing sufficient bonds to raise that amount.

Now, if the government provide 75 per cent and the Grand Trunk is to guarantee bonds to raise the other 25 per cent, what is the Grand Trunk Pacific to put in? Your road is completed, and your company has not paid a dollar. What, then, is the position of your company ? It has $20,000,000 of preferred stock and $25,000,000 of common stock, and there has not been a dollar put up for it. I suppose the Grand Trunk will get either the $20,000,000 or the $25,000,000 for guaranteeing the bonds. The balance will be divided, I suppose, among the intelligent, industrious and successful promoters. And if the Finance Minister were in that neighbourhood I fancy he would be able to form some idea where the dollar bills were. But we find the road completed, and the company has not put a dollar into it. And in this I appeal to the words of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior, who stated distinctly that the Grand Trunk is to guarantee, not the balance of the bonds, but enough of the bonds to make up the balance of the money. There will be quite a distinction between the two. It seems to me that the contract clause was such that nobody could say with certainty exactly what it meant. On the whole, I should thought it possible that under it the Grand Trunk would guarantee the bonds for the face value of 25 per cent and, if that was not sufficient, the shortage would be made up by the company in some other way. But when two of the gentlemen who made the contract, one of them the Finance Minister, who must know if anybody knows, the meaning of the financial terms, tell us that the Grand Trunk is to raise the whole 25 per cent of the cost, we naturally ask where the Grand Trunk Pacific Company is going to put in a dollar.

Now, the Minister of Justice spent some time in discussing the question of equipment, and I take that up now, because it is germane to the question of who provides the money for the construction of the road. The hon. gentleman said that the meaning of section 22 and some other sections to which he referred, was clear beyond peradventure, so clear that no lawyer of the eminence of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) should have dreamed of making such a statement as that the company was not bound to purchase the equipment to be provided for this eastern division. I venture to say that the statement made by the Minister of Justice has confirmed every member of the House who has taken the trouble to pay attention to the clause in the belief that the view expressed by the leader of the opposition and by the hon. senior member for Hamilton is absolutely accurate, and still more, that the Minister of Justice is afraid that it is so. Let us see what was done. The contract was drawn up by the Minister of Justice. Then counsel, Mr. Shepley, is called in. I wish to be understood as saying that Mr. Shepley is one of the ablest and most experienced and most painstaking counsel that the Minister of Justice could have secured. I hope it will not be thought for a moment that I am finding fault with that part of it. If Mr. Shepley received a rattling good fee, I for one will not criticise the estimate when it comes down. But, after he has revised the contract and it has been accepted, suddenly in this House a new idea is sprung, and the minister goes back to his counsel and says : Do you mean to say you were such an idiot as to leave such a hole in the contract——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not suggest that he was an idiot.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am merely putting it in extreme form. He asked the counsel if he thought he could have made such a blunder. If the Minister of Justice did not read to Mr. Shepley, the deputy minister, Mr. Newcombe, and to Mr. Gormully any more of the sections of the contract than he read here to-night, I should be sorry to say that they were wrong in the opinion they gave

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Counsel generally read contracts before they give opinions in my country.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I should think so. But the opinion was such that I concluded that they could not have done so. The Minister of Justice called our attention to

sections 11, 12, 13, 19, 22, 34, 35 and 37. In the majority of these sections, we find that all depends on the meaning of the word 'equip.' Now, 'equip' is not a legal term. I am not aware of any legal work in which any legal meaning is attached to that word. I consulted several legal lexicons, and I do not find it mentioned. Consequently I take the Standard dictionary in order to find the ordinary meaning of this English word, and I find that the meaning of 'equip' is given as 'To furnish or fit out for service, task or course; provide with all that is necessary for a successful undertaking.' You will see that it is possible to provide with all necessary for a successful undertaking without purchasing. If the Minister of Justice, upon taking office under the Prime Minister were to say: I would like to secure a house ready furnished for my residence in Ottawa; and the Prime Minister were to provide him with such a house, the Minister of Justice could hardly refuse to pay the rent on the ground that the furniture had been borrowed or leased—so long as it was not stolen. It would not be necessary that it should be purchased. Equip is one thing; purchase and equip is another thing. I should have thought under ordinary circumstances that when we find the word 'acquire' used again and again in this contract—there are probably few words used in it so frequently—that in this case the Minister of Justice would have it read 'acquire and equip' or 'purchase and equip.' Then, we should know where we were. The other clauses the minister read did not take the matter a particle further. They merely repeat the use of the word 'equip.' We do not find that it means that the company shall purchase and equip. Then, we come to section 14, which the minister did not read to this House. Let me take the liberty of reading the 14th clause to the House, and then I will ask if there is a layman in this House who cannot at a glance see the meaning of the word 'equip' as used in this contract. This clause, 14, provides for the working expenditure. And hon. gentlemen will remember that, for the first ten years the expenditure is to be deducted before the rental is paid. So, it is important to know what the working expenditure is. On the eastern division they can take certain things for working expenditure. This is the clause:

> For the purposes of this agreement, the expression 'working expenditure' as applied to the eastern division of the railway, shall mean and include all expenses of maintenance of the said division, and of the stations, buildings, works and conveniences belonging thereto, and of the rolling and other stock and movable plant used in the working thereof, and all such tolls, rents or annual sums as are paid in respect of property leased to, or held by, the company——

They have some leased property. That is admitted. Now, I will call the minister's attention to what follows:

> —in respect of the said eastern division (apart from the rent of any other leased line), or in respect of the hire of rolling stock let to the company as part of the equipment of the said eastern division.

Can the English language be plainer? Here is an agreement by which $5,000,000 of rolling stock is to be provided—not purchased—for the equipment of that road. It is marked as assigned and set apart for that division; I suppose in order that if it slips off to any other it can be brought back, and, on the average, the value of rolling stock shall be $5,000,000. There is no doubt that the value of the rolling stock is to be $5,000,000, but the sections are silent as to the ownership, except that in this section relating to working expenditure, it is provided that the Grand Trunk Pacific can add to the working expenditure any sum that they pay for the hire of rolling stock, let to the company as part of the equipment of the said eastern division. If the case were to go before a judge and the Minister of Justice were to say that 'equip' means 'purchase and equip,' would not the judge say at once: You yourself have defined it in this clause which provides that they may lease a part of the equipment of the eastern division? Is it open to question that it would be held that the requirements of the clause would be fulfilled by borrowing or leasing rolling stock for this division to the value of $5,000,000?

There is another consideration that the hon. gentleman will not overlook, that is the question of working expenses is for the first ten years. After that time we are not concerned with the working expenses. It is when the company has to pay rent that working expenses is allowed. We find that the company has to supply $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock for the eastern division, and because the government is satisfied that the business will not pay for ten years, they let them off from paying rent for ten years. When we find this state of affairs admitted by the government, would it not be the height of absurdity to say that while they will not make enough money to pay their rent, they will also be supposed to lease additional stock in addition to the $5,000,000? If that had been the case we can depend upon it that some of the shrewd lawyers who drew up this agreement would have put in two or three words here such as 'in addition to the $5,000,000 purchased therefor' or words to that effect. Now, the Minister of Justice will say: You have not touched the 35th clause. Let us read it. It provides for security in the shape of a mortgage which will be a first charge upon the railway, undertaking, equipment and property, tolls, rights and franchises of the company, including all equipment and property to be thereafter acquired by the company. If the company buys one car, the government it entitled to a mortgage on that car. If the company leases $5,000,000 worth

of equipment, what will be the effect; every lawyer knows that the lessee obtains a title which he can mortgage. That is the first charge on the lessee's interest. It would be a novel statement of law that the lessee could give a mortgage to be a charge on somebody else's property. The Minister of Justice must not forget that if the Grand Trunk Company feels so friendly to this Grand Trunk Pacific Company that they will guarantee their bonds gratuitously, they might possibly lease their cars on such favourable terms that if the government had to take over this road it would be an advantage to the government to step in and to take the lessees' position, and not compel them to buy new cars, but to use the old cars. But that is a different proposition from saying that because you are to have a mortgage upon equipment, you will have a mortgage upon the property of somebody else. Then when we take the other clauses (b), (c) and (d) they do not carry the subject any further. You come back to the equipment, and the moment you decide what equipment means then all these subsections follow naturally in their place.

Another argument the hon. gentleman made is that clause 37 is conclusive. I did not think he would refer to clause 37, but that he would have left a less skilful lawyer to refer to that. Now, here is a clause different from all other clauses in the contract. It is put in for a specific purpose, and every one knows that purpose. It is put in to ensure that whatever the company buys in the construction and equipment of its road, it should buy in Canada. I do not think a more futile clause was ever put in any agreement by any conveyancer. All that is provided is that the company shall purchase all material and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole line, from Canadian producers when the same are produced in Canada, and when such materials and supplies can be purchased in desired quantities and of equal quality for the purpose required and for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere. That is to say, if the company can buy goods in Canada just as cheaply and of as good quality as they can out of Canada, they will be wise enough to save their freight and insurance and buy them at home. But if they do not choose to buy them in Canada there is no provision by which they can be compelled to do so, and who will be able to say in years to come that the contention of the company relying on this option, was wrong? That is the purpose of that clause, to provide that what the company has to buy must be bought in Canada. What has that to do with the construction and equipment? The word 'equipment' stands by itself. If that implies that they must buy it in Canada, you do not need that clause; it is all provided for in the 22nd clause if equipment includes the idea of purchase, if equipment does not include the idea of purchase, then this clause does not apply. So I submit that the contention raised by the leader of the opposition and my hon. friend from Hamilton is quite correct, and that this document does not provide the security that should be provided for the people of this country.

Then the Minister of Justice spoke about the country not being bound to pay anything until the road was completed. Now, I think he has not carefully read the clauses, or he would find that practically the government must contribute as the road goes on. I admit that it is optional.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not contend any more than that.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I think the hon. gentleman did, for this reason; unless he did contend for more than that, it was vain to speak of it at all. The only object would be to lead the people to believe that the country is not bound to pay while the road is being built. It is one thing to say the country is legally bound to pay, I do not say that; it is another thing to say the country is practically bound to pay, and that is what I do say. If this country is guaranteeing the bonds on $75,000,000, when it saw this company crippled by extortionate charges made on every contract, why should it not advance the money in the meantime? Why, if the government exercised its option and did not pay a cent until the road was completed, that road would cost three or four times as much as it would if the contractors were paid as they went along. It would be interesting, when the hon. gentleman is again addressing the House, if he would enlighten us as to how the western section is to be built, assuming that the government pays nothing, guarantees no bonds, until the whole road is built.

I want to say a few words about the contract itself. It is such an extraordinary document that we are almost justified in declining to consider it on account of the inherent signs of weakness on almost every page of it. In the first place, it is indicative of haste, and perhaps that is the reason the Prime Minister said we must move at once, that there is no time for deliberation. If there has been one statement made in this debate that can be accepted by the House without hesitation, it is the statement that the government moved without deliberation. Perhaps one reason is that the government themselves did not know where they stood nor with whom they were dealing when they came to draw up a document for the construction of a transcontinental railway. When one looks at the original Bill, No. 64, to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, it is seen that the incorporators are:

The Honourable George A. Cox, H. M. Pellatt, and E. R. Wood, all of Toronto, Ontario, the Honourable William Gibson, of Beamsville, On-

tario, J. R. Booth, of Ottawa, Ontario, the Honourable H. B. Rainville, Charles M. Hays, Frank W. Morse and William Wainwright, all of Montreal, and John Bell of Belleville, together with such persons as become shareholders in the company, are incorporated under the name of 'The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company,' hereinafter called 'the company.'

These gentlemen applied to parliament and we gravely discussed their application in this House and passed the Bill which has gone to the Senate, but which has not been adopted there, incorporating these gentlemen as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Then, suddenly, like a bolt out of the blue, comes down the government Bill setting forth that :

An agreement has been entered into, bearing date the 29th day of July, 1903, between His Majesty the King, of the first part, and Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, C.B., G.C.M.G., and others, representing therein and acting on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—

Who are they ? The preamble tells us—

—a company incorporated by an Act of the parliament of Canada passed at the present session thereof.

They are not incorporated, and the Act is not true on its face. This may be a small matter, but it shows the recklessness and the haste with which everything in connection with this contract has been done. It appears to me that the government apparently drew the Bill and the railway lawyers drew the contract. When we look at the contract we find that it is between the government and a number of gentlemen——

Representing therein and acting on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by an Act of the parliament of Canada passed at the present session thereof.

Showing that the railway lawyers knew the true position of affairs and that the government did not. I think it is rather extraordinary that this debate has proceeded for so long a time. The right hon. leader of the government has introduced this Bill, several of his colleagues have spoken but none of them has yet explained how it is that when eight or ten gentlemen apply in the ordinary course to be incorporated, suddenly, liking the melting of the dew in the morning sun, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company disappears and we enter into a contract with several other gentlemen representing the Grand Trunk Railway Company and professing to represent the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Surely the House is entitled to an explanation as to the way in which this contract was drawn and as to why the government did not know the status of the gentlemen with whom they were dealing. Now, I will refer to section 21 of the Bill which is a peculiar section :

The Governor in Council shall have the power at any time to suspend the progress of the

work upon the said eastern division until the then next session of parliament.

Is it possible that hon. gentlemen opposite have suspicions themselves ? Is it possible that they fear that what the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says is right ? Is it possible that they anticipate, that the expenditure may be so enormous that even this country will not stand the construction of the eastern division, or is it possible that this agreement may be held before the country until after the election when the government can put in another division if they see fit ? Surely some light upon the subject should be given to an anxious and inquiring House. The hon. Minister of Justice has spoken of the care that has been exercised by the government to see that the road is constructed in a reasonable way. The hon. gentleman makes a fair presentment of the case. He points out that the government will construct the eastern division of the railway, that the company will pay 3 per cent on the cost of the railway, that the company will construct the western division of the railway, the government guaranteeing 75 per cent of the cost and that each will thereby be overlooking the line constructed by the other. He points out that in this way the country has been safeguarded. What could be safer, he asks ? How could any of the moneys of the country be improperly expended where the interests of both parties are so carefully safeguarded? Let us look at section 7 and see how far they have been safeguarded. I would like to know whether the hon. Minister of Justice or the lawyers of the railway company are responsible for this clause :

In order to ensure, for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed——

What do the people get as their security ? —that the specifications——

That the specifications—the specifications——

—for the construction of the eastern division shall be submited to, and approved of by, the company before the commencement of the work.

What about the tenders ? What about the contracts ? Where does the money come in in the specifications ? It comes in with the tenders or the contracts. I think that the hon. gentlemen opposite must surely have thought that the people were worthy subjects of Barnum's irony when he said that the people liked to be humbugged when he tells us about the provisions made for safeguarding the country, because, although he does provide for the specifications he makes no provision for the tenders and contracts and practically all the unholy work is done, if it is done at all, in connection with the tenders and contracts. The same thing applies

to the western division. We read all through that there is such a provision in respect to the specifications, but not in regard to the tenders and contracts. I notice all through this agreement that one of the inherent weaknesses of the agreement is the careless and reckless manner in which it has been entered into. It is rather singular that we should be told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we are not to be put to any expense in connection with the construction of the eastern division because the Grand Trunk Pacific is to pay us a rental of 3 per cent. We guarantee their bonds for 3 per cent, but the bonds are payable half yearly, and the rental is payable yearly. It would have been the simplest thing in the world for the government to have insisted that if they have to pay the interest half yearly they should get the rent half yearly, because, in large sums running up into millions, a half year's interest represents a considerable amount of money. If the contract were drawn in the interest of the railway company it would have been drawn exactly in the way in which it has been drawn but if it were drawn in the interest of the country it would have been drawn in such a manner as to provide that the rental should be paid half yearly. Then, there is another clause which provides that if the rent is not paid when due it is capitalized but it is not capitalized in such a way as to give compound interest to the country. There may be arrears that will be capitalized three years hence but the country will lose the interest in the meantime. Then clause 21 is a singular one. It provides that the state of affairs shall be at the end of the term :

If, upon the termination of the said lease, the government shall determine not to undertake the operation of the eastern division, the company, provided the terms offered by it are as favourable to the government as those offered by any other railway company equally competent to perform and fulfil the obligations required by the government to be assumed by the lessees thereof shall have the right to an extension or renewal of the said lease for a further period of fifty years, upon such terms as may be agreed upon.

I think any one will see that this puts the government in an extraordinary position. At the end of the time the government will be found operating the road from Moncton to Winnipeg beginning nowhere and ending nowhere. If they want to expropriate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway running to the coast they can do it, but they would have to pay for the value of the road fifty years hence. Now they contribute three-quarters of what it will cost to build it, but they will have to pay the enhanced value that will accrue to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Pacific. No other company can possibly compete with the Grand Trunk Pacific, for the lease of the eastern division, because, suppose that any other company makes as good a proposition to operate the road the Grand Trunk Pacific by reason of the efficiency of its system, its connection with and its management of the eastern division would be in a better position to carry out the lease than any other railway company and therefore practically the government are making a present of the eastern section of this road to the Grand Trunk Pacific for all time to come, and should the government want to buy out the western section fifty years from now they will have to pay what the road is worth at that time. The government have contended that one of their chief reasons for carrying through this scheme is to secure the regulation of rates, but the whole section which purports to do this really appears to do everything else. If they expect to do it in the way in which the section relating to that matter is drawn I would say that it is the surest way to avoid the accomplishment of the result which they profess to have in view. Just look for a moment at the position of the farmers of this country. We have $25,000,000 of one kind of stock, and we have $20,000,000 of another kind of stock that will be given among the promoters and the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway for nothing, and for all time to come the farmers of the North-west must make sacrifices to pay dividends on this stock which is given to some one for nothing. And yet, this is supposed to be in the interest of this country.

I am not prepared to go so far as to advocate the building of a road from Moncton to the Pacific as a government road, although perhaps the time may come when with further information, and because of changes in the conditions of the country, I might be willing to go thus far. But, Sir, I have no hesitation in saying, that as between a scheme to which the government is to contribute 75 per cent of the money for a certain time, taking all the risks, and the company supplying nothing, but getting a friend to guarantee for 25 per cent, and taking all the profits ; I say unhesitatingly that in the interests of the people of this country we had better own the road and hold the $25,000,000 preferred stock and the other millions of common stock, as trustees for the people of the country, than have outsiders drawing dividends on these stocks for 50 years to come.

I do not intend to occupy the time of the House longer, save to call attention to one point, and I call attention to that mainly in order to illustrate the style of argument that hon. gentlemen opposite have adopted. If hon. gentlemen would only honestly face the facts and reason from them, perhaps there would not be as great difference of opinion between the two sides of the House as we often find. Let me take one illustration. The Minister of the Interior went into ecstacies on the one hand, and was filled with amazement and horror on the other,

because gentlemen on this side of the House praised Mr. Booth for what he had done, and blamed the government for what they had done. That would be a perfectly fair and reasonable argument if Mr. Booth and the government had done the same thing, but it is a perfectly unreasonable argument and an insult to the intelligence of the House, if Mr. Booth and the government had not done the same thing. What are the facts? Mr. Booth had a line and the government had a line; Mr. Booth had his own Canada Atlantic Railway and the government had their own Intercolonial Railway; Mr. Booth decided to extend his line. The first thing he did was to make the surveys, to lay out the plans and locate the line, and after he had made his surveys and located the line, then he decided to build. Did the government do that? Do we not find fault with the government on that point beyond most others, that what Mr. Booth did, they did not do, because they did not make such surveys? Then when Mr. Booth got ready to build he extended his own line.

Mr. SCHELL. Let me ask the hon. gentleman, if Mr. Booth has surveyed the line that he is now proposing to build from Whitney west, and for which he has obtained a charter?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am speaking of the Canada Atlantic Railway extension to Depot Harbour, which was alluded to by the Minister of the Interior, and I am trying to show the vast difference in the circumstances under which Mr. Booth built his road to Depot Harbour, and the circumstances under which the government propose to build this road through an unknown land. Mr. Booth extended his own line. Is the government extending its line? Mr. Booth, by extending his line, improved and increased the value of his line. The government is not extending their line, they are paralleling their line. Surely there is a difference there. We may well bless Mr. Booth and blame the government as to that. Then, after Mr. Booth had built his line as an extension of his own line, he operated his line. I am not aware that the government propose to operate the line that they are going to spend so much money to construct. Then, after Mr. Booth had constructed his line he carried all his freight by his new line over the full length of the new line down to the old, and he had the additional benefit not merely of the carriage of the freight on the new line, but the additional profits from its carriage on the old. The government are not doing that; they are handing over their line to another company. Then, when Mr. Booth was looking about for a place to extend his line, he extended it to the lakes; that is along the line suggested by the leader of the opposition. Mr. Booth extended his line where he knew he could get business; he extended it to the place where people were looking for it, and where they brought their grain for transport. Has the government extended its line to the lakes? Have they not built a blind line to Winnipeg, where they get nothing except what comes from this other line which is projected as a continuation of it across the prairies? I think it is a reasonable conclusion that when this side of the House applauded Mr. Booth for what he did, they could not help but to blame the government for what they did. We were consistent in applauding Mr. Booth and blaming the government, because what that sane, sensible, shrewd, business man, Mr. Booth did to make his road a success, has been carefully avoided by the government, and that is the reason they are going to make their scheme such a failure.

We appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to recognize that this is a question which should rise above party politics. No one will deny for a moment that the expenditure of from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 must affect the credit of this country for better or for worse. No one will deny that the expenditure of $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 on this proposed railway will certainly curtail other expenditures which may be more desirable and more important in the future than the construction of this railway. And, Sir, I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite at such a time as this, to lay aside party prejudices, to look on the question simply on its merits, to decline to be automatic voting machines, to refuse to jump like jacks in the box simply because the Prime Minister may pull the strings, but as intelligent representatives of the people to recognize that they owe a duty to their country and to those who sent them here. I appeal to them to consider the reasons which have been given by the ministry in support of the measure, and if they find that no one of the reasons given is founded on fact, if they find that few of the guarantees promised are found in existence, I ask them to join with this side of the House in defeating this measure, and allowing the country to obtain the best return it possibly can for the money it may expend on the solution of the transportation problem.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.). I desire Mr. Speaker, to say a few words on this very important question. I do not think it necessary that I should offer any apology, even though I may not be able to make my remarks as interesting as many hon. gentlemen who preceded me, or who may come after me. But, Sir, having occupied a position in public life for so long a time, having witnessed the initiation of the Intercolonial Railway as well as the initiation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and having lived to see these two great projects accomplished facts, I do feel a deep interest

as a Canadian—which is the proper interest to feel—in this great national project. I feel a special interest on this occasion coming as I do from the province of New Brunswick, because at no time in the history of this country since confederation, have the interests of New Brunswick been so much exposed to misrepresentation and prejudice. I feel it my duty therefore, Sir, to repudiate many of the statements made during this debate. This whole discussion has been in many respects extraordinary. Gentlemen who spoke in opposition to the scheme have from the beginning condemned this policy, and have condemned the government for introducing it, because as they allege, there is no proper data before us. We have been told by gentlemen who have spoken against this project, that the country in New Brunswick west of Moncton is absolutely unknown, that the northern parts of Quebec and Ontario are also unknown, and the same argument is applied all along the line. But, Sir, any one listening to the discussion must be surprised at the assertions which these gentlemen make as to a total absence of information on the part of the government when you think of the full and complete information which these gentlemen themselves say they are possessed of, as to the heavy grades to be encountered, the mountains to be crossed, and the difficulties to be overcome. If there is a total absence of information, how is it that there is so much information to prejudice the scheme ? I think the two arguments are inconsistent—just as inconsistent as many of the other points taken. The Intercolonial Railway was an important factor in the question of confederation, so important that without that inducement to the maritime provinces, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick would not, I believe, have entered into the confederation at that time. Since confederation and since the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, I have sat here under both administrations, and I have heard the attempt frequently made, especially in the province of Ontario, to prejudice the members coming from that section against the Intercolonial Railway as a burthen on the people of Ontario for the special benefit of the people of the maritime provinces. I think that was a most unfair and ungenerous charge to make. In the first place, the principle was laid down from the start, that there was no idea that the Intercolonial Railway should be constructed as a commercial line. It was for the purpose of uniting the different provinces, encouraging interprovincial trade, and bringing the people together. We in the western section of the province—and I include the city of St. John and all the counties along the river in that section—felt that our interests were sacrificed by the adoption of the Robinson route; and we are told today that we are responsible because the route was not a commercial success. We are not responsible. The selection was made from a military point of view, and but for that consideration the Robinson route would never have been adopted. Hon. gentlemen may talk as they please, but those who remember the discusions before confederation and in the first session of parliament after confederation, will admit, I am sure, that the arguments were overwhelming in favour first, of the frontier route, as it was called, and secondly, the central route as a compromise. We have been told by hon. gentlemen, in this debate, and by a newspaper which has been cautiously discussing this scheme, in its issue of the 15th of August, that the central portion of New Brunswick is an impassable section of country. More than that, some hon. members have said that it is a worthless country, not worth developing. I do not feel that I have any great cause of complaint against these hon. gentlemen, because the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), the one representative in the cabinet from our province, has indicated in his speech that the road will pass through a country difficult and almost worthless, leaving out the better portions which are settled. Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as the position of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways is concerned, I have been a friend, politically speaking, of that hon. gentleman for a great many years. I supported him as the leader of a coalition government in our province, which lasted for years to the satisfaction of both parties in the province. I supported him then while he was a Liberal, as I have supported him while he was a minister in the present government. I have no desire to say one word that would be offensive to that hon. gentleman or his many friends. But I have a right to say this, that when the hon. gentleman, who represents the province of New Brunswick in the cabinet, gave the reasons why he retired from the government and condemned this policy—and I say it in all candour and in all honour—that I have not yet heard any reason given by that hon. gentleman that satisfies me that it was the reason which induced him to take that step. The hon. gentleman himself, in discussing this question, has taken the ground, as have all the newspapers which have attacked this scheme, that the weak point in it is the eastern extension of the line from Quebec to Moncton. Why, it was first assailed as the result of piratical efforts on the part of the maritime members; and if we find ourselves weak in that respect, it is because the hon. ex-Minister of Railways has given strength to that argument. But we are only weak because arguments which have no foundation in fact are used against that part of the scheme. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who always speaks as a practical man, and who has himself had a large experience as Minister of Railways—though he sometimes speaks

without being sure of his facts—stated his objections to the extension of that eastern section from Quebec to Moncton. First, he stated that it would merely be a parallel road—that for the first 100 miles after leaving Lévis it would not be more than fifteen miles from the Intercolonial Railway at any one point. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman will look into the facts, he will be the first to see that he has made a mistake. At no point after the road leaves Chaudière Junction will it be within double that distance of the Intercolonial until it passes that point in Maine so often referred to on the St. Francis river. From that point it increases the distance until it more than doubles and trebles it, and, as was well stated by the Prime Minister, it passes through a country which is quite inaccessible by the Intercolonial, and is separated from it by that range of mountains which in fact has been used as an argument against the construction of this road—as if this road would cross over those mountains. We do not generally build railways over mountains. If these ridges were impassable mountains, with no breaks or natural valleys in them, I would admit that there was something in that argument. But nature has solved the problem. Do you think you are going to traverse the Rocky Mountains with a railway because it is said they are insuperable and you cannot build a practicable line over them ? That is true, but nature has solved that problem in many cases. You have the Kicking Horse pass, the Yellow Head pass, the Pine River pass, the Peace River pass. The waters in that pass rise within 125 miles of the Pacific coast. Its waters rise in the hills and flow eastward through thousands of square miles of that territory, which lies beyond the Rocky Mountains, and find their passage through the main range of the Rocky Mountains, continue on eastward forming the Peace river, thence to Athabaska and Greater Slave lakes and into the Mackenzie river, and on to the Arctic ocean. That is on account of the natural formation there, and the question of grades does not arise at all. Other passes are south of that.

I listened to the hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), a gentleman who has attained such a reputation for his military capacities, who has such high ideals, if not great ambitions, in that direction, who excels in everything he undertakes; and he produced the most wonderful results by merely glancing over the country. I am sure he never travelled all the country he has spoken of, but everywhere he went through that portion of New Brunswick and up through Quebec, as he travelled in his imagination along that route—because he never actually travelled over it—the hills and mountains were rolling around him and getting higher and higher, until it was a question to my mind which was the most elevated—these mountain peaks or the hon. gentleman himself.

An hon. MEMBER. The doubt is in favour of the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. The proposed route, so far as I know—and I shall not undertake to assert things I have not a reasonable knowledge of—from Chaudière Junction will not cross the height of land where any of these altitudes which have been referred to occur. It will avoid the height of land by following up the valleys of the streams which fall into the St. Lawrence. Passing by that range of mountains, it will cross one or two small tributaries which flow into the St. John, it will reach the south side of that range of mountains and follow down until it comes to that point near the boundary lake, where it joins the River St. Francis. The general report on our rivers is that the difference in levels is about ten feet in the mile. There can be no very great difficulty where the difference does not exceed ten feet per mile, and it does not in the river I have mentioned. You go down that valley, you strike the valley of the St. John in Canadian territory, and go on to Edmundston and Grand Falls, and thence strike across the country to Moncton. My own impression is that the final location would be via Edmundston and Grand Falls, but that is a matter of detail to be settled later. The engineering difficulties held out against the scheme are bugbears, and have no existence outside the imaginations of gentlemen who used them as arguments. We are told that the surveys made by Sir Sandford Fleming, or under his direction, prove absolutely that it is impossible to get through that central portion of New Brunswick. Well, while the report is not very favourable, what is it ? It says that the central portion of New Brunswick is an assemblage of high hills running up the sources of the Tobique, the Miramichi, the Restigouche and the Upsalquitch. It is true that all the rivers named rise in a small area, and flow in different directions, and that in that section, where these rivers take their source, you have a cluster of hills of considerable elevation; and if any one spoke of getting a road through there, I would say, not that it was impracticable, but that there were heavy grades, and that the greatest trouble would be the curvature and the length of line. But the proposed line goes south of all these highlands. The highest of the whole range in that province is the Blue Mountain, on the north-east side of the Tobique river, about 40 or 45 miles from its junction with the St. John river. If any one were to tell me that the government had decided to build a road across the Blue Mountain, I would say that the government did not know much about the country,

and I would urge them to seek better information.

Mr. LOGAN. If you built from Rivière du Loup, you would have to cross the Blue Mountain.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. No. There is a road built from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston now and in operation. When the debate was on with regard to the question of finally locating the Intercolonial Railway, we were pretty evenly divided in New Brunswick between the valley route and the north shore route, so that our vote did not amount to much. We always believed that Nova Scotia would favour the Robinson route, because that would place it in a more advantageous position towards St. John than if the road went down the valley of the St. John. I stated in my speech at nomination that the province of Quebec would naturally favour a route which would go down the St. Lawrence through Quebec counties and develop two of these counties, while the other route would not develop so many, and that the province of Ontario might be careless about the matter unless it were influenced by political reasons. But importance was attached to the military consideration, and what turned the scales was the fact that we had the credit of the English government for the cost of the construction of the road at that time, on condition that the British government approved the route adopted. That route was built, and the feeling in New Brunswick was this: While the people were disappointed, while they felt that a road three times more expensive, a great deal longer, less commercial in its aspect was selected, still people in the western portion, in course of time, did not begrudge the road to the north shore people, and the general opinion has been that after all it was as well, because a railway was afterwards constructed in that valley, in the local interest, up as far as Edmundston, and the north shore would not have got its road had it to depend on its own resources.

The impression left on the minds of hon. gentlemen who spoke from the opposition side, judging from their speeches, was that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals left the government because he could not support that scheme conscientiously, because it was a wild, inconsiderate and ill-considered scheme. But he did not leave the cabinet, as I understand it, because the government refused to take his view and go to St. John for a shorter road. That would have been inconsistent with the ground he took himself and the ground he is given the credit of having taken. His whole ground was that he could not justify the paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway. No one will say that a shorter line than the one now proposed could be found by going from Rivière du Loup across Temiscouata to Edmundston and down by the valley of St. John.

Surely no one in this House will say that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals resigned his seat in the government because the Intercolonial was to be paralleled, and destroyed, and dismantled, and discredited, and that he would have remained a defender of that policy if they had only paralleled the road by going along the Temiscouata route to St. John instead of to Moncton? That would be inconsistent. But there is an object in having the two strings to the bow. That object appears in a newspaper published in New Brunswick, the St. John 'Telegraph.' The 'Telegraph' indicates that the hon. minister left the government when he found that the government would not agree to the construction of a road across from the Intercolonial at Rivière du Loup to Edmundston and down the valley of St. John to St. John. That is not honest politics at all. But what would be the value of such a road? You have heard the objections to the grades and curvatures and the cost of construction of the proposed route. I do not profess to be a railway engineer, but I profess to have a little practical knowledge and to be able to form opinions as to what conclusions practical men like myself might draw from certain facts. I can tell this House that a road was built from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, largely subsidized by this parliament. It has been in operation for years. It was built in the face of reports against the grades and curvatures of that route. A firm by the name of Fraser & Son, Scotchmen, who came to New Brunswick and settled in that country and succeeded in building up a lumbering and milling business, bought the limits and put up a mill, one of the largest in New Brunswick, on the shores of Lake Temiscouata, half way between Rivière du Loup and Edmundston. They made a contract with the company to deliver the lumber at Rivière du Loup for shipment. I do not know what the grades are, but I know that, with a load of ten cars, the engine has to do a great deal of puffing to pull the train over the line; and I know that if you put more than ten cars on a train you have to put on two engines. You do not require to study what the grades are; you see the effects of the grades. You could not make a profitable freight road out of that. Besides it would be 40 miles longer than the proposed road even to Edmundston, without counting the saving from Edmundston across the province to Moncton.

I shall not attempt to go into the matter of the contract or the legal conditions. I think that some of the lay members of this House are quite capable of taking part in a discussion of that kind and holding their own pretty well with the legal gentlemen. But I think it would be undesirable for me to interfere. I am satisfied that the gentlemen who are looking after the interests of the government, and to the interest of the country, are reliable men and capable of

guarding the public interest, as it is their duty to do. And, without saying anything offensive, I am not at all convinced that the gentlemen who criticise the contract are satisfied that that contract is as worthless as they appear to make out. I am satisfied that it is worthy of the support of this House. Some hon. gentlemen have said what would happen if you could get the voice of the people upon it. I can look back as one of the men who stood here over twenty years ago, when, after the acquisition of the North-west Territories and the bringing in of British Columbia, Sir John Macdonald proposed the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway transcontinental line, as it was then considered. I followed the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other evening with great interest. I thought it was one of the good speeches of this debate—argumentative and full of information. But the last part did not, in my opinion strengthen his argument, nor was it necessary to his case. I myself will make a comparison between the two contracts and the two enterprises, this one and the Canadian Pacific Railway. My object will be to prove that the Canadian people are as ready to-day to endorse the policy of the government in this scheme as they were to endorse the policy of the government at that time. I do not think it is necessary or in good taste to undertake to prove that that contract was not a good one. The country has decided that question long ago. The Canadian Pacific Railway has aided to build up this country more than anything else that has been done—we are at one on that point. But let us make a fair comparison of the two enterprises. When Sir John Macdonald entered upon his bold policy based upon his hope and confidence in the future of this country more than anything else, there was no very full information as to the capabilities of the North-west Territories, nor was there much confidence in its capabilities, but one thing largely strengthened that policy, and that was that, having brought in British Columbia, having acquired the North-west Territories, there was only one way to administer them as a part of the Dominion, and that was to build the railway. We could only hope that the railway would justify its own construction—and it did amply. The government of the day had to give large subsidies in money, in land, and in constructed railways, in order to get the company to undertake that contract. It has been said that the terms were extravagant. Anyone who can remember the debate of that day knows that there was severe criticism, and perhaps as unreasonable and unwarranted criticism as there is against this scheme to-day. If any one is inclined to think that that was an extravagant contract let him remember these two things. First that the land that was given at that time was worthless if it was not developed by the construction of that road; and second that after that company was organized, entered upon its contract, made its financial arrangements, and commenced operations, it had to come back to parliament and say: We cannot go on, we are at the end of our resources; the whole thing is up unless we get a loan of $30,000,000 from the Canadian parliament. That staggered the Canadian people, the members of parliament and even the members of the government. But, Sir John Macdonald found that it was a necessary and safe investment to make. He made the loan. It secured the construction of this great work, and every dollar of the loan was paid pack. I feel proud of having contributed to that great work. I feel proud to have lived long enough to give my vote, and as I intend to do, in favour of the great work which is now proposed. And, while I would not like to hear an hon. member decry the result or the terms of the policy of building the Canadian Pacific Railway, I am going to try to do what is fair by this policy in a comparison of the two. When that land was given to encourage the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was worthless. It has become of great value now. When the contract was entered into the faith in the future and the confidence of success was more limited than the prospects of the success of this enterprise. Cannot this government go to the people of Canada to-day and say: You endorsed the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway originally to develop the North-west and British Columbia. You did not know what you were undertaking at that time. It was a courageous undertaking. But to-day you have the country partially developed, and when I say partially developed, I have in view the almost boundless extent of that country. You propose to build another line there. Why? Because the lands that were unknown then are known now, not only to the Canadian government and people, but to the civilized world. Those lands are known now to be capable of producing enough bread to feed not only Canada but millions of people across the Atlantic. They are known to be valuable lands, bringing good prices.

One good feature about this scheme is that it will pass through undeveloped portions of that territory and will increase the value of the lands just in the same proportion that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway increased the value of the lands in the sections through which it passes. But there will be this difference, that while the Canadian Pacific Railway were entitled to the lands that they earned, they are at the same time reaping a rich harvest in the value of these lands that were of unknown value twenty years ago. The lands which will be increased in value by the construction of this road will not pass into the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, but will remain the property

of Canada for Canadian settlers. I think you should not underestimate that one feature of this contract. I do not say this for the purpose of making a contrast to the prejudice of the former contract. You could not have constructed the first line in that way, because there was no such guarantee of the future value of the land as there is now. Therefore you are fully justified in undertaking this expenditure, which is moderate after all compared with the results to be achieved.

Some one has said: Who has asked for a transcontinental line? Where is the hurry for this line? Why, Sir, three years ago this question was discussed in this parliament, and it has been discussed since; it has been discussed by the press throughout the country. Now this question of transportation is no doubt at the present time the chief question before the Canadian people, and it is worthy all their attention. It should be considered, as my hon. friend who preceded me suggested, on broad Canadian lines, independent of party considerations. This great question is coupled with another one of great importance. The solution of the transportation problem also carries with it a development to the largest possible extent of the Dominion of Canada. You cannot introduce a scheme into this country and call it a Canadian scheme if it leaves any portion of the Canadian people out in the cold, let them be little or big, few or numerous. That was the policy at the bottom of confederation, that is why the Intercolonial was built, that is why the Canadian Pacific Railway was built later—to cement together all the provinces between the two oceans. Therefore I say the scheme promises not only to solve the transportation question, but to do for Canada more than could be done in any other way by developing all the provinces of the Dominion. In the west you develop new lands all through that enormous region, you develop trade for British Columbia, you develop a new field for the mining industry of British Columbia, you develop a new outlet for timber industries, you develop agricultural lands that so far have been inaccessible. You do the same to a considerable extent for the province of Manitoba. Then you come down through northern Ontario and develop sections there of immense value to that old province, and without a cent of cost directly to that province except its proportionate share of the general cost. You come to Quebec, and you develop the northern portion of that province. I have heard some hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec say that this is a barren country through which the railway is to run. Well, I would advise them not to say that too often, because the reports do not justify the statement, and we may conclude that the argument is used more for political effect than in the interest of the province.

Now, Sir, the name of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals is used, and his authority is given for the assertion that the part of New Brunswick to be developed by this line is a barren waste. Well, I am going to make a statement on my word as a member of parliament, and I know more of that country than any other man inside this House or outside of it, and that is saying a good deal, though I am not given to boasting. I have travelled through the most of that country, I have surveyed part of that country for farm lots, in the county of Carleton adjoining my own constituency. I have fished, I have hunted, I have cruised, I have lumbered through that country, and I make the statement defying contradiction, that this country is a valuable section of country. I do not say that it will compare with the prairie section, I do not say that it will compare with the Niagara peninsula, but I do say that we cannot find in the Dominion of Canada an equal extent of wilderness lands still unsettled of greater value than this very tract that is decried to-day. I make that statement knowing whereof I speak. The upper portion of it will compare favourably with any highland in Canada, no matter how fertile it is. It has some of the finest land you can imagine. In the county of Victoria and the Madawaska region you will find highlands and bushlands of the greatest value. After that country had been surveyed into lots, you could tell a man: Go to the Crown lands office and take a map, and pick out any number you like; you cannot miss it, they are all alike. Now you cannot do that in every country, for you would be liable to get a waste lot, to get a swamp lot. That extends down through the counties of Madawaska, Victoria, Carleton and York. From York across to Moncton the land will not average as high, but it is good agricultural land, and it is well timbered. When I say well timbered I do not mean to contradict one statement that was made especially by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. One of the points made by that hon. gentleman was that the valuable timber had all been taken out of the country. There is a good deal of truth in that, but there are gentlemen here who know something about the lumberman's business, gentlemen who have not been engaged in the business but who will easily understand that when lumbering operations are carried on in territories adjacent to streams and natural watercourses which are convenient for transporting the lumber from the country the lumber can be floated down these streams and they get the benefit of these watercourses, but beyond the region of these streams there is no other outlet and the timber remains there. Practical business men in this House and in the country well know that under the conditions in a country like that where the best lumber

has been taken out of the country and where the streams have been utilized as highways down which the raw material in the form of logs is taken, if you have a railway beyond that country you will develop new industries as important as the ones which have been nearly exhausted, because you are reaching a point in the country which has hitherto not been reached by these lumbering operations and you are giving opportunities to do the most important work that can be done, that is to produce the finished article, or if not the absolutely finished article to add to its finished condition, or to approach the finished condition and to ship it in this form over the railway thus developing new interests in that section of the country besides developing the agricultural interests and these two interests combined are necessary one to the other in creating a trade for the railway that is running through the country. Fifty years ago there was talk of railway construction. You could not talk with the view of interesting any capitalist in a railway enterprise unless you brought before him statistics of good character, statistics that were undisputed that would show the probable trade that the road would do. Now it is a pretty generally accepted idea and principle that given an undeveloped country with any mineral resources, or lumber or agricultural capabilities, and put a road through it that road will develop new industries and thus bring the country into a condition of usefulness. I was very much struck also by the fact which was developed during the discussion that a man may even be led too far by his enthusiastic impulses. When the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was talking of the capabilities of the Intercolonial Railway he used one argument that to my surprise was received with wonderful applause on this side of the House. I would not applaud it and for the reason that I would not have applauded it it should not have been applauded on this side of the House if it had been thoroughly understood. What was it ? In 1883, I think, Sir Charles Tupper came to this parliament and proposed a vote of $170,000 for a guarantee for 15 years to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of joining Montreal with St. John and Halifax. The project did not mature, but next year, in 1884, Sir Charles Tupper came down to the House again with a proposition to give $250,000, speaking from memory, or $280,000 for 20 years.

Mr. LOGAN. It was $250,000.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. $250,000 for 20 years instead of $170,000 for 15 years. It was not this time to join Montreal with St. John and Halifax, but this guarantee was given to secure the construction of a road starting from the south side of the St. Lawrence, opposite Montreal, passing down through the townships to Moose Head Lake, Mattawamkeag, Fredericton and then to Salisbury. It was a well defined route as far as it appeared in the resolution. What was the explanation which Sir Charles Tupper gave for paralleling the Intercolonial Railway, even if he had to go through a foreign country to do it ? Sir Charles Tupper stated that the Intercolonial Railway had been built for military purposes and for considerations other than commercial purposes and that it had done more than was expected of it by its friends and opponents, but on account of its mileage, the ports of St. John and Halifax could not be expected to compete against American ports unless some way was found to shorten the distance to St. John. It was in order to shorten the distance to St. John by giving these better facilities for getting to St. John that the Intercolonial Railway was paralleled and it was intended that it should compete successfully. That was the point. We gave that large guarantee for this new road. It was built to St. John and not to Salisbury. What did the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals prove the other night and which I think was so strangely cheered ? He proved that Sir Charles Tupper's justification for giving $250,000 for 20 years for a short line was a mistake and then he said that Sir Charles Tupper was all wrong. After saying that Sir Charles Tupper was wrong in asking parliament to provide this guarantee and that parliament was wrong in aiding the building of a short line as a successful competitor with the Intercolonial Railway he said : I know that when the cattle embargo was on the Intercolonial Railway carried cattle down to St. John quicker and cheaper than the short line could after all the expense they have gone to. What does that mean ? I think that Sir Charles Tupper's reasoning was good. What I am complaining of is the argument that Sir Charles Tupper having asked parliament to make this expenditure and having given reasons which are logical the fact which the hon. gentleman stated proves that the building of a short line was not a success. If it was not a success in this instance, it was because the grades and curvatures were too great. Now, I perhaps have spoken too long—half an hour—but I do not think half an hour is very long compared with the speeches that have been made on this side of the House, and I promised my hon. friends that I would not take the floor until short speeches became the order of the evening.

An hon. MEMBER. The order of the morning.

Mr. SPROULE. You have already spoken an hour.

Mr. LANCASTER. Just exactly an hour.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I think half an hour.

Mr. LANCASTER. Just exactly an hour.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the hon. gentleman is about as near the mark as he is in regard to this railway contract.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman commenced speaking at half past eleven and it is now half past twelve.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I will not take up much more of your time. We had hopes in the west of the province that at the time Sir Charles Tupper made the proposition some line like this proposed line would be found through Canadian territory shortening the distance to St. John. And our hopes were reasonably well founded, and I think they would have been realized had it not been for the fact of existing lines constructed then, reaching towards Moose Head lake, and leaving the shorter distance to be constructed. To our western friends I would say that the transportation problem after all arises in that country. There is no doubt that the future welfare of Canada depends on the successful solution of that question. What the people of the west want is a cheaper outlet for their products, and no Canadian would be patriotic if he did not endeavour to secure for them that cheap outlet. We want their produce to come through Canadian territory to build up our ports in the east, as we will endeavour to help building up their country in the west. In that way the people of the west and the people of the east will have a common object in view. One hon. gentleman stated to-day that he took a broad position as a Canadian, and that he spurned the idea of sectionalism. But he complained that the government were by this scheme providing a through line for freight so that the labourers along the route would get no toll out of it, and he pointed out to the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that Collingwood was going to be destroyed by this policy. Well, that was not a very broad view of the case, because the proper idea is to get as little toll as possible out of the western grain as it passes through Canada, and the labourers will be compensated in other ways than by taking this toll.

In conclusion, I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have spoken on this subject chiefly because I know that there will be an effort to misrepresent this scheme, especially that part of it which passes through the central part of New Brunswick, and which some pretend to regard as the weak spot in the project. Well, Sir, I am sorry we have not the help of the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) to promote the interests of New Brunswick on this occasion. I am quite sure, however, that these gentlemen on the Conservative benches who now praise him so highly, would pepper him just as hotly if he were to open his mouth in favour of this project, or in favour of his province. He has risen high in the estimation of our friends of the opposition very suddenly. He deserves their respect and good opinion. He is a capable and able man, but their attitude towards him has very quickly and very materially changed. I must express my deep sympathy however, with one old friend in this House, I refer to the energetic and talented member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte). When he ceased to be a minister of the Crown he was deified all at once by his former opponents, and instead of being in their eyes an avowed traitor to his country as they had termed him, he became the ablest minister that ever sat in the Laurier cabinet. His stock went up wonderfully; he was received with open arms; he was courted and complimented and flattered. But since the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) has appeared upon the scene, I notice that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) seems to have dropped into oblivion. There is not half the importance attached to him now that there was a few months ago, and lately the affection of the members of the opposition has been centred upon this greatest man that ever was at the head of the Railway Department. But, Sir, remember that these very same gentlemen are those who denounced the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) not so long ago as anything but honest or moral. I have to say that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) has been a strong man in his province. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made it a leading feature in his speech to attack the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) who is an old personal friend of mine, and a gentleman whom I have known for a great many years. The member for East Grey dealt with the member for Westmoreland without gloves, but if he did not hurt the member for Westmoreland any more than he hurt the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme, the member for Westmoreland will long survive.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sorry I killed him.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not suppose that the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) had any desire to injure my hon. friend physically, but I can tell him that any private member in this House might feel well satisfied to enjoy so highly the confidence of his constituents as does the hon. member for Westmoreland. It was also stated by some one that the hon. member for Westmoreland was the pupil or the protégé of the ex-Minister of Railways: Let me say that the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) is a strong man in his county, and a strong man in his province. He is well known all through the province of New Brunswick, and is highly respected wherever he is known. Let no one make any mistake about the standing of the hon. member for Westmoreland in the province of New Brunswick. He is a gentleman of long experience, a gentleman with a good record, and a gentleman who is trusted among the people of New Bruns-

wick. No one would be less disposed to minimize the good qualities of the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) than I, but after very considerable experience I can say that there is no man so strong that he can do without his friends, and whatever strength that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) had in this parliament he owes it to the good friends who have stood behind him. If they stand behind him yet, he is as strong as ever, but if they do not support him, he will be very weak indeed, so far as federal influence is concerned. I myself have been pretty strong in my own county. I have fought a great many elections, and I have represented it a great many years. I suppose that even my opponents will say that I am a strong man in that county, but I would like to know how strong I would be if I lost the confidence of the men who make me strong. There is where the whole question comes in. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I can speak for my own constituency, as there are other men to speak for theirs, and I can say unhesitatingly that so far as I can judge of other constituencies, without speaking officially for them, this scheme is well viewed in New Brunswick and will receive cheerful and strong support in that province.

Mr. LOGAN. On behalf of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.40 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, August 19, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 245) to further amend the Civil Service Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, the Bill deals with certain officers of the Civil Service. The matter has been pressed upon the attention of the government for some time by one of the hon. members for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) and though the measure perhaps does not go as far as he urges, at the same time it does to some extent meet his wishes. It affects the position of the deputy heads, the chief clerks, temporary clerks or temporary writers and employees, as they are called, and also the members of the staff in several departments such as the customs, inland revenue and so on. It is a matter of detail affecting the salaries of officials. It will be better understood now that it is before the House, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will peruse the Bill he will see what it is intended to cover.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

TWENTY-FOURTH REGIMENT.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria)—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who is senior major and who junior major of the 94th Regiment ?
2. What is the qualification of each ?
3. Where does each reside ?
4. Have they each, or has either of them, leave of absence ?
5. Has either one of them been absent for years from the Regimental District ?
6. Was either one or the other appointed to his position over a senior officer ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden).

1. Senior major—Major R. Gillis ; junior major, Major D. A. McRae.
2. Major McGillis, 1st class certificate (infantry), equitation ; Major McRae, 1st class certificate (infantry), equitation.
3. Major Gillis resides at Sydney, C.B. ; Major McRae (not yet ascertained).
4. No.
5. No.
6. Major Gillis promoted over Capt. J. P. McNeil, who was not qualified for promotion.

Major McRae promoted over undermentioned captains, who were not qualified for promotion to rank of major :

Capt. J. P. McNeil, Capt. J. D. McRae, Capt. J. S. McLean, Capt. A. D. McRae, Capt. R. Y. McKenzie.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT—CONTRACTS AWARDED.

Mr. THOMSON (North Grey) asked :

1. How many contracts for public works, buildings, &c., have been awarded by the government from January 1st to July 31st of the present year ?
2. Where are such works, buildings, &c., to be located, and what is the contract price in each case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock) in the absence of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland)—I beg to give the answer to his department as follows :

1. Sixty-two.

2. Burk's Falls, Ont., wharf, $5,400.00 : Toronto, postal station 'C' heating apparatus, $986.00; Orillia, Ont., wharf at the park of, $8,389.00 ; Nelson, B.C., drill shed, heating apparatus, $215.00 ; Oromocto wharf, $6,-200.00; Sturgeon Falls, Ont., wharf, $2,810.00; Kamloops, B.C., drill shed, heating apparatus, $365.00 ; Rossland, B.C., post office and building, fittings, $4,950.00 ; Nelson, B.C., post office buildings and fittings, $4,400.00 ; Arichat, N.S., post office building, heating apparatus, $700.00 ; St. Irénée, P.Q., addition to wharf, $10,399.00 ; Guysboro, N.S., public building, fittings, $1,650.00 ; Marysville, N.B., public building, heating apparatus, $825.00 ; Montreal, P.Q., examining warehouse, fittings, $4,000.00 ; Carnduff, Ass., N.W.T., court house, heating apparatus, $1,078.00 ; Ottawa post office building, elevator, $5,-310.00 ; St. François, Island of Orleans, P.Q., isolated block, $11,800.00; Sandy Cove, N.S., public breakwater, $13,000.00; Tiverton,N.S., public breakwater, $17,000.00 ; Green Cove, N.S., breakwater, $6,475.00 ; Deseronto, public building, fixtures, $2,800.00 ; Blind River, Ont., pile wharf, $9,310.75; Dredge St. Lawrence, construction of 36 buckets,, $1,872.00 ; Tug 'Delisle,' tubular boiler, $2,525.00 ; Short Beach, N.S., breakwater, $8.095.00; Hopewell Cape, N.B., approach to pier, $900.00 ; Herring Cove, N.S., breakwater, $11,475.00 ; Middleton, N.S., armouries, heating system, &c., $946.00 ; Granby, P.Q., public building, fittings, $2,650.00 ; South Bay, Ingonish, N.S., wharf, $2,485.00 ; Pointe à Paquin, P.Q., supply of timber, $5,515.00 ; Quebec Artillery workshop, shafting for transmission of power, $1,879.00 ; Dundas, Ont., armoury fittings, $1,330.00 ; Cove Head, P.E.I., shear dam, $6,699.00 ; Sussex, N.B., armoury fittings, $4,029.00 ; Clinton, Ont., public building, heating apparatus, $1,150.00 ; Arichat, N.S., building, fittings, $1,750.00 ; Cross Point, P.Q., wharf, $9,995.00 ; Kingston, Ont., gymnasium, R.M.C., heating apparatus, $1,-910.00 ; D'Escousse, N.S., wharf and warehouse, $4,388.00 ; Huntsville, Ont., work to pile wharf, $320.00 ; Quebec Artillery workshop, electric light wiring and fittings, $442.00 ; Sarnia, Ont., public building, heating apparatus, $1,800.00 ; Washabuck Centre, N.S., wharf and road, $5,860.00; Marysville, N.B., public building, fittings, &c., $1,300.00 ; Guelph, Ont., post office additions, $30,595.00 ; Carnduff, N.W.T., court house fittings, $269 ; Dundas, Ont., drill hall, veneering and flooring, $5,750.00 ; Tug 'Ottawa,' marine return tubular boiler, $1,700.00 ; Quebec harbour improvements, $198,700.00 ; Berlin, Ont., alterations and post office, $7,316.00 ; Dredge 'J. Israel Tarte,' bow and stern cable winches, $5,700.00 ; Kingston, Ont., gymnasium, R.M.C., electric wiring and fixtures, $575.00 ; Rivière au Renard, P.Q., additional length to wharf, $41,485.00 ; Fort Lawrence, N.S., pile wharf, $14,895.00 ; Toronto Junction, Ont., post office building, $23,450.00 ; Kaslo, B.C., drill hall, fittings, &c., $525.00 ; Portage du Fort, P.Q., masonry, &c., of the bridge, $10,797.00; Edmonton, N.W.T., jail, $50,150.00 ; Fredericton, N.B., officers new stables, $3,110.00 ; Cheticamp Point, N.S., wharf, $13,880.00 ; St. Hyacinthe, P.Q., inland revenue building, $21,089.00.

DISMISSAL OF DENIS MAYRAND, ST. JEAN, QUE.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. At what date was the petition asking for the dismissal of Denis Mayrand, a government employee, at St. Jean, P.Q., sent to the government ?

2. What were the reasons set forth in support of the said petition for dismissal ?

3. What persons signed the said petition ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. R. Préfontaine).

1. There was no petition asking for the dismissal.

2. As far back as 1896, the Hon. Mr. Marchand brought to the notice of the department that Mr. Lord should be appointed, owing to the light being on his property, and any strange keeper attending to the light being very inconvenient to him. A recommendation was also made by the electors of the county of St. John asking for the appointment of Mr. Lord, the present keeper, signed : 'J. O'Cain, J. E. Herbert, P. A. Chassé, H. Moreau, M.D., E. J. Paradis, A. U. Deland, N.P., Laurent Moreau.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington). Mr. Speaker, in rising at this comparatively late stage in the debate to offer a few remarks upon the measure before the House, I shall endeavour as far as possible to avoid any prolonged reference to those points in the debate which have already occupied so much of the time of the House —points which have already been pretty thoroughly discussed by men far more capable to deal with them than I can hope to be. However, Sir, I fear that in the remarks which I have to make it may be impossible for me totally to avoid them, but I can promise that any reference I may make to them shall be very brief. Representing, as I have the honour of representing, one of the interior constituencies of Ontario, a constituency already served by one line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by two lines of the Grand Trunk Railway, yet a constituency which will be far removed from the proposed line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ; I desire to lay be-

fore the House reasons which are strong enough to convince me that in giving my support to this Bill I am only acting in the best interests of my constituents, but in the best interests of the province of Ontario, and the best interests of the Dominion of Canada in general. Now, Sir, having regard to some portion of the addresses delivered in this debate by hon. members opposite, I feel that there is one point which we cannot too prominently keep before our minds in discussing this measure. That point is, that this question is in no sense of the word local or sectional. It is in no sense of the word provincial; but on the contrary, it is national in every characteristic. For no particular section of the country, for no particular province of the Dominion, would the government be justified in entertaining so vast a proposition or in pledging the national credit to so great an amount.

But, when we view the matter in its true light, when we realize, as I submit we should realize, that it is a matter of national concern, that this measure, when carried into effect, will advance us a long stride, not only in the matter of public convenience—for that is a comparatively minor matter—but that it will advance us a long stride in national greatness and in national importance; then, Sir, I contend that in view of that perfect confidence which we all share in the future of this country, the mere vastness of the proposal should not cause us to hesitate for a single moment, but, on that contrary, should inspire us with fresh resolution. We all know that in all large assemblies of men there are those whose judgment becomes somewhat unbalanced simply by the magnitude of a proposal. There are men who under normal circumstances exercise an ordinary amount of common sense and judgment, whose opinions become unsteady simply from the effect of size and outward proportion. Now, after the first blush of this proposal has been submitted to this House, and when any effect which may have been caused by the magnitude of the proposal has passed away, I submit that upon second thought, upon mature deliberation this measure will commend itself to the vast majority of the members of this House.

Among our many differences of opinion as to the propriety of the proposal of the government, as engrafted in the resolution before us, there would appear to be one ground upon which hon. members on both sides can agree, and that common ground of agreement exists apparently from the appreciation of the fact that there is in Canada to-day a most pressing need for increased railroad facilities. The time when this proposition might be looked upon as something merely desirable, as something highly convenient if attained, has passed. The matter has now become a matter of pressing necessity; a necessity which will neither wait the time of man nor of parliament; a necessity which if we do not satisfy may find its own outlet and its own remedy, for necessity knows no law; may find an outlet and a remedy in foreign channels which in the future may require years of struggle upon our part and the expenditure of vast sums of money on our part, ere we regain ground which we may now lose by procrastination or by delay. I agree thoroughly with the statement made by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), when he said, that when trade once accommodates itself to certain specific channels it is a difficult thing to reclaim it. That is a very true proposition, and it is a proposition that we will have to face unless we take immediate action to direct trade through our own lines and through Canadian territory. I am aware, Sir, that hon. members opposite are inclined to chide the government with the statement that if this necessity is so great, if the matter is so urgent, why is it that you have taken seven years before you have awakened to the necessities of the situation? Hon. members opposite say to the government, you have had seven long years of power—long years, I suppose, they have seemed to hon. members opposite—you have had seven long years of power, and not until the fifth month of the present session have you decided upon action. I maintain that such a charge or such an insinuation is entirely without foundation; such a charge or such an insinuation is utterly unfair to the government. I contend, Sir, that it is only within the last year or two that the difficulty has really arisen, that the congestion in western traffic has really become acute. True indeed it is that for many years past the people of Manitoba, the people of the North-west Territories, the people of British Columbia have suffered, and suffered immeasurably through the imposition on them of excessive freight rates; freight rates which were the direct result of the monopoly clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, a clause which the late Conservative government permitted to be engrafted in that contract. The difficulty up to a year or two ago was one of excessive freight rates. You could generally effect shipment of your goods provided you were willing to take the small amount coming to you after payment of these freight rates. But the difficulty now is rather a double one. It is not only a difficulty in regard to freight rates owing to lack of railway competition, but it is also a difficulty arising from actual congestion of traffic in that western country. Now, Sir, far from chiding the government in respect to this measure; far from insinuating that they should have realized the situation long before they did realize it; I maintain that the people of the country are to be congratulated upon the fact that they have in power a government, strong enough and bold enough, and pos-

sessed of sufficient knowledge in railway matters, to bring down a measure, large as it may be, difficult as it may be, intricate as it may be; and a measure which, notwithstanding opposition criticism to the contrary, will be found to be a measure well considered in principle and in detail, and one which when carried into effect will in my humble opinion to a very large extent relieve this country of the difficulties which it is suffering from to-day in respect to railways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed in many of the speeches delivered upon this question by hon. members opposite—in fact in all the speeches since the hon. ex-Minister of Railways resumed his seat, with the exception perhaps of the speeches delivered yesterday—I have noticed in these speeches that they have all been prefaced by the statement, or that they have all contained an intimation that, from their point of view, the ground had been so thoroughly and so effectively covered by the ex-Minister of Railways, that because everything had been said that could be said in opposition to the Bill, that because every argument had been urged that could be urged in support of their contention, they naturally found themselves in the difficult situation of having to reiterate former statements or to repeat former arguments. That is a difficult position, no doubt, and hon. members on this side of the House sympathize with hon. members opposite in that difficulty. For I believe that when the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals delivered his address in this House at the opening of this debate he did thoroughly exhaust every ground of opposition which could reasonably be urged against this Bill. The hon. ex-minister had an incentive to do so. He had lately resigned from the cabinet. He had differed, and he was the sole one to differ, from the other members of the cabinet upon this question. His resignation caused a great deal of talk and a great deal of newspaper comment throughout the length and breadth of the land. He knew that the task was before him of justifying his position before the people of this country. He knew that he had a difficult task before him, and he exerted himself to the utmost to gather together every jot and tittle that he might use to justify his position. He exerted every energy and all his great ability in research, in examination and in preparation, if we may judge by the mass of manuscript from which the hon. ex-minister spoke in this debate. He had to justify his position, not only in this House, but in this country. Is it any wonder, then, acting under the incentive which he had that he should have exhausted the subject, that he should have elaborated every argument? and is it any wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite, who have followed the hon. ex-minister in this debate, have been compelled for the greater part merely to reiterate his statements and repeat his arguments?—not a pleasant task for any one.

Certain portions of the speech of the hon. ex-minister dealt with matters which were properly within his right to deal with. Other portions of that speech dealt with matters which I maintain he had no right to deal with, which it was pure audacity on his part to deal with. If the hon. member withdrew from the cabinet for any of a great number of reasons which he gave, he was perfectly right in withdrawing, provided he acted under conviction. He had a perfect right to object to this measure on the ground that it interfered with the Intercolonial Railway, and he was free to leave the cabinet on that ground if he so desired. He had a free hand to discuss the financial aspects of the problem; and if on that ground he differed with the government, he had a perfect right to do so, provided he was conscientious in doing so. If his objections were on the question of mileage or the nature of the country through which the road might pass, the hon. ex-minister had a free hand on all these points; and on all these points, judging from the speech which the hon. gentleman delivered, I thought he was serious and that he spoke under absolute conviction. But there were some portions of that speech which he elaborated, I thought at the time, for the purpose of drawing applause from hon. gentlemen opposite, whose applause he had never received before. Those portions of his speech on which I thought he had no right to enlarge were that there was no urgency, no necessity, and no public demand for another transcontinental railway. The hon. ex-minister surely has a memory which will take him back seven or eight months to his memorable visit to the city of Vancouver and to the speech which he delivered on that occasion. If he remembers that speech, and if he was honest in his statements to this House, why did he argue that there was no pressing necessity, no urgency, no outcry, and no general movement in favour of this road? Why, Sir, if credit is to be given to anybody, that credit must be given to the hon. ex-minister himself for having first ventilated this question, for having first created this demand, for having first started this movement in favour of another transcontinental railroad. The hon. gentleman spoke at Vancouver, under what circumstances? He had made a transcontinental trip. He had seen the country and the people, he understood the circumstances; and at a time when his mind was charged with all these matters, at a time when he had all the necessary information in his possession, he deliberately told the people of Vancouver that this measure was urgent and necessary—so urgent that not a minute was to be lost. He also told them that not only one railroad, but in the near future three or four other transcontinental lines would be necessary. Now, I ask the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and

Canals what has intervened to change his opinion from the opinion he expressed in Vancouver last fall to the opinion he expressed in this House a few days ago ? Has anything intervened at all ? I believe the hon. member spoke at Vancouver with absolute conviction ; and, if nothing has intervened since which could be expected to change the conviction of the hon. gentleman on the subject, then he must have spoken in this House absolutely without conviction, so far as the urgency and necessity of a transcontinental line was concerned.

But, Sir, there is a good deal to be gleaned as to the position of the hon. ex-minister from that letter which he himself submitted, and which has now become one of the records of this House. There is no doubt that in that letter he complains, and complains bitterly, that the right hon. leader of the government did not consult him, as he claims he should have been consulted, in regard to the preliminaries of this measure. I offer my humble opinion on that point. The right hon. leader of the government acted properly, did what he was entitled to do as a matter of right, having regard to his position, in the negotiations which took place respecting a great national transcontinental railway. Why, Sir, what more right had the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to be consulted than half a dozen other members of that same cabinet ? This proposition not only involves the Department of Railways and Canals ; it involves, and to a large extent, the Department of Finance. Surely the hon. Minister of Finance might have had the same right to complain that he was not consulted. It involves the Department of Customs ; surely the hon. Minister of Customs might have the right to complain that he was not consulted. It involves the Department of the Interior ; has not the hon. Minister of the Interior as much right to complain as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals ? But is it not a fact that none of them had a right to complain ? Is it not a fact that, having regard to the nature of the measure, the man who should conduct the preliminary negotiations was the Prime Minister of this country, irrespective of his colleagues ?

There is no doubt that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals is smarting on account of offended dignity or injured pride. I can imagine no other reason for his conversion from the views he held and the policy he enunciated at Vancouver last fall. Nothing has intervened between that time and this to account for this sudden change of front. The hon. gentleman has not given us any reason for his change of opinion. He has given nothing to show why to-day he finds that there is no urgency, no need, no public demand for this transcontinental line. History, Sir, is full of the records of political conversions, but I fail to find in the record any such sudden conversion as this. So far as I know, all political conversions have come about through the process of time. They have been the result of an evolutionary process. They have taken some little time. But the conversion of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals took but a few short months at the most, and during those months nothing happened to justify it. Why, Sir Robert Peel was charged with being a political convert, and he certainly was with regard to the Corn Laws, but his conversion was a matter of some years' experience. The late Benjamin Disraeli was accused of being a political convert—a man who had entered public life as a Radical and then became leader of the Conservative party. Gladstone was accused of being a convert upon the Home Rule question. Certainly that great statesman did undergo a radical conversion, but that likewise was the process of years' experience and the result of evolution. But for a speedy conversion, without any apparent reason, I can compare the conversion of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to no other than that Saul of Tarsus. But there is this difference. Whereas the change of heart of Paul was due to Divine intervention, in the case of the ex-minister there was the intervention of no higher power and the operation of no greater influence than his wounded pride and offended dignity. But, Sir, to a very sensitive man, a wound to his pride or a slight to his dignity may perhaps be the strongest influence which we can bring to bear upon him. To a sensitive man, a slight to his pride will even turn friends into enemies at a moment's notice. It will rankle in his bosom until he loses sight of his former convictions, until he comes to detest anything, be it political measures or otherwise, which by any means of reasoning, he can connect with that which offended his pride or dignity. I believe that that is the secret of the demonstration which the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals made in this House last week. I believe that he was driven simply by the smart of insulted pride to take the position he did a week ago in this House. Let me remind the hon. gentleman of those words of Holy Writ : 'Pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall.' Under these circumstances, is it to be wondered that the hon. minister made an exhaustive statement and that hon. members opposite find great difficulty in making speeches, without repeating in great part the statement made by the ex-minister ?

On looking over the addresses delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite, I find that, with the exception of some trifling details and some very minor criticisms, their argument was drawn, until yesterday at all events, exclusively from the statements of the ex-minister. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) followed first on the opposite side of the House. I have always looked on that hon. gentleman as a man

of some intellectual breadth; but after assaulting the proposition before the House with nothing short of wholesale condemnation, after repeating the arguments of the ex-minister, what was his main objection? He spoke of the northern portion of the province of Quebec, he pictured to us the settlement going on around the Lake St. John district, he told us of the patriotic efforts of a certain number of men to populate that district, he declared that a colonization road should be built there, and for that reason forsooth this great transcontinental railway scheme should be set aside. If ever a man of broad intellect cramped himself into a narrow confine, if ever a federal member of parliament clothed himself in the garb of pure provincialism, we had that picture in this House, when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier advanced such an argument. He was followed on the other side by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who seems to have acquired the title or railway expert of the opposition. I do not know what the experience of the hon. gentleman has been with regard to railways. But I think it is confined largely to the legal side. I do not know whether he has had any practical experience or not——

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to tell him, the hon. member for Hamilton was for years the general manager of the Hamilton and North-western Railway.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Then he has had some practical experience which I was not aware of, but he did introduce into the discussion one or two points which had been omitted by the ex-minister in his exhaustive argument. The points on which the hon. member for Hamilton based his arguments were, in my opinion, minor ones. They were criticism of detail, and I do not say that this Bill or contract is entirely free from such criticism. I believe that in detail it may be criticised; but I do not think that the hon. member for Hamilton for one moment denied the government proposition that a transcontinental railway should be built upon the principle contained in this contract and Bill. His objection was that you could not obtain proper running rights for more than one railway, that there would be a dominant and a servient railway, that the servient railway would be discriminated against, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, being the tenant of the government, would have the right to dictate terms to the other railways, and that these terms would be so oppressive as to prevent the other railways from doing business on that line. I think, Sir, that that question has been pretty thoroughly cleared up. It certainly is thoroughly cleared up so far as the Intercolonial railway is concerned, because the Intercolonial Railway is not in the position of any other road with regard to this system. It is stated in section 24 that the Intercolonial Railway shall have equal rights in the running of that road, and not such rights as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway may see fit to offer. The Intercolonial Railway will have as good a right as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to operate that road, and the right to do so on equal terms.

Then the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) seemed to doubt the financial standing of the Grand Trunk Railway. It seemed to me that that was a peculiar position for the hon. gentleman to assume. He said they had a certain amount of bonded indebtedness and he very seriously argued that it was questionable whether the Grand Trunk Railway could raise money on second mortgage bonds or whether the security of the Grand Trunk Railway was sufficient. That, I submit, is another criticism of detail, and of a detail that does not interfere in any way with the principle of the Bill.

Next, he argued that there would be a difficulty about supplying coal on the railway. There may be some slight difficulty in that respect. But, surely, that is a matter purely of detail which does not go to the principle of the Bill. And, from the whole speech of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) I should think that when the division comes upon this question, that hon. member would bury these matters of criticism of minor detail and accept the principle of this measure, as I believe in his heart he endorses it. He was followed by another gentleman, who has been referred to by his leader as perhaps the most experienced and practical railroad man in the House. I refer to the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). Now, let any one peruse the address which that hon. gentleman delivered on this subject, and if he can find in that address anything which was not exhaustively laid before the House by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) he will do more than I have been able to do. I believe that the hon. member for South Lanark must have felt staggered by the proposition, because in one portion of his address he said: But it will be asked what have we to urge as an alternative course? And then he goes on to urge delay, the appointment of a commission in order to ascertain the nature of the territory through which this road will pass, and the necessary length of the line—but to the principle of the Bill itself he takes no objection. He merely asks what has been asked in this debate by hon. gentlemen opposite that the matter be somewhat further delayed. So, with all the addresses delivered by those hon. gentlemen on the other side who spoke prior to yesterday, I do not think there is any serious opposition to the Bill, though there may be some opposition to matters of minor detail.

Now, I do not intend to touch upon the financial problem which will confront us when this Bill is passed. I believe this has

been thoroughly dealt with, I should have had something to say on that subject but for the assurance given to this House by the hon. Minister of Finance when he made the statement here that the government would see to it that the road was built to the standard of a modern commercial road. He placed the figures of cost a little low, in my opinion, and I judge of this from what I have been able to learn through inquiries I have made. The hon. minister says it may be $25,000 a mile for the whole system, but he allows for an increase of 25 per cent, or a total of $31,250 a mile. I believe the estimate made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will be found to be nearer the mark, and that the road will be likely to average about $35,000 a mile. But in going into this undertaking the government is going in with the idea that the road shall be built as a modern commercial road up to the standard of a modern commercial road; and it does not go into it bound within a limit of a thousand, or two thousand or even three thousand dollars a mile, so long as it attains the object that it has in view, of having a modern commercial road up to the standard now in vogue.

With regard also to the question of mileage, I have nothing to add to what has already been said. I say that the evidence offered to the House has been overwhelming that there will be a reasonable shortening of distance between Lévis and Moncton. The evidence is overwhelming that that shortening will be in the neighbourhood of 100 miles and may be as much as 120 and even 130 miles. Nor have I anything to add to the debate regarding the nature of the country through which the road will pass. I think that in that respect also the testimony we have before us is overwhelming, that the country will be an easy or comparatively easy country for railroad purposes. I believe, with the hon. member for Hamilton, that you can get the desired grade if you will spend the money, and that it is an easy railroading country and does not involve vast expenditure. These and some other matters, I think have been fully discussed and I do not feel called upon to deal with them.

But I should like particularly to refer to one branch of this subject which seems to me to be of more interest to residents in the portion of the country where I reside than, perhaps, in any other. You hear it frequently said, and you read it almost daily in the Conservative press, that this railroad is going to deal a death-blow to our present Intercolonial system. Now, I grant that in western Ontario, we have not that intimate knowledge of the Intercolonial which hon. members from the maritime provinces possess. Probably it is on account of our ignorance of that railroad system that this argument of injury to the Intercolonial does have some force with the people and produce some effect in the western part of Ontario. I confess that I did not know much about the Intercolonial Railroad system myself until I had occasion to examine somewhat into it. From the examination I have made, I intend to lay down two or three propositions which I think I can establish, which I am sure I can justify, from the records of the Intercolonial Railway itself. Now, Sir, the first proposition is that the Intercolonial Railway cannot be joined as the last link of a great transcontinental system; and the second, which I shall establish by figures of that railroad itself, is that the Intercolonial to-day is not of the nature of a through road, but is in the position of a purely local road. It has been said in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, and has been urged by the leader of the opposition, that the effect of this Bill be to relegate the Intercolonial to the position of a purely local road. Now Sir, there is nothing derogatory in the term 'local road.' A local road may be of vastly more importance to the maritime provinces than a through road. But I intend to submit to you figures from the returns which, I think, will clearly establish the fact that the Intercolonial is to-day purely and simply a local road; and, in the next place, I propose to show from these returns that the new line cannot have a detrimental effect upon that railway system, but, in all human probability, if it has an effect upon it at all, it will be a good effect and not a bad one. Now I accept the statement made in this House as to the original construction of that line. We all know, as a matter of history, that the Intercolonial road was not built for commercial purposes. We know, as a matter of history, that it was not laid out with a view to commercial business entirely, but its location was largely dominated by military and political considerations. We know that the best route, or that which Sir Sanford Fleming considered the best, was the route along the Maine boundary; but that was not adopted for military and political reasons. I cannot more aptly describe the Intercolonial system as it appears on the map than to refer to the description given by the Prime Minister in his opening remarks on the introduction of this Bill, when he said that if you will look at the map, starting at Halifax and ending at Quebec, following the Intercolonial road, you will see that that road fairly describes a semi-circle. Modern railroads, in their construction, pay the largest regard to the directness of their route. It is an axiom in modern railroad construction that the route to be chosen is the shortest distance between two points. As railroads are constructed now, they will even pass at a distance from great centres of population and of trade rather than have a circuit in their line of road. If they desire to reach centres of population and of trade, they do not make a circuitous route

for the main line, but build straight branches from the main line to the points to be reached. The object of the modern railroad, both on account of passengers and on account of freight, is to shorten their lines to the shortest distances between two points. Such a consideration never entered into the minds of the men who, in 1867, laid out the Intercolonial. They had no idea at that time of transcontinental traffic. There was no transcontinental trade when that road was laid out. There was no Dominion of Canada as we have it to-day. Canada existed then as far as the great lakes and no further. Subsequently we got Manitoba, later on we got the Territories, later on still we acquired British Columbia, so that I say when that road was laid out as an intercolonial railway, the idea of transcontinental trade had never entered into the mind of the men who laid it out and if that Intercolonial system could be used to-day as a portion of a transcontinental system it would be by the purest kind of accident and absolutely without any design on the part of its founders.

But, Sir, let us take a little of the history of that road because, living as I do far from the maritime provinces, I am probably entitled to hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may, with regard to the Intercolonial, at all events to a much larger extent than hon. members who live in the maritime provinces. Let us take in the first place the length of haul on the road. Look at it on the map, skirting up there by the Baie des Chaleurs, skirting the St. Lawrence to Quebec, look at that semicircle on the map if you have not travelled it. That is one thing that will always operate against that road as part of a transcontinental system. Then let us take the grades. I am informed by men who know, by experts on such subjects, that you will find on the Intercolonial fifty and sixty foot grades quite commonly. These grades would have to be removed and the distance shortened. Then let us take the equipment, neither the cars nor the engines are at present suitable for transcontinental trade. Take all these considerations together and then ask a man, will you saddle on a great transcontinental scheme the weakest kind of a weak link at one end of it? A chain we know is only as strong as its weakest link. If you will burden a transcontinental road with the Intercolonial system you will find it is a drag and a dead load on that system which may very seriously operate against the success of the whole system.

Now, let us look at the history of the road and see just what business it has done and what it is capable of doing. I find from the report of the Railway Department that we have invested to the 30th of June, 1902, in the capital of that road $74,194,307, that is over the whole system including the Prince Edward Island Railway; I find that on the Intercolonial system proper our capital invested amounts to $68,645,853.

Now, Sir, if you take the aggregate or the result of thirty-three or thirty-four years operation of that road what do you find? You find that throughout its whole history up to the 30th of June, 1902, the total receipts from all sources were $83,991,493, and the operating expenses were $92,574,580, or during that time there was an actual loss on that system of $8,583,987, of operating expenses over receipts; without entering into the question of interest on bonds or dividends or any question of that kind. Now what does that show? For that is the net result under Liberal administration and under Conservative administration and again under Conservative administration and again under Liberal administration. It shows one of two things I submit, Mr. Speaker, that either there is something radically wrong in the management of the road or something inherently wrong in the system itself. I do not believe that the system of management has been radically wrong, but I believe the system of management under government or operation under government is not a successful system and cannot be made to-day in this country a successful system. The trouble with the road itself is that it is wrong in principle of construction, it is wrong in the territory through which it passes, it is wrong because it has too great haulage, it is wrong because the grades are too great and the equipment not proper.

Now, that is a summary for all the years, but let us look at the results of the operation of the road for the year 1902. During that year, 1902, we find that the receipts for the Intercolonial system proper were $5,671,386. The operating expenses for the same year were $5,574,563, showing on the Intercolonial system proper a surplus of $96,823 or about one-seventh of one per cent on the capital invested. But when you add to that the loss which took place on the Prince Edward Island branch you will find that surplus reduced to about $57,000 or one-fourteenth of one per cent on the capital invested.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Has the hon. gentleman made any comparison of the rates charged on the Intercolonial and on the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I know it is stated and generally stated, that there is to some extent a lower rate charged on the Intercolonial than perhaps on some other railways, but I am giving these aggregate figures as the net operating figures of that system from the time it started to the present time, one-seventh of one per cent on the Intercolonial proper, one-fourteenth of one per cent on the capital invested in the whole system, while other railways to-day are increasing their dividends and laying away large surpluses at the same time.

Now, railroad operation and management have become of the nature of fixed sciences. The railroad man to-day can tell you just

what it costs to operate every mile of his railway or every train mile; the railway man can tell you just what proportion his operating expenses bear to his total receipts. We know that there were in operation in Canada in 1902, 18,714 miles of railroad made up of through railroads, local railroads and colonization railroads, railroads good, railroads bad and railroads indifferent. This whole system made its returns to the department. Taking the returns over the whole system of Canadian railways of 18,714 miles and taking the average of operating expenses on these roads and showing the proportions which they bear to the actual receipts of these roads gives us $68.54 as the proportion of operating expenses for every $100 of receipts. Now, $68.54 is rather a high proportion of operating expenses. Anywhere from $60 to $65 is about the proportion which railway men, I believe, expect. Out of every $100 they receive throughout the whole system of Canadian railroads, out of every $100 received $68.54 pays the operating expenses and the balance goes to pay dividends and to pay fixed charges, interest on bonds and the like.

But take the Intercolonial ($68.54 out of every $100 being the average upon all the good, bad and indifferent railways in Canada) $98.29 being the proportion of operating expenses on the Intercolonial; it costs $30 more per $100 of receipts to operate the Intercolonial than it costs to operate the average of all railroad systems in the Dominion of Canada. If you turn to the Prince Edward Island branch, although that perhaps is not a fair comparison, you find that for every $100 of receipts it costs $136.24 to operate that road. Now what do these figures show. As I said they show to my mind that it is not the defective management of the road that is at fault, but it is something inherently wrong in the road itself. You will find by taking the average earnings on the Intercolonial per mile of their line and comparing that with the average earnings per mile on other lines you will find they fall below year by year in good round numbers. If you take the operating expenses per mile on the Intercolonial and compare them year by year with the average on the whole system of Canadian railways you will find that for the most part they exceed the operating expenses of other roads. I have made a calculation from 1890 to 1902, and I have made that calculation upon this basis: Where there has been an average loss per mile in receipts of the Intercolonial Railway and where there has been an average excess in operating expenses on that road, I have added these figures together each year. In years where the operating expenses have made a little better showing than the average upon other Canadian railways, I have deducted them from the losses in the average receipts and from these figures I find that the proper financial standing of the Intercolonial Railway from 1890 to 1902, on the principle which I have stated when compared with the average of all other roads comprising the Canadian railway system as follows:

Year.	Below average per mile.
1890	$517
1891	682
1892	563
1893	362
1894	314
1895	275
1896	325
1897	562
1898	603
1899	548
1900	473
1901	723
1902	434

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Is that in the receipts?

Mr. GUTHRIE. That is both the receipts where they have fallen below the average of other railways and operating expenses added where they have been above the ordinary operating expenses or by subtracting them in years where they have made a better showing. I have only gone back to 1890, but this shows that both under the Conservative and under the Liberal party, that road has made a showing far below the showing of the whole Canadian railway system, covering 18,714 miles. We have had good management as far as I know. We have had fairly good management, as good management as political management can attain to. These facts demonstrate that there is something wrong in the construction or the methods of the road itself, and if we have a showing such as that road is only able to make by incorporating that road into a great transcontinental railway system, I submit we are going to weaken that railway system in the last link of the line. As a fair proposition, as a reasonable proposition, would it be a right thing when your object is, as far as possible, to have an air line provided with all modern equipment and built on the principles of modern construction, to load down that new railway enterprise with a system which has made a uniformly bad showing during all the years which it has been in operation? Then, my next proposition is this, that the returns of the road show that it cannot be operated successfully, with regard to through traffic or heavy commercial trade, and, secondly, that the returns of the road show that that road has been for many years practically what we would term a local road, serving the localities through which it runs, being of the greatest convenience and the greatest use to the people in those localities, but serving to a very slight extent the people of the rest of Canada. I have taken the receipts

of the Intercolonial Railway for 1902, and I have taken them for that year because it is the latest year for which I have been able to get returns from the operation of the system. I find that the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway were made up as follows :

Traffic.	Receipts.
Passenger traffic..	$1,787,094
Freight traffic..	3,676,813
Mails, express and all other sources..	257,083

Or, in other words, the receipts from the passenger traffic over the road represented 31·2 per cent of the total receipts, and the freight receipts, 64·03 per cent of the total. These two sources, passenger and freight traffic, supply over 95 per cent of the total receipts of the road. How is the passenger traffic made up? I have tried to investigate it, but I have not been able to get down to the details which I would like to have been able to arrive at, because I have only been able to get the returns that are contained in the blue-book issued by the department, but I find that so far as ocean-borne traffic is concerned, there were carried over the road 3,054 passengers, and that of these passengers 1,213 went westward by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and only 1,761 passengers representing this ocean-borne traffic went westward over the Intercolonial Railway. As far as the reports show, by far the greatest bulk of the traffic over the road is made up of local traffic between stations on the Intercolonial Railway. That traffic will in no sense be injured by the new proposition. That local traffic will go in the future as it has in the past, and as the country grows and becomes more prosperous, as we all hope it will, that local traffic on the Intercolonial Railway will materially increase. It should increase, because it has been increasing on other lines of railway. But, there is another feature in connection with the Intercolonial Railway passenger traffic which must not be lost sight of, and that is what is known as tourist traffic. There is a large amount of summer travel over the road, travel which will go there notwithstanding that the new line may be constructed. The Intercolonial Railway reaches the land of Evangeline, the land of the hunter, the land of the fisherman, it passes through grand scenery, waterscape and landscape, and these are the natural features which attract summer travel over the road and will continue to do so notwithstanding how many other lines may be in existence, and this traffic forms a considerable portion of the passenger traffic on the road. I maintain that, far from decreasing the passenger receipts, the present proposition is going to increase them. We have only one transcontinental railway system now. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway booking its passengers through on its own line from ocean to ocean. Any railway company would do the same thing. It is to be expected. It is right. But, with another transcontinental system, under an agreement such as the present agreement of the government with this company, I think we can safely assume that the new road having taken passengers down to Moncton or St. John, passengers who are going further oceanwards or further east will in all probability travel what is now the Intercolonial Railway system. There is practically no western travel over the road to-day. If passengers are brought east to Moncton or other points, it is quite within reason to assume that a large number of them will travel over the Intercolonial Railway, and this will be travel which that road does not get now. But passenger travel represents only 31 per cent of the total receipts of the road. The great bulk of the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway is made up from freight traffic, which represents no less than 64 per cent of the total receipts of the road. How is this traffic made up ? I mention these things because it has been so often stated that the effect of this new scheme will be to destroy the Intercolonial Railway. They say in this House, they say on the street, they say in the newspapers, that on the one hand the government has spent $70,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway and that on the other hand they are ruining that $70,000,000 of capital invested in the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, Sir, the large bulk of the traffic on that road is freight traffic representing almost two-thirds of the total receipts, and the total freight tonnage on the Intercolonial Railway for 1902, amounted to 2,385,816 tons, a very respectable freight tonnage it is, and placing that road fourth in the list as regards freight traffic in the Dominion of Canada. The tonnage was made up as follows : The first item and the largest item is coal, representing 557,520 tons, or 23·09 per cent of the whole freight traffic of the road. The next item is grain, but that falls off to 65,627 tons, or a little over two per cent of the total freight traffic in tons over the road. The next item is flour, 13,170 tons or about 5½ per cent of the total. The next item is lumber, representing 544,253 tons, or 22·08 per cent of the total. The next item is cattle, representing only 17,083 tons, of ·07 of one per cent of the total. The next item is manufactured articles, representing 531,180 tons, of 22·03 per cent of the total. The next item is fish, 23,124 tons, or one per cent of the total. The next item is sugar, 41,275 tons, or about two per cent of the total, and the other freight carried on the road amounted to 460,890 tons or 20 per cent of the total tonnage. I take these individual items simply because these are all that are given

in the returns, and if you examine what part of that freight is through-freight, and what part is local-freight, the figures will surprise any one who has not given them thought. According to this statement, the total ocean-borne freight going by the Intercolonial Railway to Europe and coming from Europe over the Intercolonial Railway for the year 1902 amounted to 183,147 tons; or in other words, all the freight which passed over the Intercolonial Railway, going to Europe, and all the freight which came from Europe over that system amounted to only 8 per cent of the total freight tonnage on that line. And of that 183,147 tons, how much was local freight and how much was through-freight? Why, out of that quantity 172,733 tons went to points on the Intercolonial Railway, or, originated at stations on the Intercolonial Railway and thence went east. Only about 10,000 tons of that whole local traffic went beyond the stations on their own line. I think, therefore, that we can assume that the whole ocean-borne traffic on the Intercolonial Railway is in the nature of local traffic. But, Sir, I can take them item by item, and we find that out of the total of 557,520 tons of coal carried on that road, there went further than the Intercolonial Railway's own stations the following: Via Ste. Rosalie, 1,131 tons; via Chaudière, 5,763 tons; via St. John, 3,640 tons, or a total of 10,534 tons went to stations beyond the Intercolonial Railway system, and might be looked upon as in the nature of through-freight, while 547,986 tons went to stations on the Intercolonial Railway itself. The next item given in the report is sugar. The total of raw sugar carried was 11,643 tons, the total shipments to points off the Intercolonial Railway west was 90 tons, and the total to stations upon their own line, 11,553 tons. The next item is refined sugar, and for the west they carried 10,793 tons, and for local stations on the Intercolonial Railway, 18,839 tons. In fresh fish the total carried on the Intercolonial Railway was 13,082 tons; for the west, 7,605 tons, and for local stations, 5,477 tons. For salt fish the total was 10,042 tons, and for the west there were 4,846 tons, and for the local stations, 5,196 tons. In fact, the only showing of shipments of freight that cannot be considered as local freight consist in their shipments of fresh and salted fish, because about half the amount they carried of these two items did go to points west. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit from these figures, that the building of the new road will not affect the local traffic. We cannot affect the coal traffic by the building of the new road, and the coal traffic represents 23·09 per cent of the entire freight carried by the Intercolonial Railway. You will not interfere with the lumber traffic, which represents 22·08 per cent of the total. Where does that lumber come from? The lumber includes cordwood in the schedule supplied in the returns, and for the most part, it comes from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There are small portions of it coming probably from the Ottawa valley and some from the neighbourhood of Quebec, but the great bulk of that lumber and cordwood is carried from and to points in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that trade will not be interfered with in the slightest degree by the new line. Then, Sir, the freight in manufactured articles represents 22·03 per cent of the total freight of the Intercolonial Railway. Where do the manufactured articles come from? Probably from portions of Quebec and from the province of Ontario, but the great bulk of these manufactured goods come from Sydney and other points in Nova Scotia, where there are large manufacturing industries. I maintain that in so far as Ontario is concerned, the new line, not touching Ontario by many hundreds of miles, all the manufactured articles which go from Ontario to-day to the maritime provinces over the Intercolonial Railway will continue to go, notwithstanding the fact that you may build your transcontinental line. The next item is flour, but that is only 5 per cent of the whole traffic, and as a large amount of that comes from the province of Ontario, I submit that the Intercolonial Railway trade in that commodity will not be affected. And if you go through these items one after the other, you will find that over 90 per cent of the freight trade of the Intercolonial Railway is purely and simply local freight; 90 per cent of it will be entirely unaffected by the construction of the new line. Nearly the whole of the present traffic on the Intercolonial Railway is local traffic, and that will be entirely unaffected by the construction of the new line. If the new line interferes at all with the Intercolonial Railway, it can only be in respect to a small portion to this through-freight and as to that freight, I am satisfied that hon. members on the other side will agree with me the Intercolonial Railway has been hauling it at an actual loss; it has been the losing part of the Intercolonial Railway freight trade.

Can it be reasonably said, from this statement of the Intercolonial Railway itself, can it be reasonably argued that a new line running anywhere from 30 miles to 100 miles from it, opening up a new territory, which will some day become developed and settled; can it be argued that that road, forming part of the new system, will in any way deteriorate the value of the Intercolonial Railway? And what is more, I submit that while it does not as a matter of fact get anything to speak of to-day in through-trade, while it does not send over its line anything to speak of in the way of through-freight, there is the probability, and the strong probability in the future, that by the construction of the new line you will be able to give to the Intercolonial Railway

a certain amount of through-freight which it never handled before, and which it may make something out of. But I am not very hopeful that the Intercolonial Railway system, as at present constructed and according to its present route, will ever be in a position, without a tremendous expenditure of money, to handle profitably what is looked upon as through-freight. In taking freight at Moncton I do not think that road is in as good position as the new road will be to handle it cheaply. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, as a sort of alternative proposition, said: Take the $15,000,000—$15,000,000 is what he figured it out to be—which you expect to spend on the new line through New Brunswick and apply that to the improvement of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, Sir, if you did that, what would you have to do to the Intercolonial Railway? You would have to change the route of that road; you would have to abolish that semicircle which the right hon. leader of the House described as being formed by the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and Quebec; you would have to cut out these 50 and 60-foot grades; you would have to put down 90-pound rails; you would have to take off the present engines, though they are reasonably good engines, I believe, and equip that road with engines weighing from 100 to 110 tons, and you would have to give it practically a new equipment in the way of cars. You would spend a tremendous amount of money in making that road anything like a modern commercial road; and I think the government have considered, and rightly considered, that the best way to cut the Gordian knot is to build a new short line through the province of New Brunswick, equipped as a modern commercial highway.

The proposition which I made at the outset was that the Intercolonial Railway, from its own reports, the nature of its construction, and the route it takes, cannot be usefully incorporated as a link in a transcontinental line. I think I have demonstrated from its own reports that it has now the business of a local road, and is serving the country as a local road; and it can do better service to the country in that way than in other ways. I think, likewise, I have demonstrated that if the new line has any effect whatever on the Intercolonial Railway, it will have a beneficial effect rather than otherwise. I do not think it will have much effect.

I have said that at confederation it became our duty, and it was a cardinal point in our contract, that that road should be built. It was also a part of our agreement that the road should be adequately maintained. The government, since they came into power in 1896, have placed the Intercolonial Railway on the best footing on which it could stand. They have brought it up to Montreal; they have given it every opportunity; they have given it practically a new equipment; they have made it as good a local road as is to be found in the country. But the people of Canada are not bound to do more for that road. All these improvements have been made, and the people of other provinces have not uttered one single objection to the expenditure. Everything has been done for the road, I submit, that we were called upon to do. As an authority for that statement, I give the statement made in this House last session by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), who, at page 3473 of 'Hansard,' said:

> I have not gone into details with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. We shall have an opportunity to discuss the various items as they come up, and of getting the fullest information concerning them from the minister. What I have sought to do is to draw the attention of the country to the enormous sums of money that have been expended on that road. What the people of Canada promised the people of the maritime provinces when they came into confederation was this—to build the Intercolonial Railway and to make it a good, efficient connection between these upper provinces and the maritime provinces.

That, I submit, is a correct statement of the case. The road was built as a link to connect the maritime provinces and the upper provinces. It has been maintained, and properly maintained. We have done all we were called upon to do with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. Shall it now be said that the mere fact that that road stands there, and that we have so much money invested in it, shall form a stumbling block when we propose a new transcontinental system? Is it fairly to be argued that because we have that road there, which does not pay its operating expenses, therefore we must not go on with a transcontinental railway system, or, going on with it, we must incorporate with it the Intercolonial Railway as a drag and dead weight upon it? I think not.

I have but a few observations to make on the question as to whether or not the new road can ever become a modern commercial road. I think that is largely a matter of expense; and we have on that point the pledge of the hon. Minister of Finance that it is the direct aim and intention of the government to make the new transcontinental road a modern commercial road, up to modern standards and modern ideas. Sir, if I thought for a moment that that end could not be attained, or that that promise would not be carried out, I would have no hesitation whatever in withdrawing my support from the measure altogether. But I believe that road can be made a first-class commercial highway in every respect, equal to any modern commercial road, according to the figures presented to this House by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). If we take the evidence which we have regarding the New Brunswick part of the country through which that road

will pass, evidence given by men who know, notably that given last night by the hon. member for Victoria (Hon. Mr. Costigan), who says he has travelled over every foot of it, the route is through a country of easy railroad construction, presenting no great natural obstacles—no mountains to be encountered, no rivers of any magnitude to be bridged. It is a country of comparatively easy construction, and to say that you can start a line at Rivière du Loup, and run southwards over a grade of 1,300 feet, in 16 miles, which is the grade on the railroad in existence there now, would be to block the whole enterprise as a modern commercial road. But, from the statement of the hon. member for Victoria made last night, and from other information which has been laid before the House, the evidence is overwhelming that a favourable route can be obtained through the province of New Brunswick, which will materially shorten the distance. So far as I can see, the only great obstacle in the way is the St. Lawrence bridge ; but that can be arranged.

With regard to the country from Quebec to Winnipeg, we have as much evidence as any one can require short of the exact location of the line. It is not yet staked out ; but we trust that in the near future it will be. But all the information which we have goes to show that there is no natural obstacle of any great moment in the way ; otherwise we would have known it merely as a matter of ordinary geography. What is the difficulty of railroad construction over 1,400 or 1,500 miles of a clay plateau ? That is easy work. Is there any difficulty about getting standard grades ? As a matter of fact, surveys have been made of the country from Lake Nipissing to Lake Nepigon, and in that stretch standard grades can be obtained, except in one or two spots, where I believe the reports are that grades will be about 1 per cent, and short grades at that. The standard grade has been stated to be 21 feet to the mile. That is bringing it down to a nice point. Engineers and railroad men have informed me that 26 feet to the mile is considered a standard grade ; that is 6 inches to 100 feet. But there is no evidence that standard grades cannot be obtained. No man has said, I have travelled through the country or have had engineers travel through it, and they have made such and such a report; but all the evidence before the House is that it is a country for easy railroad construction, well adapted to settlement, and through which standard grades will be obtained.

A great deal has been said about this road never shipping a bushel of grain if it is completed. It has been stated time and again during the course of this debate that this road will never carry any grain. I believe that statement is based almost exclusively upon the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway in that respect. I contend that to compare the 500 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Arthur and North Bay with the country through which the new road will pass, is not a fair comparison.

If ever there was a difficult piece of railway construction on the North American continent, it is that north shore part of the Canadian Pacific Railway line. The Canadian Pacific Railway officials will tell you that. Indeed the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) told us that that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway road cost them $60,000 per mile to construct, and no one who has travelled over the road will wonder at it. It is largely blown out of the solid rock, and just as soon as you begin to move rock, you begin to run into money, and very rapidly too. That road presented engineering difficulties almost insurmountable, but which have to a certain extent been surmounted, though not with a road which can be described as a modern standard, commercial line. The curves are tremendous, the grades frequent and uneven, and with the strongest engines the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot haul more than from twelve to fifteen loaded cars over it. If you cannot get a better road through the northern country than the Canadian Pacific, I would hesitate before venturing into the undertaking at all.

The hon. gentleman, the leader of the opposition, said last night that part of his policy would be to acquire that line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Port Arthur, some 500 miles, costing about $60,000 per mile through a country which is absolutely useless for the purpose of settlement, in which the timber was stripped and burnt long years ago, and which will never be of any value, unless perhaps some of these mountains and rocks contain some kind of mineral not yet discovered. Would any sane man enter into a project to obtain that road—535 miles of road at $60,000 per mile, the cost of construction ? That would amount to over $35,000,000. It would be a good bargain for the Canadian Pacific Railway, for there is no doubt that that is the portion of the line which is the great hindrance and drawback to their carrying grain. If the Canadian Pacific had avoided those mountains and rocks, those curves and windings, and gone back into the country north of the height of land where the clay belt is, I believe that it would be able to draw grain every winter down to the sea.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Does the hon. gentleman say that there is a clay-belt north of Lake Superior ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Yes, according to the map issued by the Ontario Crown Lands Department, which was exhibited in this House.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Supposing the Canadian Pacific Railway had taken some other line, how could they have got to Port Arthur ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Just as the Grand Trunk Railway will, by building a line down to Port Arthur, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will get there much more cheaply and on proper grades, over which they can draw grain, whereas the grades which are on the Canadian Pacific Railway road in that section absolutely prevent the carrying of grain.

Mr. BENNETT. On what authority does the hon. gentleman make the statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway can only haul twelve cars loaded on that line going eastward ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I say that on the eastern trip between Winnipeg and North Bay, there are grades on that road which prevent the heaviest engine on the Canadian Pacific Railway drawing more than twelve to fifteen cars loaded.

Mr. BENNETT. On what authority ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. On the authority of railway men who have so informed me.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is wrongly informed. Who is the informant ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I do not think I should be challenged any more than the hon. gentleman's own leader was, who, when he read statements of men who had informed him, would not give their names because they are officials in a road which will be in opposition to this new road we are going to build. If we cannot vastly improve upon that north shore line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I think we might well hesitate before going on with this work.

Mr. WARD. How does the hon. gentleman know that these letters read by the leader of the opposition were from officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I said that in my opinion they were. Another point is this, that the whole argument that this road cannot become a grain carrying road is based on the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. the leader of the opposition, in his first statement, said what ? He said that the Canadian Pacific Railway is carrying 40,000,000 bushels of grain and only 6 per cent of that by rail. We have also the statement of Sir William Van Horne, published a few days ago, to the effect that we can not make that a grain-carrying road. But on what is Sir William Van Horne's experience based ? Like the leader of the opposition, he bases his statement on the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is going to be in opposition to the new road.

Mr. SPROULE. The leader of the opposition gave the experience of the United States. Seventy-five per cent is carried by water.

Mr. GUTHRIE. So far as I can learn, and I have consulted railway men in this country—and some in the United States—the facts are these : If you can get a standard line, with a grade of twenty-six feet to the mile—and it would be better of course if we can get it 21 feet to the mile—and if you can lay 90 pound rails and supply cars with the capacity of from 60,000 to 80,000 pounds, and engines up to 100 or 110 tons, you can haul grain in competition with water routes. There are engines to-day that weigh 135 tons, but I do not see that we need engines of that kind in this country. Only one road in the United States uses such engines, and that is one of the iron roads of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman name a road on the continent of America which hauls grain from 1,800 and 2,000 miles by rail ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. No, the longest concerning which I have any figures, are from Chicago to Baltimore, New York and Boston. We know that the Illinois Central is hauling corn from Chicago and New Orleans and transhipping it there in competition with the river and rail route. That is 932 miles all by rail.

Mr. SPROULE. What are their freight rates for that distance ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. Between Chicago and New York, and Chicago and Baltimore and Boston, the rates are about seven and a half cents per bushel, and I know that these trunk lines are hauling large quantities of grain. Let me point to another fact. The New York Central has made to the government of the state of New York the following offer : If you will give us to improve our road what you propose to spend on the Erie canal, we will draw grain from Buffalo to the seaboard, 442 miles, at two cents. That is a well-known standing offer on the part of that railway. Indeed if we have the equipment and the grades, the engines and the cars, there is nothing to prevent an engine of 110 tons drawing from fifty to sixty cars containing each 50,000 to 60,000 pounds of grain, and then you will be in a position to compete with the water routes. But I would not argue for a moment that the summer grain trade on this road will go by rail if it can go by water. Water rates may, and probably will, come down, and I would at the earliest opportunity support any expenditure to still further improve the water route of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. KEMP. Why go to Quebec city if you cannot draw grain over that road in the summer time ?

Mr. GUTHRIE. I estimate that there will be a good deal of freight besides grain. And

I would ask the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) if this is not a correct estimate. The last year the total receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway were $43,900,000. Its grain traffic was less than nine per cent of these receipts. Will the other road have no chance of getting any of that transcontinental traffic, with better facilities on the eastern coast and a shorter route to the sea, and with terminals on the Pacific ? Will not the commerce of Toronto and Guelph and my own county and the principal part of Ontario be shipped east and west on that road as it is now on the Canadian Pacific Railway ? I have not a doubt in my own mind that the hon. member himself will be a shipper on that line as soon as it is constructed. Now, having given these rates as given to me let me ask : What is one chief object of the building of this road ? It is certainly to relieve the congestion in the western traffic. As I understand it the crop in Manitoba is harvested about the end of this month. The crop in the territory is harvested later than the end of this month. About the beginning of September, the crop in the western country can begin to move. And the canals are frozen up, or navigation is stopped, from about the first to the middle of November. This means that you have about sixty or seventy days during which you have to move probably about 60,000,000 to 70,000,000 bushels of wheat or, with other grain, amounting to about 100,000,000 bushels. There is the problem confronting you with which you have to deal. There is a portion of that grain which gets to the lake ports in time for shipment through the canal, but by far the larger quantity does not reach these ports in time. Where, then, does it stay ? It stays all the winter in elevators, from the time it is shipped to the first of May. The charge for storage is about one and a half cents per bushel for the first month and one-half cent a bushel after that until the spring. As I say, a small quantity goes out in the fall, but a large quantity remains in the elevator at a charge for handling and storage until it goes out in the spring. Would it not be better, if, in the fall of the year, the farmer could ship his grain at reasonable rates—and I will discuss the rates later on—down to the seaboard at St. John or Halifax, thus avoiding the warehousing of the grain all winter and the paying of warehouse rates upon it. Why, the warehouse rates themselves would amount to some four cents or five cents a bushel, and that should be added to the freight. I believe that the day will come, after this road is constructed, when, in all probability, grain will be shipped from Winnipeg to Quebec at eleven cents, twelve cents, or thirteen cents a bushel. If I understand the situation, grain is shipped now to Port Arthur from Winnipeg at seven and a half cents a bushel. It is then taken by water carriage to Quebec for say five cents to six cents a bushel.

That means that it is costing the farmers to-day eleven cents or twelve cents a bushel to take their grain from Winnipeg. I have not the slightest doubt that, if such a road as has been described is constructed in this country, eleven cents, twelve cents or thirteen cents a bushel will land the same grain by rail at those points which it now reaches partly by water and partly by rail ?

But, Sir, there is a vast amount of freight going over these roads, and a vast amount of freight which might go which is not now going at all. If a road were dependent on the grain trade, it would be a failure, for 65,000,000 bushels of wheat, which is the quantity we have at the present time, will not support a road—there is no question about that. We must have regard to this fact, that there are now actually engaged in agriculture in Manitoba and the Northwest about 40,000 men. These men produced last year, and will produce this year, about 100,000,000 bushels of grain, of which about 60,0000,000 to 70,000,000 is wheat. Now, the wave of immigration had hardly set in up to last year. Last year we had about 100,000 settlers, while this year the number will probably exceed 100,000. Instead of having 40,000 men engaged in raising grain, you will soon have ten times that number. That is not an unreasonable estimate. I agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that we are going to require many new roads to haul the crop of that country. He says that he believes that in the near future, instead of having 100,000,000 bushels, we shall have a product of 400,000,000 bushels of grain in that country. I believe the hon. gentleman is within the mark in this estimate. I believe that we in this House are going to live to see the day when the prediction once made in this House by Sir Charles Tupper, that we should raise 640,000,000 bushels of grain, will be literally fulfilled, though it will be twenty or twenty-five years late in its fulfilment. Will not that furnish a trade, such a trade as we could not handle at all at this moment ? The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) said in his speech last night that it will be five or six years before you have your road constructed and, in the meantime, the Grand Trunk will send their traffic through the United States. What does that prove ? Does it prove that we shall wait ? No. It proves that we should go ahead with all possible speed; that we should not wait a single moment ; that we should satisfy ourselves at once as to the measure and push forward the road, so that it may furnish a Canadian route and not have our traffic going via Chicago or Duluth. The statement was made, I believe, that to-day grain is brought from Duluth by the Canada Atlantic Railway at three cents a bushel. According to the information I have received on that subject, it was shipped at those prices because the boats had gone to Duluth laden, and took the grain at that figure

rather than make the return voyage light. There has been no such rate maintained for shipment by rail and water as three cents per bushel.

Mr. KEMP. Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I see the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) agrees with me in that proposition. Then, there is the question of cattle shipping. That was dealt with by the Minister of the Interior. The part of Ontario in which I reside is greatly interested in that question. Many a man has shipped from Ontario to the North-west a carload of cattle or several carloads. That is an all-rail shipment, not water. The demand of the people is for a competitive rate. Let there be two roads to take in these cattle, just as the farmers of western Canada want two roads to take out their grain. Then, there is going to be a vast quantity of manufactured goods shipped into Manitoba and the North-west, and it is evident that for this traffic two roads will supply the country better than one. That, I believe, is a good business proposition. Practically, all the necessaries of life, except bread-stuffs and beef, will have to be shipped into that western country for many years to come—clothing, iron manufactures, especially agricultural implements, and all other manufactured goods. So far we have only seen the beginning of the trade that is coming from that country within the next five or six years, for the benefit of the whole eastern portion of this Dominion. I believe that Ontario is as vitally interested in this project as any other part of the country, and perhaps more so. Whatever helps eastern Canada, and western Canada, is bound in my opinion, to help central Canada; and, Ontario, being the great manufacturing portion of this country, will be put in a position by this new route to make shipments of machinery, implements and manufactured goods of various kinds upon terms as good, indeed far better than that of the dealers of St. Paul and Minneapolis in the United States, notwithstandng that the duty may remain where it is. I think that is a sound business proposition also.

Now, Sir, do not let it be supposed for a moment that the government has any idea of abandoning the water route. I have heard no such expression of opinion from any quarter whatever. On the contrary, I think I may say, it is well understood by the government and by the people of this country that every facility is to be given for the water transportation of grain and other traffic. I look forward to the day when we shall have, not merely a fourteen-foot, but a twenty-foot or even a twenty-five-foot water-way through from Port Arthur to the sea ; when the St. Lawrence will be made as safe for navigation as any part of the Atlantic ocean. I would support, and heartily support, any reasonable scheme for the exploration of the Hudson's bay route. I do not say that I would consent to the building of a road until we know what the conditions of navigation are. To my mind, a sum of money might well be appropriated to settle the question of navigation of that great island sea. It is stated that navigation is possible not only for one or two months, but for five months in the year. If navigation in Hudson's bay is open for five months in the year, the people of this country should know it, and steps should be taken to make that also a grain route for the traffic of this country to England. I believe that within the next ten years we will require all the roads we now have and more, in fact all that we can possibly have.

But, Sir, speaking from the standpoint of the province of Ontario alone, I believe that this road is going to be as great a boon to the province of Ontario as anything that has transpired in Dominion or provincial affairs for many a long day. We are going to have what we have been longing to have, an east and west railroad through 700 or 800 miles of the northern portion of our province to open it up and develop it. The government of the province of Ontario is convinced that that country is one worthy of the expenditure of considerable sums of money and are themselves building a railroad into it and are prepared to go further north to connect their road with this line. There are other schemes and projects on foot for running railroads into that country north and south but what we need and most need in Ontario is a road east and west, crossing these other lines and projected lines at right angles. What the people of Canada and the people of the cities want is new towns and new villages. They want new markets for their goods and it must be borne in mind that the home market is ever the best market and our Ontario people should have it in their own province. We want new markets in this country. In my own city of Guelph we ship in car lots to the west woollens and carpets, and cream separators and agricultural implements and carriages as well as cattle and other goods. The people of the city of Guelph engaged in mercantile pursuits want that road for the purpose of obtaining competitive freight rates if for nothing else. They want two lines in order that they may be able to choose, which they have wished to do for many many years past.

Sir, it has been said by hon. members opposite that this road through the northern part of the province of Ontario will be the lean end of the contract. Sir, I believe that before that road is constructed and operated there will be many a settlement in there awaiting the construction of that railway. Why do I say that ? Why, Sir, it is known and known almost to a demonstration that that country has the greatest wealth of pulp wood in the world. It is estimated

that the pulp wood resources of that district amount to 280,000,000 cords.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, when the House arose I was discussing the question of the position of the province of Ontario in respect to this new transcontinental railway project, and I was dealing at the time incidentally with the question of pulpwood, and referring to the fact that in Ontario, north of the height of land, it is estimated that there are at least 288 million cords of pulpwood standing and so far untouched. All this pulpwood will become of commercial value by the opening up of that territory by this proposed line. We know that it has been charged throughout Ontario frequently that the pulpwood concessions already granted in Ontario have practically exhausted the supply, and that in a very few years the pulpwood of Ontario will be entirely exhausted. This fact should be borne in mind in regard to the area of pulpwood that all the concessions so far granted and numbering seven or eight or nine or thereabouts, are south of the height of land, and it has been stated by men who have made calculations that if all the existing pulpwood concessions were gone on with, if the mills were built upon them and they were operated to their fullest extent, it would take in the neighbourhood of 200 years or more to exhaust the pulpwood supply in northern Ontario. That pulpwood is in itself one of the most valuable assets which Ontario has. So long as the country remains undeveloped, so long as the pulpwood is beyond the limit of railways or of roads, so long as we cannot get at it, it is absolutely worthless to us, and by putting this railway through that section of the country, as it is proposed to be put, the province of Ontario will at once have a tremendous asset which perhaps it might not have otherwise. I think that Ontario is one of the provinces that is going to derive great benefit if this project is carried through to a conclusion. I do not know of any other province, except perhaps Manitoba, which will receive the benefit which Ontario will receive when 700 or 800 miles of well wooded territory will be opened up for settlement. I believe that the burden on the people of Ontario in connection with this enterprise will perhaps be heavier than the burden cast upon the people of other provinces, but, Sir, while the burden may be slightly heavier the compensation will be vastly in excess of that which is given to any other province by the building of this road.

I had not intended to say very much more, nor do I intend to now, but there are one or two things that I would like to refer to before resuming my seat. I watched with the greatest interest the very able speech delivered by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in this House. I must confess to some feeling of disappointment regarding it, as I believe the people of the country have looked forward to his statement as a statement which would bring forth some definite alternative policy in regard to this railway project. I am aware that the hon. gentleman has submitted some nine propositions in regard to this matter which he has put forth as a sort of alternative policy. But these nine propositions are so general in their character, and are so greatly in accord with the policy which we entertain on this side of the House, that one can scarcely realize that the leader of a great party in this country would put such propositions before the House in the nature of an alternative. The first proposition he puts forward is this :

> To secure the lowest possible rate for transportation in order that our people may obtain a portion as large as possible of the price at which their products are sold in our domestic and foreign markets.

That is one of the underlying principles of the present measure—perhaps it is the chief underlying principle. Secondly, he says :

> To secure the transportation of Canadian products through Canadian channels.

That is another underlying principle of the government's measure at the present time. Third :

> To promote trade and intercourse between the two great divisions of our country, the east with its great industrial future, its vast resources of the field, of the forest, of the mine and of the ocean, and the west with its vast plains capable of suplying the food not only of the empire, but the world, and beyond the province of British Columbia with its great mineral and other resources.

Another underlying principle of the measure which the government has brought down, and so throughout the whole nine propositions which he has laid before the House, perhaps with the exception of his mention of the Intercolonial Railway, I say that the hon. leader of the opposition, in the policy he submits as an alternative policy, has given the best evidence that he himself at heart approves of the policy which the government has now submitted to the House, and will soon submit to the country. I find that when he starts to elaborate his nine propositions it is not quite as clear what the hon. gentleman means regarding them. He certainly starts out to advocate the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay. Now, at some time in the future such a movement may be a very proper one. I doubt very much the propriety of doing so at the present time, but on looking at the speech delivered by the hon. leader of the opposition yesterday I find in column 9293 this proposal :

> If we acquired the Canada Atlantic Railway, we could build a line from that point to join the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Sudbury.

But on page 9289 the hon. gentleman says :

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not wedded to the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway.

I think there is something inconsistent in that statement, and so we find it all through. The hon. gentleman's policy is a very general and vague one, and if you examine it from beginning to end, with his proposal to carry the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay, with the proposal to carry the Intercolonial Railway from there to a point near Sudbury, with his proposal to acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, over 500 miles in length, with his proposal to acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William under certain terms, which he does not explain, at most the whole proposition can only be called a piece of patch-work. He proposes that the government should go ahead and improve the grades and curves on the most expensive section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, according to the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). Another objection that the hon. leader of the opposition has taken, and it is more in the nature of a legal objection than otherwise, is that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is not bound by this agreement. No one has pretended that the Grand Trunk Railway Company is a party to the agreement. It certainly is not a party to the agreement. The men who signed the agreement represented themselves as signing on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. This bargain or contract will not be consummated until thirty days after it has passed parliament, and it will only be consummated by the deposit of $5,000,000 in cash or securities. If the deposit of $5,000,000 is put up, I am satisfied that the men who are putting up such an enormous sum of money are not entering into any contract with the idea of fooling the government, but are genuinely proceeding with the proposition now before us. I notice also, in the remarks of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), that he found some peculiar objection to the preamble of the Bill and to the recital in the contract itself. As I read the preamble of the Bill, it is in the following language :

Whereas, an agreement has been entered into, bearing date the 29th day of July, 1903, between His Majesty the King of the first part, and Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, C.B., G.C.M.G., and others, representing therein and acting on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company incorporated by an Act of the parliament of Canada passed at the present session thereof.

The agreement is drawn in precisely the same form : the parties to the second part of the agreement being Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and the others associated with him in seeking that incorporation. What point the hon. member (Mr. Northrup) sought to make out of some discrepancy which he imagined, I failed to see then, and after an examination of the contract I still fail to see. There was one point in regard to this contract which the hon. member (Mr. Northrup) particularly dwelt upon. It was that point, started by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who said that it was in the power of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to hire or lease rolling stock to the extent of $5,000,000 and place it upon the line, and that that would be a compliance with the terms of the contract. All I have to say in regard to both the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), is this : that while they may be entitled to their own opinions upon the strict legal meaning of the contract, and while I entertain for both gentlemen's legal ability the very highest opinion, yet, I would be prepared to accept the opinions of such gentlemen as Mr. Shepley and Mr. Gormully and the Deputy Minister of Justice of Canada, in preference to the opinions of the hon. members for East Hastings and Hamilton upon that point. We have been assured that independent men who have no political bias in this matter have examined this contract and that lawyers of the highest standing have said that the clause is reasonably clear that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway can only comply with the terms of that agreement by placing its own rolling stock upon that line. But does it matter much whether they place their own rolling stock upon that line or somebody's else ? By section 22 of the contract, the company is bound to put $5,000,000 worth of modern rolling stock upon that road and maintain it in a good condition for a period of fifty years. If they do that, I don't think it matters one iota whether that rolling stock is in fact the property of the company, or whether the company may have leased it for a period of fifty years. Another point which seemed somewhat to bother my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup), was that in clause 7 of the contract it is provided in the following language :

It is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to, and approved of, by the company before the commencement of the work.

I think that is a very reasonable and a very proper provision. The company has to pay the rental at the rate of three per cent on the amount invested in the road, and they having intimate knowledge of railway traffic and railway requirements, should certainly have the right to look over these specifications before finally completing them, but the point which bothered the hon. member for Hastings most was, that he thought the government had nothing to do with the letting of the contracts, and that section 7 only referred to the specifications. Well, if he had read section 9 of the Bill he would have found :

The construction of the said eastern division and its management until completed and leased to the said company pursuant to the provisions of the said agreement shall be under the charge and control of three commissioners, to be appointed by the Governor in Council, who shall hold office during pleasure, and who, and their successors in office, shall be a body corporate under the name of 'The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway,' and are hereinafter called 'The Commissioners.'

And if he had looked at paragraph 16 of the Bill itself, he would have found that the contracts for construction were to be let, not by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway but by the commissioners, and that these contracts were to be let by tender in the ordinary way. At the time I was not impressed with the contention of the hon. gentleman in this respect, and I find now that his argument, that the government had no part in letting the contracts is entirely erroneous. A point which the hon. leader of the opposition dwelt upon, is the effect of paragraphs 42 and 43 of the contract regarding the routing of freight and the share of freight which shall go over this new line from Quebec to the seaboard. The hon. member (Mr. Borden, Halifax) when he first addressed the House said that clauses 42 and 43 contained nothing more than empty words; that the Grand Trunk Railway would only be bound by a moral obligation and that we were absolutely dependent upon the bona fides of the Grand Trunk Company for the carrying out of the meaning and intent of these provisions. That contention is likewise erroneous. The hon. gentleman probably had not time to read over the contract, because if he had he would see that by clause 25, on the completion of this railway, a lease is to be entered into between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the government of Canada, and clause 25 provides:

The said lease shall also contain such covenants and provisions including proper indemnity to the government in respect to the working of the railway, as may be deemed necessary by the government to secure the proper carrying out of this agreement.

I submit, Sir, that we can well trust the hand that drew that contract, difficult and intricate as it is; we can well trust that same hand to draw that lease and to put in that lease covenants and stipulations which will guarantee to the people of this country the carrying out of the letter as well as the spirit of this contract.

Further, I will only add, that it is apparent from all that has taken place in this debate, that almost the entire argument of hon. gentlemen opposite is based upon the statements made to the House by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). He certainly is a man of great experience and a man of great capacity, but it is strange to me that hon. members opposite who until three or four weeks ago considered the ex-minister to be anything but a railroad man or a railroad expert, should pound their desks and cover their faces with smiles of satisfaction, as he propounded his objections to the carrying out of this project. Now, with regard to the Intercolonial Railway itself, let me for a moment give you something of the opinion of that road held by the ex-Minister of Railways, who the other day said that we were going to destroy it, and that we should consider it in connection with through traffic. Speaking in this House a year ago last April, at page 3424 of 'Hansard,' the hon. ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) thus speaks of the Intercolonial Railway:

It happens that this road has never been, and perhaps it never may be, a great surplus-paying road. Conditions exist which may for some years to come control the financial results of the undertaking. It would be unfair to hold the Intercolonial to the same strict rule to which you would hold railways which are built for commercial reasons, and in view of commercial considerations exclusively. I wonder to what extent commercial considerations entered into the question of the location of the Intercolonial Railway. If we had been building a road to yield a handsome net return to the government every year from its earnings, who would undertake to build a road by the roundabout route which the Intercolonial Railway has taken?

Is that not an admission by the hon. ex-minister that that road is not suitable as a commercial road? Surely, then, it would be insane to incorporate some 1,600 miles of railroad into a road that is to be built purely for commercial purposes, at the eastern end of that long line, simply to weaken and possibly to destroy it. But, Sir, the hon. member for South Lanark has also given us his views on the Intercolonial Railway. It was during the same session and during the same debate, where he says, in the course of his remarks, at page 3475:

By the course we are now pursuing, we are simply flinging immense sums of money into a sink-hole—these expenditures are of no benefit to the country whatever. This idea of developing the Intercolonial Railway as a heavy freight line, providing heavy locomotives, and then making heavy tracks and strong bridges to bear them, is an absurdity. The road can never have the heavy, long freight trains of a western road, and these new locomotives are not as suitable for traffic upon the road as were those the road already had.

Clearly proving the conviction of the hon. member for South Lanark, who has been heralded as the greatest authority on railroads in this House, that that road cannot be adapted as a commercial highway for carrying the heavy trains which are now used almost exclusively on commercial railroads.

It is interesting also to note the opinion of the hon. member for South Lanark as to the capacity of the hon. ex-minister in regard to railroads. It was during the same debate that the hon. member for South Lanark, who is the great railway

expert of the opposition, or of the House, as his leader would have us believe summarized the capacity of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, at page 3453, in the following words. After reciting a long paragraph from some statement which had been formerly made by the ex-minister, he goes on to say :

> The hon. gentleman led the House to believe that the country was virtually incurring no fresh debt by purchasing the Drummond County Railway and acquiring the entry into the city of Montreal. The facts are against him, as I will soon show. His purpose was he said, to put life into the old concern, to make it a going and prosperous business, to show what the energy and ability of a man of business could do in the management of a concern that was put under his control. You would have thought that the hon. gentleman had been a railroad expert from his birth up. He is good at declamation ; he is good at making statements and promises, but none of them ever pan out. Nothing he promises to the people of this country is ever fulfilled.

That was the opinion which the hon. member for South Lanark entertained of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals but a year ago or thereabouts. But, Sir, take another extract from the same debate, at page 3475, where the hon. member for South Lanark thus describes the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals :

> The Minister of Railways and Canals has made a statement concerning his administration of the Intercolonial Railway which railroad men when they read it, from one end of the country to the other, will laugh at. It is a perfect farce.

With such statements before us, how is it possible that the hon. members, who applauded the hon. member for South Lanark only a year ago when he was so severely criticising the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, should, but a few days ago, almost to a man, and the hon. member for South Lanark himself, applaud the hon. ex-minister until there hands were sore from pounding their desks ? I believe the hon. ex-minister never in his life enjoyed five hours more than he did the five hours of his opening speech in this debate. He had at his mercy, under his thumb, the great body of the opposition who had been maligning him and criticising him for the last six years in no uncertain language. For five hours he held them at his beck and call. When he desired them to rise to the occasion, he would make some sweeping general assertion against the government's project, and they would rise to the occasion, every man of them. But when he finally desired to produce something in the nature of a climax, when he desired one hurrah greater than any others, he himself stooped to make the mean insinuation that an honourable senator of this country had something to do with this scheme, and made them pound again like so many tin soldiers, while he himself stood laughing at them. The hon. ex-minister has had the grim satisfaction of wiping out six years of the oposition's denunciation of him, and of appearing to them within the last week or so as a hero and the propounder and exponent of the only objections they have been able to raise in this House against this measure.

With reference to the speech delivered by the hon. leader of the opposition, it is but fair to assume that our grounds of difference in connection with this proposal are but few and slight. I believe that on the great features of the proposal we are practically all agreed. It is only in matters of detail, and in many instances minor details, that we lack a consensus of opinion. We are agreed that there is an urgent necessity for greater transcontinental railroad facilities in this country. The expanding trade and commerce of our country demands it. The rapid development of our Northwest country demands it. The want of competitive freight rates demand it. The steady onward march of commercial and industrial methods, rendering competition keener and still more keen, until the question of railway facilities and railway rates becomes not only an important but a dominating factor in most commercial transactions, demands it. That man were dull indeed who, either in this House or out of this House, would express an opinion contrary to the opinion that I believe we all share, namely, that the necessity is great, that the moment is opportune, that the ability of our country to meet her national requirements is beyond a peradventure. These being our common grounds of agreement, they are the main questions involved in the consideration of this measure. Our differences appear to arise as to the best methods of putting our conclusions into effect.

While I submit that there is not in this country to-day a condition of affairs which would justify a government in taking over the railroad systems of the country and operating them, either by a commission or otherwise, I do not despair that at some time in the future there may be such a condition of affairs as to render that sort of management possible. Certainly the management of the Intercolonial Railway system is not very encouraging as an example of government management. We have in this House an hon. member who occasionally starts on his favourite theme of the nationalization of railroads. I refer to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean). I do not think the hon. member has a very clear or concise idea of what he means by that high-sounding term; but time and time again, in this House, and in his newspaper in Toronto, he elaborates on what he is pleased to term the nationalization of railroads, as the only mode of relief from all our difficulties—as the only panacea for all our ills in connection with railway mat-

ters. Surely the people of this country, if they pay any attention to the statements of the hon. member for East York will say :

Now is the winter of our discontent
Made glorious summer by this son of York.

But, Sir, so far this idea, I think, is in embryo only. I look forward to the day when the matter may be taken up seriously, but I do not think that at present any one can seriously contend that we should go in for government operation of railways, either by commission or otherwise.

We know that the Conservative party always consider it a tremendous triumph that they had a great deal to do with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think that this country can look with very great pride upon the accomplishment of that great work. I know that when travelling in other countries, notably in the United States, and hearing the puffing and blowing which goes on there about their miles of railway, my own breast has swelled with pride when I thought that in a country of 5,500,000 of people, we have the greatest system of railway, under single management, in America and perhaps even in the world. I look forward to the day when we will have another such system. I believe that we are taking the first steps towards realizing that expectation at present, but I do not think that the Conservatives are entitled to the credit. Nor were they entitled to all the credit for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was a road which the people of Canada, as a whole, constructed. I notice that the hon. leader of the opposition, in his remarks yesterday, proclaimed to his followers, as he turned towards them with a grand gesture : We built the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, it was the Canadian people who built it, but the unfortunate feature is that although we built it, we do not own a dollar of it. Since then a radical change of procedure has taken place. That part of the new transcontinental line which we are going to build, we intend to own ; and while we do not intend to operate it ourselves, we shall lease it and allow other railway companies to have running powers over it, and operate it, in conjunction with ourselves, if we so desire.

Our hon. friends opposite say that there is a great deal of sentiment in this proposal. I am glad to know that there is, I have heard it claimed that there was a great deal of public sentiment behind the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, and one of the most cheering facts, in connection with the scheme before the House is that there is so much public sentiment behind it. But if there be sentiment behind it, it is certainly a high and noble sentiment—that sentiment which we call patriotism is perhaps the highest the human heart is capable of. Long may the people of this country have that sentiment with regard to all their institutions, their great railways, banks and public systems of one kind or another ; and so long as that sentiment has force, Canada will be assured of a prominent place among the nations of the world.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). Although this debate has been rather prolonged, Mr. Speaker, the question before the House has so much to do with the future of this country, that it is hardly necessary for me to offer any apology whatever for putting my views upon record concerning it. I think we may put from our minds altogether the expectation that we shall dispose of this question and conclude this debate at an early day. It seems to me a question on which we may rightly expect representatives from all parts of the country to express their opinion. This session is already in its sixth month. To-day it completes its twenty-third week, and those of us who are from the extremes of this country, either in the west or in the east, feel that we have a very just cause for complaint indeed at having been kept here so long, but we consider also that it would be unreasonable to expect this parliament, after it has sat here, from month to month, quibbling and quarrelling over comparatively insignificant questions, to dispose in an off-hand way, of a matter so important as the one now being considered.

I wish to pay some attention to the speech made yesterday by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell). I find that speech a most peculiar one—one I can well imagine he will yet wish he had not been under the necessity of making. In it he made a radical reversal of his former attitude on the principle of government ownership as applied to railways. The necessity for his doing this, he explained in an early stage of his remarks, when he told the House that he would not have addressed it at all on this subject, had it not been for the fact :

Some years ago I advocated a proposition, which has been mentioned in the course of this discussion, as a possible alternative to the policy propounded by the government. Shortly after the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway, a report obtained currency that the government was about to purchase the Parry Sound road for the purpose of still further extending the Intercolonial Railway and pushing it forward in the direction of the green fields of the west. It seemed to me at the time that this was a logical sequence of the steps already taken for the extension of the road to Montreal.

When an hon. gentleman has to admit that a few years ago he was advocating a system of government ownership, when he has to admit that he was advocating a policy of removing the Intercolonial Railway from the position it had hitherto occupied, of merely being operated in accordance with the terms of confederation—when he admits that he advocated making it a competing road by extending it to Montreal, and afterwards further on to Georgian bay, in the expectation of still further extending it into the west—when an hon. gentleman

has to admit that that was his position a few years ago, and that he is to-day obliged to reverse that position, I feel for him. When he finds that in the whirligig of events it was necessary for him to go back completely on the stand he took a few years ago, he has my deepest sympathy. But it is unfortunate that public men, when they are under such necessity, will not fairly and frankly tell us the real reason, and not try and explain something which cannot be explained. I am prepared to admire the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who got up and said: I believe in government ownership, my people believe in it, we want a government road through the west, but we cannot get it, and I accept this scheme for the good there is in it, but I only accept it because we cannot get what we want. There is something to admire in frankness of that kind, but one can only feel pity for an hon. gentleman who is under the necessity of arguing against his own convictions; and I think we might very well ask such men not to render up to party what belongs to mankind.

The hon. member from Hants (Mr. Russell) laid down this proposition, as a finality on the question of government operation: He prefaced his proposition by telling us that human nature will have to be altogether regenerated, that governments will have to be administered on a different basis, that the general public will have to move up to a higher plane before we could consider government operation and ownership of railways as a practical proposition.

> In a democratic state there never will be a government railway operated in successful competition with a private railway.

And he seems to take the position that until that occurs which he says will never occur, his argument remains good. Well, his statement is so laid that it is beyond the reach of demonstration. What would be 'successful competition' of a state-owned railway in a democratic state with a privately-owned railway? What would be the relative quality of success. A private railway is operated for private ends, for private profits. Its success depends on its being able to get the maximum rate and make the maximum profit. But with the publicly-owned road in a democratic state the object is to serve the public—it is a public end, and not a capitalistic end that is to be obtained. Success? How can success be measured in a matter of this kind? Well, let us take a parallel case. Speaking of railways in this country or any other country where the railways are privately owned, we should lay it down as a rule that a small railway cannot successfully compete with a big transcontinental line. That seems to be a proper way to state the question. And, until you can show a small road successfully competing with a big one, the hon. member for Hants would not agree that competition is possible. Well, the outcome of this kind of test is that the big road acquires and extinguishes the small one. That is success in the big road. What has been the experience in those democratic states and the other states where there has been public operation of railways? Every time, the result has been that they have acquired the other roads. That is their success. To make his statement good, the hon. gentleman quoted the cases of Belgium and Prussia. Now, I imagine that he did not quote them as democratic states, but it is true they did have an experience of partial government operation and partial private operation of railways. What has been the result? I would direct the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Russell) attention especially to this. As he has referred to the matter, I will give him the result in these two countries:

> When Prussia took over the railways (passing the law near the close of 1879 and taking the roads soon after), one of the first steps of the government was a great reduction of rates, with the result of a great increase of traffic. The policy of reduction has been continued, and the rates are now among the lowest in the world, as will appear shortly, yet the roads pay very well, indeed. Prussia is realizing a profit of $75,000,000 a year on the railways above operating expenses and interest, and in the last fifteen years she has realized a clear profit of $500,000,000 above operation and interest. The capital has been very greatly reduced. I cannot state the exact figures, but it is the policy of the government year by year to make certain payments reducing the capital, so that by the middle of the next century there will be no capitalization of the railways at all.

Is that an answer to the hon. gentleman's challenge? Is that any evidence of the success of state-operated roads in competition with private roads? It can hardly be denied that success has been obtained, for private roads have been absorbed. Now, take the case of Belgium:

> The Belgian government, at the outset, established very low rates—about four-fifths cent a mile.

Hear that, Canadians.

> Later an express service was started at somewhat higher rates, but the ordinary fares were reduced from time to time, and are still the lowest in the world, except perhaps, on some of the lines in India. The average fare, third-class, in 1898, was two-thirds of a cent a mile, and on the whole traffic, including all the classes, the average fare was 0·88 of cent a mile.

And then the hon. member for Hants, to make his point good, referred to the handicap the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was under in trying to operate the Intercolonial before it was extended so that it could compete for traffic. Well, that is granted. But what would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) do? He was in favour of that extension to Montreal where the Intercolonial could compete for the whole

traffic of the west. But I find it is not only the principle of government ownership that the hon. member for Hants finds fault with, but he is very sarcastic in his description of those who advocate that principle. He tells us, on the information of Mr. Ackworth :

—that the movement for government operation is like the scarlet fever. It is liable to attack any community and at irregular intervals to become epidemic, but its attacks as a rule are severe, only in the case of the younger and more irrepressible portion of the population.

I think, if the hon. member's statement is to be taken seriously, that there is a large amount of fever of this kind among the irrepressible, the youthful, and the folly-stricken in this country at the present time. He admits that he made an exception of the the two ex-ministers in this House. And he admits also :

Now, I must admit at the outset, that I have a great degree of sympathy with the views those hon. gentlemen have presented to the House. I have been at times seriously threatened with the symptoms of the disease with which they are afflicted.

He admits that he at one time was afflicted of the disease. But he has got better. Oh, yes. And it is to be noted that his recovery was remarkably rapid and remarkably complete. And now we are told that those who believe in and advocate the government ownership of railways are the cranks, and schemers, the youthful portion of the population, the hopeful, the optimistic. Well, if that is true, the hon. gentleman must carry out his own logic in its application to the nations of the world. And I would like to line up the nations of the world according to the standard set by the hon. member for Hants. He can say at once, as he does say to Canada : Be quiet ; Agitation cease : You have the railways : You have not been imposed upon by the young, the hopeful, the optimistic. Of course, you have a great deal of agitation upon this subject, but that is all a mistake. You, fortunately, through a good deal of tribulation, chose the right way ; you were led by the wisdom and experience of the older heads. And he will say to Britain : This sentiment expressed for so many years in your country that you would like to have an opportunity of again inaugurating this railway system is all wrong. You started exactly right ; your older and wiser heads were the ones that had control of your affairs when this policy had its inception. It is true you have complained that for years continental products have been delivered at your ports, and to your interior cities, at lower freight rates than are given to neighboring towns in your own country. It is true you have had to send goods from Liverpool to New York and ship them back to London, because it is cheaper to do than to ship them 206 miles by rail direct to London. That is all very true. But you are quite mistaken in the conclusion you draw. The great army of railway workers of Britain who are working for far less wages than those employed in other branches of industry in that country, look across to the continent and wonder how it is that under state operation there the operatives of the railway lines are better paid relatively than other labour in those countries. They may wonder how it is that it is sixty-four years since the parliamentary rate of one penny per mile was passed and it has never been improved on leaving Great Britain to-day one of the highest priced countries for railway travelling in the world. They may wonder how these things are, but the member for Hants tells them 'you are right, you are old and not young.' And to the United States with its marvellous railway development he says that the agitation there has been a mistake. Nearly forty state railway commissions have been called into existence for nothing, they were only dreams or were created to rectify grievances that evidently never existed. They complain there that the railway monopoly was the father, sponsor of all the big monopolies, that it has discriminated against and ruined cities and even states and that it has corrupted legislators and judges and that it is to-day and has been for years past enabled to put a restraining influence even on the professors of sociology and political economy so that this rising generation shall not know even of the wisdom of these men who put aside all of these little follies in the early years so that wiser heads prevailed and they kept clear of state ownership and operation. It would be novel indeed to hear Chancellor Bismarck charged with being carried away with youthful fancies and follies. He was wrong, the member for Hants says he was wrong, that he was foolish in 1876 when he told Prussia that it was time to put a stop to the exploitation of the public for private interests, when he said that the carrying on of these roads was to all intents a public service and when he said it should be done by the public and for the public. He was wrong, the member for Hants told us so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTTEE. And Australia, democratic Australia, you started wrong. The successes that you achieved are bad, you have started wrong, you have allowed your young men to prevail, those who would prefer to run Australia for the benefit of the people who are in Australia, you who have got a railway system to which as a matter of fact we do not pay much attention in Canada, Great Britain and the United States, because it compares favourably under state ownership with our own. You have been mistaken. Nova Scotia is willing to correct you.

And democratic New Zealand, New Zealand who have been so remarkably successful

in sociological experiments that other nations have not dared to attempt. In New Zealand where you have at last found out a way to construct branch lines to districts where there seem to be no call for them whatever, where it is being done now by contract with settlers that come to settle upon the lands which the branches shall serve. These men enter into a contract with the government that in addition to clearing the lands and planting crops they shall also construct the right of way and grade up everything ready for the metals and do it at so much a day. Thus living right there they construct their lines even in the districts that are so poor—and they have many districts poorer than ours—too poor to support a good line of railway, but they have these railway branches built in this way and have thus a sufficient supply and service to meet their needs and they have arrived to that extent at the very forefront of democratic operation and ownership of railways. But the member for Hants says if you do not fall in with his theory, you are behind the times.

What shall I say about Switzerland? Surely here is a case of the old growing young, a nation that started wise becoming foolish. A country, remember, composed of more varying peoples, languages and religions than are settled on any other spot of similar size, who have been able to so govern themselves as to live together in peace, as to be a model for the continent in which they are located. These people have been getting worse. They started with private roads and it was only five years ago, only in 1898 I believe, that by popular vote by two to one these people showed evidence of this youthful fever and converted every private railway within their bounds into a public railway and are to-day operating them themselves with remarkable success.

Well, are there no others? Yes, surely there are others, there are two others. There is Spain and there is Mexico. The hon. gentleman will like his company. Take Spain for instance. I can imagine the hon. gentleman telling Spain that she is the model of wisdom, that her people are the old heads, that they are not feverish and I can imagine the candid man in Spain replying to the member for Hants, 'yes, we have been before reminded that we are a back number.'

And Mexico. Well Mexico is in our class. The member for Hants has said so. And China. Here is proof positive that they are in the sear and yellow leaf of wisdom for they have not only refused to operate railroads, not only have they given such railroads as they have over to private control and private profit, but they have kept to this principle with the post offices and have left them to private control. China indeed. China must be the apex of the hon. gentleman's logic.

And, Sir, I forgot to mention in passing in connection with the case of Great Britain that the gentleman to follow out his reasoning would commend them for their system although they so bitterly regret that is was ever started on the private system. This country that has confusion worse confounded in the railway world is the country that has been most successful in operating a post office system, one with an adaptability and elasticity and usefulness to the people of the country that make it a model to all democratic people and this applies not only to the post office but to the telegraph service as well. You find them here, these two principles operating on the same ground and operating so diversely and how the hon. member for Hants feels so sure in congratulating that country on the private ownership of the railroads is more than I can understand.

In passing let me mention one point from which the hon. gentleman extracted much fun, and why he did so I cannot imagine. He wanted to know whether, if we nationalized this road or any other road, we in Canada who are not used, as a matter of fact, to very large salaries, would be prepared to sit quietly and see any commission or government hire railway operators or managers at $40,000 or $50,000 a year—yes, $50,000 a year, and they go all the way up to $75,000 a year, I believe. It is true that men do get these salaries—five, six and seven times as large as are paid to the Prime Minister of this country. I wonder that the hon. gentleman did not see that that was one of the evils of the very system he was defending. These men cannot earn as much as $70,000 a year at such employment. Are these experts in this business so vastly superior to men who are fitted and well fitted to be the Premier of this country; to be cabinet ministers or judges, or to take up the leading positions of life, that they can command ten times the salary paid to those occupying the high positions which I have enumerated? It seems to me that the argument is against the hon. gentleman. If we did take over these roads, if we did at the present time proceed with a national policy of railway construction and operation, perhaps we might, and perhaps we would have to, and perhaps it would be profitable for us, to pay the high salaries that others pay. It seems to me quite likely that we would have to do as other roads do, and we would find ourselves doing what has become too common a practice in this country, going across the line to the United States and giving to the citizens of that country all the big salaries that we have to pay. We might have to do that, but I believe we could soon train our own people to be more successful managers than we could get from amongst the people to the south of us who would not be acquired with the system in this country. I believe we could very well train men in this country to take

these positions and carry out their duties in an efficient manner. If we adopted such a system it would be a source of strength to the country, and it would give confidence to our people and to our young men especially. The hon. member for Hants roamed all over the world to find some place that he could cite as having tried the system of government ownership, discredited it and condemned it. He wanted to find one country to suit his case, and he did mention one—Italy. The hon. gentleman is perfectly welcome to have Italy placed to his credit when the facts as they exist are properly stated and understood. He stated that after a great deal of trouble the government finally took hold of the railways and operated them, but that after a few years things got into such a deplorable state that they had to call in a commission, and the result of the investigation of this commission was the abolition of the system and the leasing of the lines to private companies, the government retaining the ownership and leasing the lines. I do not think the case has been fully stated by the hon. gentleman. I have been paying some attention myself to the different countries which have tried this system, and I find that Italy is the only one which has gone back upon it. I want to give another view of the case of Italy and a view which seems to be more reasonable than the authority which the hon. gentleman quoted. I am reading from the papers that were presented to a United States Senate committee that was investigating this matter in connection with Bill 1707 :

Sometimes the decision of the Italian commission of 1880 is referred to as proof of the inferiority of government roads. Professor Hadley, now president of Yale, has used this argument in his book on railroad transportation and in an adress three years ago before the Twentieth Century Club in Boston.

That is, I believe, the authority that the hon. gentleman quoted.

But the fact is that the commission decided against state operation for reasons which are partly invalid on their face and partly inapplicable to this country. The commission based its conclusion mainly upon three propositions: (1) That the credit and finances of the Italian government were too weak to make it wise to undertake the operation of the railroads, needing, as they did, large sums for improvements and extensions, and strong financial backing to steady their operations under the fluctuations of traffic.

That, at all events, is a condition that does not exist in this country at the present time.

The unsatisfactory results of a brief experience with direct operation in northern Italy (1878-1881), the said results being due partly to the weakness and inefficiency of the Italian government, partly to the fact that the lines came to the government from the private companies in a dilapidated condition, and partly to the fact that the road having been part of an Austrian system was officered throughout by Austrians, who were, of course, displaced en masse when the road was taken by the Italian government, as it could not trust the loyalty of such employees, the result being that all the most valuable officers and employees were swept away and their places filled by occupants in large part green and unfit.

Then it goes on to give other reasons, but I will omit them until I come to this one :

Finally, it is charged on high authority that the commission was packed with railway men and agents of those who desired to lease and operate the roads instead of having the government take charge of them.

That seems to me to offset the evidence that the hon. gentleman submitted. I think I have dealt with the chief points that the hon. gentleman brought forward in his attempt to discredit not only the principle, but the advocates of government ownership of railways.

All through this debate, from the very first speaker until the last, hardly an hon. member has risen to speak on this Bill without dealing with the necessity of another transcontinental or trunk line of railways, although the question has been viewed from different standpoints and different conclusions have been arrived at as to how the result desired is to be accomplished. Coming from the part of the country from which I do come, I can say that our people are optimists in the matter of railway building. They do not believe they have too many lines. They think that there is room in this country for a great many more, even larger systems, than we have to-day. They think that it would be a good plan, if possible, to deepen this country, to give it breadth and development. The province of Manitoba, as far as settlement has gone, is fairly well supplied with railway accommodation as far as the number of lines is concerned. They are probably close enough together in the settled parts of the province, but Manitoba is not western Canada by any means, and although growth has been rapid lately, there is no doubt that as settlement increases the new business that is coming from the west will tax the present lines of railway. We believe that there is lots of room and that a great deal of development is still necessary.

I myself looked upon the railway engine as a great missionary of civilization, and I look to railway development to increase our resources, and to give our country breadth, strength and development, such as we have not dreamed of. All the information that I have from the west is in this direction. The question of a new transcontinental road was not raised as a matter of fact until last fall, when the trans-Canada people entered into their very energetic campaign to construct a railway from Quebec across the continent, and I imagine for other purposes. It was that which first brought up the question of a transcontinental line. The rough idea of the scheme, the notion

that there was room for another line of transcontinental railway was beyond all contradiction approved of in the west. What the opinion in the east was, I have to gather from newspapers and the ordinary sources of information, but I believe it can be taken for granted that since the country has grown so as to be able to tax the capacities of the lines we have, it is proper that more lines should be constructed. It may be true, and it probably is true, that better railway facilities in the west would do away with such congestion as we had last year, and that with proper equipment and proper management the existing roads might be able to carry out all the present traffic. But in considering the question of a new transcontinental line it canont be expected that it is in any way going to affect the traffic of the immediate future, for even although the existing railways are sufficient to-day, there is no possibility that they could handle all the freight that will be offered even within the next few years to come. There is every indication that by the time the new road will be completed to connect the east with the west, the products of the west will have increased so enormously that at no time will traffic be meagre and light, as it was when the first railroad was put through.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that there is some objection and that there should be some objection taken to the fact that this project was first brought before the House as a signed contract. I do not think it makes for the best enlightenment on the subject to have a project of this kind laid on the Table of the House as a contract signed and sealed between the government and private parties. It has been our experience that under such circumstances party men have not felt inclined to express their real thoughts and opinions as to the best policy, and as to the varying degrees of probability of constructing railways here and there, as they otherwise might do. It seems to me that such a proceeding on the part of the government is to some extent clipping the wings of parliament ; that it is taking away to some extent the prerogatives of parliament. And although we may have confidence in the men who compose the cabinet, still I believe that the collective wisdom of the members of this House could put before the government and before the country some ideas that possibly may not have been thought of; some considerations that have not been duly weighed, and some propositions that are worth considering. At all events, parliamentary government is parliamentary government, and not cabinet government, and there is a distinction which should be drawn and which can be drawn, and ought to be respected as between the two.

I do not think, Sir, there can be any two questions so far as the people of the west are concerned, as to the need and the necessity for taking immediate steps looking towards the construction of another transcontinental railroad. Let me point out that in nearly every instance, until the last few months, when this question became purely a political and partisan question; until within the last few months every expression of opinion that came from the west was in favour of a government road and it was even specifically in favour of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway into the business of the west, and straight on to the Pacific coast. That was the hope and the aspiration of the people on the prairie. I am quite sure that in my own city of Winnipeg, if this question could be divested altogether of partisan feeling, the people of Winnipeg would be two-thirds or three-fourths in favour of a government road extended through to the west. Whatever may be the reflections of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), it is nevertheless true that the people of the west are inclined to be hopeful and optimistic, and that they would hail with gladness the announcement that a government road was to be constructed. When the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) was in Vancouver last year he said he had a dream of a government road being put through to the west ; a dream of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, and I have never yet in the west met the editor of a newspaper, no nor even a politician, who found fault with that forecast and who did not hope that the dream would come true. Shortly after the session of parliament was called, I received a little book containing the resolutions of the East Assiniboia Central Liberal Association, and I notice this resolution amongst others :

> Whereas various railway companies will seek aid from the government at the coming session of parliament ;
>
> Therefore be it resolved that this association places itself on record as being unanimously opposed to the granting of any lands to railways, and that no financial or other aid be granted to any railway company without absolute control of rates being reserved to the government and under such conditons as will enable the government to purchase such roads, in the event of the violation by such companies of the obligations assumed in their contract with parliament ; and this association respectfully urges upon the Dominion parliament the necessity of extending the Intercolonial Railway as a government transcontinental line.

That is a form of resolution of a most guarded kind, and it was more guarded and far more reserved than the ordinary resolution which was being passed at that time. The very day this House assembled in March last, at a public meeting held at Winnipeg, the following resolution was passed :

> Whereas, the recent and continuing rapid settlement of the west has made it imperative that greatly increased transportation facilities be provided, and recognizing this opportunity two corporations have made known their intention of constructing railways of a transcontinental character, and all indications are that proposals are to be made to the Dominion and

provincial governments for subsidies and grants of moneys and lands of large proportions for these corporations ;

And whereas the policy of bonusing with money and bestowing the public lands on such corporations is vicious in principle, and has resulted in grievously burdening the settlers, and provides all the incentives for corruption in political life ;

And, whereas another development of this system is becoming prominent in the transferring of large blocks of land to irrigation companies ;

Therefore, be it resolved, that we reiterate our opposition to all proposals for the continuance or extension of the iniquitous bonusing policy, or pledging the public credit for private interests, and affirm our belief that this is an opportune time to enter upon an unqualified system of government acquisition and construction of railways, including the extension of the Intercolonial Railway through to the west.

That was the invariable conclusion of these resolutions. That resolution was passed at a meeting in Winnipeg on March 12, the day on which this House met.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a little attention to the contract we are discussing. My principal objection to that contract is that it is a contract, made by the government of Canada with private persons who seek to secure the carrying out of a public service. As an advocate and supporter of the government ownership of railways, my principal objection to this contract is that it is a contract. For that reason I do not compare it with the old Canadian Pacific Railway contract. I have never been accused of saying much that could be construed as being favourable to the government or the parliament that endorsed that contract. It seems to me that it would be absurd to rejoice over a contract that gave $35,000,000 in constructed works, $25,000,000 in money, 25,000,000 acres of land, exemption from taxation for twenty years and an absolute monopoly for twenty years, wholly into private hands, practically without any reservation or real control. In addition to this, the right to interfere with rates was put absolutely beyond our control. It was stated that the rates should not be interfered with until the company earned 10 per cent, and I suppose for all practical purposes that time will never come ; the company will see that it will not. In that respect the country must have been saved a lot of trouble in regulating the railway, because we contracted ourselves out of it. I have never felt, even considering the times and the circumstances in which that contract was made, that the right and proper thing was done. I regret that when the country stood ready to do so much, it should not have done all—that even if it put into private hands the operation of the railway, it should not have retained the ownership, which it could almost have done with the money it put into the railway.

The present contract has been before the country for some weeks, and it is remarkable what little attention it is attracting. This big work and this big line of policy that has been outlined, does not touch the popular chord by any means. What a difference there would have been if there had been laid before the country a proposal for the construction by the government of a railway from the east to the west, the government retaining the ownership and control. As a matter of politics it would have been one of the most popular things that could have been devised. It would have got the assent of more people in this country than anything else that could be named. I recognize the objections which are urged against a course of that kind. The political objection is this, that the people, even though you serve them, do not remain constant ; that although you do what they desire, they forget ; that other questions come up, and they deal with them as they arise. The corporations do not. The corporations never forget. They never forget a friend. We have had experience of this in our province, and also in this Dominion. But that simply strengthens my position—my belief not only in the feasibility, but in the imperativeness, in the interest of good government, and of the country generally, of our owning and controlling these large services.

Looking over the clauses of this contract, and tracing the projected line, one is struck —and I do not care who that is or where he sits—with our intense ignorance of the country through which the greater part of this road is projected. It may be better than we suppose. We hope at all events that the country to the north of us is good country, that can be settled, and is worthy of development. Perhaps it is ; but whatever it is, we can never be disappointed or surprised, because we know nothing about it. It is best to acknowledge at once that we do not know what this north country is. If it turns out well, we shall be gratified. If it does not, let us hope that a railway will not be put through it. That I believe must be the ground on which this contract is entered into. This question of knowledge before action is a very important one. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not a success. Had there been more deliberation, at all events had a proper route been chosen, the development of our western country would not have been retarded twelve or fourteen years, as it was. The country is developing now, people are going in, and it is taking the position we expected it to take. But for twelve or fourteen years it looked as if that were not going to be the case. We practically stood still during those years, and I cannot imagine that that would have happened if the Canadian Pacific Railway had been constructed through one of those passes through which this contract contemplates that this new line will be taken. It was a

serious mistake to make in the first instance. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had been taken to Edmonton, probably by this time it would have been advisable to construct a line along the route where the Canadian Pacific Railway is now; but the result of putting it there at that time was to retard the development of the country for twelve or fourteen years. We ought to have been in a far better position than we are to-day. The men who were in this country then know that their expectations for many years were not realized. If the Canadian Pacific Railway route had been better chosen, Canada would have been to-day far different from what it is. This is an important question, and I hope, whatever may be the necessities of the government, after this contract is ratified, if it is ratified, that they will not be led, notwithstanding the taking idea of rapid construction, to start constructing this line until they thoroughly understand where it is going and what is going to be its general condition. I must say that I think that that would be the right course to take, and one which would meet the necessities of the case. What is wanted in the immediate future is government connection between Winnipeg and the great lakes, and from the east of the lakes to the Intercolonial Railway. Giving those connections, we will be able to handle the traffic that will offer until we are certain that this road not only can be constructed, but will be constructed in the place best calculated to give the best results.

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) attracted a good deal of attention, and properly so, but for the amount of 'ifs' which he made use of in discussing the character of this proposed route between Quebec and Winnipeg. He did not at all commit himself to any statement that the 'ifs' could be carried out. If the grades, if the general conditions of the country, and so on were of such a character, it might be possible to transport grain from the prairies of the west to St. John in the east. That was as far as the hon. member would go, and that simply confirms the opinion I am trying to put before the House that we should not allow ourselves to be carried away by any idea of rush in this matter. It is better to provide the required facilities to the lakes and then from the lakes to Montreal and the eastern coast rather than start this work, which it will take years to complete in any case, and which, when completed, may enable the hon. member for North Norfolk to say: You did not consider my 'ifs,' and the road is not fulfilling the purposes for which it was intended.

The hon. member for North Norfolk gave all his attention to the section from Winnipeg to Quebec. True he was dealing with that because that is the government constructed portion; but as far as the traffic is concerned—and the great object of this proposed line is to give an outlet to the traffic of the west—why should not the government construct and own the whole line from the east to the coast? The hon. member for North Norfolk, however, left the west to take care of itself. But the far west, which is the new west that is being developed, is too far west, and St. John and Halifax are too far east, for us to pay attention only to the grades on the eastern section. The waters of the west are too near the far west, and if the position be such—and there is hardly any doubt that it is—that it will be practicable to take the products of the far west to the waters of the west, it would be suicidal to allow any private company to refuse to overcome the grades and the obstacles that exist in the Rocky mountains for the sake of forcing traffic right across this continent to the seaboard of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. However much sentiment there may be in the matter—and by the way our shippers in the west do not pay much attention to the sentiment of an all-Canadian line, it is the freight bills they look after—it would not be to our advantage, as a nation, to attempt to force traffic over a continental haul to eastern ports, if that is going to cost more than to send it across the Rockies and put it on board ship at a Pacific port. At present the products of the western states are being exported from San Francisco. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) told us the other night that as the chain of mountains in British Columbia go north, they also go west, so that our western country is nearer the Pacific ocean than are the western states. If the transcontinental railway is going to be the benefit to Canada which it can be, no expense should be spared—and I doubt if a private company would most effectively do this—in keeping the grades through those mountains down, so that our traffic from the west would be able to go a few hundred miles into Fort Simpson. The products of the western states are carried around Cape Horn, and the products of British Columbia and west of the mountains, are to a large extent, carried around Cape Horn. But that is not always going to be the case. How long will it take to complete this projected work? Five years is the first estimate, but suppose we say eight years, in that time the United States expect to have the Panama canal constructed. That canal is going to make a vast difference in the Pacific trade and also to our western ports. It is going to make it impracticable to ship grain 3,000 miles by rail when you are within a few hundred miles of Fort Simpson. Yesterday's cable news gave the information that the Colombian senate had rejected, for the time-being, the contemplated treaty with the United States for the acquisition of this tract, but they have simply given the Colombia government power to make the

necessary treaty, and the supposition is that they are simply expecting to get some concessions. The United States have got their preparations made and have parties organized ready to go down to the Panama canal, and expect to complete that work in eight years. And as the cost is only $150,000,000, there is no reasonable doubt that they will carry the work through as soon as they get the necessary rights. But even if they do not, they will then build the Nicaraguan canal. This was the canal which they had selected, and which would have been in proceess of construction by this if the old Panama Company of France, had not offered its old works at a reasonable price. In all probability this Panama canal will have an immense influence on the western traffic of this country. It will reduce the time to the old country tremendously and at once put freight rates, for the products of the west, far below what we may expect, even with the low grades to be hoped for over 3,000 miles of rail haul. I am surprised that the hon. member for North Norfolk should have overlooked this matter of grades in the west. Surely if we are going to guarantee a line in the west, there must be some importance in that question. The reason why a great deal of trade has not already gone through the Canadian Pacific Railway to the port of Vancouver is the excessive grades on that road, owing to the ill-judgment of the locators in constructing it through the Kicking Horse pass.

As regarls the running rights under this contract, I have heard them discussed from every point of view, and an ordinary person would be excused for saying that the possibility of various railways exercising running rights over one line depended altogether on who was speaking. But looking at the contract, I see that all railways are to have just about the same rights as they have under the Railway Act. They have running rights, if they want them, under terms that are favourable to the company that grants them. But the Intercolonial has special privileges over that road, which, if hon. gentlemen on the other side were not attempting to reduce the character of the Intercolonial, might at some time be used to make the Intercolonial a trunk line. But I do not think there is any intention of doing so, and the cause to which I have referred will probably never be taken advantage of. But this does not begin to meet my views of a government trunk line. I can thoroughly understand that many hon. gentleman would not be prepared to support my views in favour of the nationalization of railways who would yet commit themselves altogether to government ownership of the trunk line. So, it seems to me, I have a right to look in this contract for a proper scheme of a government trunk road. Taking the plain meaning of the contract and the circumstances under which it was drawn up, we can only conclude that the object to be attained is this: There is a large section of this country in which we fear there will be no local traffic, but through which must be hauled the grain of more prosperous districts. If the government builds that road and so controls the capitalization, it can keep down the rates on this non-productive and costly road to the actual cost of construction and hauling. That appears to me to be the proper meaning for me to take out of the contract. But if this is the object, it seems to me the government should build the road from Quebec to Winnipeg and put it in charge of an operating company and keep that as a trunk road for the use of all parties who want to use it. The operating company would have nothing to do with individual shippers or with freight bills or collections. It would simply take the cars from the companies delivering them at terminal points or branch line points wherever indicated. It would provide the motive power of course, and the necessary staff to pass over that trunk line all cars that were given into its hands. There would be no duplication of authority; there would be no question of running rights; no question whether it would be possible, or practicable or profitable for the operating company to grant running rights to other companies. They would be an operating company only, and there would be no possible friction. Early in the history of the road, it could be demonstrated what it actually costs to haul a car a mile, and that would be the basis of the price to any one who wanted to send a car over the road. If local trade should be developed, some arrangement could be made with another company to pick it up, or the operating company itself could pick it up. Outside of that, all traffic should be passed through in bulk, in carloads. This, it seems to me, would be a proper government trunk road. If run in this way it would be of some use to the west. For any districts in the west that were settling up, if the companies for any reason did not see fit to put in a branch line, or if the people did not want to be in the hands of a large corporation, the people themselves could form a company or a small body of capitalists could construct a road to the point where the freight would be handed over to the trunk road, and they would send their traffic over that road on equal terms with all others. It would be understood exactly how much it would cost to pass a car over the road, so that the charge to all would be known to everybody, and the other roads would simply give their price to haul to Winnipeg where the traffic could be handed over to the trunk line. This, it seems to me, would be a proper plan for a government-constructed and government-owned trunk line. I am surprised that it has not been adopted in this case, that is, while recognizing the fact

that the government does not believe in government ownership and is not prepared for the nationalization of the railways, yet wants to do everything possible to develop the country and to avoid putting it in the hands of railway corporations. That, it seems to me, would be a proper way to spend the people's money on a trunk road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, other gentlemen far more competent than I am, have dealt with the matter of guarantees and the general bonding privileges of this road. I have not much to say on that subject. But I have listened attentively to the explanations that have been given by others. We are to pay all the money for the construction of this expensive, non-productive eastern section, and we are to guarantee 75 per cent of the balance of the cost from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada guarantees the Grand Trunk Pacific Company for the other 25 per cent. The government, I suppose, gives the first guarantee, and I do not quite understand what is the value of, or necessity for, the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. For the last few years, the company has been in better shape than formerly, but I do not regard its position as superior to that of the government. Just what is the use of their guarantee I do not quite understand. It reminds me of a few lines the poet put together in this form :

> In Klon, that town of monks and bones,
> And pavements fanged with murderous stones,
> And hags and rags and hideous wenches,
> I counted two and seventy stenches
> All well-defined and separate stinks,
> Ye nymphs that reign o'er sewers and sinks,
> The River Rhine, it is well known,
> Doth wash your city of Colonge ;
> But tell me, nymphs, what power divine
> Shall henceforth wash the River Rhine.

And when this guarantee was explained to the House the question struck me : Who is going to guarantee the Grand Trunk ? The country is, of course. Well, if we have to guarantee everything, for there is no doubt that practically the credit of the government is involved in these railways; why do we not construct them and own them ?

How does the account of the Dominion of Canada stand with regard to its railway operations ? I take from the Statistical Year-book the following facts : Bonuses granted to railways, $52,831,000. Suppose we strike an average between the estimate of the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific and add $70,000,000 for that. Then, the government roads owned and operated by the government represent an expenditure of $74,194,000. This makes a total of $197,026,000 in money spent on the railways—the greater part of the national debt. The number of acres of land granted to railways is 58,288,092. Of course, about 8,000,000 acres have been granted by the province, but all out of the public domain. But we will say 48,000,000 acres. The bigger part of the national debt and 48,000,000 acres of land and what have we got for it ? Surely we ought to have a lot, the biggest part of our national debt is on this debtor account of the railway ledger. What have we got ? Well, in two or three generations we shall have, provided these corporations do not get so large as to be able to negotiate with us beforehand, in two or three generations we shall have a trunk road there, to hand over to posterity. It will have no branch lines and no connections but there will be a road. Of course the bonds will have to be floated again, it has to be bought about that time but we shall have the road ; and then we have the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway. The Intercolonial as far as it is possible and practicable seems to me at present to be a first-class railway. There has been a good deal of money spent on it, and I believe the late Minister of Railways and Canals is justified in boasting that he has brought that road up to the condition of a really useful practical railway of first-class character. We are going to relegate that to a second-class character, and then all we have got is our interest simply as users of the other railways of the country when we have to travel and we have to pay a high rate for that. I believe that our passenger rate is practically higher than on any other extensive system in the world. We have given the bigger part of our national debt, we have given a kingdom in lands and that is the way the ledger stands at the present time. Why, Sir, I never feel that I have to apologize, that I have to plead my youth or my rawness or my optimism when I say I am in favour of national railways, and at this time, when the opportunity presents itself and has to be met as perhaps never before ; it seems to me that this is the opportune time, to start on the method that has been tested the world over and proved successful, the method of the government not only paying for and constructing and owning but also operating its own roads.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this House four years ago an advocate of the nationalization of railways. There is a good deal of opportunity during the protracted sojourns that we have in this city for a man to try his theories, to test his beliefs, to hear and to read the other side. The magnificent library in connection with this parliament is of great value in this respect particularly. We can not only see and read and understand what we have in our own country but we can understand and become acquainted with what has been done under other systems in other lands and other continents. I say that for four years I have watched the work of this House. A greater part of our time has been taken up with struggles in the Railway Committee especially, with all kinds of Bills, some legitimate enough, some

good enough considering our policy, and some bad enough. I have noticed that the promoters of the worst ones have generally tried to get a certain following on one side of the House and then to make it a party question when their Bills would often not stand close straightforward criticism; they try to make it a party measure so as to get it through the House. I have seen during this time, every member has seen it, and must have been impressed as much as I have with the amount of time and the amount of trouble and even I believe the amount of loss to public rights that has been caused by the passage through this House time after time, session after session, of railway Bills. I have seen too the lobbies filled with railway men, with their lawyers, the very best lawyers. They have their business to do under our system. I am not complaining while we follow the practice of granting charters, I am not finding fault with them, but I see they are here, they are the most prominent, outside the members themselves, the most prominent and most constant and the most devoted to their duties——

An hon. MEMBER. And the most aggressive.

Mr. PUTTEE. Yes, and the most aggressive of all those that are around this House, and I say that I have noticed these things. I have opposed every time the Subsily Bill. I am opposed to subsidies and these things have not made me more favourably disposed to them, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my temperament is such that it inclines me, impels me often to take no part in a discussion or a debate for the fear perhaps of being considered as posing, as seeking simply to get a little notoriety, but I say I have the consent of any little intelligence that I have got in saying that this whole system is wrong, that it is an imposition on the people who sent us here to look after their interests and their interests alone. It is a giving away of prerogatives and privileges, of property and resources that should only be used and exploited for the public good and we give them for private good and for private benefit. I say we become forgers of fetters, creators of taskmasters for the very people of whose interests and whose interests alone we here as the parliament of Canada ought to be preservers and protectors. Believing that, Mr. Speaker, believing that that principle is right, believing that it is practically unassailable, I think, and I have thought, that at this time at this change of the policy of the country that it was right and proper for me to put these sentiments of my own on record and to state exactly where I am on that railway proposition and those that have in the past come before this House.

Now, I want to deal shortly with the question of government ownership as it is before us, and although the hon. member for Hants seemed to think that those who proposed to advocate this principle were the few, were the cranks, the schemers, the youthful unreliables and although I have not come to that conclusion by observing the members of this House during the last session. I have come to the conclusion and I believe there is a very strong feeling among the members of this House in favour of a new policy of this kind and that is one reason why I regret that this contract is brought down here as a contract so that it closed the mouths and changed the current of thought and changed the method of expression that would otherwise have been given by the members of this House.

But I am not so lonely, I quote here for instance from the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) who said :

> My decided preference is for a government owned and government operated railway across the continent.

That is mine too, and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, a man of experience, a man who has never that I can remember been in the habit of coinciding with the hon. gentleman who was last Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) the Hon. John Haggart, during this debate said :

> There is no probability of this parliament acceding to any such thing as a government railway, although in my heart I believe, judging from the experience of other countries, that a government railway can be managed and run as economically as any other railway. My experience upon the Intercolonial Railway was that you could get a service as cheaply and buy supplies cheaper than upon any other railroad in Canada.

I do not feel as lonely as the hon. member for Hants would have the House believe. I have quoted statements of two men whom we may look upon as being experienced in railway matters, as we have a right to do. A man who has been Minister of Railways and Canals for seven years and a man who has been in that position in previous years certainly have experience in these matters, and I consider that in this parliament we are bound to accept their opinions as having greater weight than opinions which are not based upon actual experience. The right hon. Prime Minister said :

> I formed my opinions some years ago, and perhaps I may be permitted to relate a personal experience which went far to form my own conviction in this regard. In the fall of 1896, Mr. J. R. Booth, of this city, invited me to visit his railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway, which was then in process of construction. I accepted the invitation. The road had been built almost to the shores of Georgian bay, perhaps within half a mile of it. When we left the train we walked to the shore of the lake, a bleak shore with not a building upon it. Mr. Booth said : this is the terminus of my railway. I asked Mr. Booth : Where is the trade to come from ? His answer was : I have to create it.

One of the first and most expensive and boldest things Mr. Booth did to create that trade was to construct the Canada Atlantic Railway. Is that not the experience in every case ? You have to provide the service first and if you do provide the service you can get the trade. Did the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), when he extended the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, go down there to create the trade ? No, he went there to accept the trade, he made it a success and the acquisition of that piece of road was the one thing that put the Intercolonial Railway in a better position than it had ever occupied before. The question which is now presenting itself to us is really the one of ownership vs. control. We are now proceeding upon an attempt to control. Without going into the matter, I want to say that this has been a very thorny road to tread. It has not so far been attended with any alarming amount of success. In the United States they have spent millions, they have had some forty state commissions and they have their interstate commerce commission, and yet they have been able to make no very great success out of it. We attempt to control railways for the sake of keeping the rates down, for the sake of serving our people better and for the sake of drawing the claws of the railway companies; of trying to hold them down, trying to prevent them from taking too much from us, but from all the experience that we have had in efforts of this kind this attempt is likely to be expensive as well as unsatisfactory. It would be better to face the alternative at once and adopt a national policy in railway operation.

Some hon. members have expressed themselves in favour of government ownership and they have told us that this contract is in itself one step towards government ownership. Well, it may be or it may not be. Probably it will not have this effect ; certainly it has not had this effect so far because hon. gentlemen who have hitherto been supporters of the principle of government ownership are obliged to go back on their records, to go back on the arguments put forward by themselves in former times in favour of this principle and as a believer in it I do not accept this proposition as one step towards government ownership. Then, there is another reason to commend it, and it is this : If the operating company, the Grand Trunk Pacific, default, if they cannot pay the interest, the contract becomes null and void and the road becomes our own, not only our own to have and to hold, but to operate. In other words, if it is a success it belongs to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, but if it is a failure it belongs to the people of Canada. I was speaking of the account of the Dominion of Canada in regard to railway business. The opposite side of the picture is disclosed by our public reports, which show that $63,000,000—the hon. Minister of Justice mentioned $83,000,000, and he is probably right—have been spent on our canals. We own our canals, because they are not interest earners. They do not produce interest and profit and therefore we own our canals. If the Grand Trunk Pacific is not a paying concern we will have all the duties of government ownership thrown upon us.

The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who advocated very strongly the principle of government ownership this session in the Railway Committee has spoken on this question, but he has also found it necessary as an advocate and sympathizer with government ownership to change his position. He regrets that it is not practicable. He regrets that he finds it necessary to part with his hope of constructing and operating a transcontinental railway by the government. This is the reason he gives :

> Another feature of the government embarking in a general scheme of ownership of our lines of railway would be the questions that might arise in the future as to the construction of additional lines and of branch lines. There would also be involved, by reason of the pressure that might be exercised upon parliament, the question of the duplication of railway lines. There might be too tight a rein exercised, or it might be too free. It would all depend on the political pressure that would be brought to bear. To the extent that this might operate either in the one direction or the other, it would be productive of injury to the public interest. You could not be too stinted ; and it would not be in the public interest to have too free a hand. The interest of communities not served by railways, or not having the advantages of government lines, would always be brought to the front and parliament would be besieged time and again for the duplication of lines, in order that these communities might share in the advantages of government-owned railways.

His objection to advocating this principle is that it would be impracticable, unprofitable and unsafe, because the government would be open to influences, that the people would use their influence to get lines constructed, deflected or duplicated. That is a line of argument that has been urged and sometimes it has been urged with some effect. But, what is the reverse ? Is it a defect that is inherent in public ownership ? I say not. It is merely a defect that is peculiar to our present system. I have never been along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, but I have carefully noted all that has been said in this House by men who know, and my firm belief is that there can be no reason for the construction of the new line from Quebec to Moncton, except that very political reason which the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has urged against the policy of government ownership. That line may be profitable, and in the future necessary, but from the day the private Bill of the Grand

Trunk Pacific Railway was introduced until now, the only vital reason that has been given for the construction of that portion of the line, whether it parallels the Intercolonial Railway or not, is the reason that it is a political railway. That being true, and I submit to every reasonable man that it is true, there is no argument in it against the public ownership of this road. Indeed, it is an argument in favour of public ownership. I am opposed altogether to any system that would be open to abuses of this kind, and that could be effected by influences of this kind. The sad truth is, however, that railway matters do mix up with politics in this country. They meddle with our political institutions and, they meddle too effectively. There are too great interests involved in the private ownership of railways, and under our system of government these interests are altogether too powerful. There is no doubt that we often legislate in opposition to the general consensus of the opinion of this House, and against the intelligence of this House. We often legislate on railway matters in a manner that we would not legislate, if railway interests were less powerful than they are.

The trouble is with many of us that we are slaves to the thing that is; that we have been reared in contact with, the thing that surrounds us, and that we are apt to believe in it just because it exists. We found it in existence here; we were born in it, some of us; we cannot imagine anything else; it is the thing that is, and we are committed to it. Last year I had the pleasure of meeting a gentleman who was then outside of Australia for the first time. He had been able to visit leisurely a great part of the United States, and he had travelled to a considerable extent through Canada. I met him on the steamer as we were leaving Canada for the old land, and finding that his comparisons between democratic Australia and the United States and Canada were most interesting, I asked him: What strikes you as the most remarkable thing in this country, and he replied: 'The most remarkable thing to me is that your railways are controlled by private individuals. I was born in Australia, where the railways are under public control, and having lived under that system it seems to me that in a great democratic country like this which declares that all men are born equal, and which provides that its citizens shall be well protected, I believe that the government itself should be the owner of the railways, and not tremendous railway corporations. It seems to me, he said, although I do not know it, that these corporations must wield a powerful, and I would suppose, mischievous effect on the body politic. He was convinced that the wealth and strength of these corporations, in promoting their own interests, which must necessarily sometimes be antagonistic to the interests of the public, must have a very pernicious effect on our political system. I have said we are slaves to that which is; we are slaves to the things we are used to. In that instance this gentleman had been used to exactly the opposite system which we pursue in this country, and it was the strangest thing that he had met with on this continent.

Now, Sir, I want to lay down the proposition that railway transportation is properly a government function. When that is conceded, as conceded it must be, it then becomes a question of expediency as to whether we should delegate our powers to private parties or whether we should exercise them ourselves. It never occurred to me but that this definition of the character of a railway would be properly understood, until I heard the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison), a gentleman of the law, speak the other evening. He said:

> The whole contract discloses the fact that the Liberal party have apparently, for the first time recognized the cardinal principle which seems to underly our constitution, and one which heretofore has been ignored by hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, the subordination of transportation corporations to the sovereignty of parliament.

He was of the opinion—and I do not blame him for not holding that opinion before, except that he may be blamed for having taken so long to learn it—he was of opinion that parliament is sovereign, that this matter of transportation is a function of government. We have wandered so far away from the recognition of the principle that even a lawyer is struck by the fact that we are coming back to it. In 1876, Bismarck explained that railway transportation was a function of government, and he proclaimed the doctrine for economic as well as for state and military reasons. John Stuart Mill, who is generally accepted as an authority who cannot be gainsaid on such matters, distinctly lays down the proposition that the operation of railways is a government function. Indeed, when we pass a railway Bill in this parliament, we put in a clause delegating our powers, when we state that the Act is for the general advantage of Canada. We recognize that we give to private parties powers that by right belong only to the government. The railway commissions of the United States in their reports to their various states and to the central government, are continually reiterating this principle. It seems as if they are doing it in a spirit of despair, for time and again they have to draw attention to the fact that the powers they are trying to control are powers that should belong to the government. And, Sir, that principle, conceded as it must be conceded, I lay down the further proposition that this power can be exercised by government aside from the influence of politics, and that it can be used by the gov-

ernment for the public benefit without the damaging influence and interference of partisan politics. If this is a power that belongs to the government, we should not delegate it unless there are good and sufficient reasons. If it is a power that can be used by us and exercised by us properly for our own benefit, then I say it should be exercised by us for our own benefit. That it can be so exercised I am going to show by simply taking the experience of the colony of Autralia, as given by Mr. H. H. Lusk, who has been forty years in that colony, at one time being Secretary of State of New Zealand, and who has lived in the United States for three or four years, long enough to form a fair opinion of the system there.

Mr. COWAN. What are you quoting from ?

Mr. PUTTEE. I am quoting from a report of a hearing before a Senate committee of the United States in 1900, given to Mr. Lusk, whom the hon. gentleman will recognize as an authority on Australian matters :

In Australasia altogether there are 15,000 miles of government railroads, and they are operated to the entire satisfaction of the people. There are no complaints whatever as to any favouritism as between one class of persons and another. There are no complaints as to discourtesy or want of attention on the part of officials, and there has absolutely, during the last ten years, been no complaint that politics has interfered in any way with them, and my only wish here is to state what our experience has been and, as far as I may, why it has been so. Now, I think that our experience, both of the efficiency of the service and of its absolute freedom from political abuses may be referred to the mode in which the service has been organized. You see, it is not merely that we have experts from the outside to manage it, but it is that every employee of the railroad is a civil servant of the government. Not one of them can be dismissed except for cause. Not one of them can be defrauded of his right of promotion if he deserves it, in his turn. Their rights in that way are strictly preserved to them by law. If complaint is made, the employee has a right to a public investigation before he is punished by degradation or loss of office. Up to a certain age, different in different colonies, they are entitled to remain in the service and in most of them, if not in all, there is a provision made for retiring allowances at an age which is fixed. : . . . With regard to the question of politics, there is no possibility of exercising governmental influence to make the men vote one way or the other.

The CHAIRMAN. It is pretty difficult to get them to vote against the government ?

Mr. LUSK. Not the slightest in the world. Sometimes they do vote against the government. I remember one case in New South Wales in which the vote of the operatives of the railway was regarded as being very strong against the government, owing to certain legislation that was supposed to be opposed to the labour interst, and they naturally went for the most part in favour of the interest of labour, and they were certainly not in favour of the government at that time.

Then, referring to New Zealand and the question of political control there, he says :

The thing would have been a dead failure if any attempt of that kind had been made ; but no attempt was made.

I could make other quotations along the same line, but I will not take up the time of the House with them. At the same time, I believe that the matter which I have introduced from this report is valuable, and I have not seen it referred to before in this country.

I would like to call the attention of those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this principle of government ownership on the ground that it is impracticable, to the similarity between the conditions existing in Canada and those in Australia. The people of Australia live under a government similar to ours, they speak the same language, they have the same sentiments, the same regard for their rights and the same business methods. They have practically a continent to govern, as we have. Their population is sparse, and it is important to them, as it is to us, to have lines of railway connecting the different parts of the country with each other. The mileage of their railways is large, as ours is. So that the comparison between the two countries is very apt. We have a population of over 5,000,000; they have a population of about 4,000,000. They have 15,000 miles of railway owned and operated by the government. We have over 18,000 miles. If I had time, I could quote from Mr. Lusk, to show that their experience of government railways has been altogether satisfactory. After living in the United States, where private ownership of railways is supposed to have reached almost the flower, he claims that the service there is not better than the service in his own country. In Australia, the value of money is not quite so high as it is in Canada ; but the rates on their railways are about the same as ours, except passenger rates, which, as in almost every other country, are far below ours. One thing that should not be forgotten is that on government railways, practically in all countries, school children are carried free. That country, which boasts of having made such a success of its railways, has a debt of $600,000,000 on account of the 15,000 miles of railways owned by the government—a good many of them constructed by the government, but the major portion of them, I believe, purchased from private parties, with all the disabilities that are incident to their construction and ownership by private parties. In Canada with between eighteen and nineteen thousand miles of road the liabilities are over a billion of dollars. It is not fair to contrast the United States railway system or even the British system, with that of Europe. The comparison between Canada and Australia is about as fair a one as can be made in a matter of this kind, and that comparison

is undoubtedly in favour of the government ownership and operation of railways. My great objection to private corporations operating railways under special privileges, and using powers delegated by the government, that properly belong to the government, is, after all that the system results in erecting vast private enterprises, which are naturally first and foremost for private interests, and not for the public interests. That is to a large extent the reason for my opposition to these private roads. I believe, too, that these private corporations do meddle in politics a great deal more than they care to admit and that the cause of good government will gain by not encouraging the formation of these corporations. The interests of good government lie altogether in the public ownership of our great railways. But, we are also far behind in our civil service, in the way we operate it, in the influences exerted upon it, and it seems to me that if we could reform that system, which is badly in need of improvement, it would be a good secondary result of a plan of government ownership.

Then, there is the question of discrimination—a question that can never be buried under a private railway system, a question that comes up now and again more strongly than at other times, that flourishes all the time in the United States, and is never absent from this country. The question of discrimination can never be settled except by the national ownership of railways. Then there is the other matter of fair and equal service to all. This is something which is no less important than low rates.

Before I close my remarks, I want to advocate what I think would be right and what I have advocated before in this House, and that is that questions of this kind should not be settled off-hand even in this parliament. This is a question which affects every citizen of this country. I would be prepared to support a policy of expending our own money on our own roads with the idea of keeping these roads and using them for our own purposes. But when we are making a contract with private parties, when we are giving them either our credit or large sums, when we are following a policy which, I am confident, the majority of the people would not approve, opportunity should be given to the people to declare their opinion on this policy before we finally adopt it. In my opinion, the people would gladly escape from this policy of bonusing and subsidizing and guaranteeing, which makes more distant the policy of the people owning and operating their own roads. Before committing the country to a contract of this kind, before committing it to the large expenditures involved in this contract, it is only fair that the people should have an opportunity of declaring whether they are in favour of it or opposed to it. I am a believer in the principle of the referendum. I believe that we would not be doing anything derogatory to the dignity of this parliament if this contract were sent to the country and submitted to the vote of the people. The question before the people would be this contract or public ownership. I believe that the people should be given the opportunity of declaring themselves on this question, irrespective altogether of partisan influence. I do not mean simply the return or the defeat of the government at a general election. At a general election all sorts of questions are discussed—separate schools, bonding privileges and railway policy, tariff, and each of these has more weight in some constituencies than it has in others. But what I submit is that this particular scheme should be referred to the people for their sanction or rejection. As I have said before, I believe in the nationalization of railways. I have never seen the necessity for government ownership so strongly as I do at present, and I am going to place in your hand, Sir, an amendment declaring what a really national railway policy would be.

I beg to move, therefore :

That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted :—

By reason of growth in population and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada, and especially the western part thereof, the time is opportune for the adoption of a definite policy of government construction and operation of railways, under a properly safeguarded civil service system, put entirely beyond the influence of partisan politics.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

RELIEF OF ELLEN McDERMID.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 229) for the relief of Ellen McDermid.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to point out one or two things with reference to this case. This Bill is for the relief of Ellen McDermid, who is described in the Bill as being from the village of Gilbert Plains, in the county of Marquette, in the province of Manitoba. This lady is obliged, if she has just cause for claiming a divorce—as, no doubt, she has—to come from Manitoba to Ottawa to secure that act of justice. She comes here at great expense, beyond question. The expense and difficulty of securing a divorce is so great that the only wonder is that the attempt was made at all. I desire to call the attention of the House, not for the first time, to the absurdity of our law. If divorce

is properly granted, if there is any reason why it should be granted, it is a judicial act, and an act of justice to the one making claim for relief. As it is an act of justice it should be obtainable without the expense and difficulty attending the present proceedings. This lady, if she has just cause for claiming divorce, should have had, by the law, facilities given her to obtain that act of justice with less expense and less difficulty. She should have been able to obtain it in the province of Manitoba. There should be some provision made whereby this judicial Act could be performed in that province instead of making it necessary for the claimant to apply to the parliament of Canada. I think that this case, among many others, illustrates in a striking manner the absurdity, to say nothing of the injustice of our laws.

Mr. CLARKE. What would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) suggest ?

Mr. CHARLTON. A divorce court. Some judge connected with the courts of Manitoba should be clothed with power to hear and deal with divorce cases without additional expense to the country and without very much additional trouble to the judges on whom that duty would devolve.

Motion agreed to ; Bill considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF STEPHEN WILSON.

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (West York) moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 228) for the relief of Stephen Wilson.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). We have here another case, Mr. Speaker, just a little worse than the one we have just dealt with. Mr. Stephen Wilson, I see, is a resident of Red Deer, in the district of Alberta, North-west Territories, who, this preamble recites, has just cause for asking for divorce. He was brought to Ottawa from Red Deer, away off in Alberta, to obtain here an act of justice which, the law provides, shall be obtainable by him if the circumstances are such as to warrant it. Now, I would like to ask what reason there is for bringing Mr. Sephen Wilson to Ottawa ?

Mr. COCHRANE. To get a divorce.

Mr. CHARLTON. If Mr. Wilson is entitled to get a divorce, the law lays down the reasons for which he is entitled to it. If he claims that divorce under the law, there must be a judicial procedure to ascertain whether his claim is or is not well founded. About the most awkward body for this to be referred to that one could imagine is the Senate of the Dominion of Canada. If you referred it to a divorce court you would have a proper procedure, and a proper decision in accordance with the law. Referring it to the parliament of Canada, great expense must be incurred, and there is, perhaps, some little doubt as to whether the decree will be obtained, some uncertainty as to the manner in which the committee will deal with the matter. At all events, it can be asserted without hesitation that the matter will not be dealt with more in accordance with the principles of the statute, the decision will not be prompter or more just in its character, than if the case were referred to a divorce court. I think it would be well to call attention to this absurdity time, and time, and time again, as often as a Bill of this kind comes before this House. It is a disgrace to this government, it is a disgrace to the parliament of Canada, that this condition of things is permitted to exist. I repeat that, if a divorce is obtainable, it is obtainable for cause. If there is cause, the law must define what it is. If there is cause defined by the law, the person who claims that he has just cause for seeking a decree of divorce should go to a divorce court, which should be constituted for the hearing of these cases. Let a proper class of judges in each province be authorized to hear these cases ; let the procedure be simple, speedy and inexpensive, instead of, as in a case of this kind, bringing a man here at an expense of $1,000 or $1,500, deterring many who are justly entitled to a decree of divorce from attempting to obtain it.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) could take a much more effectual way of having the law passed which he proposes. He brought in a resolution, which was discussed at some length, in favour of a divorce court being established. I had the pleasure of strongly supporting that resolution ; and I see that the different law societies in Ontario have, in very strong articles in their journals, backed it up. But, instead of taking up the time of the House now, and on other occasions when these Bills come up, if the hon. gentleman would use his influence to induce the right hon. leader of the government, whom he follows most closely, to allow such a Bill to pass, his work would be much more effective. For the right hon. Prime Minister promptly sat on the hon. gentleman's resolution. Yet, the hon. gentleman follows his leader very closely. Although a year or two ago he seemed somewhat restive, he has suddenly become now a most devoted follower. If instead of delaying the House in going over a proposal which has been fully discussed, he should appeal to his leader and the leader of the House, and the controller of the destinies of this country. I think it is idle for the hon. gentleman to express these sentiments in public. He would better serve the object he advocates by bringing his influence to bear upon the right hon.

gentleman who leads the House, but who declines to allow his Bill to pass.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I think perhaps the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) for once is wrong. The very fact that a member cannot persuade the government which he supports to bring forward a Bill like that is no reason why he should not at every opportune time raise the question in the House. That is just the way that gains can be made. If as a matter of fact there should be a majority in the House opposed to the measure that is no reason why on every occasion the subject should not be brought up.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. He withdrew the motion, he did not press it to a division.

Mr. FRASER. I am one of those who are in sympathy with having a divorce court subject to the highest court in every province in the Dominion. But the only way we can gain that is as I said by on every occasion having the views of those who are in favour of it presented to the House.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Then bring in a Bill.

Mr. FRASER. We might not be able to carry it. You cannot change the views of a government on such a question and the majority of those who support the government may not be in favour of it and I understand that that has been the case with every government that ever existed in Canada.

I think on the general question of divorce the strongest case should be required to be made out, but I do think it a hardship in a case as clear as this that a man should have at great expense to come from the Northwest Territories here and to pay large fees and I shall in the House pursue the same course of expressing my views in the belief that the only way of gaining anything in a matter of this kind is by continually pressing for it notwithstanding the opinion that has been held by all governments in Canada. There never was a government in Canada that would bring in a Bill like this, that is the unfortunate part. In Nova Scotia we are much more favoured because like British Columbia and New Brunswick we had a divorce court previous to confederation and they could not take it from us. I think myself we should have this court, but I also think that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has a right on all occasions to bring his views before parliament. As I said before only on the strongest case being made out should a divorce be granted, but there are cases in all civilized countries in which I think it would be a great hardship that a man should be obliged to live with a woman or that a woman should be obliged to live with a man during a whole lifetime, and it is only by bringing it up on every occasion in the hope that a majority on both sides will join together to bring about that which no government up to this day has done that progress can be made.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). On this occasion I have to differ from the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). The question before the House is whether a particular individual is entitled to a divorce. We are not discussing the general question as to whether there ought to be a divorce court in this country or not. The objection taken by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) was that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was not discussing the Bill before the House. He was bringing up an abstract question with which we are not dealing at the present moment. Now, Sir, I think if we are anxious to promote the particular object which the two gentlemen opposite have been advocating the better way is to introduce every session a definite and positive resolution upon that question and discuss it in the House, not to bring it up on questions of this kind where, instead of helping the gentleman or lady, I do not know which it is who is seeking relief on this occasion, by discussing an abstract question we are departing from the question before the House as to whether we shall grant the relief asked for on this occasion or not.

Motion agreed to, Bill reported, read a third time—on division—and passed.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a national transcontinental railway.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, this debate has continued for several days; it has been participated in by hon. members on both sides of the House with very great ability, and I would not presume to hope or think that at this stage I could add any new points to the discussion. The most I can hope for is to perhaps review some points brought up and to place them before the House in a slightly different light possibly from what we have heard them discussed by hon. members who have spoken. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) this afternoon or this morning, and I think both this morning and afternoon, spoke in regard to the opposition as having applauded the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals when he was making a speech in this House. Before proceeding to discuss this question I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that so far as my observation goes the members on this side of the House have paid very little attention in their speeches to what the ex-minister said; they have worked out this problem from their own

standpoint and I think they can be excused for applauding some of the things the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said, some of the principles he enunciated. The members on the government benches have as a matter of fact taken up five or six times as much time in discussing the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals than the members on this side of the House. There is another matter to which I would like to draw attention. I notice in one of the newspapers published in Toronto, a paper which lends its support to the Grand Trunk Pacific project very earnestly and very enthusiastically, that that paper is giving out from time to time reports of surveys which are being made from Winnipeg east as far as the Quebec boundary. It is stated in that paper that these surveys are being made by the Grand Trunk Railway. I would like to inquire from the government why it is that the Grand Trunk Railway are making these surveys. As I understand it this railway is to be built by the government and as I understand the situation it seems to me the government should send out exploration parties and survey parties and that as fast as these parties are able to make reports these should be placed on the Table of this House. I would like to have some member on the opposite side of the House explain what is the reason that the Grand Trunk Railway are making these surveys and whether the government intend to act upon the surveys which are made by the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of attention to the observations which were addressed to this House by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I listened to what he had to say in regard to patriotism and I also had in my mind when he was speaking the position he took upon this question in May last. The hon. gentleman referred to the question of the patriotic motives of hon. members on this side of the House and I wish to refer very briefly to that subject. I shall read what he said :

> A first-class road from Winnipeg to Quebec and the maritime provinces for the purpose of securing the trade of the North-west for these ports—that is the object had in view by the government, that is the purpose they intend to attempt to attain ; and if our hon. friends on the opposite side wish to throw obstacles in the way of that purpose, I merely say that in that regard they are not patriotic.

I think that might have come perhaps with better grace from some other hon. member on the other side of the House. The question suggested itself to my mind when the hon. gentleman used these words whether the hon. gentleman had any recollection of document No. 4062 which was filed with Secretary Carlisle of the United States government, indexed 'Charlton, John,' on behalf of the Michigan lumber interests in which document, which was presented as a petition, the hon. gentleman undertook to advise and petition the United States government in connection with the framing of the Wilson Tariff Bill, that, in case the Canadian government imposed an export duty on logs, power should be taken under the Wilson Bill to revert to the McKinley tariff and put a higher duty on Canadian lumber ? These sentiments came with ill-grace from that hon. gentleman and I hope we will hear no more on that subject from any other hon. member on that side of the House. I think we are perfectly justified in criticising this proposition now before the House and that our patriotic motives should not be questioned.

But, the hon. gentleman was put up by the government to reply to a speech made by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and I listened with very much interest to what the hon. gentleman had to say remembering what he had said a few weeks ago on this very subject. When the hon. gentleman stood up to address the House I wondered what he was going to say. I wondered whether he would approve the government policy or disprove of it in some respects because he was clearly on record as being opposed to this scheme in May last. I wish to draw the attention of the House to what he said on that occasion. He spoke as follows :

> That trade will seek the waters of the great chain of lakes ; inevitably, during the season of navigation, that grain will be carried to Lake Superior, and improvements have been made in the construction of lake vessels and the deepening of channels between the head of Lake Superior and Buffalo, which enable forwarders to secure the shipment of wheat from Duluth or from Port Arthur to Buffalo at a ridiculously low rate as compared with rates prevalent a few years ago. For a cent and a quarter or a cent and a half per bushel, you can lay down your wheat at Duluth or at Port Arthur, and a cent and a half will put it in an elevator at Buffalo. . . . . So you have the possibility of carrying wheat from Port Arthur to New York for within three cents a bushel, or at most within four cents a bushel. Now there are conditions which render it, in my opinion, impossible at present to compete with that route. It is useless to think of hauling wheat from a point as far west as Port Arthur by an all-rail route to Quebec——

That was three months ago.

> —or to Halifax at prices such as those I quoted with regard to the American lines.

Then he went on to say :

> If, after having given to our seaports connections in the form of a railway to Quebec right through the country, and a railway from Quebec for winter communication with Halifax and St. John, we attempt in addition to affording facilities and the best facilities that can be given, roads with low grades and great capacity for hauling heavy loads—not the loads that can be hauled over the New York Central and Lake Shore of 2,000 tons to a train—to force trade over these roads we will make a mistake, because we have to allow this trade to find a natural outlet. . . . . We must

simply make with care and make efficiently provision for securing this trade in our own seaports under circumstances which are possible, having regard to our natural facilities and natural advantages.

Then he went on to say :

I do not believe that we are in a condition to-day, even if we decided to improve the Ottawa River Valley route, to decide what are the proper conditions upon which to proceed. For this reason I think the appointment of a commission to take this whole question under consideration is in the highest degree desirable, is not only desirable but is necessary. We are now confronting conditions that require careful consideration. We are called upon to inaugurate a policy and to proceed in a direction that has for its purpose the affording to the great North-west of transportation facilities. It is beyond all things necessary that we should make no false step, that we should proceed upon no false hypothesis or basis ; and for that reason it is a wise thing to appoint a commission, composed of men who are capable of examining this question and arriving at correct conclusions. We cannot do it here in an expert and scientific manner, we must rely upon the service of men of the character of those who are to be composed of this commission. Let us wait until we have the decision of these men as to the proper course to pursue.

It is said by the right hon. leader of the government that time will not wait. Well the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) is willing to wait. We had the hon. gentleman giving the House the benefit of his knowledge and talking in a way directly opposite to these sentiments. If this is the course which hon. gentlemen opposite are going to take reliance cannot be placed upon their statements. They should not change their ground quite so soon.

As far as this transcontinental railway policy is concerned I wish first to say in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway that I feel I ought to congratulate the company on having at its head a man of such marked ability as Mr. Charles M. Hays, the general manager. It would be a good thing for the North-west Territories and for the development of transportation facilities if we could get the Grand Trunk Railway into that country under the able management of that gentleman, because I think we could accomplish a great deal. I think if we could do so it would be a good thing for the North-west Territories, good for the Grand Trunk Railway Company and good for the country generally. The position seems to be, however, in regard to this project, as far as the eastern end of it is concerned, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company and Mr. Hays did not want it, that they do not want it now, that it has been forced upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company and as a result we have before us a bargain which is full of complications and is going to lead to a great amount of trouble in the future. No doubt what has given rise to the discussion of this question of increased facilities in the North-west was the congestion which took place throughout that country last fall, a congestion caused by the shortage of cars and motive power on the Canadian Northern and Canadian Pacific Railways. This is what brought about this discussion, and this is why a great deal of enthusiasm has been created over the project we now have before us. I wish to say that it was my hope, and I stated it publicly, that when the government brought before the House this transportation policy hon. members on this side of the House would find it to be their duty to support it. I felt that it was impossible for us to be opposed to it. I felt that the appointment of a commission was a step in the right direction, and I felt that we would be able to support the policy of the government. It has been charged by hon. gentlemen opposite that we on this side of the House are making the same mistake in criticising this policy of the government that the Liberals did in criticising the policy of the Conservative government in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway project. The ground which these hon. gentlemen take is false ground. They have no cause for making such statements. I submit, Sir, that the Conservative party have not made any very great errors in respect to any great national policy which they have ever propounded to this country. The Conservative party made no mistake as to our fiscal policy ; they made no mistake in regard to commercial union with the United States.

Mr. COCHRANE. No, siree.

Mr. COWAN. You made a bad mistake in 1896.

Mr. COCHRANE. The country made that mistake.

Mr. KEMP. The Conservative party made no mistake with regard to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, nor in regard to any other great national policy which they have submitted to the people of Canada. Let me point out briefly the history of this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway project. The idea seemed to prevail in certain quarters that the Canadian Northern Railway was a ripe apple ready to drop from the tree into the hands of certain men and certain financial interests, and so they prepared to gather it in. On the 24th of November last the plot or the scheme or whatever you like to call it, was launched on the public in the form of an interview given to the 'Globe' newspaper by Mr. Hays, general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway. In the 'Globe' of the following day an editorial pointed out, that the interview of the previous day was an official one given by Mr. Hays. That interview stated among other things, that the Grand Trunk Railway intended to purchase the Canadian Northern Railway, and when Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson came to Canada he also stated that such was the intention of the Grand Trunk Railway. In due course Mr. Mackenzie, of the

Canadian Northern Railway, stated that the Canadian Northern Railway would not sell out, but that on the contrary they intended to build east to Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa and Quebec. The Canadian Northern Railway proceeded to carry out its design, and they acquired the Great Northern to Quebec, and they also acquired a charter to enter New Brunswick. After this matter had been discussed in the public press for a month, and after a good deal of alarm had been expressed by the public as to whether it was the intention of the government to put through the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and also to bonus the Canadian Northern Railway, on the 24th of December the Toronto 'Globe' stated editorially that two lines would not be bonused. I take it for granted that this statement was inspired, because I do not think the 'Globe' would undertake to speak for itself on such a matter without having some indication as to what the government intended. Mr. Hays had been to Ottawa on previous occasions with regard to this matter, as reported in the public press, but on the 4th of December he came here and interviewed the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I believe there was a cabinet meeting on that day, and it was stated in an interview by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that Mr. Hays had been acquainted with the views of the government in respect to this transportation question. Nothing of moment occurred until parliament met, and then we read these words in the speech from the Throne :

> The great influx of population into our North-western Territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

That announcement was followed by the Order in Council dated May 19th, under which a commission was appointed to inquire into the transportation question and was given instructions as to what the nature of their inquiry should be. This document has been read to the House before, but the principles laid down in it are so sound and patriotic, that it cannot be read too often, and therefore I intend to submit it to the consideraion of the House. It says :

> On a report dated April 6, 1903, from the Minister of Public Works, stating that he had under consideration questions affecting the transportation of Canadian products to the markets of the world through and by Canadian ports with a view of placing the Canadian producer in a position to compete, and compete successfully, through all Canadian channels with the producers and exporters of other countries.

The minister submits that it may be assumed that grain and other products will naturally seek their markets by the cheapest routes, and therefore the method of attaining the object desired should be to make the Canadian routes cheaper and more convenient than competing routes.

That the development of North-western Canada has manifested the inabilty of existing Canadian transportation agencies to take care of Canadian products.

That our agricultural exports can only command the prices over seas to which their natural excellence entitles them when they cease to be confounded and confused with the inferior and often adulterated articles produced elsewhere ; and to preserve their separate identity they must go through Canadian channels.

The minister further states that the questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.

This involves the consideration of their transportation :—

From place of production to Canadian seaports.

From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.

From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.

From Canadian seaports to Europe

From place of production through Canadian ports on the Pacific.

As it affects the products of the eastern provinces of Canada it involves their movement :—

To the seaports.

From the seaports to Europe.

It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding :—

The conditions of original shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding such shipments.

The storage requirements of lake, river and ocean ports.

The harbour facilities of the inland lakes, rivers and Atlantic and Pacific ports.

The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally, any improvement, enlargements, or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.

The minister further states that in making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

The forces operating against the attainment of all Canadian transport, namely :—

Competition by United States railways ;

Competition by United States vessels from Lake Superior ports ;

Diversion of Canadian products through eastern outlets to Boston, Portland and other United States ports, should be investigated, and the best and most economical methods used by our competitors should be carefully studied and reported upon.

The minister apprehends that in these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its own products, and it is thought that the

most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts who may be appointed and authorized under the provisions of chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

The routes to be inquired into as within the scope of the commission were the rail and water routes, and it seems to me beyond question that it was then the intention of the government to carry out the policy which they had promised last year to the Canadian Northern Railway, by bonusing it as far as Edmonton, and then to rest until they had inquired into the transportation facilities of the country. It is natural to suppose that the government did not get expert evidence in regard to the questions involved in this document of instructions to the commission; it is natural to suppose that the government knew nothing more about the questions referred to in this document now than when they appointed this commission, which has not yet sat. Is it fair to assume, however, that no expert information has been given to the government in regard to a railway running from Winnipeg to Quebec and St. John which as a transportation medium through which the grain of the North-west could be transported in competition with other routes, is entirely impracticable and therefore if it can be shown that the government went into this scheme hurriedly, and for reasons which are not very clear to the House now, it must be assumed that had this transportation commission reported, the government would not have been able to justify their position in the eyes of the country in building the eastern end of this transcontinental railway, at all events, rather than take the chance of their transportation commission condemning the scheme as they would surely have done, they took a leap in the dark.

The idea of a transcontinental railway, running across the map as nearly as possible in a straight line, seems to have seized the members of the government and made such an impression upon them that they have worked out the proposition which we have before us. The first proposition made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company was not an unreasonable one. That proposition, as I understand it, was for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to start at Gravenburst or North Bay, to connect with the Canadian Northern system at Port Arthur, to obtain control of the Canadian Northern system, and to build a line from its western terminus to the Pacific coast. That was the first proposition brought to the attention of the House and the country, and it seems to me that it was a reasonable one for consideration. Had that proposition been carried out, a train could have started from Halifax or St. John and reached the Pacific coast without running over a single mile of the Canadian Pacific Railway track, and it would have been altogether in Canadian territory. That would have been as truly an all-Canadian transcontinental system as the one proposed, and it would not have jeopardized our credit or our finances to the slightest extent.

But, Sir, we come to this rush policy, the policy outlined by the Prime Minister in his speech, when he said that time would not wait, and that we would be landed in the shallows unless we went on and voted the money and agreed to this bargain, and carried out this work without delay, notwithstanding the fact that the government had no intention of building this eastern section of the road, according to the statement set out in the report giving instructions to the transportation commission which they were to appoint. In passing, I may say that we have heard very little from the ministers who have spoken in regard to the appointment of that commission. It cannot be that they have dropped it because Sir Wililam Van Horne would not act upon it. Surely we are entitled to know why the government are not going on with the commission, and what they intend to do in regard to the proposition for its appointment. We have had other railway projects before this country—projects involving the expenditure of a smaller amount of money than this project, and we have given them due deliberation. They have been as important in their way as this is. But here is a great project which we had no hint of at the time this House met. The country knew nothing about it, and yet the government propose this policy of rush. The Prime Minister, in speaking on this question, spoke very eloquently, and apparently with great feeling. He used these words:

> To those who urge upon us the policy of to-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow; to those who tell us, wait, wait, wait; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is: No, this is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood tide is upon us that leads on to fortune; if we let it pass it may never recur again. If we let it pass the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be arrested in the shallows.

These, Mr. Speaker, were eloquent words, and I very much enjoyed the speech of the Prime Minister from the standpoint of eloquence. But in my opinion, this kind of language was used for the purpose of chloroforming the people of the country—for the purpose of impressing them with this scheme of the government. I cannot see any other way of explaining it. The Prime Minister also referred to the position he took when the short line to St. John across the state of Maine was being discussed in this House. He read from 'Hansard' what he stated on that occasion. This is what he said:

> Well, Sir, we took strong exception to this policy and that exception was formulated in an

amendment which I myself moved from the opposition benches and which was in these words:

In the opinion of this House, additional surveys are requisite in order to a sound decision for the short line railway, and it would be premature to adopt any line before further surveys have been made.

The right hon. gentleman goes on to say:

The surveys which had been made had not been completed. The line was simply surveyed in a portion of the province of Quebec and very little in the province of New Brunswick. We therefore demanded before the policy was adopted to run that line of railway across the state of Maine, that new surveys should be made so that we might come to a better understanding of the question and arrive at a more proper decision.

Is that not in marked contrast to the right hon. gentleman's policy in regard to this transcontinental railway? He moved that the House delay action until they got more surveys and more information. Yet he comes before this House now, and he is not willing to have a survey or to obtain the slightest information on this question except what may be obtained from books in the library, but what has really very little bearing on the question of constructing a modern railway through that section of country.

The right hon. gentleman also referred to a matter which it seemed to me was outside of this discussion. He said:

I am sorry that Sir Charles Tupper did not with equal firmness insist that not only should the terminus be in Canadian territory, in Canadian waters, but that the route itself should be in Canadian territory. When he agreed that the line should be in American territory, Sir Charles Tupper went back on the heart and conscience of the Canadian people.

No truer Canadian, no more patriotic citizen, ever stood on the floor of this House than Sir Charles Tupper, and I do not believe that he went back on the heart and conscience of the Canadian people at all. I believe the government of that day were justified in building that short line railway, and I believe that St. John has become a winter port in the truest sense of the word through the building of that railway. When the right hon. gentleman spoke of Sir Charles Tupper having gone back on the heart and conscience of the Canadian people, it occurred to my mind that in the position the right hon. gentleman had taken in years gone by on various matters, he had gone back on the heart and conscience of the Canadian people. I would like to quote what the right hon. gentleman said in this House in regard to one or two things, which, when I was a young man, went back on my heart and conscience; and I regretted that a fellow-countryman of mine was capable of making the statements which the right hon. gentleman made on those occasions. The right hon. gentleman, speaking in this House on April 5, 1888, on the question of unrestricted reciprocity, upon a resolution which was moved by the now Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), as recorded in 'Hansard,' gave utterance to this sentiment:

We, on this side of the House, believe that the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) exactly meets the case; we believe that the solution of the problem is complete unrestricted reciprocity with the great nation to the south of us.

This had for its aim and object the annexation of this country to the United States, and I claim that the right hon. gentleman went back on the heart and conscience of the Canadian people by uttering such sentiments. In Toronto, September 30th, 1899, the hon. gentleman also said:

We are asked sometimes, gentlemen, what is the programme of the Liberal party. This is the programme of the Liberal party: To obtain continental freedom of trade. That is our programme at this moment. But, gentlemen, others of you will say, is that the only question? Are there no other questions pressing for solution? Yes, gentlemen, there are other questions, and important questions, too, that will soon come into the arena of active politics; but as I read history, as I read Canadian history, one great reform at a time is as much as a party can effect, and if we fix our eyes steadily on one reform and devote all our energies to its accomplishment, success will certainly crown our efforts at no distant day; fixing our eyes steadily upon the goal, we shall go on steadily until we reach it—unrestricted continental reciprocity.

The right hon. gentleman made a very eloquent speech in this House in connection with this transcontinental railway question. This speech, which he made in regard to unrestricted reciprocity, covered 51 pages of this book which I hold in my hand. He made a mistake with regard to his policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and I fancy he wishes he had never adopted such a policy. Had the hon. gentleman, however, been in the position of Prime Minister in those days, and been enabled to put this policy into effect, he would, no doubt, have done so, and would have made a great mistake. He comes before this House to-day with this great railway project, about which we know very little. On its behalf he made an eloquent appeal, perhaps not second in eloquence to the one from which I have just read an extract, but in this case, as in the other, I think he will find that he has made a mistake. Before results of this contract can be known, this and other governments will be out of power. Many members of this House will have passed away, and the country will then experience the dire results of being saddled with this contract, which we on this side are protesting against. No time for information, no time for surveys, say hon. gentlemen opposite. This project must be rushed through without information and without reflection. What mandate have the government from the people for the scheme they have submitted to us? What mandate

have they for committing the country to the vast expenditure which this project will involve, and which will result in our not having the necessary money for improving our waterways and other transportation facilities ?

The hon. the Minister of the Interior endeavoured to show that there was a demand in certain parts of the country for this project. He quoted from certain newspapers in the North-west. He quoted a resolution of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, but that resolution was not in reference to this project at all. It was rather a resolution of censure on the government for not taking any steps to relieve the congested state of affairs which existed in the North-west with reference to the transportation of grain. It had no reference to the project before the House at all, but simply called on the government to take measures to alleviate the existing conditions. The hon. Minister of the Interior also laid particular stress on a resolution of the Board of Trade of Toronto, which was passed at a meeting of the council of that board. But I would like to impress on the House the fact that that really was not a resolution of the board of trade. On the 23rd of June, the council of the board of trade did pass a resolution upon a report of a certain committee appointed to investigate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway charter. I had the pleasure of securing for the secretary of the board of trade a number of copies of the Bill in order that he might distribute then among the members of that body. Instead, however, of bringing the report upon that Bill before the council of the board of trade, the gentleman who had charge of the committee, who was chairman of the committee, and vice-president of the board—and I may say that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell), who also has the honour of sitting on the council of that board, was present, I believe, at the committee meeting—and my hon. friend from West York with others decided to bring in a resolution regarding the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway project. This resolution was brought in on the 23rd of June, when there was very little known about the project, when there was very little about it in the newspapers. But in some mysterious way or other, those gentlemen who supported this resolution, got an inkling of what the government intended to do, and in order to strengthen the hands of the government, a resolution was framed and rushed through the council, contrary to the practice which has prevailed for many years in matters of this kind. In all such matters, the usual practice has been to refer them to an open meeting of the board of trade, to which the public and the press are admitted. But in this case, there was a star chamber inquiry, and this resolution was rushed through, although it was not at all adopted unanimously. This resolution was in favour of an outlet by the shortest and cheapest route for the productions of the North-west. But it seems as though the committee must have been informed that the government would perhaps go further than they desired, for at the end of the first paragraph I see these words :

> And the advisability of competition without the extravagance of the duplication of lines.

They seem to have been possessed of the idea that the government intended to duplicate the Intercolonial Railway. They were afraid that the government would do something silly, and so guarded themselves in this way. What happened afterwards ? Mr. Peleg Howland, of Toronto, who is a good supporter of this government, and who also helped to put this resolution through the council of the board of trade, came out in an interview a short time ago, in which he said :

> I am strongly opposed to building a line from Quebec to Moncton, and I think for the present at least the Intercolonial Railway is sufficient. Personally I am not fully convinced that the time has arrived when a line should be built from Quebec to Winnipeg, but if so, then I believe it should be built and owned by the government, and running privileges given all roads desiring the same.

In an interview, Mr. J. D. Allen, vice-president of the board of trade, and who was chairman of the sub-committee, which investigated this question and brought in this resolution, heartily approved of the government's decision. But when I say that Mr. Allen, who is a good friend of mine, was the defeated Liberal candidate from West Toronto, I think I have said enough on this subject to show how it came about that this resolution came to be passed. It did not by any means, represent the opinion of the board of trade, and I believe the board of trade would not endorse the project to-day under any circumstances whatever.

Now, in regard to the matter of the transcontinental railway the Prime Minister seemed to rest his case mainly on two points, the question of the bonding privilege, and the question of carrying the products of the North-west to the seaboard in a more economical way than has been possible in the past. Take the question of the bonding privilege first. The right hon. gentleman seems to have been seized of the importance of this part of the question, and he represented to us that it is absolutely necessary, because of this bonding question, to have this railway built, although—a point which seems to have been largely overlooked—we have now two railways going through New Brunswick, the Intercolonial and the Temiscouata line, from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, and from Edmundston to St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway. The right hon. gentleman refers in his speech to the discussion which took place in this House in regard to the short line through the state of Maine to St. John,

New Brunswick. He tries to lead us to believe that the resolution which he moved at that time, had it been carried, would have prevented this railway from going through American territory. I confess, I cannot so interpret that resolution. The Prime Minister said in his speech introducing this Bill :

I am sorry to say that this motion was defeated. If it had not been defeated, if the policy which was there enunciated had been implemented, probably it would not be my duty today to ask this House to vote money for the building of another line between Quebec and Moncton, for the line would have been built on the very ground where we now propose to locate it.

The right hon. gentleman took up a great deal of time in dealing with the bonding privilege as one of the arguments in favour of this project. We all agree with the loyal sentiments he uttered. We are all loyal Canadians—it is not necessary to say that, for that is taken for granted. But I would point out to the House the position which the right hon. gentleman took with regard to this bonding question on a previous occasion. The right hon. gentleman took part in a discussion on the contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate, and his position then was directly the opposite of that which he takes to-day. The right hon. gentleman spoke on December 21st, 1880, and this is what he said, according to the 'Hansard' report :

The only point on which there is any disagreement is as to the expediency of building the whole road at once, or only as rapidly as the wants of the country require. I think it must be perfectly manifest that this section on the north shore of Lake Superior is not required at the present time, that its construction might be advantageously postponed until some future period, and that it would be quite sufficient, at present, to build the eastern section as far as Sault Ste. Marie. The fertile plains of the west are separated from the east by an extent of barren territory in the region north of the lake, while it happens that the route along the southern shore would pass through some of the best lands on the continent —through several of the most important states of the Union. Would it not be better, under these circumstances, to bring the road immediately to Sault Ste. Marie, tap the American system of railways, and secure not merely the trade of our own North-west, but a large share of the traffic from those states. This is so evident from a geographical point of view, that I will not stay to discuss it.

The policy enunciated by the right hon. gentleman on that occasion was not to build the railway north of the lakes. He was perfectly willing to take his chances on the bonding privilege, and he was also perfectly willing to cut off our great North-west from eastern Canada by making our railway connection through the United States. And he comes down now, when there is not a sign of trouble with the United States, and urges the danger of the abrogation of the bonding privilege as a justification of the whole scheme. My impression is that the Prime Minister made a great mistake in making so much of this bonding matter. It was not a good thing for us to raise the question. It is undoubtedly a great benefit to this country to have the products of the United States come to our seaports for shipment ; but it is a greater benefit to the United States to have our products go to their ports. There were times in our history when signs were not wanting that the American people might cancel the bonding privilege. But those days have long gone by. The people of the United States tried to coerce this country with a high tariff, the McKinley tariff—advocated, I am sorry to say, by some Canadians as a means of coercing Canada—they tried to force us into a commercial union with their country. But the Americans now are convinced that this policy of coercion will not succeed. They are more friendly with us now than ever before. They are holding reciprocity conventions and passing resolutions favouring closer trade relations. We have the Michigan Central Railway running through Ontario, which would be very seriously affected if the bonding privilege were withdrawn. We have the Wabash Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway also. Then it must not be forgotten that the people of New England are interested in the maintenance of this bonding privilege and would protest most strongly if it were withdrawn. We have all these railways running through Canada, helping to bring business to American ports and helping also to reduce the charges for the transportation of American products which go to the New England states. In days gone by the United States tried all their experiments of foreign policy upon this country. Now they have Cuba and the Philippines and they must have a more conciliatory foreign policy. The fact that they have launched out into colonization in this way is a guarantee of their good behaviour. In discussing this bonding question the Prime Minister laid a good deal of stress on what the New York 'Sun' had said in days gone by in reference to this question. Therefore I take the liberty of reading a few words from the New York 'Sun' to show what it thinks now on this question. A few days ago the New York 'Sun' said :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Canadian Premier, addressed the parliament at Ottawa on July 30 and formally committed the ministry and the Liberal party to the support of the Grand Trunk Pacific transcontinental railway project. Mr. R. L. Borden, the leader of the Conservatives, replied on behalf of his party, and it is quite evident that Mr. Borden had not a little the best in the argument. Sir Wilfrid's speech was of considerable length, filling in solid type an entire page in the newspapers.

We have already commented upon the merits of the proposed railway plan. A point of more important immediate interest to the American people appears in the speeches of Sir Wilfrid

Laurier and Mr. Borden in reference to the bonding privileges extended to Canadian goods in transit through the United States. Upon that question Mr. Borden had much the best of the discussion, both in point of fact and of patriotism. Sir Wilfrid advanced an argument in favour of the proposed line, evidently intended as an appeal to the patriotic sentiment of his people, that the government laid it down as a principle upon which they were willing to be judged by friend and foe alike, that Canada should have a transcontinental railway 'with its terminus on Canadian waters, and every inch of it in Canadian territory.' With all respect to Sir Wilfrid, this savours of gallery play, an oratorical display for effect only. The United States has no transcontinental railway from sea to sea, unless the 'Sunset Route,' the eastern terminus of which is at New Orleans, be counted as such. We have systems and connecting lines which make up such a route, but no through single line from ocean to ocean. Although she has only one line where we have several, Canadians or Canadian products can now go from Vancouver to Halifax without touching an inch of our soil.

From this false premise, Sir Wilfrid argued Canadian dependence for transcontinental transportation upon the good-will of the United States in maintaining the bonding privilege over American lines to American ports. Having highways of their own. . . .

Whatever Canada ships through the United States is just so much an advantage to the United States. There are also articles produced in Canada whereof an increased shipment to the United States would be of mutual advantage.

Now, the Prime Minister took the liberty of quoting from the New York 'Sun,' and I take the liberty also, and I think it shows there is very little agitation or no agitation at all and no hope on their part that the bonding privilege will be cancelled, and I think so far as that excuse for this great project is concerned it falls to the ground. At all events the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who have spoken since on that subject have referred very gingerly to this aspect of the subject as enunciated by the Prime Minister.

It was said by the Prime Minister that the eastern part of this railway would cost the country $12,000,000 and not one cent more than $13,000,000 and that the cost of the western section would not exceed $3,780,000. In this connection I would like to know why no mention is made in the contract of what the grades on this railway are to be and what the curvatures are to be? it seems to me that this is a very important thing. Supposing this railway is not built to the satisfaction of the Grand Trunk Pacific can they not say afterwards that they cannot carry grain over this line because it was not built to the proper standard? It seems to me that will be the position they can reasonably take. The argument of the Minister of Finance is that the government is going to build a cheap railway and he makes his figures fit into a cheap railway. The Minister of the Interior says it is going to be a first-class railway and is going into competition with, and will carry grain as cheaply as it is carried over any railway in the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have made up the cost of this project and I am prepared to give the details of my figures and to have them open to criticism. The first cost that I made up I thought was a little high; I had calculated the interest at three and a half per cent. I think it will cost the government more than three per cent to get money. A very large amount of money will be required and with expenses and everything I think it will go over three per cent. I do not know that it will go quite three and a half per cent, but I feel justified in stating that my figures should bear three and a quarter per cent interest. A good deal has been said about the cost of this railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. An hon. member on the government side speaking in the House to-day put the cost at $35,000 a mile. From what inquiries I have made on the subject I do not believe that a railway such as it is contemplated to build for the purpose of carrying grain with grades such as a road of this kind requires can be built for anything like that. This railroad it must be remembered runs at right angles with the rivers. There will be a great amount of bridging; the country in many places is rocky and the rocky ridges or mountains run at right angles to the route of the railway and I believe the cost will be not less than $40,000 per mile. I believe that is the figure that will be necessary to build the railway. Calculating the distance from Moncton to Winnipeg at 1,825 miles at $40,000 per mile gives the cost of that section at $73,000,000. Calculating the interest as I have said at 3¼ per cent for seven years (compounding once a year)—and in this connection I want to say that I have not brought to my help an actuary as the Minister of Finance did, I have simply figured this matter in the way I figure ordinary business transactions and the way I have been taught all my life; I cannot understand the way the Minister of Finance explained it; it seemed to me he was juggling with figures—I figure the interest on $73,000,000 for seven years at 3¼ per cent (compounding that interest once a year) at $18,317,345; and then there is an additional three years during which we are likely to have to pay interest and I assume we will have to pay interest that will make in all $27,513,282.

Then we give this road to the Grand Trunk for forty years, and they pay us 3 per cent. Now, supposing they pay 3 per cent, supposing the revenue of that road is sufficient which I doubt very much—I believe it will be found that the cost of maintenance will take everything and I do not believe the Grand Trunk Pacific will be able to pay 3 per cent, but even if they are able to pay if we have to pay 3¼ per cent that leaves in the forty years $7,300,000. The five years

of construction figured as two and a half years and 3½ per cent compound interest on $73,000,000 will give $6,086,715.

Then we have the mountain section. The Prime Minister stated in the House that the length of the mountain section would be between 600 and 700 miles. The Minister of Finance makes it less and I am taking the figures of the Prime Minister at 650 miles. Taking this at $30,000 per mile we have a cost of construction of $19,500,000 and the interest on this for seven years at 3 per cent (compounded once a year) is $4,482,540. Then for an additional three years making in all ten years we have interest of $6,706,368.

I take the Quebec bridge and terminals at $5,000,000 and this totals up to $125,606,365, not including any depreciation on account of paralleling the Intercolonial.

Then we have a liability or what perhaps some might call an indirect liability of the guarantee of bonds of the mountain section 650 miles at $30,000 per mile, $19,500,000 and 1,150 miles of the prairie section at $13,000 per mile which comes to $14,950,000, these two guarantees coming to $34,450,000. This gives a grand total of $160,056,365 including cash expenditure and liability or in other words not taking into consideration the liability but only the cash payment a debt against every family in this country of $114 calculating five to a family on our population.

I would like to point out in this connection, Mr. Speaker, to show the magnitude of this thing that the paid-up capital of all the chartered banks in this country is $76,660,301, but this railway, this project according to my figures will cost $125,606,365, leaving an excess over the paid-up capital of the chartered banks of $48,946,064.

Now, Sir, something has been said about Canadian produce going over this line and two clauses, clauses 43 and 44 have been referred to as 'the pious clauses,' and I believe that they are so in every sense of the word. I think that they cannot be enforced. I do not think it is possible under these clauses to oblige the Grand Trunk Pacific to take grain from Winnipeg to St. John and transport it to a Canadian port and I believe they will not do it.

In passing I would like also to draw attention to the fact that the distance from Montreal to St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway is 481 miles. From Montreal to St. John by Rivière du Loup and Edmundston, the line in existence to-day is 585 miles and I do not believe that the government if they build this railway through New Brunswick will get a shorter line from Montreal or Lévis to St. John, New Brunswick, than the existing lines. There was a point which was referred to in this debate by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). He gave it in a very graphic way when he said that Mr. Hays in the Railway Committee was willing to do almost anything that the committee wanted him to do.

He was willing to promise to build the road anywhere and everywhere and at any time and all times and to change his route on the suggestion of any particular section and to go on a thousand miles on the mere hint of some member of the committee.

As the hon. member for Hamilton pointed out that was the attitude of Mr. Hays before the Railway Committee, and while Mr. Hays was willing to extend this railway to Quebec or to the maritime provinces in committee he was downstairs later in the day making a bargain with the right hon. leader of the government that the government should build the road and assume the whole responsibility for its cost.

There is also another question about which we have not heard very much from our hon. friends opposite, and that is the arrangement made with the Grand Trunk Pacific as to running rights over the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Halifax and St. John. It has been said, and said very truly, that this policy of the government when carried out will largely control the policy of the Intercolonial Railway. I remember that, when a few years ago the question of selling the Intercolonial Railway to another railway company was brought up, when it was suggested that the Canadian Pacific Railway could operate the Intercolonial Railway to better advantage than the government, the people of the maritime provinces rose up in protest against any such proposition. I would like to ask if this proposition does not give the Grand Trunk Company as much control over the Intercolonial Railway as the Canadian Pacific Railway would have had if it had assumed control of the railway, and whether the Grand Trunk Railway are not going to assume control over it ?

The question of paying 3 per cent on the capital expenditure on this railway is a very important one and I have wondered if the government ever expect the railway reallly to pay this 3 per cent. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have to pay the expense of maintenance, to pay the officers' salaries, &c., and they have to put $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock upon the road which at the present prices of locomotives, freight cars and passenger cars would mean that they would put on 100 locomotives, 3,000 freight cars and 60 passenger cars. At present prices, that number of locomotives, freight cars and passenger cars would amount to $5,000,000. The ordinary rental that is charged by one railway to another for the hire of a locomotive per day is $10, for a box freight car 75 cents, and for a passenger car $4. That gives a total rental on the basis of the number of locomotives, freight cars and passenger cars that I have mentioned of $3,490 per day. I would like to find out what the agreement says in regard to the prices

the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are going to charge for the hire of their rolling stock to be used upon the railway and to ask if they cannot charge almost any price they like. If they charge at the rates which I have mentioned, the total of which is $3,490 per day, it would amount in one year to $1,273,850, or 3 per cent on $40,000,000.

Now, I come to what is perhaps the most important part of this discussion—the question of freight rates. I have said that the government have largely built up their case on the bonding privilege and on the question of being able to handle the grain of the west and I have observed that the members of the government who have spoken upon this question have referred very gingerly to the question of the bonding privilege. I noticed also that the members of the government who have spoken, with one or two exceptions, have hardly touched the question of the cost of transporting grain. The hon. Minister of the Interior, however, was willing to tackle that question and he approached it with the courage of a Napoleon. You will have noticed that a lawyer very frequently, when he expresses his opinion in regard to a question of law, is very careful as to what he says, but when it comes down to a question of this kind we have an example of a lawyer expressing his opinion in regard to a matter of this importance in a very reckless manner indeed. The hon. Minister of the Interior gave us two or three illustrations of the way he figured out this matter of transportation. He had found somewhere or another—I do not know how he came across it—but he had found, he said, that grain was carried from Kansas City to Chicago for 5 cents per 100 pounds. I understand that he gave the page of the book in which he found that statement. It is not, however, to be had in the library and I was anxious to have seen it to have found out what explanation there was for such a statement, because, as a matter of fact, no such rate exists from Kansas City to Chicago. The rate from Kansas City to Chicago is 14 cents per 100 pounds, not 5 cents per 100 pounds. The average rate from Kansas City to Chicago is not less than 12 cents per 100 pounds, and I do not think it has been less than 12 cents for a long time past. That is more than half a cent per ton per mile. The hon. Minister of the Interior then went on to say that if grain could be carried—and he built up his case on that—from Kansas City to Chicago for 5 cents per 100 pounds, you could carry it from Winnipeg to St. John for 11½ cents per bushel. It seems to me that there should be a limit to what a minister of the Crown should say in this House and can send forth to the country. I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce anything to contradict the statement I make that the rate from Kansas City to Chicago is 14 cents per 100 pounds and that the average rate is not less than 12 cents per 100 pounds. The hon. gentleman also referred to the rate on the New York Central from Buffalo to New York as being 2½ cents per bushel, but later on he said that:

> I talked with a prominent member of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange the day before yesterday, and I asked him, how that 10·85 cent rate would compare with the rates which he is now paying from Winnipeg to New York by lake and rail. He tells me that, taking into account the rate by lake and the rate by rail, and a small additional charge for extra insurance which they have to pay by reason of this mixed carriage, the rate to-day from Winnipeg to New York is 16¼ cents.

He states at the top of the column that the New York Central rate is 2½ cents per bushel, and here he says that the statement which was made to him by a prominent member of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange was that the rate from Winnipeg to New York was 16½ cents per bushel. We all know that the rate from Winnipeg to the head of the lakes is 7½ cents per bushel. We all know that the rate from the head of the lakes to Buffalo is not more than 2 cents per bushel; 7½ cents added to 2 is 9½ cents, and 9½ cents subtracted from 16½ cents is 7 which, therefore, according to his own figures is the rate per bushel from Buffalo to New York. So that, he actually says himself that the rate is 7 cents from Buffalo to New York; yet, he figures out a rate of 10·56 cents a bushel from Winnipeg to St. John, on the basis of a rate of 2½ cents per bushel on the New York Central. He then comes to the Canada Atlantic Railway and he makes up this rate of 10½ or 11 cents a bushel on the basis of the rate at which the Canada Atlantic Railway carries grain for. There is a very low rate existing at the present time on the Canada Atlantic Railway to Montreal. There is very little grain offering for carriage as last year's crop was shipped by the first of July, and the boats on the lakes are trying to get a little return cargo, they are cutting each other's throats and in that way they have got the rate down to a very low figure. In the fall when the new crop comes to be handled the rate will go up to 4 or 4½ cents a bushel from Parry Sound to Montreal. The government have built their case up largely on the basis of being able to carry grain from Winnipeg to Quebec and to Halifax and St. John. Even if we could carry grain over this road upon the most favourable conditions that it is carried over the American roads, could we attempt to compete with their lowest rates in face of the climatic conditions in winter in northern Canada, which renders the motive power of a railway engine, often from 25 to 33 per cent less, than if that engine were operating under favourable conditions on an American railroad, not taking into consideration the long rail haul over this proposed railway. We have some evidence as to what it costs to carry grain. There

was an inquiry made a few years ago by a special committee of the Senate, and the evidence was published, and I have the testimony here of Mr. G. A. Thompson, of Duluth, a man who is well posted in regard to the cost of carrying grain by water and by rail, and this is what Mr. Thompson says :

There has been a magnificent reduction in the rail rates corresponding to this table which I have shown you here, but suppose we turn now to the water rates. We find that on the Erie canal the rate is very much less. Turn to the lakes. There at the outlet of Lake Superior the records are kept very close, and in 1896 the average price received for the transportation of freight which went through the canals at the outlet of Lake Superior was ninety-one hundredths of one mill. We can state the fact broadly by saying that in general the cost of deep water transportation is only about one-tenth the average cost of rail transportation. Suppose I go, just for a moment into a little further elaboration of the figures. During that same year, according to a statement made before a meeting of the Lake Carriers' Association, the average rate of freight transportation on all the great lakes was only eighty-five one hundredths of a mill, and that mainly because there was deeper water in some of the channels below than in the St. Mary's canal and some of the outlets in that neighbourhood. Let us now find the ultimate limits of competition in order to discover the cheapest known form of transportation. A careful series of experiments conducted on the Grand Trunk Railway here in Canada some years ago showed that the actual net cost of transportation, that is exclusive of interest on bonds, &c., was five mills per ton per mile. The average net cost in 1896 on the railroads of the United States was somewhat larger than that, being nearly six mills per ton per mile. There are a few coal roads where practically all the loads are carried by gravity, and the engines are used merely for the purpose of running the empty cars back again, and on these the average cost is three and half mills per ton ; but the best rate in actual railroad transportation under ordinary conditions is four mills per ton per mile.

Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL. Does that include the long and the short haul ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. The road on which freight is carried at that low cost is the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern Railway. Coming back to the story I was starting to tell you about the two railway presidents, I may mention the name of one of them. The western man was Mr. James Hill, president of the Great Northern road. He said ' 'I have built some steamships myself. Those steamships are built to the full draught of water at the Sault. This was before the larger canals were opened. They carry twenty-seven hundred tons of freight, and they make the run from Duluth to Buffalo in three and half days, and cost an average of $120 per day. Now, in round numbers, almost as exactly as we can name it the distance from Duluth to Buffalo is 1,000 miles, and working that down we find that the cost is fifteen one thousandths of a cent per ton per mile. Turning that into figures that business men understand better than they cannot understand these microscopic rates, it means one-twenty-seventh of four mills, and that is the absolute net cost of carrying freight on the great lakes. That is to say, we do on the great lakes for $1 what it cost the best situated railway in the United States $27 to do. Therefore, without going further into these figures—I could give them by the hour, if necessary—you will agree with me in my conclusion that water transportation is the cheapest, and therefore if economy in transportation is the chief factor in the prosperity of nations, that nation which enlarges its waterways and developes them to the greatest possible extent will have done for its citizens, its producers and its consumers alike, the very best which can be done. But we are not through with these interesting matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to place one or two illustrations before the House as to what it means to carry grain at so much per ton per mile, as is referred to in that evidence. Certain hon. members have dealt with this subject on the assumption that there is no basis of cost in regard to matters of this kind. They have proceeded under the assumption that railroads have been running in Canada and the United States all these years, and that they have not yet got down to any figures as to what it costs to transport grain, and as to what they have to pay for wear and tear, for coal, for the wages of men, and for all the things that enter into the operations of a railway. This report says that the figures Mr. Thomson gives do not include the interest on the bonds. Now, if it were possible to force the grain out of the North-west over this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to the seaboard, I would like to show what it would cost to the people of the North-west, basing my calculations on what is the actual cost of transportation. As was pointed out by the leader of the opposition yesterday, the cost to the Grand Trunk Railway for hauling freight where they have return cargo, and where they have plenty of traffic, is five mills per ton per mile. I will first take the calculation at five mills per ton per mile and then I will take four mills per ton per mile, although it is quite certain that this new road can never attain to the position in this respect of the best American roads, and this gentleman says in his evidence that the best-situated railways in the United States can haul for four mills per ton per mile. I will take the calculation at five mills per ton per mile, or, a half cent per ton per mile. From Winnipeg to Quebec the distance is 1,425 miles, and at five mills per ton per mile that would mean $7.12½ cents per ton, or 36 cents per 100 pounds. The present rate from Winnipeg to Port Arthur is ten cents per 100 pounds, and from Port Arthur to Montreal eight cents per 100 pounds. I am assuming that the rate from Port Arthur to Montreal is not 3½ cents per bushel, which is a cut rate, but I am taking five cents per bushel as the rate from Port Arthur to Montreal, which I know is the current rate under normal conditions this year. Therefore the rate from Port Arthur to Montreal is eight cents per 100 pounds, and the rate from Winnipeg to Montreal would be, as I have shown, eighteen cents per 100 pounds.

The all-rail rate half a cent per ton per mile from Winnipeg to Quebec would be 36 cents per 100 pounds, whereas the present rate from Winnipeg to Montreal is eighteen cents per 100 pounds, which would leave a difference of eighteen cents per 100 pounds in favour of Montreal, as compared with any possible rate that could be charged on the new railroad to Quebec. That would mean that a bushel of wheat in Winnipeg which at present is worth eighty-five cents would only be worth 74·20 cents if carried by this new line of railway. If we had an export of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat, and if it were posible to force wheat over this railway to the extent of 50,000,000 bushels, then at a loss of 18 cents per 100 pounds it would mean a loss on that amount of wheat of $5,400,000 to the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west, at the rate of half a cent per ton per mile. Now, making the basis of the calculation four mills per ton per mile, instead of five mills, then from Winnipeg to Quebec the rate would be $5.70 per ton, or 28½ cents per 100 pounds, and that is a difference in favour of the present rate to Montreal of 10½ cents per 100 pounds. That would mean on an export of 50,000,000 bushels a loss of $3,150,000 to the farmers of the west. Now, if we attempt to force to St. John, N.B., 25,000,000 bushels of wheat over this new line, then basing the rate at five mills per ton per mile, there would be a loss on that quantity exported of $4,350,000, and on the basis of four mills per ton per mile there would be a loss of $3,000,000, calculating the present rate from Port Arthur to Montreal at 18 cents per 100 pounds. The idea of hauling grain from Winnipeg to Quebec over this road would be just as reasonable as if the Canadian Pacific Railway would talk about hauling grain from Winnipeg to Montreal to compete with the water route, with this exception, that the new railroad might possibly be a better railroad for transportation, and that is the only advantage which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad could possibly have over the Canadian Pacific Railway. But be that as it may, the Canadian Pacific Railway would never think of doing anything of the kind. I have made the calculation as to the carriage of this wheat to St. John, N.B., and if it could possibly be carried to Halifax the distance would be 100 miles greater, and the cost proportionately greater. I have read to the House the statement that it costs $120 per day to run one of these vessels carrying 90,000 bushels of grain, and hon. gentlemen can see how infinitesimal that cost is as compared with the expense of keeping up a railway.

It has been said that grain could be carried from Port Arthur to Port Colborne or Buffalo in one of these large vessels carrying 250,000 bushels, at from 1¼ to 1½ cents per bushel, but I believe that grain can be carried nearly a thousand miles from Port Arthur to Port Colborne at one cent, and from there to Montreal for two cents more, so that grain could in the near future be carried from Port Arthur to Montreal by water for a sum not exceeding three cents a bushel. In this connection I would like to say that it seems to me that it should be the policy of the government to equip Port Colborne, to build elevators, and to make further improvements there, in order that we may be able to compete with Buffalo, for the grain will come to one or other of these ports.

The Prime Minister referred to the possibility of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway carrying the products of the North-west, but the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) admitted candidly, that it was not possible to carry grain to Quebec by this road. He said there would be other things to carry. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, has there been any demand in this country that there should be a railway built for the purpose of carrying the manufactures of this country to the North-west? What business of that kind will there be for this road that any other road in existence could not carry without any increase of rolling stock or of capital or anything else? This road will not decrease the cost of carrying manufactured products to the North-west by one cent. The existing lines could carry six times as much of those products as they are carrying at the present time.

The right hon. Prime Minister made a great point of the importance of the proposed road for the shipment of manufactures to the North-west. I would like to read what he said on this point:

> For one, two, three generations, at least, and perhaps more, these new settlers will grow cereals, and probably nothing else. They will have need of everything that is required by civilized men. They will have need of clothing, furniture and every other kind of manufacture. Then, Sir, what shall we do? Shall we allow them to be supplied by our American neighbours, or shall we provide a railway which will enable our manufacturers in Ontario and Quebec to supply them with what they shall require? There is one thing above all which will be their chief need, and that is lumber. They must have lumber for their houses, their barns and their stables, and all their buildings. Where are they to get it? Not from the section of country where they live and work. The lumber is not to be had in that section.
>
> But luckily for us, the other section of the road, the section between Moncton and Quebec, is rich in lumber of every kind; and the moment the road is open, there will be established an important trade between the older sections of the country and these newer sections.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have dealt sufficiently long with the bonding question and with the grain question, and I would like to take up this question of lumber very briefly. The Prime Minister proposes to take lumber from New Brunswick to build barns for the farmers of the North-west. I wonder what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who knows some-

thing about the lumber business, would say of this suggestion. The hon. member for North Norfolk ventured to go as far east as the Timiskaming district in northern Ontario for lumber, but he thought he had better stop there, and not go any further east. The price of common pine in Winnipeg to-day is $19 per thousand feet. The cost of transporting lumber from the province of New Brunswick to the prairies beyond Winnipeg would be more than lumber is worth in Winnipeg. We all know that lumber cannot be transported any great distance without great cost, because it is such a cheap and bulky product; and yet the Prime Minister suggests that the people of the province of New Brunswick are going to send lumber over the proposed railway for the purpose of building barns for the settlers in the North-west. Why, the Lake of the Woods district, which is only a little over 100 miles east of Winnipeg, is full of lumber, and there will be no lumber whatever going from New Brunswick to the North-west, a distance of 1,600 miles. I merely mention this to show some of the astounding arguments which hon. gentlemen opposite have resorted to on this question.

Now, I feel very much interested in the building up of the St. Lawrence route. Some people ask, how is it that our canals do so little business, and that our great St. Lawrence waterway is not utilized to a greater extent than it is? Well, Sir, the reason is very clear. For many years we had no Canadian bottoms on the lakes, or at least very few, to move the grain from the west. The Americans had the business, and they managed to keep it, and it has been going to Buffalo. I have here a letter which was written to me on the 3rd of June, 1899, by a gentleman who used to be a member of this House, the late George H. Bertram. That gentleman, in the conduct of his business, and in this House, advocated the consideration of this transportation question on broad lines. In this letter he said:

> I am quite satisfied in my own mind from a thorough examination of the whole question, that the St. Lawrence route via the Welland canal will ultimately be the controlling route, as to rates, provided there are sufficient Canadian vessels to do the business, and ample facilities at Montreal for receiving and exporting the grain of the west.
>
> I quite agree that a greater necessity than ever exists to increase 'the number and capacity of Canadian bottoms at present engaged in the grain-carrying traffic upon the great lakes,' and that the government should encourage in some substantial way, the creating of a large Canadian marine capable of hauling the North-west grain.

Mr. Bertram was very anxious that the government should give a bounty on the registered tonnage of Canadian vessels to offset the duty on the fittings of vessels which come into this country, while British bottoms come in free of duty. He did not succeed in convincing the government of his views. Other gentlemen have urged the same views on the government. If the government adopted that policy we would have more Canadian bottoms on the lakes than we have at the present time. However, through private enterprise we are getting a Canadian marine together by slow degrees. There have been imported into Canada from Great Britain this year for service on the lakes thirteen new vessels, a large number were imported last year, and there have been three vessels made in this country this year. But what the government should do is to encourage by a bounty the building of Canadian vessels for service on the lakes, and if we succeeded in building up a Canadian marine, we should be able, with the improvements in our canals and waterways between the head of the lakes and Montreal, to carry our own grain at least. The situation is very encouraging at the present time. The increased tonnage of the Canadian marine is showing its results perceptibly in our exports. In the last few years the total tonnage of seagoing vessels which left the port of Montreal from the opening of navigation up to the 1st of August in each year was as follows: In 1900, 644,312 tons; in 1901, 719,082; in 1902, 726,820 tons, and in 1903, 922,911 tons. But what is more encouraging is that the total tonnage of inland vessels arriving at the port of Montreal from the opening of navigation up to the 1st of August was as follows: In 1900, 774,729 tons; in 1901, 743,926 tons; in 1902, 852,761 tons, and in 1903, 1,956,949 tons. So it will be seen that what we have long hoped for, namely, the development of the St. Lawrence route and the diversion of the grain traffic from the Buffalo route, is coming about. I have always claimed that the St. Lawrence waterway will be the regulator of freight rates, and that we shall not be obliged in future, as we have been in the past, to say that the Erie Canal and the New York Central Railway are the regulators of freight rates. But what we have to do is to equip the St. Lawrence waterway so that we shall be able to carry our own grain in competition with the Buffalo route, and when we have done that we will get American grain also, and carry that to our own seaports. The grain of the North-west is bound to come out of the country by the lakes and the St. Lawrence waterway, or by the Georgian bay, and then on by rail to Montreal; and if the Prime Minister would be a little patient, and instead of forcing on this railway to Quebec, would devote himself to improving the means of transportation by water, he would accomplish in that way what he will never accomplish by this railway. We have heard it said that grain has been carried to Quebec for 3½c. per bushel. There

is no doubt that Quebec will be a great port in the future. I am as much an admirer of Quebec as any hon. member of this House; but we do not want to go into the great expense of this proposed railway at the present time just because of the solicitation and the earnest appeals of the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister, who, rightly, no doubt, because their constituencies are in Quebec, advocate this project. If the government desired to do something of real benefit to the farmers of the North-west, let them follow the example of the Manitoba government, when they said to the Canadian Northern people, You will have to reduce the cost of carrying grain from points in the west to the head of the lakes 2, 3 or 4 cents per 100 pounds. When this bargain was made, the rate from Winnipeg to the head of the lakes was 14 cents per hundred pounds. It has since been reduced to 12 cents per hundred pounds, and on the 1st of September it will be 10 cents. If this government had undertaken, in connection with this deal, to find out what the average rates were, and said to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway: 'What you have to do is to put before us a scheme whereby the cost of carrying grain to the sea-board will be reduced one, two or three cents per hundred pounds, such a policy would have interested the people of the North-west, and carried the country. This does not in any way relieve the conditions of the North-west. It does not reduce the cost of transportation to the farmers of that country one-millionth part of one cent. But whatever this proposal may accomplish, it has led to a very interesting debate, and we have had from hon. gentlemen supporting this project demonstrations of how you can force water to flow up hill. I have given a very full statement of this question of grain rates, and challenge any member of this House to contradict anything I have said. You cannot compete with the water system of the St. Lawrence by a railway paralleling it, and I have every hope that the great bulk of the grain of the North-west will go out by way of Georgian Bay or Welland Canal, and the St. Lawrence route in the future, as well as a large share of the grain of our neighbours to the south.

When I interrupted the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) this morning, by calling his attention to the fact that this road could not carry grain in competition with the water route, he admitted my statement, but he said that manufactured products would go over it. But that will not be of any benefit, because the rates will not be reduced, as the railways now in existence can carry much more freight than they are able to secure. He also said that the Intercolonial Railway would not be handicapped because freight from the west to the maritime provinces would still go over that line. How does he make that out? The Grand Trunk Railway has a system which gridirons Ontario, which gathers the manufactured products from most of the cities and towns of Ontario, and the Grand Trunk Railway will take that freight to Lévis, over its own road, and will not haul it over the Intercolonial Railway. It will do what it can to earn the interest it will have to pay the government.

Again, it is said by hon. members that if we cannot take grain over this road in the summer, we surely will take it in the winter. But grain does not go out of our North-west or the American west in the winter time to any great extent. The transportation rates are so high that it pays better to store it away until the spring. Grain is sold for certain deliveries, and as much as possible is forced out of the country in the fall. What is left is held in the elevators, and the cost of carrying it in the elevators is very much less than would be the cost of taking it out in the winter.

The hon. Minister of Justice said that the day was dawning when the city of Quebec would get justice. Well, I want to see that city get justice, and I believe that the port of Quebec will benefit by the transhipment of grain, and the increased tonnage of ocean vessels which will go there. But I say that it will not be practicable to send grain to Quebec by this route. What the government should do, and what I would urge the hon. minister to advocate, is to improve the St. Lawrence system, so that vessels may go to the St. Lawrence ports just as easily and as safely as to any port on the continent, and also to improve our canal system. If that be done, the port of Quebec will be sure to reap a large share of profit.

The government have no mandate to push through this scheme at present. I believe that they should proceed along the line they laid down at the opening of the session, and appoint a commission. I look upon the government as occupying the position of trustees, and I cannot see how they are going to justify themselves before the people, when they have rushed into this project without having any expert knowledge of the cost of carrying the grain and other products, and of the capabilities of the country through which this railway will go. The have absolutely no knowledge of the conditions except the meagre information which they have placed before us, and are therefore not justified in going on with this project.

A good deal is said about diverting traffic and making it run from east to west or west to east, instead of from south to north, but in this connection you must not consider railway facilities only. In fact railways only occupy a minor position with regard to this matter. You must have your tariff so arranged that the products of the United States will not go from the south to the north. You must adjust your tariff to suit Canadian industries, and then you will have traffic for your railways

running east and west. The questions of fiscal policy and transportation policy go hand in hand, and the government will do well to consider these two questions as one. I am sorry to say that the government are weak on the tariff question, just as they have shown themselves weak on the question before the House. They would not have shown themselves weak with regard to the project before us had they followed out their original policy of appointing a commission to inquire into the whole question of transportation. A good deal has been said about wild speculation. We have heard of loan companies and private individuals going into wild speculations and gambling in stocks; but I would like to know if a more impulsive unconsidered thing was ever done by a private individual than has been done by this government, when, in a few weeks, it jumped to a conclusion and placed the project we are now discussing before this House. I would like to know if there is any record of anything of the kind having ever before been done by the government of any civilized country. If you take the cost of the railway at $125,000,000, and add that to our national debt, it brings our national debt up to the sum of nearly $400,000,000. It makes the liability to which we are committing ourselves in one session of parliament, including the guarantees we have assumed, including the estimates of this session, which I put at $65,000,000, including the guarantee of the Montreal harbour bonds, and the Canadian Northern Railway bonds, including all these, it makes a liability which we are incurring in one session, of $237,350,365. What I would like hon. members on the other side to give their attention to, when discussing this question, is the appointment of a commission on the transportation question. I would like them to explain why it was not appointed. Let us know the reasons which made the government go back on that policy? I would like to have them also show, if they can, that the figures I have given of the cost of transporting grain to the sea-board are wrong. I would like to know also how lumber can be brought from New Brunswick to points west of Winnipeg, and how the grain which the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will bring from the lakes is going to Canadian seaports. I would like to have the government show how the farmers of the North-west are going to be benefited to the slightest extent by this project? Where the grain and the other produce of the North-west are going, while the eastern section is being constructed, and after the western section has been completed? I would also like to know if it is necessary, in connection with a great national project of this kind, that a corporation should come to this government or any government with terms, conditions and schemes. Surely if we were going to build a great transcontinental railway we should have had an opportunity of making our own plans and specifications and asking for tenders on those plans and specifications in a business-like way.

Mr. Speaker, I must apologize for having taken up so much of the time of the House. I did not intend to speak so long. In bringing my remarks rapidly to a close, I would say that there are two things which it is desirable to keep in mind. The first is to send Canadian goods through Canadian channels to the seaboard, and the other is to provide low rates in favour of the producer of the west. The result of the government's policy will be to send goods for years by way of Chicago, as the line to Quebec will not be built, and, even if it were finished, it would not be able to take the business. Moreover, the scheme will not reduce the cost of transportation. I shall be glad to have any Ontario members like my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) defend this scheme from an Ontario standpoint. I am especially interested in seeing some of my friends on the other side from Ontario attempt to defend this scheme along the line on which the government have attempted to defend it.

I am in favour of providing the west with all the transportation facilities necessary. We must adopt a generous policy with regard to Manitoba and the North-west Territory. As this scheme stands, the most objectionable part is the eastern portion of the line. That is an impracticable scheme; the road will only be a sink-hole for all time to come, and a burden upon the country. What the country wants is adequate transportation facilities to the North-west and cheaper rates. This road will be a burden upon the people of the North-west as well of the rest of this country; it will not realize the millioneth part of a cent, so far as reduction in freight rates is concerned. The effect of it will be to place the Intercolonial under the control of the Grand Trunk. The distance is not likely to be materially shortened between Montreal or Quebec and St. John or Halifax. Even if there is a shortening of the distance to the extent of 60 miles on a transcontinental railway 3,600 miles in length, this shortening of the distance will be of no practical value. The people have not shown that they are in favour of this scheme; they have not petitioned for it. There is every reason to believe that they are against it. If the government reduced the freight rate two or three cents a hundred, that would have pleased the people and would have been a good business proposition. The result of the policy of the government with regard to this scheme will be that the western part of the road will be in operation many years before the eastern part. A channel for trade through the United States will be established, a channel that we do not now use. And even when the whole railroad is

in operation, it will not be able to carry the grain in competition with the water route. I would also like to refer to sections 42 and 43 of the contract which I have referred to as the pious clauses. I would point out that there is a dispute between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial in reference to the wording of the traffic agreement now existing between them. I believe that the Grand Trunk will interpret that agreement strictly according to the legal and technical wording of it, and I think that nothing less can be expected than that they will do so. What I would do would be to improve the St. Lawrence water-way so as to take a large share of our trade to the seaboard, and, when this was done we could get a larger share of the American trade. This is not a party question. It it too serious to be handled in that way but impartially and carefully. I again appeal to the government to reconsider the question of the eastern portion of the road. That portion will not answer anything that is expected of it as an addition to the transportation facilities of this country. I hope that in the interests of the country, in regard to that part of the scheme, at any rate, the government will see their way clear to reconsider it, and, having withdrawn it, will secure expert evidence which will enable them to develop a plan more in accordance with the interest of the country as a whole.

Mr. JAMES J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, from certain articles I have seen in the newspapers and from information received from other sources, I am led to believe that a good deal of misapprehension exists in the minds of some persons in the province from which I come in regard to this national transcontinental railroad. I deem it my duty, therefore, to remove, if I can, some of this misapprehension. In my judgment the strongest and ablest—certainly the strongest—speech in this House against the proposed scheme, was that delivered by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). I believe that it was the speech that had the most effect in the country. This was not entirely due to the speech itself, but was, in my opinion, due to the fact that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals had been for many years associated with the Liberal party and had been for seven years a member of the government and the head of the Department of Railways and Canals. The part of that speech which appeared to the hon. gentleman himself, I think, to be the strongest, that part at least, on which he laid the most emphasis, was the part in which he alleged the undue haste, unwarranted and unexampled haste with which this project had been sprung upon parliament and the country. He said there had been no demand, from any party or any province of the Dominion, that there was no need of the railway, and he could not understand what induced the government to proceed with it. In order that there may be no misunderstanding on this point, I will, with your permission, read a short extract from the hon. gentleman's speech, which was delivered on the 11th day of this month :

> The government of this country, realizing the enormous magnitude of this measure ; realizing that it is perhaps a measure without parallel in the history of this country ; realizing that no question so momentous in its nature, and involving such large responsibilities on the country had ever been presented to parliament since the confederation of the provinces of British North America ; realizing also that this decision and determination to carry this project through, if it could be carried through this parliament, and if the assent of the country could be secured for it ; realizing all this, my right hon. friend very naturally felt that the people of the country would expect that some satisfactory explanation should be furnished, as to why, with such unusual and such unexampled haste a measure of this magnitude and this character had been pressed upon them. My right hon. friend, realized this as any one with the same responsibilities and occupying the same position would have realized it, and therefore, we observe that the very first feature of this whole question to which the Prime Minister directed his attention, was to repel if possible the charge, or to answer if possible the accusation which must have entered into the mind of almost everybody from one part of Canada to the other, that this question had been sprung with undue haste and without deliberation. The right hon. gentleman undertook an answer to that phase of the case, and I will give the House in his own words the answer which he gave. Let me tell the House in the first place, however, wherein it was that the right hon. gentleman did not offer an explanation of his course. He did not deny that there had not been deliberation ; he did not affirm that the government of the country had availed itself of all proper sources of information, and had waited until they had exhausted all the means in their power to ascertain what the conditions were in the various portions of the country which this road was to traverse ; he did not tell us the need which had arisen for us to jump headlong into a scheme of this kind ; he did not tell us that he had summoned to his assistance the wisest counsels which the country could afford ; he did not tell us that he had sought the assistance of experts in order to know what the traffic conditions were which would make this railway desirable ; he did not even pretend to tell us that he had done these things. . . . . I have been a willing listener to any demand of this kind, and I am bound to say I have not heard any great outcry for another transcontinental line from ocean to ocean. I do not know where the cry was made that it reached others. It was not made, at all events, so that it reached me. . . . .
>
> I make bold to say that there is no evidence that the people of this country demand this legislation. I will commence with the province of British Columbia and ask you : Is there any call, loud or weak from the province of British Columbia that another railway should be put through the passes of the Rockies and carried to Fort Simpson ? If there is, I have not heard it. I would like to see the proof that can be brought in support of any such statement. Such a feeling does not exist.

vince of Ontario ? Have we heard even a whisper of it before this thing was suggested?

Now, Sir, in the course of his remarks he further said that there was no demand from the great province of Ontario, that there was no demand from the North-west Territories and that in fact there was railway accommodation in the North-west Territories for 5,000,000 population ; there was no demand from British Columbia. But was the hon. gentleman of that opinion a few months ago ? Some seven or eight months ago he was on the Pacific coast and this is what he was reported to have said in reply to an address from the Victoria Board of Trade, and I presume the hon. gentleman gives utterance to sentiments there in accord with the views of the Board of Trade which he was addressing. This was on the 9th of October and he said :

There is no country where the soil is more fertile than in the millions of acres in Canada which the plough has not yet touched, and which man has not yet invaded. Railways were necessary to open up these great fertile tracts. If we are to invite the people from the world outside to immigrate here, they have a right to expect that the government can assure them the means of transportation. That means a great many railways in many parts of Canada and we feel as a government that we have ample justification in going to all reasonable lengths to meet this need. The tide of immigration was just setting in full and strong towards Canada particularly from the south, and he believed the time was near when there would be a greater immigration than ever before to Canada from the motherland. This influx of settlers he said, must bring its problems ; it meant an increase of soil production and necessarily of means of transport. We cannot long remain content with only one transcontinental line.

It cannot come fast enough to satisfy me and I am doing all I can in my small way without public pretense about it to ensure its construction.

There are young men, perhaps the middle aged men, who are listening to me who will live to see four transcontinental lines running through Canada. And they will not see more than enough.

That was on the 9th of October. Did the hon. gentleman change his opinion a little later ? Of course up to this time he could not have heard of the resolution passed by the Truro Board of Trade, of the resolution passed by the Halifax Board of Trade, of the resolution passed by the Moncton Board of Trade, of the opinions expressed by the leading merchants of Montreal and other cities, of the resolutions passed by the Toronto Board of Trade, of the many articles which appeared during the previous months in the leading newspapers of the country and the expressions of opinion that had been received from various bodies.

But on the 24th of November the hon. gentleman was still of the same opinion. He gave an interview to the 'Mail and Empire.' On that day the 'Mail and Empire' correspondent 'asked the minister to-night if he had at the time in his mind the possibility of the extension of the Grand Trunk to the Pacific coast,' and Mr. Blair replied :

Well, so long as the subject is one now of public knowledge I may frankly say that I knew what was coming. Mr. Hays has discussed the matter with me on several occasions, but until a definite conclusion was reached by the company I did not feel at liberty to speak of it. I am free to confess that in my judgment the development of the Canadian North-west and British Columbia will be so rapid in the next few years as to afford ample traffic for three transcontinental lines, and I am glad to know that the Grand Trunk Railway Company seeks to share in that development. To build a railway from Gravenhurst or North Bay through New Ontario, across Manitoba and the territories to the Pacific coast via the Pine or Peace river passes—the route which, I believe, the Grand Trunk Railway contemplates to adopt—cannot be less than 2,500 miles. It is a pretty big undertaking but it has been done before, and can certainly be accomplished again.

The hon. gentleman did not believe on the 24th November last that there was ample railway accommodation in the North-west Territories for 5,000,000 of people.

But perhaps as that is some seven or eight months ago he changed his mind a little later on ; of course every man has a right to change his mind if he wants to. But here is what I find. I find that he did not change his mind up to the 13th of July. Of course I believe the hon. gentleman had very considerable objection to the extension of the line from Quebec to Moncton, but even for that piece of road he had not an insuperable objection. He had no particular objection as you will see by his letter to the Premier to the building of the line from Quebec to the Pacific ocean. On the 13th of July, he says :

As I have said, I am in favour of the whole line being built and owned by government ; but having abandoned any expectation in that regard I am equally in favour of the whole line being a company line, if any portion of it, or a substantial portion, is to be a company line, and therefore I am prepared, since Council has determined to go forward with this undertaking at once, to co-operate with my colleagues in guaranteeing the bonds over the whole line to an extent not exceeding three-quarters of the cost of the construction of the railway.

The hon. gentleman seems not to be unalterably opposed to guaranteeing the bonds of the whole line at least from Quebec to the Pacific coast. He was not opposed to the extension of the line from Quebec to St. John, no not entirely opposed to that even, although later on he said it would parallel and destroy the Intercolonial. But on the 3rd of June, I find the hon. gentleman voting in the Committee on Railways and Canals for the line to be extended to St. John. Now in my opinion if the building of this line from Quebec to Moncton will destroy the Intercolonial, will parallel the

Intercolonial, will duplicate the Intercolonial, the building of it to St. John would certainly have that effect to the same degree. Now, Sir, as I have said, in the speech made by the hon. gentleman on the 11th of this month, he dwelt particularly and emphasized strongly his principal objection to that portion of the line between Quebec and Moncton and he said it would destroy the Intercolonial and I think the hon. gentlemen opposite who have followed him since have largely followed his views in that respect up to last night. I am bound to say that last night the hon. the leader of the opposition said he would not oppose the building of the line from Moncton to Quebec for or from Moncton to Lévis which is practically the same thing so that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals is thrown over by his friends at least to that extent. Now, Sir, would this line if built from Lévis to Moncton parallel and destroy the Intercolonial ? The only way it could do that I apprehend would be by taking trade and traffic from the Intercolonial and it could only do that if it were a shorter and better road. Now, our hon. friends opposite, most of them, say that it is almost impossible if not altogether impossible to build a road there that will be much shorter and that it is impossible, almost if not entirely impossible to build a road that will be equal to the Intercolonial so far as grades and curves are concerned. So that when they say that this road will take traffic from the Intercolonial Railway and at the same time that it will not be as good a road as the Intercolonial Railway they are proving too much and they are contradicting themselves. But, why will this line destroy the Intercolonial Railway ? According to the arrangements that have been made it will hand over to the Intercolonial Railway the transcontinental traffic that it will bring from the west, traffic which the Intercolonial Railway would not and could not obtain in any other way, traffic that it has not now, that it never had and consequently as far as that goes it will be an advantage to the Intercolonial Railway. It will not, of course, take away any local traffic from the Intercolonial Railway. Nobody has said that it will do that and it will not to any large extent take away any through-traffic from the Intercolonial. The Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway at the present time have an agreement which will run for upwards of ninety years that the Grand Trunk Railway has to deliver at Montreal all the trade it gathers up in the province of Ontario and at points west of Montreal which is destined for points east of Montreal to the Intercolonial, and while that agreement lasts no other railway could take away that trade that the Intercolonial Railway now gets. But, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) last night said that he was not opposed to the building of another road from Moncton to Quebec, but that he would have it a government road. Then, if that were carried out the government would have two roads on its hands from Quebec to Moncton. The government would then have to hustle to provide traffic for two roads instead of one. Would that not injure the Intercolonial Railway if it could be injured ? Under the present arrangements when this road is built and leased to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company the government need not worry any more about it. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has to provide traffic for that road and the government can turn its attention to the upbuilding of the Intercolonial Railway, and surely the government will be as efficient in the future as it has been in the past. The hon. leader of the opposition last night stated that he was not opposed to the building of a line from Quebec to Winnipeg but he said he would make it a colonization road. Surely, it would be well if the road were built to make it both a colonization and a transcontinental railway. Why not use it for both purposes ? Would there be any objection to having transcontinental freight going over it and at the same time making it a colonization road? The hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken appear to be in favour of building a line from Winnipeg to North Bay. That would have no effect at all in accomplishing the object we have in view. The traffic that the Grand Trunk Pacific under these circumstances would bring down as far as North Bay would find its way to Montreal and Toronto and ultimately to Portland. Would that be a desirable thing? That is what we are anxious to prevent. If we can carry that traffic to our own country and ship it from our own ports would that not be a desirable thing to do ? Particularly as the road from Winnipeg to North Bay would cover about three-quarters of the whole distance would it not be well to go on and build the other fourth and thus complete the road to Quebec, an ocean port on the river St. Lawrence, especially as this road will bring Quebec as near to the wheat fields of the North-west Territories as Montreal now is with the existing lines. In addition to that Quebec is 180 miles nearer the ocean than Montreal and the traffic that goes over the Grand Trunk Pacific as far as Quebec must either be shipped by Quebec or sent on to some maritime province port. It cannot then go out to a foreign port. But, it has been said that it will be impossible to carry grain by this line from the North-west Territories. Sir Wm. Van Horne has been quoted as saying something to the effect that no railway would voluntarily carry grain from the wheat fields of the North-west to Montreal and to the ocean ports. As a matter of fact, according to the statement made by the hon. Minister of the Interior and even by the hon. leader of the opposition himself, large quantities

of grain are now being carried by rail from the North-west Territories. Although he is an experienced railway man Sir Wm. Van Horne is not the only man in Canada who is an authority upon these questions. There are other railway men who are second only if they are second to Sir Wm. Van Horne. There is the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. Hays. He surely has had some experience. There is Mr. Wainwright and Mr. McGuigan who assist Mr. Hays in the management of the Grand Trunk Railway and they claim that grain can be carried by this route. They do more than make that claim; they are willing to put their money into the enterprise and back it up by their reputations as business men and railway men, and according to the ex-Minister of Railways they will put $28,000,000 of their own money into the undertaking. Whether grain can be carried or not, certainly, in the estimation of these men, sufficient traffic will go over this road to enable this company to pay interest on the cost of construction for forty-three years out of the fifty. That to my mind is the strongest possible proof that can be adduced in favour of the building of this road. When you get a company, like the old Grand Trunk Railway Company of this country, and when you get capable railway managers, like Mr. Hays and those who are associated with him, going into this enterprise and agreeing to operate the road, to keep it up to a high standard of efficiency, to pay all the operating expenses and to pay interest on the cost of construction for forty-three years it shows that in their estimation, at all events, it is going to do business. We need not worry very much about what kind of business it is going to do. It must not be forgotten that there are other kinds of trade in Canada besides the business of carrying grain. There is another industry in the North-west Territories that is perhaps second only to the business of grain growing. I refer to cattle raising. The great ranches of the North-west Territories are only beginning to be used and when better facilities are given to the people who are in the ranching business for getting their cattle out to the markets of the world, an enormous development will take place in that business as it will in other businesses in which the west is engaged. Last year ten million dollars worth of cattle were shipped out of the country, and a large portion of the cattle shipped from the North-west could not find sufficient railways to carry them east and, I think, 30,000 head had to go through the United States and be carried by United States railways to the seaboard. Is that a desirable state of things ? It is possibly true that grain during the summer months will take the lake route in preference to the rail route, but cattle cannot be carried by way of the lakes. The cattle must travel by rail the whole way from the point where they are raised to the point where they are embarked on the ocean, and it is therefore necessary that we should provide facilities for handling this large traffic. Then, there is another industry that would be very important as far as this railway is concerned and as far as the settlers in the North-west Territories are concerned. That is the lumber industry. It is impossible, according to the information that I have received, according to information that has been given to this House and according to what we know, that the North-west Territories can be settled, that immigrants can go in there, and live unless they can get lumber with which to build their houses and barns and other buildings that are necessary for them. This road when built will go through the great lumber regions of northern Ontario and Quebec, and through the mountain districts of British Columbia and will be enabled to carry lumber to the settlers on the plains. This of itself will give rise to important industries. The establishment of mills on these rivers in northern Ontario and in British Columbia where this lumber would be manufactured, will give employment to thousands of hands and call for the investment of ten of thousands of dollars.

But, the point which most concerns the province from which I come and for that matter the other provinces, I suppose, is the financial aspect of this question, and that is the point which has been most misrepresented by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Finance went pretty fully into this question and anybody who followed him closely ought to have a good knowledge of the financial side of this proposition. I need not say that the words of the Finance Minister will be accepted in this House and in this country pretty generally. He showed conclusively that $13,750,000 now invested in interest-bearing securities would provide sufficient money to meet all the demands the government would be bound to meet in connection with this transcontinental railway. There is another way of looking at the question. It appears to me that our friends opposite ignore the fact, wilfully ignore the fact, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will meet its obligations. There is no doubt in the minds of sensible men in Canada that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will meet the obligations, because it will have deposited with the government before it commences its construction at all, a guarantee of $5,000,000 in cash or in securities that will remain in the hands of the government until the road is completed up to within $5,000,000 of its total cost. That money will only be released by the government in instalments in order to enable the company to finally build and equip its road. In addition to that, the company puts at least $30,000,000 of its own money into the enterprise. The government guarantees the bonds on the prairie section, but is not responsible for any interest in any shape or manner as regards

that section, so long as the company will meet its obligations. The government guarantees the bonds on the mountain section to the extent of not more than $30,000 per mile, or three-fourths of the cost, and it will pay the interest on that guarantee for seven years.

Now, Sir, let me refer to the part of the road which will be built by the government itself from Moncton to Winnipeg. It is said that that road will be between 1,700 and 1,800 miles in length, and I will take the longest mileage on which to base my calculation. The ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) estimated that it would cost $35,000 per mile to build that section. In criticising the project from his standpoint, it was to his interest to put the cost of the road as high as possible, and I think most people in the country will come to the conclusion that he did so. Experienced railway men have said that it will not cost more than $25,000 per mile, but be that as it may, I will take the figures given by the ex-Minister of Railways. Now, 1,800 miles of railroad at $35,000 per mile would amount to $63,000,000. I am sure that in the opinion of every reasonable man in this country, that will include the interest during the time of construction and everything up to date when the road is finished. The cost of that portion of the Quebec bridge which can be debited to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, according to the estimate of the Finance Minister, will not exceed $2,000,000. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier estimated that the total cost of the Quebec bridge is $5,000,000. but as four or five other railways will use that bridge, that portion which can be debited to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ought certainly not exceed $2,000,000. We have then as the total cost of the railway, and bridge included, $65,000,000. The interest on this amount at three per cent for seven years is $13,650,000. That is the total charge the government will have to meet, because at the end of seven years the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway takes over the road and pays the interest on the cost of construction from that time forward for the balance of the fifty years.

The mountain section is estimated at 480 miles, and supposing it is 500 miles long, then at $30,000 a mile or a total cost of $15,000,000 and the interest on that for seven years would be $3,150,000, or a total cost to us altogether of $16,800,000. That I submit is the largest amount for which the government of this country becomes responsible. It is the outside figure, because at the end of fifty years, when the bonds for the building of this railway will have matured, does any intelligent or reasonable man in Canada suppose that the railway will not then be worth a great deal more than it cost, and if the government of that day sees fit to operate the railway, will it not be worth more to the government than it has cost ; or if the government of that day will operate the railway they will certainly get a rental for it far in excess of three per cent, and possibly twice that amount. The development of the country by that time will have been such that the railway will certainly be more valuable than when it was constructed. Now then, would this $16,800,000 be an enormous sum for the people of this country to meet ? Suppose we take it over and divide the population of Canada into it. The population of Canada at present is upwards of 5,500,000, and before we are called upon to pay any large contribution to this railway our population will have reached 6,000,000. That would just amount to $2.80 per head. If the people of this country had to pay $2.80 per head in one year, would it bankrupt them ?

Mr. BUREAU. Not much.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). I think it was the hon. member for East Grey who said that the burden placed upon the people of this country by this proposed railway would precipitate his constituents into the yawning abyss of financial ruin.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Oh, my.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). Well, the statement of the hon. gentleman was a very strong statement in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. I said that according to the estimate I made of the obligations incurred by us, it would represent from $100 to $125, standing against each family in the country, which might fairly be regarded as a mortgage on the farm of every farmer as long as the youngest member of the family was alive.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). I cannot possibly see how $16,800,000 would represent a mortgage of $125 on each family in the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. member pretend to say that the eastern section can be built for $16,000,000 ?

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) I do not say that, but I say that that sum will be the interest for seven years.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman aware that we must borrow the money ?

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.). Yes, I am aware of that. Well, now, we are not called upon even to pay this $2.80 per head in one year, because it will be spread over a period of fourteen years, and we will be asked to pay it in fourteen annual instalments which will amount to just 20 cents a year for each one of our population. Twenty cents a year per capita the people of this country will have to pay in order to provide a transcontinental railway from Moncton to the Pacific ocean.

Mr. HENDERSON. Cheap enough.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) Yes, it is cheap enough; it is an excellent bargain. I do not think there is a man in this country who will have to mortgage his farm in order to raise that 20 cents. I do not think there is a farmer in Ontario who will have to do so; I know that there is not one in Prince Edward Island. But shall we have to pay the 20 cents even? No. Before the 14 years will have expired, our population will have at least doubled. Some people think it will have trebled. I believe that hon. gentlemen opposite agree that it will at least have doubled; and consequently our per capita contribution to this railway will be cut in two, and will be down to 10 cents. But during a portion of that time our population will be no more than 6,000,000, so that I suppose it will be fair to strike an average, and say that our contribution during the 14 years will be 15 cents per capita per year. What do we get for that? We get a transcontinental railway, a railway from ocean to ocean.

But this is not all of the financial aspect of the question. This railway will pass through 1,200 miles of fertile territory in the North-west, throwing open to settlement from 25,000,000 to 50,000,000 acres of land. It will be a conservative estimate to put upon that land the value of $3 an acre. The hon. Minister of the Interior the other evening stated that he felt justified in saying that before ten years will have elapsed, the Interior Department will have sold 20,000,000 acres of land to settlers for at least $3 an acre in consequence of the building of this transcontinental railway. So that the railway will return directly to the treasury of this country from the land sales alone three or four or five times what the people of the country will be called on to pay for the building of it. That money will remain in the treasury or be used for the necessary public works throughout the country, and at the end of the fifty-year period, if the people of the country had to pay the bonds on which the money to build this railroad was borrowed, long before that period would have elapsed the money that would come from the land sales in the North-west in consequence of the building of the railway, would more than provide for the lifting of those bonds, and the railway would not therefore cost the people of this country one cent. The increased value of the lands through which the railway will pass will more than pay for the railway.

There is another way of looking at the matter. Will any man in this House deny that this country will do a largely increased business in consequence of the building of this railway, that it will induce immigration to come to this country, and $100,000,000 of capital? Surely this will give a great impetus to the trade and commerce of the country, and what will be the profits the people will derive from that increase of trade? I am inclined to think that it will be at least three or four times what we shall be called on to pay. The position appears to me to be something like this. If a farmer or a merchant or a manufacturer, or any man doing business in Canada, were morally certain that by enlarging his plant, increasing his machinery, putting up more buildings, perhaps doing a little judicious advertising, his business would be so much increased that the profit on the increased business would more than pay the interest on the expenditure, would any progressive business man hesitate to make that expenditure; and that to my mind is the position of this country with regard to the financial aspect of this railway.

It was said that this will parallel the Intercolonial; but that cry has been dropped, and it is said now that it will duplicate it. As the hon. leader of the opposition has said that he is not opposed to the building of a railway from Quebec to Moncton, the statement that this road will parallel and destroy the Intercolonial will certainly have to be dropped or modified. But are there any other places in Canada where railroads parallel or run close to each other which have been built by the people of this country? There are certainly many cases, and yet we never heard this cry raised before, that the railroads were paralleling or destroying each other. The Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Pacific from Quebec to Moncton will average sixty miles apart. Let us compare them with other railroads which run close to each other. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic from Ottawa to Montreal are on the average sixteen miles apart. The Canadian Pacific, when it had only one line from Ottawa to Montreal, was not satisfied with that, but built another line; and there is also river navigation between these two cities. So that there are three lines of railways and the river between Ottawa and Montreal, and I suppose they all find trade. Then the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto are on the average only twenty-five miles apart, less than half the distance between the proposed railway and the Intercolonial. The Grand Trunk and the Canada Atlantic from Montreal to the Georgian bay are on the average sixty miles apart; the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern between Winnipeg and Port Arthur are on the average sixty miles apart; yet, these railways are not said to parallel one another.

It may be said, and it has been said, that the people of Prince Edward Island will get no benefit whatever from the building of this railway; but I have this to say, that the province of Prince Edward Island is an integral part of the Dominion of Canada, and the people of that island, if I understand them, and I think I do, are willing to pay their fair share of whatever is

required to provide the necessary public works throughout the Dominion of Canada for the development of the trade of the country, knowing and believing that their fellow-Canadians in the other provinces will give what is fair and reasonable to enable them at least to overcome the natural disadvantages and difficulties which are incidental to their insular position, and to provide the necessary public works in that province.

There are some things that we greatly require in Prince Edward Island, and I take this opportunity of presenting in a few words some of the needs of that province. At the time of confederation it was stipulated in the terms of union that we would have continuous and efficient steam communication, winter and summer, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and an efficient up-to-date telegraphic service. Well, Sir, reasonable efforts have been put forth to provide these requirements in the past; but I must say that these stipulations have not been carried out in their entirety. We are not unreasonable in our demands. What we require now is a third winter steamer. Our trade has grown so fast and I am sure the members from the other provinces will be glad to hear that the development of Prince Edward Island is going on as rapidly as that of the other provinces of the Dominion; so that where a few years ago we required only two steamers to accommodate our trade we now require three. The cost of a third steamer will not be large, and she could be used in the fishery protective service in the summer, and for communication between the island and the mainland in the winter. We have been demanding improved telegraphic communication for several years. Our present telegraphic service is open only twelve hours out of the twenty-four on week days, and is closed every Sunday. In that respect we are a very exemplary people. And it costs one hundred per cent more to send a telegram to or from the island than it does on the mainland. These are grievances that ought to be removed and removed quickly; and while we are willing to contribute our fair share to the construction of public works necessary for the development of the other provinces, we ask our brother Canadians in those provinces to contribute sufficiently to overcome these difficulties to which I have referred and which are incidental to our insular position. In addition we require a few more miles of railway accommodation in order to carry on our business, and I would impress on hon. members, what many of them do not seem to know, that the people of Prince Edward Island built and paid for their own railway at the time of confederation. Consequently, when we are contributing to the construction of railways in the other provinces we have a claim on them for reasonable railway accommodation in our own.

But will the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific be of any direct advantage to the farmers of Prince Edward Island? I believe it will. It will certainly develop the coal, iron and steel business of Nova Scotia such as nothing else could do. We know how valuable the markets of Sydney and other towns of Nova Scotia have been to our farmers during the last few years. We know that anything which will build up the towns and cities of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and thus provide a market for the products of Prince Edward Island, will be of the greatest advantage to the farmers of that island. The larger markets which will be given to us in Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and New Brunswick, by the construction of this railway, will repay us three or four times at least our contribution towards its construction. These are the chief reasons why this project appeals to my support.

The leader of the opposition last night laid before this House an alternative proposition. He proposed to extend the Intercolonial to Georgian Bay or to purchase the Canada Atlantic Railway and then build from Georgian Bay to Sudbury. He proposed also to acquire by purchase the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, and to spend large sums on the improvement of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to Winnipeg and on improvement of the Canadian Northern from Fort William to Winnipeg. He did not tell us, nor has any gentleman opposite told us, what all this would cost; but in my judgment it would cost at least as much as this transcontinental line. To improve the Canadian Pacific Railway, its grades and curves, from North Bay to Fort William, would certainly cost a large sum of money. To buy the Canadian Northern Railway to Parry Sound or Geogian Bay would cost a heavy sum. The country to Sudbury is said to be a very difficult one to build through and very expensive. But even when that would be all done, we would have no more railway transportation facilities than we now possess. The facilities might be improved, but they would not be increased. But the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with that. He said he was in favour of building from Quebec to Winnipeg and from Quebec to Moncton. He was not afraid to spend money. In fact he was willing to promise anything and only invited the people to ask for whatever they wanted. He was going to improve the docks and terminal facilities at Halifax, make Montreal a free port, improve the harbour facilities at Quebec, and in fact all along the lakes. I have no doubt it would take $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 to carry out all the improvements which the leader of the opposition advocat-

ed last night, and as he unfolded his scheme, I could not help feeling compassion for the misery which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) must have suffered when he thought of his constituents and the mortgage that would be put upon them and the farmers of Ontario before half these improvements were carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. These improvements would be carried out for half the cost of the government undertaking.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Give us the figures.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). I think my hon. friend will find out that I have not exaggerated. The scheme submitted by the government commends itself to my judgment. This proposed railway will extend from Moncton through the central part of New Brunswick and give railway accommodation and development to that province. It will extend along through the southern portion of Quebec. It will extend from Quebec westerly and northwesterly and through the northern part of the province of Ontario, opening up in that province great mineral wealth and giving access to valuable timber areas and rich agricultural lands. It will give depth to our country as well as length, and we will no longer be a fringe of settlement along the international boundary. It will provide a living band of men and women in that portion of country which is not now inhabited, that is between the east and the west, and extending on on to the Pacific coast. These are desirable things to accomplish and which cannot be accomplished in any other way.

But there is something else which commends this proposition to my approval. If the time should ever come—and it will not come through any fault of ours—when we may have to stand shoulder to shoulder in defence of our country, our institutions and our laws, think what a sense of security this continental railway extending from the impregnable fortress of Quebec in the east to a fortified fort on the Pacific ocean, will give us. Our troops could be easily transferred from the west to the east or from the east to the west and placed at any intermediate point where danger might threaten. Should that day ever come, is there a man in Canada who would begrudge this contribution of 15 cents a year for fourteen years for the power and security which such a line of communication would afford ? Mr. Speaker, the people of cities yet unbuilt will rise up to do honour to the men who had the ability to conceive and the courage to carry through, in spite of the opposition of friend and foe, this great national undertaking, an undertaking which will do much to make of Canada a nation among the nations of the earth.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I move the adjournment of the debate.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden). It it only eleven o'clock, and it seems to me we ought to go on.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, two or three times since this debate commenced, have asked for an early adjournment. We have been running pretty late for some time, and I think the government might consent to the adjournment now. I do not think it would prolong the debate if we adjourned.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) might go on, as has been done by other hon. gentlemen, deliver part of his speech, and finish tomorrow.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, when, towards the latter part of 1902, it was announced in the public press of the province of Ontario that certain gentlemen were about to undertake the construction of a transcontinental line, that announcement was hailed with considerable pleasure by people of the Dominion generally. We all had faith in the future greatness of the country and felt that a second transcontinental railway was not only a desirable project in the interests of the Dominion, but one that would probably be a remunerative undertaking to those who projected it. The announcement made at that time was a business proposition. And forthwith the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which really stood as a sponsor for the undertaking, caused to be circulated among the business men of this country a book called 'Facts concerning the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.' At the same time they caused to be circulated throughout the Dominion a map showing where the projected line of railway was to run. And when one looks back over those six months, it seems impossible to reconcile the proposition now before parliament with the proposition announced by these gentlemen. A few words from this book issued by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will show what the proposition was which they had in view at that time. I quote from page 2 of this book :

> The proposed Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which will extend from Quebec to the Pacific coast by way of North Bay, the present junction of the Grand Trunk Railway, a distance of about 3,025 miles.

So, it is plain from the prospectus that there was no intention on the part of these gentlemen, no thought present to their minds, of building from a point further east than North Bay in the province of Ontario. Further than that, in the maps that were issued by these parties at the time, it was plainly shown that the construction was to

commence at North Bay. The public will naturally wonder why, after the lapse of two or three months such a striking departure has been made from the original scheme. A reference to the 'Canadian Gazette' of that time—the original notice, I think was given about the 15th of December—shows that it was to be built from North Bay to the Pacific ocean, with branches to Winnipeg and Calgary. There is a little history concerning the change of base by these parties, and I am going to refer to it briefly.

Some year or two ago, there was granted by the parliament of Canada a charter to certain gentlemen of the city of Quebec for what was known as the Trans-Canada railway. That was a railway that was to run from the city of Quebec westward away to the north of Lake Winnipeg and through to the Pacific coast. After that charter had been issued, the proposition known as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway came up. So, the government were face to face with a difficulty. They had a proposition with the large backing that was behind the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, not only the magnates of the Grand Trunk, but such men, high in the councils of the Liberal party, as Senators Cox and Gibson. The government were alive to the fact that if these two charters were to be gone on with, they would have to face two gigantic railway subsidies. What were they to do ? At once, efforts were made to bring the parties together and head off either one railway or the other. Of course, it would be utterly impossible to do away with Senators Cox and Gibson, owing to the great power they have with this government. A gentleman who is a member of the government from the province of Ontario saw at once the position in which the government would be placed. One subsidy was bad enough, but what was to be done if two railway subsidies had to be paid to two distinct corporations ? The month of December went by. The application of the Grand Trunk Pacific was in, and it was well understood that the granting of a charter would be followed by a demand for a subsidy. A charter had already been granted to the Trans-Canadian people, and, of course they would make application to parliament for a subsidy. One must cast his eye over the situation in the province of Quebec to see the strong position held by the Trans-Canada people. We have all seen what has been going on for the last six or seven years in the city of Montreal. Thanks to the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) great works have been going on in the harbour of that city with a view of attracting and handling the transportation traffic of this continent. Now, I would recall to the minds of hon. members the fact that two years ago the members of this House and of the Senate were treated in the most royal manner in the city of Quebec by the city council and the board of trade there. On that occasion, at a magnificent banquet that was tendered to us, it was pointed out that the great city of Quebec was being side-tracked. We were told that the Great Northern and Canada Atlantic Railway systems, by an arrangement, had succeeded in attracting a large portion of the grain trade to that port. And it was an open secret that the people of the city were loud in complaints, that the Premier, representing one of the constituencies of the city of Quebec and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) representing the county of Quebec had not been able to prevail upon the government to secure any desirable improvements in the port of Quebec, but that all the improvements were being made in the port of Montreal, and that the whole trade was tending in that direction. Plainly, if things were to continue as they then were, the city of Quebec would be left in the background, to the great advantage of the city of Montreal. The Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) knew full well that the Trans-Canada charter had been granted and that the Premier and the Minister of Justice would not stand idly by—dare not stand idly by—nor would the other members from the Quebec district remain quiet, and see the Trans-Canada railway charter left without being supplemented with a subsidy. The Postmaster General saw the dilemma—two applications for subsidies, one on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific and one on behalf of the Trans-Canada. And the Postmaster General thought he would come to the front, and so on March 24, at a banquet tendered in Toronto at which the Postmaster General spoke he saw the necessity of breaking the ice in order that the government might at once be placed in a position to bring these two rival companies to an arrangement. Speaking in Toronto on that occasion the Postmaster General who had been discussing at that time that question of transportation generally in the Dominion of Canada said as reported in the Toronto 'News':

> For example, were a railway to be built direct between Winnipeg and Quebec city, the latter would be within less than 1,300 miles of Winnipeg, as against Portland's over 1,700 miles. Boston's nearly 1,800 miles and New York's 1,900 miles. We have also a corresponding shorter ocean distance to Great Britain.

Further on he said, and this was the point at which the Postmaster General desired to make himself solid with the public, and more particularly with the province of Ontario :

> Public opinion to-day appears to be more or less against subsidizing railways. Is there any prospect of capitalists out of their own capital alone building a line over the thousand miles of country to which I have alluded, which for many a year will fail to supply any reasonable return on the capital invested ? Capitalists are

not philanthropists, but expect a return upon their investments. Shall we proceed to subsidize the various railways that are now proposing to extend their lines to Manitoba ? Shall the country extend the Intercolonial Railway, say, from Quebec to the Pacific Ocean, not only investing the capital involved in the work itself, but also operating the line, or shall we simply build a railway highway available under proper regulations, as would be a canal. for the traffic of all railways between Manitoba and, say, the city of Quebec, with its branch connections with intermediate provinces, or shall we fold our arms, shrink from discharging our proper responsibilities, and let the country drift ?

There are those who, forgetting that the progressive Canada of to-day is not the old, unprogressive Canada of half-a-dozen years ago, think her affairs can be managed now as then. There are others who, for party purposes, would paralyse our action by endeavouring to deter us from having the courage to meet the altered conditions of to-day. Neither of these classes, I think, represents true Canada. There is a third, a more broad-minded, progressive, enterprising and patriotic section of the people, an 'Onward Canada' party in effect, who, recognizing the unparalleled progress our country is making to-day, demand that, instead of deterring the movement by inaction, we should take occasion by the hand, and wisely and masterfully grapple with, and if possible successfully solve, the problems growing out of Canada's great and unprecedented development.

A Serious Problem.

One of the most serious of these problems is the railway question to which I have alluded. The wise solution of this problem as, for example, by direct railway connection between Manitoba and Quebec city, means much for Canada.

Now, Sir, what was plain ? It was plain that the Postmaster General saw the dilemma facing the government, the Trans-Canada Railway Company with its powerful influence which would be exerted in its behalf demanding a subsidy, and the company headed by Senator Cox and Senator Gibson. The Postmaster General at once rushed into the foreground with his idea of putting both of these railways to one side if possible, and at all events if not putting both, at least putting one of them to one side. Then what happened ? That was the position of matters until parliament met, and when parliament met the Grand Trunk Pacific Company came along with their notice and asked then that a charter should be granted them in the terms upon which they had originally applied, namely from North Bay and North Bay alone, as the eastern point to the Pacific coast. We all know what happened in the Railway Committee, when the committee met about the 8th of May, Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and Mr. Charles M. Hays were present as representing the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and then, not to the amazement of hon. gentlemen in this House, because it was pretty well known to what extent matters had gone, the company at once threw up their hands and said : 'We have changed our plans, we are not going to build a railway to North Bay, but we intend to make our eastern point exactly what the Postmaster General said it would be, namely, the city of Quebec.' What happened then ? There was the dilemma hon. gentlemen had to meet with their party friends, the maritime province men up in arms one and all. We all remember the hon. member for Westmoreland and the hon. member for Cumberland as they each in turn addressed Sir Rivers-Wilson and Mr. Hays, and what was the result ? Sir Rivers-Wilson and Mr. Hays both made the positive and distinct statements that the railway would not go beyond Quebec, and the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. asked, 'Why stop at Quebec,' to which Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson answered : 'We have an agreemen with the government for the maritime ports of St. John and Halifax, and I think that answers the question.' The answer there, no doubt, referred to the arrangement that existed between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. Further on the hon. member for Cumberland asked if they would build to the maritime provinces. Mr. Hays' answer to that was most emphatic : 'We will certainly not build there.'

Mr. BROCK. And they will not either.

Mr. BENNETT. Here was the party confronted with the dilemma that their maritime province members were to go on strike unless the government came down from their perch, and agreed to meet the wishes of their supporters from every part of the Dominion. There cannot be a doubt that as a business proposition the Grand Trunk never intended to build east of North Bay, but were driven into that by their supporters from Quebec, and after their supporters from the province of Quebec had succeeded in driving them to build it to the city of Quebec then, pleased with the prospect of what could be done by driving, the maritime province men followed suit, and the result is that to-day the people of Canada are being saddled with what was very properly termed by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals a political railway, and not a practical railway or a business railway at all.

So much, Sir, for the inception of the road, and the position it has reached to-day. We need not here go into this fact that at about that time, when the Bill was before the committee, the government had not succeeded in dragooning the Ontario ministers into accepting the Moncton proposition. It is a notorious fact that it was only at the point of the pistol that the ministers from Ontario were driven into this arrangement, and I believe to-day that the clause that exists in the contract that parliament can at any time stop the work at this end, was the last peg upon which the ministers from Ontario are hanging their caps to-day, and that there is no intention on the part

of the government ever to build one mile east of Quebec. I say that the Minister of Customs and the Postmaster General, when they go into the campaign this fall which was announced by the hon. member for South Wellington to-day, would be held this fall, I say that every one of their ministers will pin his faith to that clause and point out to the province of Ontario that that contract contains a clause that they need not build eastward from Quebec at all, but that parliament will have the right and have the power to stop the construction of the work from that point at any time.

Now this debate was opened by the Prime Minister, and that hon. gentleman made a very lengthy speech, a speech that is being franked not by thousands, but by thousands of tens of thousands, into every province from end to end of the Dominion, and I hope and trust that a great many of them may be sent into East Simcoe. I haven't much to say about that speech, but I shall do it the courtesy of referring to it at greater length than his followers have done to-day. We may take the speech and read it under its different heads. A great part of it is devoted to the fact that this is to be an all-Canadian route, and that Canada must have an all-Canadian route. There is not the humblest back bencher on the government side who will rise and repeat his language in that regard, because it has been exploded. Every one knows and every school boy knows that there is a Canadian system of railways irrespective of this one, from end to end of the Dominion, and no single word has been heard and no single word will be heard further in this debate as to the question of an all-Canadian railroad, and as to the filling of that long desired want.

The next point in it was the bonding privileges and to-day we heard two or three gentlemen on that side of the House, and not a single one of them has mentioned the bonding privileges. There is no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, who when he rises in his place, and I am sure no minister who speaks on this question from this on, will urge as a reason for the construction of this railway the necessity of preserving ourselves in such a position that there may be no abrogation of the bonding privilege on the part of the United States of America. Now, the fact of the matter is that the government has been driven from pillar to post on this question. In the first place the influences of Senator Cox were so great that they had to bow to them. In the next place, the influence of Trans-Canada Railway Company were so great that they had to bow to these also, and being met, as they would be met, with requests for two subsidies by these two rival roads, when they found themselves able to deal with only one, the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), and I congratulate the hon. gentleman, that for once he has had his way, apparently has driven the government into this scheme for the construction of a part of this railway system, and as a result the Dominion of Canada is in the position in which it finds itself placed to-day. We have heard from the other side of the House some very lengthy speeches, and all of them have been tinged with one thing and one thing in particular. The ministers have seen fit not to abuse the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and so they have delegated that work to the back-benchers and each little back-bencher seems to think it incumbent upon himself to say everything he can of an abusive nature of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Abuse is all very well in its way but the people of this Dominion want something else than abuse. They want argument, and I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that abuse and vituperation of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals are not going to raise them in the estimation either in the people of this country or of the members of this House. Sir, common gratitude should prompt some of these hon. gentlemen to speak in a proper manner of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Can any one imagine that the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) three months ago would have risen in his place and told the great big ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that he was not fit to untie the shoes of the right hon. Premier ? I can only fancy this, that if the hon. member for Hants had said that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would have at once propounded this question : If I am not fit to unloose the latchet of the shoes of the right hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion, in the name of all that is good what menial service should the hon. member for Hants perform for that great man ?

Now, Sir, there has been a great deal said in the public press on this question and more particularly in the independent press of this country. I am going to quote some of the statements that have been published. Nobody expected to see the 'Globe' newspaper go up against this proposition. Who could imagine, in the name of all that is good, that the 'Globe' would say one word disparaging of it ? Who could imagine that the 'Globe,' after having seen the Crow's Nest deal through, the greatest iniquity that this government has ever perpetrated in the interests of the 'Globe,' could for a moment rise up and try to beat from the public gaze this great proposition of Senator Cox ? We will take the 'Farmers' Sun,' which is a pretty good paper. The 'Farmers' Sun' says in a recent issue :

> There is no justification for imposing such a burden on the farmers of Ontario and the west. They have grain to sell. They must sell it in Britain. Nothing could be more natural nor more profitable than that they should seek their market by the cheapest route.

And then we find that the government has

been unfortunate in this, that while it has the able assistance of the 'Globe' newspaper in perpetrating any scheme upon the public, unfortunately it is not always able to control the Montreal 'Witness,' and the 'Witness' says :

Curiously enough nothing is said about these branch lines in the contract, or has been announced concerning them. Yet these three are all obvious necessities. The one to Fort William would carry more freight than the main line as most of the grain will still cross the lakes by water. That to Montreal would make Portland as tempting a port as it now is to the present Grand Trunk Railway system, there being a constant tendency to take to the water as soon as possible.

Well, that seems to be different from the government, because most of the members of the government have taken to the woods and the hon. member for Hants, if all reports are true, is to have a judgeship at an early day as a reward for holding a brief in defence of this iniquitous proposition. The great question as affecting this proposition to-day is the question of the railway haul of the vast products of the west. Last fall I had great pleasure in visiting the province of Manitoba and a good portion of the North-west Territories, and any hon. member of this House who may journey to the west to see that great country must be struck with the unlimited possibilities of its resources. One of the needs, and it seems to me the growing need, if one can listen to what is said by the settlers, is more railway accommodation for the country. What particularly strikes one in listening to their complaints, is that they do not complain so much of the absence of railway systems but rather of the fact that there has been a congestion of trade due to the fact that they did not have a sufficient number of cars or sufficient amount of locomotive power. To-day the question in the west, as far as we can see and as far as all can see, is the question of getting the crop out to the seaboard in the quickest possible way, and also at the least possible rate. In all lines of business and in all walks of life the success of those engaged in similar undertakings should afford a guide and criterion for others, if we look to the western trade of the United States what is the lesson taught by it ? Go to the north-western states, to Dakota, Minnesota, and all that line of north-western states, go to Illinois, and the states that lie west and south of Chicago, and you will find this fact that with all their large railway accommodation in that country the grain is not carried from the west to the east by the all-rail route but it is carried by a mixed system of water and rail, and therefore I say that to-day in Canada it has been demonstrated that the proper way of bringing out the grain from the North-west is to pursue the system which is being pursued by the people of the United States. We have that very system in this country in carrying grain from the west to the east. I recall to mind, which is in the history of the last parliament, because it was the subject of a debate in this House, that upon one occasion the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals attempted to carry 300,000 bushels of grain to St. John from the North-west. What was the result ? That grain was brought from points in the north shore of Lake Superior to Parry Sound, it was taken down over the Canada Atlantic Railway, the Great Northern Railway and the Intercolonial Railway to St. John, and the result of the carriage of that grain for that long distance was that there was a loss of $10,000 on one cargo of 300,000 bushels. If it is a fact that on one single cargo, because that amount would only make up the cargo of one of the large freighters on the great lakes, there was a loss of $10,000, how is it possible to carry grain from the far west to the east over a long grain haul, and in the case to which I have referred it was not as long a grain haul as it would be in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific, because the grain was put into the cars at Parry Sound ? If this project is ever to go into effect, how is it possible to carry grain over this long haul from the west to St. John or Halifax ? The people of Canada to-day have in St. John and Halifax large grain elevators, and it is a notorious fact that although the Halifax elevator cost this country some hundreds of thousands of dollars not a single bushel of grain has ever been passed through it.

As to the St. John elevator, I do not think it ever held a bushel of grain outside of these 300,000 bushels. In the face of this experience the government tell us that they are going to turn the whole tide of transportation, and carry grain by rail over this immense distance from the prairies along the north shore of Lake Superior, and clear through to the tidewater of the Atlantic. Let me call the attention of the House to this fact. Toledo is only 250 miles from Buffalo, and yet they carried by rail last year about 7,000,000 bushels of grain to Toledo and there transferred it to vessels and took it to Buffalo. That proves beyond all doubt that there can only be a successful grain carrying trade on this continent by water and by rail. From Chicago to New York the distance is 950 miles, taking the average of the different railway systems connecting the two cities, but only a trifling quantity of grain is carried by all-rail between these two points and that only during the winter season. Last year's report of the Buffalo Merchants' Exchange shows that Buffalo received the immense quantity of 124,626,434 bushels of grain, and of grain reduced to flour 60,133,080 bushels, representing the total receipts at Buffalo, 184,759,518 bushels for the year. This shows that the people of the United States have made a success of the grain carrying business. I regret to say that in

this quantity of grain sent to Buffalo it embraces not only United States grown wheat, but 10,648,865 bushels of wheat from Fort William, and 542,000 bushels from Port Arthur.

This transportation question is not new to the government or to this parliament. I myself had the honour of moving two or three resolutions asking that the government should deal with it in a business-like way, but I was always met with the answer that we were going to rely on our mixed system of transportation by lake by rail and by canal. We have the opinions of masters of transportation in this country as to how grain should be carried from the west to the east. Sir Wm. Van Horne recently stated in the city of Toronto, that the long haul around the great lakes was dreaded because it was unprofitable, and that the bulk of the grain brought by that route was carried in the winter months and used by the millers in Ontario to keep their mills going during the cold season. Let us assume that the output of Manitoba and the North-west last year was 40,000,000 or 45,000,000 bushels of grain, and Sir Wm. Van Horne's statement is demonstrated to be correct when we find that only 2,500,000 bushels of that was carried by rail around the shores of Lake Superior. Mr. Robert Meighen, president of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, has given this opinion :

> We want low-grade, double-track railways from the Georgian bay ports to Montreal. When this is accomplished you will freight wheat across the lake from Fort William to Georgian bay ports for one cent, and from there to Montreal for three and a half cents, or less, per bushel winter and summer. Do not forget that our canals are closed for six months of the year.

The opinion of those competent judges is that we have in Canada to-day a system for the carriage of grain which if we could only utilize it would bring the most successful results. The lake ports on the Georgian bay have a most decided advantage over Buffalo, from the fact that vessels plying to Midland and Parry Harbour can make three trips in the same time that they make only two trips to Buffalo.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. That is an immense advantage in the fall of the year. There are vessels plying on the great lakes, and we have seen some of them in Midland, which carry 250,000 bushels of wheat, and assuming that the rate in the fall of the year is two cents per bushel—and I have often seen it higher—a vessel will make $5,000 more in freight because of the additional trip which it can make to a Georgian bay port than if she were plying to Buffalo. And yet we are told by gentlemen opposite that the experience of the United States is to be brushed aside and, that the lake route is not to be utilized, because forsooth the Minister of the Interior quoted some figures here which were not substantiated by fact, and which are not figures that would be endorsed by men who know the business. Let me tell the House that the carrying trade which we have established on the Georgian bay is only to-day in its infancy. Last fall an arrangement was spoken of and was about to be put into force between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, which would have resulted in millions and millions of bushels of grain being carried from Midland to Peterborough by the Canadian Pacific Railway and thence east, and carried by the Grand Trunk Railway to Belleville, and from that point to Montreal. That arrangement was a joint user of what is known as the Midland division of the Grand Trunk Railway by these two rival railroads. It has been argued in this House that there could not be a user of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway by other companies, and it might be said that there could not be a user of the Midland division by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the answer to that is that this piece of road is only about 90 miles long, and because of its shortness the difficulties could be overcome.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How many miles ?

Mr. BENNETT. Between 90 and 100.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. It is 100 miles.

Mr. BENNETT., It is not quite 100 miles, and if the road were straightened as contemplated, the distance would be decreased by ten miles. But even suppose it is 100 miles, if that arrangement had been carried out immense quantities of grain would have been carried over the line. Any one who passes over that portion of the Grand Trunk will see proof that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway never intend to carry any grain by all-rail to the east, except, of course, the trifling quantity that might be taken out during the winter months. The Grand Trunk Railway are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on the Midland division to-day, with the object of carrying their grain from Port Arthur or Fort William to Midland and thence to the east. Every one in Midland knows that even after this proposition was launched last fall, the Grand Trunk Railway owned every available foot of water frontage in that town for a distance of over two miles, and it is an open secret that the Grand Trunk Railway intend to send their grain trade to that point. What we want in this Dominion is a first-class outlet for our grain from the west, not by rail throughout, but to the head of the waters of Lake Superior.

The province of Ontario lately had the honour of a visit from Premier Roblin of the province of Manitoba, and what did he say ? I take it that anything coming from that gentleman should carry considerable

weight and authority. Premier Roblin has everything to gain by pointing out fairly and honestly the necessities and requirements of the west; it is not to be expected that he would come down to the province of Ontario and make statements which would be inimical to the interests of the people of Manitoba and the North-west; and the whole tenor of the statements made was that any congestion of trade in the west happened between Winnipeg and the head of the lakes, and that the great and pressing necessity in the west to-day was for more railway equipment and an easier and better passage for grain to the head of the lakes.

It has been urged by the government that very prompt action should be taken on this question. I need not repeat what have been termed the hysterical remarks of the Premier as to the necessity of haste. Why, Sir, what do we see ? We see this government lying dormant, not moving its hand, for six years. What were they doing ? Taking up the ends of the canal system which had been left as a legacy by the late government, and from time to time effecting improvements upon them. Beyond that this government has not lifted its hand. It could have gone to the Grand Trunk or to the Canada Atlantic Railway people, and, by perhaps offering a bonus for the carriage of grain when it reached a large amount, they might have diverted a large part of the grain trade now going to Buffalo, both that of Canada and that of the United States. But this government have stood still; they have done practically nothing for the last six years. And now at once we hear these hysterical screeches, without any surveys being made or any reports being had, to the effect that this country must be plunged into an expenditure ranging anywhere from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 for the construction of this railway. And through what part of the country is it to run ? There has not been laid on the Table of this House the report of a single engineer who has ever gone over that territory. We have heard reports from missionaries and from other gentlemen who have seen parts of that country; but in the prospectus issued by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company itself the following language is used with reference to this very country :

> The unanimous report of all explorers who have travelled over the territory north of the Georgian bay and Lake Superior, is to the effect that it will not in the immediate future furnish business sufficient to support a railway, and it would not, therefore, be a business proposition to build one there, it was used as a link to reach the more fertile lands of Manitoba and the North-west ; the mileage through the unproductive section is estimated as 1,000.

There is the prospectus of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company condemning the very territory that is to be traversed by this railway. In the face of this fact, should not the government, before they plunge the country into this enormous expenditure, do one of two things—either submit to parliament next session or in a subsequent session a full and complete survey of that country, or, as they are going to the country this fall, after passing this Bill, if they can pass it, go to the country, and we challenge them to do so, on this very question. Speaking for myself I have rather a hard constituency; but I tell the hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches that as they are going to the country this fall, it would be more manly and more fair to the people of Canada, before they manacle them and tie them down with this immense debt around their necks, to give them a chance to say whether they will accept it or not of their own free will. But the government know that they would be hazarding too much on that throw of the dice; and therefore they propose to pass the Bill as it is, and then go to their party friends and say to them : What is the use of turning us out ? The contract is executed, the bonds are signed; if the Conservative party come into power, they cannot upset what has been done. That is the position these hon. gentlemen are in.

With regard to the canal system of this country, on which we have spent an enormous sum of money, why do the government not insist on the people of this country recognizing that the future transportation trade of the country should be done by the Georgian Bay and the connecting railways to the east ? They have certainly at all times led them to believe that our canal system was to be the solution of the transportation question, not only for the Dominion of Canada, but for a great portion of the western states. Already we have expended some $70,000,000 on that canal system, and I am gratified to be able to say that by the removal of the tolls this year, a greater quantity of grain has gone to the city of Kingston than in any previous year, and that a greater quantity has gone down the St. Lawrence system than ever before, and I think twice as much as went up to this time last year. So keen has the competition been that the fact is advertised that grain is being carried from the head of Lake Superior clear through to the port of Montreal for four cents a bushel. That is cheap transportation. When hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches have been from time to time consulted by the representatives in this House as to what their stand was on the question of transportation, what has been their answer ? I am going to quote from the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) as reported in 'Hansard' of 1901, at page 1,106. That hon. gentleman said :

> It may be three or four or five years before we get into full swing, but there is no doubt, in my mind, that the improvements which are in contemplation at Port Colborne, properly and efficiently carried out, and in the harbour of Montreal and the route perhaps below, will

make the St. Lawrence superior to any other route.

What have we done since that time? We have loaned to the harbour commissioners of Montreal vast sums, which have been expended on that harbour on the strength of the assurance of the government that the canal system would be perfected. On the strength of the expenditure of millions of dollars there, we have gone further. What have we done? You, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Archibald Campbell), I believe, are a member of a company which, with laudable energy and commendable enterprise, is seizing the occasion to construct elevators at Port Colborne. I congratulate you upon your energy, and I hope and trust that your best expectations will be realized. What is the calculation at present? We are unable to take past Port Colborne boats carrying over 70,000 bushels. We have already expended upwards of $3,000,000 at Port Colborne—for what purpose? To construct there a huge harbour, dredge it to a great depth, and construct great docks on which it is intended that capitalists shall build elevators. It is expected that vessels carrying 300,000 bushels of grain can land at the docks and deliver their grain to the elevators, where in turn it will be delivered to smaller boats, which will carry it through the canals and the St. Lawrence river to Montreal or Quebec. But these hon. gentlemen tell the enterprising vesselmen of this country that they are going to place before the public of Canada a transportation scheme that is to put all others into the background. They are going to raise in this country a spirit of disquiet and unrest among men who are proposing to go into the grain carrying business. Further on the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said this:

> We will see with Montreal properly equipped that there will be no reason in the world why shippers should not prefer the St. Lawrence to any other route.

Yesterday, in the course of the debate, some hon. gentleman quoted the Minister of Agriculture as having last year, in the debate on the motion of my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. McLaren), in reference to transportation, practically made use of the very words of the then Minister of Railways and Canals, and endorsed in its entirety the canal system of Canada. But on the assurance thus given, these hon. gentlemen went through the country and defended the expenditure of these millions at Port Colborne and these hundreds of thousands on the St. Lawrence canal system. Let me read what the Postmaster General said at the city of Hamilton on the 26th of September last:

> As you know, the task of providing a sufficient and adequate water route from the gulf of the St. Lawrence to the upper lakes is no easy one, but from the moment of our accession to office until this date, it has been continuously prosecuted with all possible speed. When we shall have completed the improvements at Port Colborne next spring, we shall have made that port a safe harbour where grain can be received and shipped to our maritime ports.

Yet this hon. gentleman was forced to come to this parliament and say that all these predictions as to the carrying trade by the St. Lawrence canals and the mixed trade of the upper lakes by rail and water were things of the past.

During the course of this debate we have heard some very wonderful statements as to the cost of this railway. The last gentleman who resumed his seat (Mr. Hughes) said that the cost would be 15 cents per head during fourteen years for every person in the country, and had time only permitted, I have no doubt he would have been able to show that instead of our taxpayers having to pay anything, every one of them would receive a bonus from the construction of this road. We had first the statement of the Prime Minister that the cost would be $13,000,000. That statement nobody has since repeated. Nobody will do the right hon. gentleman the honour of repeating the statement made by him. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) would rather trust himself to the fickle member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) than to the First Minister. But those who have trusted the hon. member for North Norfolk in the past know what a broken reed he is for any one to lean upon.

What is to be the actual cost of the railway? We heard a few days ago the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and I have heard so many conflicting statements in this regard that I thought, in order to be up to the times, I would make an estimate myself. This is the estimate which I propose to submit to my electors when I shall next have the pleasure of meeting them. What will be the actual cost of this railway? From Wininpeg to Moncton, 1,800 miles, at $40,000 per mile, the cost will be $72,000,000. The interest during ten years at 3½ per cent will be $25,200,000. The difference between 3 and 3½ per cent, which we will have to pay for 40 years, will be $12,640,000. The mountain section will cost for interest on the bonds during ten years, $7,200,000, making a total of $117,040,000. I may say, in passing, that the estimate of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was, in round figures, about $120,000,000. When people contrast this estimate of the ex-minister with the figures of the hon. member for North Norfok, who makes the amount $70,000,000, they will ask why is there so much discrepancy? And they will further ask: How is it possible that the First Minister came to make the statement that this road was only going to cost the people $13,000,000? The argument will be this, that the $13,000,000 will be the interest to be paid on a certain amount; and as the government do not ask

that the Grand Trunk Railway shall pay the interest for a certain number of years, and will make that company a present of a certain amount of interest, the right hon. gentleman estimates that at $13,000,000. And in arriving at this result, he takes good care to make the cost of the road a very trifling amount. But there is something beyond this cost of $117,000,000 to $120,000,000. There is this fact, that there are certain endorsements to be made of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and people in the province of Ontario, particularly in the county of Simcoe, have an idea what the promises of the Grand Trunk Railway mean. The Grand Trunk Railway is a debtor to this country of millions unpaid. It is a debtor to the county of Simcoe of an amount which runs into several hundreds of thousands of dollars. That liability is hoary with age, no interest or principal having been paid upon it for the last forty years. Under this arrangement, we are going to guarantee millions, because on the prairie section we guarantee that we shall pay $9,000,000 interest if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway do not pay it. There is something more. Under the terms of this contract we are bound to purchase the Quebec bridge, which means an expenditure of from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000, and we have got to settle with the Trans-Canada people. I know not what that may amount to, but it is only a matter of common honesty and fairness that this government should deal liberally with the Trans-Canada, seeing that they were in the field before the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was ever known. Then there is the question of betterments, which means that during the tenure of this lease the betterments are to be made by the Dominion, and upon these I understand they are to pay interest. Add these together. Had we accepted the original proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway, we would have granted them, in all probability, a subsidy on the line from North Bay to Winnipeg, and then guaranteed their bonds, as the government did the bonds of the Mackenzie and Mann system. This country would pay out in cold cash $12,800,000 of subsidy, but we know where we stand. What is going to be the result of this scheme, as a business proposition, in other parts of the Dominion? First, we are to go down to the maritime provinces, where we have spent already $70,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, and we are to parallel that railway, and thus practically reduce it to a position of penury. We are going to put it to one side and make it useless. But there is not a word in this contract which will prevent the Grand Trunk Railway doing what they propose to do and what they are making arrangements at Midland to do, namely, to carry the grain from Midland on to Montreal and from Montreal to Portland. There is nothing in the contract to prevent their doing this. True there is a clause providing that they shall endeavour, as far as possible, to have grain routed to a Canadian port, but there is nothing in the contract to compel them to do it. Worse than that. Does any man in his senses believe that when this Bill passes and the Grand Trunk Railway are entitled to receive aid they will not at that very moment commence the western section? Why, the rails will be laid, and I hope they will, from Wininpeg on towards Edmonton, and what will be the result? I understand that in modern times rails have been laid at as high a rate as seven or eight miles a day, and even, as an hon. gentleman near me suggests, ten miles a day. So, next year we might expect to see a large portion of the Grand Trunk Pacific extended from Winnipeg westward. And when that system is extended it will garner its trade and carry it from the west to Winnipeg. Then it will be forced to do one of three things—take the traffic down under an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to Fort William; take it down under an arrangement with the Mackenzie and Mann road to Port Arthur, or make an arrangement with an American road and take it to Duluth. Or, either they or the government might build another line from Winnipeg to the head of Lake Superior. But there is nothing to compel them to abstain from building the road west, and, as the eastern section cannot be completed—nobody pretends it can be completed—within less than five or six years, the Grand Trunk Pacific will be free, if they please, to send the traffic through by way of Portland.

Now, this contract were it not such a serious matter, would be amusing. And in all this serious matter one wonders who has been the little joker in making up this contract. If ever there was contract abounding in silly propositions, this is that contract. We heard the Premier making the announcement with all his dramatic style that no senator or member of the House of Commons of Canada is to have a contract for the construction under this scheme. Whoever expected that any senator or member of this House would have a contract for construction work? Why it would be a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. But there is nothing in the contract—and it would have been silly to insert it—to say that a senator or member of this House may not be a member of a construction company having a contract on this road. Need I refer to the clause respecting the purchase of supplies in Canada? It is not worth the paper it is written on, not worth the trouble it took to draft it. Then take the question of duties on imports. There is a feature of the contract which will bear heavily on our Canadian manufacturers, because it allows the importation of goods by this company free of duty so far as the government section is concerned.

I listened yesterday to the statement made by the leader of the opposition, and I must say that I believe that his policy will appeal more strongly to the people of the North-west and to the people of Canada generally than will the proposition that the government has laid before us. One great reason why it will command the favour of the people is that it does not plunge this country into such enormous expenditure. Why, Sir, whither are we drifting? To-day we have a public debt, in round numbers, of $275,000,000. We are going to add to that at one sweep about $125,000,000, making a total debt of $400,000,000, or, as has been calculated, about $125 for every head of a family.

Our position is that the Grand Trunk Pacific will not give an outlet for several years to come for the increased product of the north-western country. Settlers are going in there in large numbers. Last year 100,000 people went in, and we hope and trust that this will not be the limit, but that the number will increase very much. Yet the government must admit, and every man must admit, that this eastern section will not be finished in less than from five to eight years, so that in that time there will only be the two present outlets to the head of the lakes, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern. The proposition of the leader of the opposition is to go to the very root of the difficulty. He proposes to expropriate either the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern line between Winnipeg and the head of the lakes. Or, if neither of these can be done, let the government take the matter boldly in hand and build a road and thus control the situation between these two points. Let this road be under government ownership, and let it be used in common by all companies that wish to use it. But I believe that every sane man will shudder at the prospect of duplicating the railway system around Lake Superior and will demand that there should be a common user of that road not only by the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Pacific, but by the Mackenzie and Mann system as well. As to the route from Georgian Bay by the Canada Atlantic system, I have to say that that would not be as good a proposition as the acquisition of the Midland division of the Grand Trunk. If this government were to acquire the road from Midland to Peterborough and to the Grand Trunk main line, not only would they put Peterborough in immediate touch with the waters of Georgian Bay and with the main line, but they would put the Canadian Pacific in immediate touch with Georgian Bay, and these two would have a quick route from the waters of Georgian Bay to their main lines running eastward.

One of the strongest reasons for condemning this proposition of the government is that it is brought before us in the dying hours of the session. On so great a question, there should be no decision until the people have been consulted. It is utterly unfair to bind the country, in an important matter of this kind, without giving them a chance to speak. This government has announced to its friends in this House that they must be prepared to go before the people this fall. One of their supporters, inadvertently, no doubt, dropped a hint to-day to the effect that this fall the members of this House may expect to face the electors. I say, in view of that fact, it would be more honest, it would be more fair, not only to this generation but to generations to come, that before thrusting upon them the heavy responsibilities of the expenditure involved by this scheme, for the government should have the courage of its convictions, if it has convictions, and meet the people face to face. Let them meet their political opponents face to face. Let them throw down the gage of battle, and let that gage be whether the country is or is not to be saddled with this great debt for all time to come. Speaking as one on this side, I invite the hon. gentlemen to dissolve the House and go to the electors on this question, and, going to the country on this question, we are prepared to abide by that result.

On motion of Mr. Macpherson the debate was adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. W. S. Fielding) the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, August 20, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PENSION SYSTEM.

Mr. GOURLEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

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

2. Has the government the said pension system under consideration, or has it finally adopted such a system ?

3. Was a system of pensions or retiring allowances for the employees of the Intercolonial Railway drawn up by the officials at Moncton, and approved by the General Manager and the Minister of Railways, last year or the present year ?

4. Was such scheme or any scheme of pensions submitted to the government for approval ?

5. Has such scheme or any scheme been approved by the government ?

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

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The question of the pension

fund for the Intercolonial Railway officials was under consideration of the government in the time of the late Minister of Railways, but no action was taken thereon, and the matter has not since been dealt with.

THE JAPANESE TARIFF.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What classes of goods and merchandise, the product of the United States, are admitted into Japan on more favourable terms than goods and merchandise of the same classes, the product of Canada ?

2. Have any steps been taken by the government of Canada, and if so, what steps, to secure for the products of Canada equally favourable treatment in the markets of Japan to that now enjoyed by the products of the United States ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Japanese tariff is what is called a double columned tariff ; one tariff being termed the General tariff and the other the Conventional tariff. Under the Conventional tariff lower rates are granted to such countries as have specific treaties with Japan. Canada is not one of these countries and consequently all the privileges of the Conventional tariff go to such countries as have treaties, but do not extend to Canada. The items in the tariff to which this applies are quite numerous, and I can only refer the hon. gentleman to the tariff itself which he can no doubt obtain on inquiry. One of the difficulties in the way of negotiating any treaty with Japan is, what is called, the favoured nation clause. We have had the matter under consideration, and negotiations of a confidential character have passed between the Canadian government and the government of Japan. The conditions require that if any treaty is made it shall contain what is called the favoured nation clause, which would oblige Japan to give to all other countries any privilege which she may grant to us and vice versa. As hon. gentlemen are aware, that creates some complications and interferes with our freedom, and for the present we have not been able to come to an understanding. The matter, however, is still under consideration.

FATAL ACCIDENTS ON CANADIAN RAILWAYS.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many accidents involving loss of human life took place on the railways of Canada during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1903 ?

2. How many human lives were lost in such accidents, or as a result of such accidents ?

3. Has the government yet appointed any official whose duty it shall be to make a full and exhaustive inquiry and report, on oath, into the circumstances attendant upon, and the causes which may have contributed to all railway accidents which occur in Canada, including the system by which the traffic of the railway is operated ; the speed the trains were moving when the accidents occurred ; the condition of track and rolling stock ; the hours which the train men, station agents, telegraph operators and other officials of the companies were on duty, in connection with the movement of trains to which accidents occurred ; the wages paid employees ; the sufficiency and qualification of the staff employed on the trains, and at the stations, telegraph offices, &c.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. As far as returns have been received, there were twenty-one accidents on railways in Canada involving loss of human life during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

2. Lives lost in such accidents or as a result of such accidents, sixty-three.

3. No permanent appointment has been made.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into Committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, and the motion of Mr. Puttee in amendment thereto.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Burrard.) Mr. Speaker. I shall not attempt to follow the argument of my good friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) as I wish to view this question from a standpoint entirely different from his. He spoke for his own province of Ontario ; I shall speak from the standpoint of the province of British Columbia.

I would not have taken part in this debate were it not that the hon the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) made the statement in attempting to justify his action in resigning, that the province of British Columbia were not asking that a new transcontinental line be built and also that there is actually no hurry as far as the west is concerned that a new line be constructed. Either the hon. gentleman has a very short memory, or he could not have taken the Victoria board of trade seriously, when on the 8th day of October last year the following request was made to the hon. gentleman in his official capacity of Minister of Railways in the city of Victoria on the occasion of his visit to British Columbia last fall.

The board desire to place themselves on record as in favour of assistance being given to the C. N. R., so as to provide at as early a date as possible a second transcontinental line across British Columbia. They desire to point out that in view of the very rapid colonization of the prairie region, it necessarily calls for the provision of a new route whereby the grain there produced can readily reach the ocean.

Now, Sir, there is only one of two deductions to be drawn from the hon. minister's remarks—either his memory failed him, or he took the Victoria board of trade to be men who were not responsible for their actions, and then paid no heed to what

irresponsible people like the board of trade in one of our principal cities of the coast might say. From either deduction the hon. gentleman does not emerge with any great degree of credit to himself. In speaking on this question, I wish to speak entirely from a British Columbia standpoint, and point out to the House the great good which has accrued to British Columbia from the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and building it through, possibly, the poorest part of our province. Striking into our province at the Kicking Horse pass, it finds its way through the Rocky Mountains following the valley of the Columbia river, then passing through Eagle pass it strikes the head waters of the Shuswap lake and strikes the South Thompson river valley, and following down through the valley of the Thompson until it strikes the Fraser at Lytton and from there down to the tidal waters of Burrard inlet. It found little to entice the imagination outside the grandeur of the mountain scenery And we all know that scenery will not fill the pockets nor will it suffice to stay the appetite. However, I wish to show the House what has been accomplished by the construction of the great Canadian Pacific Railway.

Prior to the advent of this railway, British Columbia was a country isolated from eastern Canada, having nothing in common other than devotion to the old flag and yielding homage to the same sovereign. It was a country which, from its isolation, had no natural national aspirations. But its people were men of courage and determination in that small and isolated community, and they recognized the great future of British Columbia if it could only get a railroad carried through connecting the eastern part of Canada with the west. The building of the Canadian Pacific Railway has made what was once the fishing hamlet of New Westminster a large, thriving commercial and populous city. It made a new province for Canada, one of the brightest gems in the Crown of confederation. It made the men who, while proud to say that they are British Columbians, still prouder to say they are Canadians. It made what was in 1883 a primeval forest into our present great city of Vancouver. It made it possible where 20 years ago stood only the Douglas fir and the British Columbia cedar, that a city of 35,000 people live to-day. Where not one dollar of customs revenue was collected 20 years ago, where the past year the sum of $1,388,709 was collected. It made possible, where banks were unknown, where to-day stand six of the leading banking institutions of Canada. Where bank clearances were unknown, to where during the first six months of the present year the clearances amounted to nearly 29 million dollars. It made the great seaport of Vancouver and created what last year was the fourth largest port for customs collections in the Dominion Where ships were unknown practically 20 years ago, to-day in the harbour of Vancouver boats flying almost every maritime flag in the world can be seen loading and unloading. It has made and created a new trade with the Orient. It made and created a new trade with Australia and New Zealand. It has made and created a new trade with the United States. It made and created a new province whose inhabitants are a happy and contented Canadian people. It made possible the development of a section of our mining country, which only goes to prove that we have greater than has been found. It made it possible for us to produce in the last 16 years 31,640,303 ounces of silver, valued at $18,475,882 ; it made it possible for us to produce 280,200,845 pounds of lead, valued at $10,447,540; it made it possible for us to produce 92,652,480 pounds of copper, valued at $12,333,200; or a total value of silver, lead and copper of $41,256,603. And prior to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway this condition of things was unknown in British Columbia.

Now, Sir, when that which is only a small part of the many wonderful things I could name can be done in the green tree, what can be done in the dry ? If that can be accomplished by the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway through the lean section of our wonderful province, what can be accomplished by the building of another line of railroad through the fat section of our province ?

That the western part of our province—that part to be traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific—is a fat section, and that it is a section which is crying for a railroad, that the people who live there are clamouring for a railroad, that the mineral which is hid in our mountain ledges is awaiting the advent of this new road to enrich the coffers of the Canadian people. I will show and prove, and I think to the satisfaction of every hon. gentleman in the House. I will read to you a few extracts from the annual report of the Minister of Mines for the year ending 1902 ; and for fear that our good friend, the hon. gentleman who represents Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock), should say that it is cooked, I will inform him and the House that the Minister of Mines is no less a personage than Edward Gaylor Prior, a Conservative of the Tory school, who was the recognized leader of the Conservative party for British Columbia in this House and a minister of the Crown. On page 45 of that report I find the following with reference to a part of the province which the Grand Trunk Pacific will traverse :

> Two principal reasons seem to have deterred capitalists from investing here ; the first being the high price asked by prospectors for their holdings, and the other being the idea, widely prevalent, that the northern coast of British Columbia is locked up with ice and snow during the greater part of the year, with a conse-

quent very short working season. This is a very great mistake. With the exception of a very few days in mid-winter, there is not any portion of the Dominion, or northern and eastern United States, where a longer working season obtains. The snowfall at Port Simpson, which is the most northerly point on the coast of British Columbia, is much less than at Vancouver, the register for last winter, which was an average one, being 14 inches. Mr. J. H. Rodgers, who spent the winter of 1901-02 at the Bonanza mine, on Observatory inlet, and who had a gang of miners working continuously, informs me that there was only one day from January 1st till July 23rd (the date on which I saw him) on which his men could not work out of doors, and that was on the occasion of a heavy snowstorm in March.

I may say that this is a report of Mr. John Flewin, a gentleman whom I know very well, who has been mining recorder in that part of the country for many years. The following refers to a part of the country which is exactly along the projected line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway :

Miners in the Kitamaat, Kitsilas and Telkwa camps are still hoping for the building of the Kitamaat-Hazelton Railway, which will give access to the rich mineral belt of the coast and Kitsilas range of mountains, and the extensive agricultural, grazing and hydraulic areas of the Upper Skeena, the Bulkley and Omenica. At the present time, however, lack of transportation facilities is an effectual bar to extensive development work.

I know that country myself to a certain extent, and I know the great difficulties the miners are subjected to for want of railway communication. I will go a little further, and will read what is said about the Ptarmigan group of mines in the Kitsilas camp, which is a very rich camp :

The owners of this group, realizing that nothing more can be done to develop these claims without better transportation facilities, only employed a small gang of men during the season. Work was shut down in September, and a shipment of five tons of ore was made to test the property. The owners have applied for Crown grants for this group.

Statutory assessment work has also been performed on the Washington, Northland, Toulon, Bull-Dog, Montezeuma, Eureka, Hatzie, Golden Crown, Ruby, Granite, Golden King, Goldfinch, Golden Eagle, Golden Crown Extension, Strathcona, Helma and Monte Cristo. I do not anticipate that any extensive development work will be prosecuted on any of these properties, some of which look exceedingly promising until railroad communication with the coast becomes an accomplished fact. The Skeena river is, at best, a very uncertain highway, owing to the sudden rise and fall of the waters ; added to which the freight rates are so high as to effectually deter any one from attempting to take in the supplies and machinery necessary for conducting mining operations on a large scale.

The following refers to the Telkwa river camp :—

In this camp only the usual assessment work has been performed on the Forrest Group, the Big Blue, Surprise and Constance mineral claims. The same difficulty—want of communication—is experienced here as at Kitsilas.

Perhaps the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) would tell these men that they have no need of a railroad. Well, I can fancy the hon. gentleman going to their camp and telling them so. If he did, I think he would find a more rapid means of transit out of that camp than he is accustomed to. I take it that these men know the value of railroad building to a mining country. Then, we travel further east to the districts of the Cariboo, Omenica, and Cassiar, about which the report says :

As for the transportation facilities for getting in supplies, &c., into the district, they have not materially changed since the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, except that the roads are much improved. Ashcroft is the point of departure from the railway. From here a stage runs twice a week in summer and once a week in winter to Barkerville—285 miles—while from the 150-Mile House stages go once a week to Quesnel Forks and Bullion, sixty miles, and to Harper's Camp, thirty-five miles. The roads are good, the numerous stopping houses are clean, comfortable and reasonable as to price, and the stages as comfortable as stages ever are. The stage company carries both mail and express, running 'specials' whenever the traffic justifies it. The freight rate from Ashcroft to Barkerville is six cents per pound, and to Quesnel from four cents to five cents. These rates, of from $100 to $120 per ton, seem almost prohibitive as to heavy mine machinery, &c., and often amount to more than the cost of the articles ; yet, while they are high, the rates are not extortionate, as at these figures there is nothing more in it than bare wages for the freighters, so that these amounts will not be materially reduced until a railway of some sort is built into the district.

In the Cariboo country alone, under these adverse conditions, placer gold to the value of $4,168,307 has been produced during the past three years. And when you consider, Mr. Speaker, that these districts are situated three and five hundred miles from other means of transportation, consequently these have to be packed on horses and mules' backs from the seaboard or from Ashcroft on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, you can readily see the immense difficulties surrounding the carrying out of the enterprise. The hon. gentleman says no need for haste. Let us look further afield, and see if we cannot find the Macedonian cry : Come over and help us.

This report, which I am about to read, is from the gold commissioner of the Omineca mining division, a gentleman who has been many years in that country and on whose statements we can thoroughly rely. By it you will see that there is no doubt as to the future of the country and the immediate requirement of another transcontinental line :

Now that two transcontinental railways are heading for the Pacific coast, both of which will tap the Omineca district, and one which, if the Pine or Peace river pass is chosen, will pass within a short distance of Manson creek,

which is at present the centre of mining operations in this vicinity, the Omineca district is bound to spring into prominence, as once the great cost and difficulty of travel and transportation of supplies have been reduced, as they will be by railway communication, the hundred square miles of country that at present are unknown and unprospected will be thrown open. A vast extent of country lying north of the Omineca river and west of the Findlay is known at the present time to contain gold in paying quantities if supplies could be got into that portion of the district, and it only requires improved means of transportation to convert this locality from an undeveloped wilderness, as the greater portion of it is to-day, into one of the richest and best mining districts in the province. A railway will place Manson, as regards transportation, in the same position as Revelstoke on the Canadian Pacific Railway is at present. During this past season several parties of prospectors were in the district, but on account of shortage of supplies were unable to push their way any distance from Manson. Some, however, were so favourably impressed with what they saw of the country, that they have stored part of their outfit and intend returning next season.

As the transportation question is to-day the most important question before the people of Canada, every effort should be put forth to give additional transportation facilities between the great central wheat and cattle country of Canada and the Atlantic seaboard. But, in doing this I am afraid we are liable to lose sight of the fact that Canada has another gateway in the west which deserves consideration. Providence has been very kind to us in placing the great wheat and cattle country in the centre of this vast Dominion, and it is so situated that it is almost equally distant from each coast. In making this statement, I would endeavour to show that in the near future almost half the trade of the North-west Territories of Canada will, of necessity, go to the Pacific coast at Vancouver instead of coming eastward via Montreal or St. John. Vancouver, situated as she is on one of the greatest harbours of the world, is eminently fitted to be the great western gateway of Canada.

At the present time and for the past number of years a very large export grain trade is carried on between the western coast of the United States and continental points, and at the cities of Tacoma, Portland and San Francisco, numbers of vessels are loaded each year with grain for Europe and Japan. This grain is transported by rail, in many cases, a distance of 900 miles from the coast, and what they are now doing on the western coast of the United States we can equally well do on the western coast of Canada, and in this way relieve the channels of transportation in eastern Canada at times when it is almost impossible to handle the trade.

The best transportation authorities have stated that freight can be carried four and a half miles by water for every one mile by land. On that basis I will endeavour to show just how far east from the Pacific coast the dividing line can be. That is the line where the freight rate will divide so that part will go east and part will go west.

At the present time the government of the United States have undertaken to build the great Panama canal, which they expect to have completed within eight years. When this canal is completed it will revolutionize the trade, not only to the United States, but to western Canada, and while we are in a position to-day to take advantage of the very long water route around Cape Horn, yet when this immense undertaking is completed, the distance from Liverpool to Vancouver will be reduced about 8,000 miles and the dangers of navigation will be reduced at least 50 per cent. I have discussed this matter with ship captains, and they all agree that the dangers around Cape Horn are greater than during all the rest of the voyage. Sometimes, they say, it takes them as long as sixty days to make around Cape Horn.

Take a point 960 miles east of Vancouver which shall bring you in the vicinity of Moosejaw, and multiply that by four and a half, to bring it up to a water rate, it will amount to 4,320 miles, and from Vancouver to Liverpool via Panama canal, the distance is 8,520 miles. This gives the total distance from Moosejaw to Liverpool, via Vancouver and the Panama canal, of 12,840 miles. From said point in the North-west Territories to St. John by rail is 2,124 miles, which, when converted into water rate, will amount to 9,558 miles. From St. John to Liverpool, the distance is 2,700 miles, making a total distance of 12,879 miles, at an all water rate. This, I think will show that the time will come in the near future when the dividing line between the east and the west will be decided upon by transportation companies for their own advantage.

At the present time the greatest article for transportation from the Pacific coast to the North-west Territories is lumber. As an indication of what the trade of western Canada will be in the future, I will refer to the lumber trade as it is at present. The government of Canada are doing everything possible to encourage immigration to the North-west Territories. In doing so every effort should be put forth by the government of Canada, so that the people coming into Canada should not suffer by unnecessary hardships. It is stated that 100,000 settlers will settle in the North-west this year, and it is computed that an average of four people comprise a family. Consequently there will be, at the very least, 25,000 families who will require houses to live in within a year. Each family will require a house say 17 x 21 feet, which, when subdivided, will make two bed rooms 8 x 9 feet and a kitchen 11 x 16 feet. This house if double boarded which is necessary in a cold climate, will require

5,000 feet of lumber, figuring the roof as lumber doubled. In addition to the house, they will require a small stable suitable for four horses, which will require 3,500 feet of lumber, making in all 8,500 feet for each family. We have estimated that there will be 25,000 families. Consequently they will require in all 212,500,000 feet of lumber. The people now in the country will require for new buildings, railway purposes, elevators and the building of new towns, &c., as much more, making in all the enormous amount of 425,000,000 feet. This will load 53,125 cars at 8,000 feet per car or 5,312 trains of ten cars each, or 14½ trains for each and every day in the year. And, as nearly all this lumber must come from British Columbia, and mostly from Vancouver for the present, you can instantly see that the Canadian Pacific Railway, as now constituted, have a big contract in hand to carry on this enormous business.

In dealing with this question of transportation so far, I have only taken up the part which refers to Canada and Europe. I do not intend to omit probably the greater factor which we shall have in the near future in connection with the transportation question, and that is the trade which is increasing day by day between the Pacific coast and the orient, Australia, South Africa and India. This trade is increasing by leaps and bounds. I recollect very well when the first steamboats came into Vancouver with merchandise from the east. Their first trips were a little before my time, but I can remember when the old 'Abyssinian' and 'Parthian' were objects of interest to us, the first boats on the Pacific carrying merchandise from the orient to our ports. The cargoes were very small indeed. But the great Canadian Pacific went out for business with the orient, and they got it. And they have now five of the largest steamers of the Pacific carrying merchandise, and that trade is increasing as I say, by leaps and bounds. I would like the House to realize the immense latent possibilities in this trade. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the half has not been told. And when the Grand Trunk Pacific with the knowledge and the capital they have, and having the desire and being under the business necessity of developing traffic—when they take the field a business will be built up as compared with which that of the present will be nothing. I do not wish to be too extravagant in my estimate. But, Mr. Speaker, I can remember, in my short sixteen years of experience on the coast the immense development which has already taken place through the advent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway has done immense things for our country; it has done the things that no other agency could ever be expected to accomplish. It went into the primeval forest and built the city of Vancouver. It has built opera houses, sugar refineries, and smelters. Will any hon. gentleman tell me that I should support a government operated road in the face of the things I have seen and know? I am as strong a believer in government control as any man in this House; I yield to no man in my desire to maintain intact the rights and interests of all the people. But I believe that under the contract now before us we have all the good features of government ownership and government control, without the incubus of government operation. If we were a people who would stand being policed like the people of Germany—and I do not want to make any reflection on that people, but it cannot be denied that we are more democratic than they are—we could operate state-owned roads. But until we come to understand that we must be governed by one man and ruled with the strong hand, we need never expect to have state-owned and state-operated railways in Canada. The theory of state-operated railroads is a beautiful thing, but it is idle to talk of it in the case of a people who have the sense of independence that inspires the people of this Dominion. I believe in state-governed railroads as this one, but I have got a little off the track——

Mr. GALLIHER. You are on a good track anyway.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I was speaking of the trade that will be developed with China and Japan. It is estimated that there are 450,000,000 people living in those two countries. Up to three years ago they had not adopted western ideas, they had not begun to wear European clothing or eat such food as we eat. But Japan has taken the initiative. Japan, Mr. Speaker, is remarkable for its power of imitating other nations. But, up to this hour, Japan was simply an imitator. Nor do I wish to make any disparaging remarks about the Japanese. I do not like them as they appear in this country, it is quite true. But they are good enough people in Japan as the Chinese are good enough people in China. These people are all right in their place, but they do not make good Canadians. If the Japanese go on as they are now going it will not be many years before they will be able to take their stand with other nations of the world. They are rapidly adopting our ideas. They have begun to eat wheat flour and are putting up roller mills to grind wheat from this continent. They are already importing considerable quantities of American and Canadian flour. They are more anxious now to get the Canadian than the American article, for our good friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has been over there and has shown them the excellent bread that can be made from Manitoba No. 1 hard. China is fast becoming Japanized, if you will allow me that expression. The Chinese people see that their Japanese neighbours are going ahead fast, and they are

following in their footsteps. While China may never use flour universally as a food, while there may be millions of people there who will never use it, owing to the fact that rice is so much cheaper, yet I believe that the better and wealthier classes in China and Japan will use flour. I think I am safe in saying that, within fifteen years—for we must remember that events move more rapidly than they used to do—150,000,000 millions in the orient will be eating flour. It is easy to see what that would mean for Canada. Mr. Hill, possibly one of the best railroad men we have in America says that the market for the North-western part of America is China and Japan, and that the demand there will keep wheat up to its normal price.

In addition to this, the trade between Canada and Australia, and also the trade between Canada and South America are increasing very rapidly. I have endeavoured to suggest that fair opportunities should be afforded for the trade I have just mentioned. For, no matter what our sentiments may be as between east and west, the trade of the country will go through its natural channels. But, unless you improve and develop these natural channels, the trade of the country will dwindle. For many years the trade of British Columbia went through American ports. It was not until the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway were we able to deal direct with the people in the orient.

We are in Canada peculiarly situated as it is only in Canada that any vast amount of unoccupied arable land exists. Now the great migrations of population have always been for the most part along the parallels of latitude of the north temperate zone. From prehistoric times the population of the far east has widened out in every widening circle of thousands of years. Vast numbers of people have moved towards the setting sun. At last the course of that movement to the western boundary of the old world was reached and then population moved across the ocean and during the nineteenth century Europe sent to the shores of the United States eighteen million souls, attracted altogether I may say by the wonderful free public lands offered by the American people. I take it, and I may diverge a little here that no country can be a great manufacturing country until its arable lands are exhausted. We know what immense strides the American people have made during the last one hundred years on account of the wonderful arable lands of that country. They have reached and have reached some time ago the point of exhaustion of these lands, but we, in Canada, are in the same position as the people of the United States were seventy-five years ago. The western half of Canada equals in area England, Ireland, Scotland, Denmark, Switzerland, Germany and most of European Russia, and the production of the Canadian soil will surpass that of the corresponding European area. There are in these sections of Canada fully two millions of acres of land fit for production and there are in the corresponding area of Europe to which I have referred two hundred and fifteen million souls. I have not mentioned in this connection the wonderful productiveness of British Columbia which has such great food resources in her waters. Salmon abound in almost incredible numbers, while halibut and cod are even more plentiful. I can tell you that the British Columbia halibut banks equal any in the world and when I say that a boat can go out from the shores of Vancouver and come back in four days with a full cargo of halibut, it is almost beyond belief.

Mr. SPROULE. We cannot tell fish stories like that in the east.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Perhaps we cannot tell fish stories. But in the waters of British Columbia there are no suckers.

British Columbia has been for years a prospecting ground for gold and it is known that in this metal that province is wonderfully rich, then there are copper, coal and iron. It is well known that the iron mines, especially in southern British Columbia, are rich and they are placed as if nature had intended them to be for the use of man, for there are rich coal fields close at hand. I have spoken already of the vast wealth of British Columbia in agriculture, fish and minerals, and I should add that our country is particularly rich in its supply of timber, of cedar and Douglas fir. The forests of British Columbia contain over two hundred billions feet of uncut fir and cedar. It has been said that British Columbia seems destined to become the shipyard for the supply of all nations.

Now, I could go on, but I have promised the House that I will not take up its time. I will only say in conclusion that the man who says we are not, in British Columbia, clamouring for another transcontinental line does not understand the feeling of the people of British Columbia.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I was informed this morning that I would follow the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson). I have listened closely to the hon. member and as far as I can see, he has made very few points either for or against this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It seems to me that his principal arguments and language have been in favour of Vancouver or Burrard's Inlet, and it seems that the only important thing, according to the gentlemen sitting around him in that section, are suckers. Well, Mr. McCraney, who ought to know all about that country, who has been there a number of years, writes me that it is not suckers but grafters, and that there are so many of them that they are really an injury and a curse to the country. Now, whatever a grafter is, I do not know. It may be a fish for all

I know, but I have to reply and speak, I believe, in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. But an amendment has been moved in the House, and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I will be able to speak on that amendment, which refers to government ownership of railways. It was on this question that the election in West Elgin hinged; if I had not been an advocate of government ownership of railroads and of no bonuses to railroads unless the railroads or whoever got the bonuses were obliged to give back to the government something for the money paid to them, I do not believe that I would be here in this House, and I am sure that the sentiment has grown all over this vast country in favour of government ownership, and I notice that one party in this House only a few days ago pledged themselves to, or at least, enunciated their policy as government ownership. I suppose owing to the unique position I occupy in this House, my speech will not commend itself perhaps to any gentleman on this side or on that side of the House, but at the same time I wish to say that I do not think it would be right, I do not think it is right, for any man in this House to discuss any question in any way other than on its merits. We have heard vituperation, we have heard some of the vilest language, language such as would not be used in a common village debate, and the desk thumping and the rattling was astonishing to me when any one would make a point which members thought was for or against them. I do not suppose there will be any desk-thumping on either side when I have made a point. I do hope there will be no desk-thumping. Those who disagree with me have a perfect right to do so, and those who agree with me have a perfect right to do so, but I do not think any gentleman has a right to abuse me because I do not belong to this or that party. We are all supposed to be here to do what is best in the interests of our country, that is what we advocate on the hustings and what we talk to our constituents—country before party. Yet, in nine cases out of ten the party elects the member and expects him to be there too. Now, Sir, I am tool to no one, and I do not expect any one to be a tool to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this country and this House, too, is getting tired of this debate. We have not had a new idea advanced for the last three or four days, and it is about time that some member started out on a fresh route. Well, we have to confine ourselves to the subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman saying hear hear, but I do not want them to thump the desk. Now, Sir, I would not speak on this question, because, as I said before, very little has been said on the question proper, but I wish to put myself on record as being strongly in favour of government ownership. This plan that the government have introduced may be better than my plan, but at the same time, I hold these convictions and I dare to express them.

Now, Sir, we are all aware that railroads are a great blessing wherever they are planted. We know that if we were to be deprived of railroads we would go back almost into an uncivilized condition. Therefore, we must have them, and the country must be developed. Consequently, wherever there are no railroads it is the duty of the government to see that they are built, and that the country is opened up. I will not say now whether it is proper for the government to push forward this scheme at this particular time, not knowing anything about those vast regions that we have heard of; although some gentlemen undertake to tell us how many trees, how many streams, how many mountains there are in that stretch of country 3,000 miles long, I have not seen one person yet that has ever been over the line. But we believe that sometime that country will be developed, and that there is room enough in the region to be traversed by this railroad to plant 10,000,000 of people, on a strip 20 miles wide each side of the road. The people of Europe are waiting to go in there, and we are told here that we cannot wait any longer for this road. The people of Europe are waiting for us to bring them out here and plant them on these fertile plains of the Northwest. But whether this is the proper time to build the road in the way proposed, is another question, and I am not now discussing whether the proposition is right or wrong, though those who have introduced it and have thoroughly studied it, ought to know. But speaking of the millions coming out to this country, or waiting to come, why, Sir, if the children of Israel, when the Exodus took place, and who had so much difficulty in crossing the Red sea, had known about this glorious heritage that we have on this continent, they would never have settled in Palestine, which is about the poorest land under Heaven, but they would have come out to this country, and we would now have Jews for our neighbours. Why, the people generally don't know what a glorious heritags we have here. If that land is as good as it is reported to be, then we shall want more than one road, and we shall want them built by the government. I do not mean to say that the operation of the road should be carried on by the government, because we do not want to see every man who works on that road a mere government hack, who is put there to vote as the government tells him to vote. I am strongly opposed to that. The ex-Minister of Railways said that the Intercolonial should not be placed under a commission. I think that every government railway should be operated by a commission. We do not want to see every man who works for the government obliged to vote

just as the Minister of Railways tells him to.

Now, speaking of railroads and their advantages, the first time I had the pleasure of travelling through the North-west, there were no railways built, and to get there I had to go through American territory. I struck our boundary at Emerson. Winnipeg was not very large then, it was called old Fort Garry, a little while before, and it would be old Fort Garry yet if the Canadian Pacific Railway had not been built. So you see the great good that has been done by that railroad in building up the North-west. That country has been called the great lone land, and if we had not had railroads built through it, it would be a great lone land yet, whereas it is now blossoming like the rose, with thousands of miles of railroad running in every direction.

The Canadian Pacific Railway was a very costly affair for Canada when it was built. I do not say that the promoters of that road did not act to the best of their light, according to the best knowledge they had, but they made a great mistake. We are all apt to make mistakes, but when they recognized a syndicate of men and granted them large bonuses of money, and lands, and railroads already constructed, amounting altogether, I think, to some $145,000,000, they created an enormous corporation, and I think they then made a mistake. They had the courage to secure the building of the road by a company, but they should have had courage enough to bond that road, and gone to England and borrowed the money on their own responsibility, and then the people would have owned the road. As it was they became responsible for the bonds. Then we would have owned that road ourselves, and every acre of that land, and a great portion of that country would not now be under the control of a corporation. But you have lost that opportunity, and now that another opportunity presents itself equally favourable, I hope the government will not let it pass. You have had one unfortunate experience of that kind, and don't have another. I say that $145,000,000 of money would have built that road, every inch of it; it did not cost $50,000 a mile; then you would not have a wealthy syndicate composed of Lord somebodies, and of great noblemen to look up to, but you would have had instead a railroad owned by yourselves. I have great sympathy with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) who moved that amendment yesterday, and talked so logically and with so much good sense. I am sure other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question will excuse me when I say that it was the best speech yet made in this House since this debate began.

This proposed Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will not pass through my constituency, it will not come within several hundred miles of it. At the same time, the people of my constituency are broad minded, and are willing to help their neighbours to develop this country. They want to see this country something more than a mere fringe along the American border, but I do not think they will complain if this road is built and owned by the people themselves. I do not think they are anxious to see another great syndicate formed, having such vast power in this country. By this proposition you are creating an incubus which you propose to place upon your own necks, something that will be a damage to the public interest. Why, Sir, with these two large corporations, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Company, to say nothing of this new Grand Trunk Pacific Company, if they were to unite their forces at the next election they could elect nearly every man they wished. They have influence and power enough in almost every constituency to elect nearly every man who comes to this House, and they will elect such men as will serve their purpose. They are not Grits or Tories, they are looking after their own interests. The other day a member of this House said to me, I am just between the devil and the deep sea, or words to that effect. He said, 'There are a thousand Grand Trunk votes in my constituency, and if I vote against that measure the Grand Trunk Company will use all its influence against me; and if I do not vote against it, then the farmers will all vote against me.'

It was something like the juror who was sitting on the trial of the seven bishops in the reign of James II. This juror who was a brewer was much concerned and he said: Oh Lord, I am ruined anyhow; if I give a verdict against the bishops I will never brew any more beer for the people, and if I do not, I will never brew any more beer for the king. That poor brewer was in jeopardy, and that is just the way with the members of this House who are under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway the Grand Trunk Railway and all the other railways. Now, Sir, we want to get out from that position. So far as I am concerned I don't care for any of these corporations. I will do my duty. This country is not so old that we cannot retrace our steps and start on the right track. We started wrong some years ago; let us start right now, and we have excellent advice how to do it. The member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) took strong ground against government ownership; the member for Hants (Mr. Russell) followed him in the same strain, and the Minister of Justice supported these two gentlemen. But unfortunately for the Minister of Justice he brought some evidence in which altogether he did not like. He supported his case against government ownership by quotations from Sir John A. Macdonald, but I do not think he would swear on John A. Macdonald for every thing; however he used him because it suited his purpose. John A.

Macdonald was bound hand and foot to the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate and could not help himself—it is quite possible that the gentlemen on the treasury benches are in the same fix to-day with other railway corporations. Now, Sir, I do not wish to take up the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). This is about the time that I usually conclude my speech, but if the House is determined to say 'go on' I will have to be polite. You would think that the member for Westmoreland lived in the western part of Canada and knew nothing about the Intercolonial Railway. He does not seem to know that it cost $70,000,000 and that it is doing excellent service in its own way. He forgets that the country through which it runs is unsettled and that it is almost impossible to make the Intercolonial Railway pay commercially. Why, it was never intended to pay commercially. It was built as a military road, and we all remember that the Trent affair helped to bring about its construction. However, it has connected the colonies and we could not get along without the Intercolonial. It is one of the grandest things in Canada although it does cost something. I would like to see more of it. If the Intercolonial railway does not pay the Dominion in cash, it pays the people of the maritime provinces, and generally speaking it pays us all to have it.

It has been argued by gentlemen on the treasury benches that the government could not operate a railway in the public interest. I am sorry the Postmaster General is not present, because I would like to tell him that he his discharging a public duty very well, and we hear no complaints. Hundreds of thousands of dollars go through his hands and millions of people are reached, and reached pretty accurately through the instrumentality of the post office. If the government can run the post office right, what is the matter with them running the railways right. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) said it would take $50,000 a year to pay a magnate to look after a government railway. Well, Sir, there is no danger of him getting the job. If it takes $50,000 a year to pay a railway manager, I do not wonder that the shareholders get no dividend. I think $50,000 a year is more than one man can earn. I think there is a mistake in that regard, but the hon. gentleman may know that they get $50,000, I do not. It is admitted that the Postmaster General runs the post office, or at least it is run to the best of the Postmaster General's ability through his deputy. We have other institutions run by the government which I suppose you gentlemen have no experience of and I hope you never will; I mean the penitentiaries. I understand that the penitentiaries are run well enough. Then there are the asylums and other institutions managed by the government all over the country, and there is no reason why the railroads should not be managed by the government. Of course it will take some time to get into it; some time to get the right men, but we have boys growing up in Canada who will be quite competent to run our railroads and we need not go to the United States or any where else for them. Now, as to the bonding privilege, I felt pleased the other day to hear the Prime Minister with all his eloquence expound the idea that we should be independent of the Americans. But the hon. gentleman has the Intercolonial Railway over which we can bring all the stuff we want in bond. I do not think we need fear any threats about the bonding privileges. I hate to be threatened; I am just as sensitive as the Prime Minister as to that, but this threatening does not amount to much, and so long as there are such presidents as Roosevelt there is no danger of any injustice being done to us Canadians. But, Sir, if we should happen to get a crank as president as we had some years ago, then we might perhaps be in jeopardy. I do not know that I need mention his name for you gentlemen are well enough posted to know who I mean. If we are in jeopardy from that cause we cannot get straight to the ocean simply because the land that our forefathers fought for, was given away by a certain Lord Ashburton, and consequently we are hemmed in and cannot get in a straight line to our ocean ports.

I remember reading some time ago of a legislator in the United States who was very anxious to do some great good for Canada. So he cudgelled his brains and got up a resolution to have the Senate of the United States and the President and the whole machinery put into operation in order to buy Canada from Great Britain and hand it over to the United States. I believe there was one fool enough in the world to attempt to do that. I am not so big a fool as that; I will not go so far; but if our government were to appeal to the American government and tell them that there is a piece of land down there lying near our orchard which once belonged to us, and that we are willing to pay a fair price for it, I think the people living in that part of the state of Maine would be glad to come under the old flag which has waved a thousand years, and which represents more civil and religius liberty than any other flag in the world. I think we might buy that part of the state of Maine, and then we would have a straight road to St John. I think it would be just as rational for us to propose to do that as for the United States legislator to propose that the United States should buy up Canada.

While we have the Intercolonial, there is no difficulty about getting to the sea; but you people will not wait long enough to get there; you want to hurry to New York or Boston, because it will save you a few hours'

time. I think we ought to patronize our own ports, and carry as much of our produce as possible over the Intercolonial. I got a copy of the Intercolonial Railway time-table this morning, and I see that six trains run a day on that railway, and many others could be run. We are told by members of this House that it is one of the best roads in America, with the easiest grades, and that although it is a little longer, it makes as good time to the seaboard as other roads. If that is so, the question of the bonding privilege is settled. We can ship our own products over our own road through our own territory. So that I do not think we have anything to complain of so far as independence of the bonding privilege is concerned. But, as has been well argued here, the Americans themselves are not anxious to abrogate the bonding privilege, because they make a profit out of it; and the American people are not willing to give up anything that they make money out of—my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) knows that.

Now, Sir, we had a discussion here the other day on the two-cent-a-mile rate. Railways should be compelled to carry passengers for two cents a mile That would be easily accomplished if the government owned the railways. There would not be any begging of the railway magnates to do justice to the people of this country, because the government would then see that the people got justice. The railways to-day are masters of the situation, and their mandate has to be obeyed. I have had opportunities of knowing that. Some years ago the people in my section applied to this House for a charter to build a railroad through the southern counties of Ontario; they came here year after year, but they met with the direst opposition from the railway companies and the other parties interested. But finally they obtained a charter to build the road, and they built it. The Canada Southern owned it for a time, but finally leased it, I am told, to the Michigan Central for 999 years. So we are sure whose hands we are in during our time. There are managers and superintendents of railroads who are very courteous and try to accommodate the people, and to oblige them; but at other times they are not just so obliging. Some members of this House wept scalding tears and showed a great deal of sympathy for the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals because he left the cabinet. Well, Sir, I did not weep any tears, simply because I found that that hon. gentleman, while he was the Minister of Railways and Canals, was the guardian angel of the railways; and whenever the farmers of this country asked for justice from the railways, that hon. gentleman stood by them as if he owned them, and he was master of the situation. So I did not shed any tears. A town in my constituency, a growing and thriving place called Dutton, near the centre of the thriving township of Dunwich, has but one railroad crossing in the town. The people of that place appealed to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to have another road built some sixty rods from the first one, so that the farmers might ship their cattle, draw their grain to the mill, and do other business. They sent maps and plans and letters, showing the necessity for the change. There are two railway tracks there parallel and close to each other, and when I tell you that very often a train goes thundering along one track at the rate of a mile a minute while cars are standing on the other, you will realize why the people there wanted another crossing. Their request was so reasonable that I thought no Committee of the Privy Council would refuse to grant it. I appeared before the Committee of the Privy Council and appealed to them on the subject, but my appeal had no effect whatever. The present crossing is a very dangerous one, a number of people having been killed there. The government sent their engineer, and the railway company sent its engineer, to make an examination, and I went and met them. The councils of the township and town both petitioned for another crossing; but they did not get it, and have not got it yet.

The other day I brought up the question of protecting farmers and drovers in connection with the shipment of cattle, and stated that some of the wealthiest and best men in our part of the country had been killed; and when I asked the late Minister of Railways and Canals if he could not put something in the Railway Commission Bill to protect the farmers, he just laughed at me. Well, I think the men who pay a heavy price for shipping their cattle on the railroad ought to be protected against negligence or carelessness. But the minister ignored my request altogether. If we had government ownership, do you not think something would be done to remedy the grievances of these people? Only last session I asked the Minister of Railways and Canals to compel the railway companies to make the farm gates in such a way that a small boy could go down through the farm and bring the cattle across from the other side of the track. He said he could not do it now because a great many of them, instead of swinging on hinges, were rolling along on slides and often in snow three or four feet deep, so that the children could not open them. I asked him to provide that railway companies would have to make these gates swing on hinges. And the large member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) came to his rescue, and of course our request was not granted. We know that in everything the farmers have applied for, they have been snubbed. We know how long the cattle-guard question was discussed in this House, session after session, and how long the farmers

have been trying to have the railway companies obliged to pay them for their injured and killed cattle. But the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would never yield an inch until forced to do so by members of his own party. Even on the question of drainage across railway tracks, he set a determined front against the railways being obliged to contribute to the expense, but I am pleased to see that in the new act this obligation is imposed on the railway companies, and the ex-minister was the only one who voted against the amendment to this effect. I am therefore not going to shed any tears because the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals is out of the cabinet. I had no intention of making these references to the ex-minister, but it becomes my duty to do so as advocating the government ownership of railways.

I am strongly in favour of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), but I am afraid that the people are not far enough advanced to adopt it. You cannot get the people advanced in a very short time. The hon. member for Winnipeg is many years ahead of his time, and in that respect perhaps he resembles the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who has been advocating the same thing for years, and whose voice no doubt will be heard on this Bill before the debate is closed.

I wish to make an appeal to this House on behalf of the farmers. We have been here since the middle of March and have had to neglect our harvest. It seems to me that this House ought to meet in January. I moved last year an amendment to a resolution, and by my amendment I asked that the House should meet in the middle of January, but it was laughed out of court. But just as soon as we have a majority of farmers in this House, we will meet the first week in January and will quit for harvest. If the farmers were represented here in proportion to their wealth and numbers, they would run this House to suit the greatest industry in this country, the agricultural interest, but they unfortunately allow the wire-pullers to run this country. No doubt some of the men here are earnest, hard workers, regular in attendance, and anxious to get business done, but there are a great many others who would give Rudyard Kipling plenty of opportunity for the exercise of his satire. We know what Kipling wrote about the English dudes, who neglect their business, squander their opportunities and waste their time. He said that they were 'flannelled fools at the wicket and muddled oafs at the goal.' If he were to see how half the members of this House fill in their time—one hour in the chamber and then dawdling around the lobbies, he would hit them off pretty sarcastically. I say this in all kindness, because I do not wish to hurt anybody's feelings, but we should do something to get on with business and go out and help the country. Our farmers are paying $2 per day for harvest hands, and half the members of this House are able-bodied men who would be willing to take a job in the harvest field. They would be better employed in that work than dawdling around here, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that you will use your influence to have the work of the session forwarded and to induce the government to take up the policy of government ownership of railways as soon as possible.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. member for West Elgin, who has just spoken, upon the arguments he used in favour of government ownership of railways. He arrives at the conclusion that because the government can run penitentiaries and lunatic asylums it can run railways. That seems to have been one of the leading arguments in support of the resolution moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee).

Before going into the details of the proposition before the House, I desire to offer my sincere congratulations to the government for having grappled with this railway problem in a strong and fearless manner—in such a way as not only to do justice to the west and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but also to the maritime provinces which have been crying out so long for better communication with the rest of the Dominion. Some people are surprised that the maritime provinces should have put up the fight they have in order to have this railway built into those provinces. But if those people lived in the provinces down by the sea, if they knew the difficulties under which we have laboured since we came into confederation, they would find no cause to wonder that our constant endeavours have been to bring ourselves in as close communication as possible with the central provinces. Such a policy appeals to our hearty support because we recognize the position in which we have been placed by confederation. It is to be regretted that we could not have this railway problem discussed without bringing in extraneous matter, but the hon. gentleman, who has left the cabinet and who held the portfolio of Railways and Canals during seven years, took upon himself to bring into the discussion matters which had nothing whatever to do with the problem before the country; and while I have been, and I am still, a personal friend of the hon. gentleman, I must say that I do not think it was to his credit, when he discussed this question, which should be discussed on a high plane, to have brought in the name of Senator Cox. What has Senator Cox to do with the railway problem? As a matter of fact, he only consented to become an associate with the Grand Trunk Railway in this matter

after he had been urged most strongly by them to do so. And suppose he is associated with the Grand Trunk Railway, what have we got to say against him ? Is there anything in that association of which we should be ashamed ? You would think, by the way he is talked about in this country by the opposition, that he is a jailbird and only fit for one of the penitentiaries referred to by the hon. member for Elgin, The facts are that Senator Cox has risen from the humblest station to a foremost place among the leading men of the Dominion of Canada. To-day he is the president of one of the largest life insurance companies, one of the largest fire insurance companies and one of the largest banks in the Dominion. He is honoured by all who know him best ; and we know that it is an advantage to every business undertaking, however great, to have his name associated with it. This criticism of Senator Cox is only an attempt on the part of the opponents of this project to draw a red herring across the trail. My friend the ex-Minister of Railways and the hon. members on the other side of the House have contended that there was no need for this road. The hon. ex-minister said that it was never mooted until just before it was brought under the consideration of the House, and he further said that he saw no reason now for the construction of the proposed national line. He cried out in a dramatic way : Where is the crisis the Premier speaks of ? And he accused the government of being seized with hysteria. I will prove out of the ex-minister's own mouth that the construction of this railway is an immediate and imperative necessity. We have had quoted here the hon. gentleman's speech in British Columbia. Let me read a despatch from Montreal after the Minister of Railways had returned from the west. This despatch appears in the Manitoba 'Free Press' of November 3rd, 1902. This shows what the hon. gentleman thought at that time, for this is an account of an interview with him. He said :

There is ample room for at least four more railways right through to the Pacific. The thing that impressed me on my trip through the North-west most of all was the need for more railways. I went over portions of the Canadian Pacific, Northern Pacific, Canadian Northern, and Great Northern, and found that while they had advanced very rapidly they had been unable to keep up with the remarkable progress of the country.

And further on he said :

Not only should the west have at least four more railways, but I am further convinced that it must have them, or the cause of immigration which has been so active will receive a severe setting back. The out-lying districts are already filling up very rapidly, and unless transportation facilities are afforded the settlers, they will quickly become discontented and advise others not to come into the country. . . As a result of my visit——

This was the railway administrator of this country who was speaking.

—I hope to show parliament the necessity for a government railway——

That is his peculiar kind of railway, of course, but nevertheless a railway——

—through the west, for their cannot any longer be any doubt that the future of the Dominion lies greatly in the districts beyond the great lakes.

Mr. BROCK. Did the ex-minister say that all those four railways were to go from Moncton ?

Mr. LOGAN. When I read the language of the ex-Minister of Railways saying that there is room for at least four more railways——

Mr. BROCK. All from Moncton ?

Mr. LOGAN. All transcontinental railways. I take it that the maritime provinces are as much a part of Canada as the province of Ontario. And the sooner my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) from the city of Toronto, which always wants everything it can get, realizes that the province of Nova Scotia is as much a part of the Dominion of Canada as the great city of Toronto, the sooner he will reach a very important truth. The ex-Minister of Railways, in the city of Montreal—not at a Vancouver banquet, where he might be affected by a spirit of exaltation, to use the expression which he has used with regard to the government, but when he came back, and in the quiet of the eastern part of Canada—expressed himself as I have quoted. Then he proceeded to his own province of New Brunswick. At the town of Campbellton he was tendered a banquet on the 1st December, 1902. He is reported in the St. John 'Telegraph'—which should report him correctly, as it belongs to him—to have spoken as follows, in reply to the toast of 'The Land we Live in.' :

He believed there was not a Canadian who had not within the last six or ten years learned a broader and higher conception of his country and its possibilities, and in following up this idea, the minister referred to his recent trip across the continent from Sydney to Victoria. Although the several provinces through which he had passed gave evidence of abounding prosperity, it was in the great and fertile west that the marvellous promise of Canada's future was conspicuous.

This trip had led him while at the coast, to tell of what his idea of what that country might become, and what its railway requirements would be. He had on that occasion spoken of the time near at hand when four transcontinental lines would find a profitable business and it was in the nature of a vindication of that view——

Listen to this—this is where he takes credit for the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. You will see that he is the father of the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, according to his own language :

—that six weeks later the Grand Trunk Railway had announced its purpose to construct a line from Ontario to the coast. If the present rate of immigration was maintained, the time might also come, when, as some one competent to form a judgment has said, a railway every thirty miles in both directions would not be more than enough to handle the vast volume of traffic that would be offering. Mr. Blair then spoke of his desire to have the Intercolonial extended to the Georgian Bay to Toronto, to various parts of Ontario and later, if the ground was not then altogether occupied, across the continent.

It will be seen that the idea in his mind at that time was that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be built across the continent to the Pacific ocean, and that some time later, if it were required, the Intercolonial also might be gradually extended across to the Pacific :

This statement of the minister's personal wishes was received with great cheering, as were also his patriotic reference to the future of the Dominion.

Some time afterwards the hon. gentleman was in the city of St. John, taking part in the election for the local legislature. He was not then loved by the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, as he is to-day. He was asked by a Conservative paper in St. John the reasons for his being there and taking part in a provincial election. He said, as reported in the St. John 'Telegraph' :

I am here because I believe it is in the interests of the Candian people as it is in the intersts of the people of St. John and this province, that they should not at this juncture, at the height of our glorious prosperity and with promising results in view, strike a blow or do an injury to the government which obtains at Ottawa at the present time.

I trust the ex-minister will read these words of his own and will apply them to himself at the present time. And what did he say with reference to railways ? Speaking on February 19th, 1903, he said, as reported by the St. John 'Telegraph' :

There is an immense western country behind the business of this port——

The port of St. John——

—and the people of Canada had become convinced that their products should find an outlet through Canadian ports.

And later on he said :

The productions of the west were increasing at a rate which warranted the belief that in the course of a few years 200,000,000 bushels of grain would be available for export and that half that quantity at least would find an outlet through the ports of St. John, Halifax and possibly Sydney.

Here we have the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals saying that the time was near at hand when, with proper facilities for connecting the east with the west, 100,000,000 bushels of grain would find their outlet through St. John, Halifax and, possibly, Sydney. In the speech he delivered at Vancouver on the 9th October, 1902, he said that the second transcontinental railway could not come fast enough for him. And he said further :

Nothing would prove so fruitful of magnicent realization to the people of this great west, than to run the railway right through to the Pacific coast and operate it upon, I will not say merely economical rates, but upon rates sufficient to pay working expenses, without dividend for the government or any one else.

That is his scheme—to build a railway to the coast without dividend either to the government or any one else.

That has been my dream. I dream that still, and I believe that it would be of no disadvantage even from a financial standpoint, to the people of this Dominion, either east or west ; I believe we would not feel the burden. I believe we would not know we had a road resting upon our shoulders. . . . . I can say with confidence that you have the sympathetic consideration of the government of the day. It would be, I think the proudest act which the government could achieve to lay down a broad, enlightened, progressive and imposing policy covering the grounds which I have pointed out to you.

There is where he laid down the policy, in the first place, of a second transcontinental road, declaring that it could not come fast enough for him. We see that he has also said that we needed four transcontinental railways, and that the transcontinental railway should be built and operated by the government. I happened to pick up the Halifax 'Herald,' and read an editorial upon this proposition of the ex-Minister of Railways. What does it say ? Of course, the 'Herald' talks differently now. But at that time it thus paid its compliments to the Minister of Railways :

Now, what would the country gain in return for this vast annual financial loss.

Under government ownership and operation.

Nothing whatever, so far as can be judged from the 'operating' of the Intercolonial. That road is 'operating' at an annual loss to the Dominion treasury of about $2,500,000——

Instead of the $1,5000,000 estimated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) :

—yet the part of the country specially served by it enjoys no better rates, and better service is afforded elsewhere by company roads that are making money and paying dividends. The same thing on a larger scale is all that could be looked for under Mr. Blair's 'dream.' It would afford the Minister of Railways a larger field for his 'peculiar methods' of management ; but the country has already had more than enough of Mr. Blair's 'peculiar methods' of 'operating' railways.

Sir, this is the language of the Halifax 'Herald' of last fall, after the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals had expressed his view in favour of the government owning a railway across the continent. But at the present time the newspapers of the op-

position are singing this gentleman's praises. He has not got these 'peculiar methods' apparently at the present time. When that hon. gentleman spoke in this House and denounced the government, and endeavoured to hold the Premier of this country up to scorn—endeavoured, I say, because the man does not live who is big enough to hold the Premier of this country up to scorn—but he endeavoured to do so, and for doing so the opposition cheered him loudly, and when he sat down they came over and gave him the right hand of fellowship, and welcomed him into their hearts, and into their ranks too, I presume. Only a short time ago we heard the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) charging the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals with having a 'toll gate' in the Windsor hotel, in the city of Montreal, but these same gentlemen gave him the right hand of fellowship the other night. They cried out, 'hear, hear,' when the hon. member for Compton charged him with having a toll gate in the Windsor hotel, though I did not believe a word of it, and we do not believe it to-day. But these very gentlemen apparently believed it, because they cheered the statement. They have painted him in the blackest colours, they have called him a boodler, and yet he is not so black, he is not so putrified, but they are quite willing to take him to their arms. Sir, the people of this country are not blind, they are able to appreciate the value of opinions so diametrically opposed to each other, expressed by the same men. We all know how their opinions have changed within the last six months with reference to the hon. member for St. Mary's division (Hon. Mr. Tarte), whom only a few months ago they covered with approbrious epithets, and spoke of him as that 'traitor Tarte.'

Let us consider what the proposition of building a transcontinental railway to be owned and operated by the government, means to this country. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals lately has stated that he has no quarrel with the building of the road from Quebec to Winnipeg, and thence to Port Simpson, but he does quarrel with the building of the road from Quebec to Moncton. Let us take the Intercolonial as a basis for argument for or against government ownership. The Intercolonial Railway has cost on capital account, over $70,000,000, or nearly $50,000 per mile. The deficits since 1876, after deducting surpluses, amounted to $5,281,000, or an average deficit of $200,000 per year. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Quebec to Winnipeg, according to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would be 1,400 miles long, and he thinks it will cost $49,000,000. The prairie section is 1,100 or 1,200 miles long, and a fair estimate of the cost of that section, to make it a first class railway, is $20,000 per mile. Call the length 1,000 miles, and you have $20,000,000 as the cost of the prairie section. The mountain section is about 600 miles long. The hon. member for South Lanark, speaking the other day in this debate, said that the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior exceeded $60,000 per mile. I do not suppose that the cost of this railroad through the mountain section will be any less than that sum. Therefore that 600 miles of the mountain section would cost $36,000,000. Adding the cost of the three sections together we have a total for the main line of $105,000,000. Now, this road cannot be operated merely as a main line without branches. There would have to be a branch into Montreal, one to North Bay, one to Port Arthur, with branches to Brandon, Regina, Prince Albert, Calgary and other points. If any one will figure out the distances of these different branches he will find that they exceed 1,000 miles. Put down the combined length at 1,000 miles, and let us estimate the average cost of their construction at $25,000 a mile, because many of these branches will have to pass through a difficult country for railway construction—1,000 miles of branch lines at $25,000 a mile, make a total of $25,000,000. Add that to the $105,000,000 and you have $130,000,000 for roadbed alone. Rolling stock and terminals for such a transcontinental railway to be operated by the government would without doubt amount to as much as $30,000,000. We cannot judge as to the cost of the elevators that would be necessary, we cannot judge as to the cost of the hotels that would be necessary, or the cost of parks, &c., or the cost of terminal facilities at Port Simpson. Therefore we will not put down anything for elevators, hotels, parks or anything of that sort, but we will simply estimate the cost of roadbed and rolling stock at $160,000,000. Suppose we borrowed that money at 3 per cent. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said we might have some difficulty in borrowing money at that rate, but I suppose we can borrow at 3 per cent, in which case we will have an annual interest account of $4,800,000. Now if the deficit on that road bear the same ratio to length as those on the 1,500 miles of the Intercolonial, we would have a deficit every year of $560,000. Therefore the total loss to the country in operating that government road, taking the Intercolonial as an example, would be $5,360,000 per year, or $1 for every man, woman and child in the whole Dominion.

But that is not all. It is necessary, in the operation of railways, to make good connections with them. But we would meet the antagonism of the great Grand Trunk system in Ontario, there would be the antagonism of the Canadian Pacific Railway system in Ontario, Quebec, and the west, and naturally we would have the antagonism of the Canadian Northern in the western country. Then when we had built our line from Quebec to Port Simpson it would be necessary for transcontinental trade, to have

lines of steamers running from Quebec to Liverpool on this side, and from Port Simpson to China and Japan on the Pacific. So we have now, not estimating the cost of these steamship lines, and without considering the question of elevators or the other things I have mentioned, an annual cost to the people of this country for this transcontinental road, of $5,300,000. Now, Sir, the hon. member for South Lanark does not agree with my proposition that the deficits on the Intercolonial are only $200,000 per year. In a speech which he delivered in this House in the present debate he stated,

If I mistake not, the deficit on the Intercolonial, if charged to revenue instead of being charged to capital account, would amount to $1,500,000 per year. If that is the case, if, 1,500 miles of railway occasion a deficit of $1,500,000 a year, then 3,200 miles of railway would occasion a deficit of $3,200,000. Add to that amount the interest account, and you have a loss to this country in operating this transcontinental road by the government, of $8,000,000 a year.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose I made a calculation of the cost to this country per annum of a government owned line of railway from Quebec to Port Simpson, and the operation of that railroad by the government. In the items which I gave of the expenditure was one for interest upon the capital invested. The reason that I made that calculation was that that was the proposition that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals made in Vancouver, where he said that his ideal railway was a railway across the continent owned by the government upon which, as he said, there would never be any dividends paid, but which would simply be operated to the end that it would if possible or as nearly as possible pay the working expenses. Now I also showed that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, at Campbellton, N.B., claimed credit of having given the Grand Trunk Railway people the cue upon the railway proposition. Now, Sir, admitting that there was need of a railway across the continent, a second transcontinental, not four transcontinental railways, admitting that there was need of one transcontinental railway across the continent, there were two or three ways in which this railroad could be built. One of them would have been to adopt the policy of our friends opposite when they constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell at any length upon the contract made by the late government for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am not here to-day to quarrel in reference to that subject, but I may be permitted to as shortly as possible state what were the conditions, the arrangements made by the late Conservative government for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway which was not a transcontinental railway, but only a railway from the centre of Canada to the Pacific coast. The government of that day gave to the promoters of that railway completed railway to the value of $30,000,000, they gave cash subsidy to the value of $25,000,000, they gave to the company 25,000,000 acres of selected lands in Manitoba and the Northwest. Of course, it is difficult to estimate the exact value of those lands, but when asking for a loan from the government in 1884, Mr. Stephen, now Lord Mount Stephen, said the lands which up to that time had been sold, had produced on an average $2.36 per acre. In 1892 Sir Wm. Van Horne said that the average selling price up to that time had been $4.05 per acre. Assuming the value of that land to be $3 per acre, we have a value of land of $75,000,000, or a total value given to this company of $135,000,000 in money and land. But besides this great assistance to this railway, they were given other important concessions. They were given, for instance, the privilege of importing their rails and other supplies for that railway free of duty. They were given exemption from taxation for twenty years from the time of the sale of the land, they were given a monopoly of the traffic of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. The government was not to assist any other railway building south of their railway towards the United States border. And lastly, there was in their contract no regulation of freight rates until 10 per cent should be paid upon the whole stock of the company, whether that stock was watered or whether it was not.

Now, Sir, the 'Weekly Sun' has been referred to here, the organ of the farmers of Ontario, so-called, I read from the 'Weekly Sun,' of Toronto a short time ago the following:

> The Canadian Pacific Railway has just declared a half-yearly dividend upon its ordinary stock at the rate of 4 per cent per annum. Its ordinary stock amounts to $65,000,000 and the half-yearly dividend just paid upon it is $1,300,000. Yet of this $65,000,000 stock only $8,500,000 at the outside went into the road. The remainder went into the pockets of the promoters and stockholders. The dividend just paid is equal to more than 30½ per cent upon the money that went into the enterprise. Yet we are told that we must not attempt to regulate freight rates until the dividend amounts to 10 per cent upon the $65,000,000 stock, or in other words, until the road pays 150 per cent, annually upon the capital which was actually expended upon it.

So much then for the experience of this country in building a railroad by land grant and cash subsidy. The government of the present day, realizing that another transcontinental railway was necessary, concluded to assist in building such a railway. They concluded to build that railway from

Quebec to Port Simpson. They had much reason for building from Quebec to Port Simpson, because they would open up a new northern empire of Canada. They had the advice of men who have traversed that country from end to end, they had the advice of Sir Sandford Fleming, who, in an interview published last autumn, stated that he was himself in favour of building from Quebec to Winnipeg. I quote from Sir Sandford Fleming :

I am inclined to think Mr. Blair is on the right track in proposing to extend the Intercolonial to the Pacific. It seems to me, however, that it would be a mistake to try to form a new transcontinental line in a haphazard way by connecting various fragments of railway which have been located without any general plans. The effect would be to lengthen the whole line and unduly lower its engineering character, and almost certainly give it features which would be for ever regarded as blemishing to a great transcontinental line. To realize Mr. Blair's conception of a new national railway, it should in my judgment begin at the Quebec bridge now building, where it would form a direct connection with the Intercolonial, and it should extend from Quebec by the most direct route to Port Simpson on the Pacific. From what I know of the general character of the greater part of the intervening distance, I believe a line with splendid engineering features could with ordinary care be secured.

That was his advice in reference to the engineering features. They are being justified every day. Only a few days ago the first report came in from the engineers of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and they report that from Winnipeg to the north of Lake Nepigon, on this route, they have found they can easily place a road with grades that are low enough for the most up-to-date railway in the country. Now, Sir, I am not going to attempt to-day to describe the country between Quebec and Winnipeg. That has been ably dealt with and it seems to me exhaustively dealt with by the hon. Minister of the Interior. It has been shown by him that we have there a vast acreage of fertile land. He has read from the report of Dr. Bell upon that proposition, but he did not read all of Dr. Bell's report, and I will only encroach upon the time of this House for one moment while I refer to another report made by Dr. Bell of the geological survey of Canada upon the climate and the character of the country in this northern domain. In his report, which is dated Ottawa, 7th March, 1887, Dr. Bell says :

The summer and winter temperatures resemble those of the county of Rimouski.

Why the hon. leader of the opposition in the province of Quebec, the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), referred to this the other day as a sub-Arctic region. Well, if it is a sub-Arctic region, the county of Rimouski must be quite as much a sub-Arctic region.

The summers not so hot nor the winters not so cold as at Winnipeg.

The average snowfall is about three feet or a little more, still not quite so great as about the city of Quebec. Potatoes and all other kinds of root crops have been found to do remarkably well. Hay also grows luxuriantly. Barley would, I think, be a sure crop every year, and rye could also be grown with advantage. Barley is sold every year at Moose Factory and Rupert's House, and it has ripened well every year that I have visited these parts. However, these places are much further north than the region I have indicated, and what is worse for them, they are near the sea, which is said to have an unfavourable influence in the autumn. Mr. John McIntyre (now at Fort William) says he has ripened wheat at Missinaibi and New Brunswick House within the above area. I have had experiments made at New Brunswick House and at Norfolk, on the Abitibi river, with a great variety of field and garden seeds, and the results have proved that this region is capable of growing anything which can be raised, say in the county of Rimouski. I regard the region as well-suited for stock-raising and dairy farming, and it is not unlikely to prove fit for grain also. The soil at Moose Factory is heavy and cold, still vegetables, &c., grow successfully here. Among the kinds may be mentioned potatoes, beans, peas, turnips, beets, carrots, cabbage, onions, &c., &c. As showing the absence of summer frost at Moose Factory in 1887, I mention at page 27c of my report for that year, that, on our return to Moose Factory, from the north, in the end of September, we found that there had been no frost there all summer, and the most tender plants, such as beans, balsams, melons, cucumbers, tobacco, the castor oil bean, &c., growing in the open air, were still quite green and flourishing. That summer was, however, probably a finer one than usual.

Minerals are to be found in this region; nearly all the metals are to be looked for in the Huronian formation, a belt of which is believed to run all the way from near Lake Abitibi to the south of Lake Mistassini, and this would be crossed by any railway from Quebec to James Bay. Iron and gypsum are abundant in the north-west of Moose Factory.

It would be wearisome to the House if I continued to read the reports of explorers and missionaries and of the officers of the Geological Department. Suffice it to say that they all point to the conclusion that this northern country through which the proposed line shall run is a country rich in agriculture, rich in timber and rich in minerals. Why last year the Hudson Bay Company sent in $30,000 worth of the most modern flour machinery to Fort Vermillion on the Peace river, and although that settlement is more than 200 miles north of the proposed route.

Mr. BELL. To what point was that machinery sent ?

Mr. LOGAN. To Fort Vermillion on the Peace river.

Mr. BELL. That is not further north.

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, and it is even north of the Trans-Canada which my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) endorsed in the city of Quebec.

Now, Sir, the government have submitted this proposition to build a transcontinental line. The government had before them the experience of managing the Intercolonial Railway and they had before them the experience of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in the light of this experience they have submitted the proposition which is now before the House and which we are asked to endorse. That proposition is as follows :

The government pays interest for seven years and guarantees the interest for a further period of forty-three years at three per cent on bonds of mountain section up to three-quarters of the cost but the total amount not to exceed $30,000 per mile. The old Grand Trunk Railway guarantees the balance of cost for construction; the government will take a first mortgage on the road and on the rolling stock. The old Grand Trunk Railway with its $150,000,000 of assets in order not to suffer loss must protect the government. It has been shown by actuarial calculation that the total amount of money for the payment by the government of seven years interest could be provided by the present sum of $2,334,575.90.

On the prairie section the government guarantees interest at three per cent for fifty years on three-quarters of the cost of the road, the total amount not to exceed $13,000 per mile. The eastern section from Winnipeg to Moncton is to be built and owned by the government as the neck of the great western bottle. This is to be a common highway for all railways, the government reserving right of way for the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific to be given a lease of this line for a period of fifty years and to pay the government three per cent upon its total outlay after seven years. The government therefore borrows the money, pays interest for seven years, and after that interest will be paid by the Grand Trunk Pacific for a period of forty-three years, when the road improved and developed as it must be will revert to the government. The amount required to pay the total interest for the seven years is computed by actuarial calculation to be $8,853,504.

The total amount, therefore, required at the present time to pay all the interest as above for seven years on the mountain section as well as on the eastern section amounts to $11,188,079.90. The company is to provide $20,000,000 of rolling stock, $5,000,000 of which is to belong to the eastern section, and the government takes a mortgage upon this rolling stock of the eastern division as well as that of the western. It is almost beyond doubt that that prairie section will not cost the government of Canada one single red cent. In reference to the eastern section it is not the case of a man buying a right of way, but the government having the fee simple reserves the right of way over the property that it leases to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Of course, Mr. Speaker, when we say that the total cost of the road to us is to be $11,188,079.90, we do not deny that the government have to provide the money for building the eastern section, but at the same time we do know it to be a fact that we simply pay the interest upon that money and the interest upon the bonds of the western section for seven years, and after that we have not one dollar of interest to pay for a period of forty-three years. There are no exemptions from taxation as was the case with the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. There is no exemption from customs duties on the import of rails or other supplies as was the case in the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. There is no exemption from taxation for a period of twenty years; there is no impediment to traffic in Manitoba and the North-west, and there is no restriction that freight rates shall not be regulated by the government until the road earns ten per cent on the whole cost. There is nothing whatever of that kind in this proposition. From Port Simpson to Winnipeg the government will have control of the rates on that road, and from Winnipeg to Moncton it will own the road and therefore control it, and having reserved the right for the Intercolonial Railway to run over that line, it really means an extension of the Intercolonial Railway from the maritime provinces clear through to the city of Winnipeg. It is worth mentioning that the officers of the Ontario government have reported that the country through which this railway runs in that province contains 16,000,000 acres of good agricultural land. It has been proven by the officers of the Quebec government that in northern Quebec there are many million acres of excellent land which can be cultivated in years to come.

This proposition of the government, Mr. Speaker, doubles the size of Canada; it gives us a new empire to the north ; it gives hope and it gives encouragement to the people in Canada. It gives new life to our great west; it gives quick communication between the west and the east.

What have we got as an alternative proposition from the leader of the opposition ? Let me first point out that a picnic was held last week in Toronto, and it was heralded far and near that the picnic was to be in honour of the leader of the opposition. He was the trump card to be played, but he did not go. He wrote a letter to say that he had to speak on Thursday, and the matter was so important that he could not leave the House of Commons. He was labouring with the question on Thursday, and brought forth nothing; Friday came, with no better result; Saturday and Sunday followed, when he may have reflected and prayed over his proposition; Monday came, and nothing was done. He was listening for some echo from the back benches to tell him what to do. He heard the speech of my hon. friend from

West Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and still nothing came forth. But finally, after struggling with this question for over a week, he comes forward with what kind of a proposition? He condemns the proposition of the government and offers to us as an alternative proposition : that we shall extend the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay by purchasing the Canada Atlantic Railway or by building a new line; that we shall build a road from Scotia Junction on the Canada Atlantic to Sudbury on the Canadian Pacific Railway; and that we shall expropriate the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Port Arthur. In other words, after all that we have heard about the lean end and the fat end of this transcontinental railway contract, the hon. leader of the opposition proposes that we shall expropriate the lean part of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Port Arthur, and make it a common highway for all railways, giving them all running rights over it. We have had the opinion expressed time and again by the railway experts of the opposition, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that running rights over a common railway are of no use. But the hon. leader of the opposition proposes that the government shall control that line, and open it on equal terms to all railroads. But he follows that up with the further proposition to make the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway give running rights over their roads from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. Now, let us see what the railway experts of the opposition to this contract say with regard to running rights. I read, for instance, from 'Hansard' what the ex-Minister of Railways said, at page 8710 :

> A more absolutely unworkable, and, in the opinion of every railway man in the country, a more senseless suggestion it would be difficult to make.

Then, I read what the hon. member for Hamilton said—'Hansard,' page 8595 :

> There is not a railway man in the whole of America who would contradict his statement that it would be utterly impracticable to exercise running powers over a long line such as this.

I quote these hon. gentlemen against the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition to have running rights from Port Arthur to Winnipeg over two roads, controlled by two separate companies, in exactly the same way as the government propose to have running rights over the Grand Trunk Pacific from Quebec to Winnipeg. The echoes of the speech of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), in which he talked about starting on a junketing tour from Quebec and going to the Pacific coast, had scarcely died away before the hon. leader of the opposition makes the proposition to obtain running rights over these two railways from Port Arthur to Winnipeg. Then, the hon. gentleman is ready to assist almost every railway in the country. In fact, it seems to me that he has been groping in the dark, and finally he says, Give me any old thing that I can put before the country as a proposition. He is very much like the Hebrew gentleman who went in a store where he saw a notice, 'If you do not see what you want, ask for it.' He went home and put up a notice in his own store, which read : 'If you do not know what you want, ask for it.' That is about the position of the hon. leader of the opposition—if you do not know what railway you want to assist, simply ask for it, and you will have your wish granted. He proposes to assist the Grand Trunk to build from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and from there, coming back to his first love, he proposes to build a line from Edmonton to Port Simpson, with equal running rights to all railways. Here we have the same proposition that has been condemned by the hon. gentleman's own railway experts. We do not gather from the hon. gentleman's remarks in what way he proposes to benefit the Intercolonial Railway by this long, crazy, patchwork policy for a railway from Montreal to the Pacific coast. He stated that Wolvin & Co. are carrying grain from Fort William to Quebec at 3½ cents a bushel, and that it has been carried as low as 3 cents a bushel. Does he think he can carry wheat by this hop, skip and jump railway of his from Fort William to Montreal at 3 cents a bushel ?

Another part of the hon. gentleman's proposal is to run a railway from Jacques Cartier Junction to Coteau, and for that purpose we would have to build a bridge over the Ottawa river. I have the estimate of a railway man that the cost of that road and the bridge would be at least $1,000,000. To purchase the Canada Atlantic would require $17,000,000. It has been stated before a committee of this House that that was the original cost of this railway, and we would not be likely to get it below cost. To build a road from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, say at $25,000 a mile, would cost $3,000,000. To expropriate the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Port Arthur, a distance of 634 miles, estimated at $60,000 per mile, which is the amount the hon. member for South Lanark says that road cost the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which would amount in round numbers to $38,000,000. That road, if it is to be used by four or five different railways, would have to be double-tracked, and its grades and curves would have to be improved. It is admitted by the Canadian Pacific Railway officials that that portion of their road running east from Port Arthur to North Bay is not a grain road—is not in a condition to handle that kind of traffic. You would also have to provide rolling stock for it. These im-

provements, I estimate, would cost $19,000,000. These various items make a total of $78,000,000, which would have to be spent to carry out that portion of the hon. gentleman's scheme from Jacques Cartier, on the island of Montreal, to the city of Winnipeg, and the country would own only part of the road at that. Then, the hon. gentleman proposes to assist the Grand Trunk to build a line from Winnipeg to Edmonton. I cannot make any estimate of what that assistance would cost, because I do not know what kind of assistance he would give. Probably if he acted on the experience of his supporters in days gone by, it would be a cash subsidy. Then he proposes to build a line through the mountains from Edmonton to the coast, a distance of 600 miles at least. This would cost probably more than the north shore line of the Canadian Pacific Railway around Lake Superior, because in building that road, the company had easy communication by water to bring in supplies, whereas there would be no such advantage in building a line through the Rocky mountains. But put it at the same amount, $60,000 a mile, which would mean a further cost of $36,000,000. Then, we would have to provide terminals at Port Simpson and other places, rolling stock, branch lines in different directions, and a Pacific steamship line.

I have no data on which I can estimate the cost of these. But even without these, taking only the cost of getting to Winnipeg and then to Edmonton, and thence to the coast, the total, according to the data we have before us will be $114,000,000. The hon. gentleman afterwards said he proposed to build a line from Lévis to Moncton at the expense of the government. Such a line, according to the estimates of the ex-Minister of Railways, will cost $15,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman proposed to build a colonization road from Winnipeg to Quebec ; and in fact, before he got through, he endorsed the line which the present government proposes to build. Such a line will cost, according to the lowest calculation, $49,000,000. The hon. gentleman would have to provide that road with rolling stock and he also would have to provide rolling stock for the road from Montreal to Port Arthur, which he proposes to buy, and I think a low estimate of the rolling stock he would have to get for that line would be $25,000,000. That would make a total of $203,000,000, which the hon. gentleman's plan would cost this country, and what would we get in exchange ? A patchwork railway system. The hon. gentleman's policy is one of despair, a policy of the setting sun, as opposed to the policy of hope and the rising sun enunciated by this government. From Montreal to the coast the hon. gentleman does not propose to add one acre of cultivated land to the area now opened by railways, except from Edmonton through the Rockies to the coast. By this proposal we would have this immense sum of $114,000,000 paid out without having one acre of land opened up for cultivation. And if he went on to build the line from Winnipeg to Quebec, we would have the total expenditure increased to the sum of $203,000,000. Suppose he should buy the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway from Port Arthur to Winnipeg ; these two propositions would cost him $17,000,000 for the Canada Atlantic Railway, and $38,000,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, or $55,000,000 for them both. And will that scheme add any more railways to Canada ? No, Sir. Is he going to pay out that money to the workingmen, the artisans, the wholesale men and the manufacturers of Canada ? No, but to the magnates of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a millionaire who lives in Ottawa and owns the Canada Atlantic Railway. But our proposition means more money for the manufacturer, the wholesale man, the workingman and the artisan.

We have in the Bill a clause which provides, in the most stringent way, that all supplies shall be purchased in the Dominion. What does that mean ? It means even more prosperity during the next seven or eight years added to the great prosperity we have at present.

The bitterest attacks of the opposition have been made on the line from Quebec to Moncton. I take my share of responsibility for that line. I tried to put up as good a case as I could in the Railway Committee in favour of this transcontinental road being built to a maritime winter port. In the maritime provinces we have been long enough seeing the products of Canada pass down into American territory and to American ports, while the grass almost grew in the streets of our cities, and the universal demand of our people was that no assistance should be given any other transcontinental road which would not be built into the maritime provinces, so as to utilize our Canadian maritime ports. That is not a new idea. The Intercolonial Railway does not serve that purpose. I do not want to take up the time of the House in going into the matter of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, but I may refer to a motion made in this House by the late lamented Alexander Mackenzie, on May 17th, 1869. In this motion he condemned the proposed Baie des Chaleurs route, and advocated a route connecting Rivière du Loup with the valley of the St. John. He admitted that this meant a loss of the imperial guarantee, but he asked would it not be better for Canada to raise less than one half of the amount on its own debentures and secure the construction of the shorter and cheaper and more commercially valuable road. He believed the true policy was to have sought the most direct route to the nearest seaport. Sir Charles Tupper said :

At the Quebec conference it was agreed by an overwhelming majority that the imperial au-

thorities should decide the question of route. Therefore, it was too late in the day to raise the question. The imperial government had decided to have no other route and hence according to the agreement of the governments of the provinces no other route should be accepted by our government.

Besides setting forth the fact that the imperial government had decided the route, Sir Charles Tupper proceeded to argue in favour of building by the northern route, on the ground of intercontinental communication. He said :

The capitalists of England were spending their money lavishly in the attempt to shorten the distance between the two continents. He argued that by the Intercolonial two days could be saved in reaching England ; and he believed the day was not far distant when the line would become the great highway between the two continents. This view of the question raised it to one of immense national importance. St. John's, Newfoundland was only 1,640 miles from Queenstown, and by building a railway across Newfoundland 250 miles—a perfectly practical scheme—the port of Shippegan, in New Brunswick,——

That was the great winter port then.

—which possessed a capital harbour for seven months in the year, would be brought into direct communication with England, and the great cities of the west would be brought nearer to Liverpool by 266 miles than by the route by way of Halifax. But without building a mile of railway in Newfoundland, Shippegan was nearer to Liverpool by way of Belle Isle by 127 miles than Halifax.

I shall not quote any further. I simply point this out to show to what length they had to go to justify the building of this road by the long and circuitous route of the north shore, instead of by the shortest route across New Brunswick. The strongest argument of Sir Charles Tupper was that the imperial government had decided on the route, and, therefore, the House had no right to change that decision. In the course of that debate, Mr. Ryan, a distinguished New Brunswicker, said that in 1864, Mr. Fleming had made a survey of the central route, and that it was reported to be quite practical.

I have here a speech delivered in the House of Commons by the Hon. Mr. Fisher, also a New Brunswick man, who knew that country as well as any man of that time. I shall not quote his speech at length, but will read this statement from it, and contrast it with that made by the ex-Minister of Railways. To hear the ex-minister, one would imagine that there was a Sahara desert in that part of New Brunswick. Here is what Mr. Fisher said in 1867 :

From Green river to the mouth of the Nashwaak, there is a parallelogram of about thirty-five miles by one hundred and fifty, containing from two to three millions of acres of land of the first quality, the very garden of New Brunswick. Fleming says, judging from the portion cleared on the lower part of the Keswick valley, the soil must be of superior quality. This part of the province is settling rapidly.

Why ? Because they expected to get railway communication. But the railway communication did not come, for the road was built by the northern shore. And the people who live there have left that country. But the garden of New Brunswick still remains, and we propose to build through the garden of New Brunswick by this line from Winnipeg to Moncton. But, Sir, I do not need to quote authorities of long ago, I do not need to quote engineers. I can quote the man who to-day is looked upon by hon. members opposite—within the last few days —as the highest authority on earth, the ex-Minister of Railways. Upon one occasion, discussing the Intercolonial estimates, that hon. gentleman said :

There is no question that the Intercolonial was not located with reference to business or commercial considerations. I have remarked before, and I remark now, that there was one particular in which political considerations did fatally injure the Intercolonial Railway. That injury was done, not merely once, but for the entire life of the railway. The location of the Intercolonial was most unhappy from the point of view of achieving financial results, and was due entirely to those considerations of state—imperial, if you will--war considerations, large and potent considerations, which were thought to over-balance altogether business considerations. As everybody knows, the location is very unfavourable, not only because of the enormous distances between important points and between the termini of the railway, but because of the inferior character, from a productive business point of view, of a large portion of the country which it traverses. A large portion of the railway does not yield returns at all commensurate with the cost of its operation. That important portion between St. John and Halifax is, I think, paying quite a handsome return over its cost and the expenses of operation; but the rest of the railway is not, and that is due to the enormous distances over which the traffic has to be hauled, to the small amount of local traffic which comes to the road, and to another consideration of a very potent character, which is, that at almost every important point on the road, at all events, from Halifax nearly to Montreal, it has to face water competition.

I could multiply quotations by the hour in reference to the impracticability of using the Intercolonial for through-traffic. But the opposition have admitted that the ex-Minister of Railways speaks with supreme authority, so I do not think I need to quote further to convince them that the Intercolonial, as at present constituted, is long and circuitous, and, though its grades may be good, it is not the road for transcontinental traffic.

Now, it has been asked in this House, who is calling for this road to the maritime provinces ? Who wants it ? I will endeavour to show who wants the road. In 1884 it was considered so important to get shorter connection with the maritime provinces that a resolution was brought down in this House to grant a large sum—the resolution was afterwards amended so as to grant $250,000 a year—to the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a road from Montreal down to the maritime provinces. This was built, mark

you, to connect Montreal with the ports of the maritime provinces, Halifax and St. John being especially mentioned. Sir Charles Tupper spoke on the subject of the Intercolonial at that time. He was Minister of Railways, and an energetic administrator of his department. He took pride in the Intercolonial, no doubt, and endeavoured to make it a success. But this is what he said, speaking in this House in 1884 :

Although every effort has been made to render the operation of the Intercolonial Railway as successful as possible, although more has been accomplished in the development of the country, in the development of the trade and business of the country through the agency of the Intercolonial Railway than any person on either side of this House a few years ago supposed to be possible, still we have found we were too heavily handicapped by the distance, and that we could not, reluctantly as we are driven to the conclusion, we have been driven to the conclusion, by the force of circumstances and by the practical results, that it is impossible for the ports of St. John and Halifax to compete with the nearer ports of Portland and Boston, in the United States. Under these circumstances, the attention of the government has been drawn, as I have said on one or two occasions before in this House, to the best means by which we might secure a realization of that which we all desire, the Atlantic terminus being in Canadian territory, as well as the Pacific terminus, and thus be placed in a position to fairly compete for the great transcontinental trade and traffic that we all know must flow over that line. . .

And so on, in a long speech, in which he advocated the building of a shorter line, and admitted that the Intercolonial, much as he regretted it, could not compete with the roads leading to the United States ports. He said also :

I have only to read these figures to the House, I think, in order to show that the government, in asking for this aid, in extending practically the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, involving, as it will, the transport of the traffic of both the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, down to our own coasts and our own ports in the maritime provinces, are asking aid, which will, without any question, assure the completion of that. I have already stated that it is proposed that this shall not only be the shortest line to Montreal, but the shortest line to Quebec.

As I say, this resolution was brought in by the Sir John Macdonald government to give a large amount of money per year to the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a road to the maritime provinces. The Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has already alluded to the remarks of Sir Hector Langevin on that occasion, when that gentleman said :

Well, I am sure the hon. gentleman will be pleased to hear the declaration which the government makes through me, that in the arrangements to be made with the company to build the railway, to take advantage of this vote of money, of $250,000 during twenty years, the government will take care to secure the completion of the railway, not only to Mattawamkeag, but also to Salisbury, and if that is not secured, there will be no subsidy given. We must act in good faith ; the faith of parliament is pledged, and we must take care that that money is employed as parliament wishes.

I could quote other speeches of that kind. But that one citation from a speech of Hon. Edward Blake suffices :

We are now called upon to recognize that, at any rate, as far as the arts of peace are concerned, the Intercolonial has not answered its purpose. I do not say it has been useless; far from it. I am quite free to admit that it has developed the traffic far greater than I, for my part, expected it would ; I am free to admit that it has done more good than I expected it would, and I rejoice to know it ; but I say that we are now recognizing, in the most formal manner, that it has failed to accomplish its real, its main purpose, which was, not to protect us in case of war, but to benefit us during a time of peace and give us real and as close a connection with one another as geography allowed.

Well, Sir, that resolution passed. We did not hear anything then about paralleling the Intercolonial. And the road was built from Montreal to St. John. But it was not built to connect with the city of Halifax or the other ports in the maritime provinces. And what happened ? In 1889, Sir John A. Macdonald introduced a resolution into this House, and I wish to call particular attention to it, as I shall show that some hon. gentlemen who have spoken very strongly against the building of the road by the government and handing it over under lease to the Grand Trunk, voted for this proposition. Sir John A. Macdonald moved :

That it is expedient that a railway should be constructed as a government work, between the point of junction on the New Brunswick Railway——

At that time acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway——

—at or near Harvey, in the province of New Brunswick, and a point of junction with the Intercolonial, at or near Salisbury, in said province or somewhere between Salisbury and Moncton, and that the sum of five hundred thousand dollars be granted towards the construction of said railway.

Sir John A. Macdonald made a speech on the subject of this Salisbury resolution. He said :

This railway is a link in the short line from Montreal to Halifax. . . . The government feel that they have pledged themselves to parliament and to the country through which this road passes, that the road should be built.

Sir John claimed that the distance from Harvey to Salisbury would be shortened by 27 miles. The Canadian Pacific Railway officials stated that it would be shortened only 14 or 16 miles. Others claimed 8 or 10 miles. The new line was to be 113 miles long, crossing the St. John river at Fredericton. Sir John said he had an offer from the Fredericton Bridge Company to build the road at $16,000 a mile. If that was a

fair estimate of the cost, we can build this new line from Lévis to Moncton for $6,400,000. Sir John Macdonald said the government would build the road and supply the bridge at Fredericton. And what were they going to do with it after it was built ? They were not only paralleling the Intercolonial from St. John to Moncton, but they were competing with that line around the north shore. In spite of this, they were going to lease the road to the Canadian Pacific Railway. And for what rental ? For 3 per cent on the total cost ? No ; they were going to give it to them free of charge for a term of twenty years. In the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway it was provided, in reference to any rate concession granted by the Intercolonial Railway to any railway in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway :

Then the lessees of Canadian Pacific Railway shall be notified thereof and shall be granted corresponding concessions and further it provided the lessees shall have the right to maintain freight and passenger agents at such points on the Intercolonial Railway as they may elect and to sell tickets and make through rates for passengers and freight either way over the lines of the Intercolonial Railway east of Moncton to and from points on their lines of railway.

Mr. Speaker, that was the resolution which was moved by Sir John A. Macdonald. It was pointed out at that time—and let me call the attention of the opposition to the fact—that there was not any survey made, not an engineer had visited the proposed route. That was pointed out to Sir John A. Macdonald, and he was asked whether they were going to build it by contract or by day's labour, and he answered that they would not bind themselves to either plan, but the government would build it just as they thought best. Well, this aroused the ire of the hon. member for St. John city. It seems to be not an uncommon thing in this House for the members for St. John city to have their ire aroused. But at that time it aroused the ire of Mr. Weldon, who then occupied the same seat in this House as is occupied at the present time by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). Mr. Weldon moved this amendment :

That the said resolution be not now agreed to, but it be resolved, that no action should be taken by this House, authorizing the construction by the government of Canada of another line of railway between Harvey and Salisbury or Moncton, until a proper survey of the proposed line, and reliable estimate of its probable cost are laid before parliament and until time has established that the existing line of railway between the points named is not sufficient to meet the demands of passenger and freight traffic.

That, Sir, was the amendment of Mr. Weldon, the member for St. John. He merely asked that surveys should be made, that an inquiry should be made, that time should be taken. But at that time also it was said that time would not wait. So this amendment was voted down, and among the members of the Liberal-Conservative party who stood up in this chamber and voted in favour of the government building this road to compete with the other government road and with the Canadian Pacific Railway, among the members who voted for a Bill by which the government were to build a road and hand it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway holus bolus, were the hon. member for South Lanark, the hon. member for East Grey and the hon. member for Leeds ; and last, but not least, the hon. member for Queen's and Sunbury (Mr. Wilmot).

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if that road has ever been built ?

Mr. LOGAN. Even if the road was not built, it was provided for in this parliament, and the hon. gentleman voted that it should be constructed, and he cannot now hide himself behind the fact that the Senate threw the Bill out.

Mr. SPROULE. Should not the fact that it has never been built be a salutary lesson to-day to hon. gentlemen that there was some substantial reason for it ?

Mr. LOGAN. I am not here to contend that this Harvey-Salisbury branch should be built, but I am pointing out to the hon. gentleman that he wanted to build it as a government road and hand it over to a company, without a dollar's interest or rental, and he was willing to do that without a survey having been made, and when the government did not know anything whatever about the route.

Mr. WILMOT. What was the date of that vote ?

Mr. LOGAN. That vote was in the year 1889. Now, Sir, there was another amendment, and that too was voted down. Sir Richard Cartwright moved another amendment which you would think would have been endorsed by almost every hon. gentleman in this House. What was it ? He pointed out the fact that there was already a road known as the Temiscouata road from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, and it was proposed to build a road from Edmundston to Moncton. They were already talking about this Edmundston-Moncton road because it would give the shortened distances as we have them to-day. In his amendment he simply asked that this road from Edmundston to Moncton should have running rights over this proposed government road that was to be built by the government from Harvey to Salisbury. You could not imagine that anybody would have the supreme audacity to get up in this House and vote against such a proposition as that. He simply asked that this road should have running rights, and he pointed out the fact that the short line railway ran through the state of Maine, and it might sometime be necessary, in case of trouble with the United States, to run down

from Edmundston to Moncton; he was even then thinking about this bonding privilege. So he moved that amendment, and you would scarcely imagine that anybody would vote against it. Let me first read his amendment:

That this report be not now received, but that it be declared, that inasmuch as the Temiscouata Railway has already been constructed entirely through Canadian territory, from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston, on the River St. John, and inasmuch as the distance from Montreal to Moncton is thereby capable of being greatly reduced, and cannot, in any event be more than a few miles in excess of the distance by the so-called Short Line Railway, across the state of Maine, and whereas it is now proposed to construct a line from Harvey to Salisbury, entirely at the public expense, it is expedient that the said Temiscouata Railway should be granted full running powers over the said line from Harvey to Salisbury.

That was voted down by, among others, the hon. member for South Lanark, the hon. member for East Grey, and the hon. member for Queen's and Sunbury.

Now, what is the next proposition we come to? I find that in that same year, 1889, the New Brunswick legislature was in session, and there was some doubt expressed in that legislature as to whether this Harvey-Salisbury branch would be built to connect Harvey with Moncton. They doubted the sincerity of some of our friends opposite, and so a Bill was introduced into the New Brunswick legislature by a number of gentlemen, most of whom resided in Fredericton. Mr. Wilson introduced the Bill. He spoke of the importance of the short line railway, and of the necessity of its being built across the province according to the promise made to the people of the province by the Dominion government. There being some doubt as to the Dominion government building the short line, incorporation powers were sought by R. C. Skinner, A. D. Richard, F. P. Thompson, who is now one of our most respected senators, and Louis G. de Bertram, of New York, for that purpose. The Dominion government failing to build the road, the company wanted to be on deck, as it were, to construct it. Now, that was the proposition for a company in New Brunswick to build this connecting link, and the members for St. John naturally opposed it. I am not blaming the members for St. John for having opposed it, because no doubt it meant the taking away of a large amount of traffic from the city of St. John. I find in the discussion of that Bill that the then member for York in the local legislature is reported in the New Brunswick 'Hansard' of 1889, page 116, as follows:

It is said that the building of this short line will interfere with the trade in St. John. He thought that the hon. members who had taken that view did not represent the best sentiment of St. John. He did not think the people of St. John were wanting in energy, pluck and enterprise. That being so, they had nothing to fear by the competition of Halifax so far as the short line railway was concerned.

Those were the words of the then member for York, in the province of New Brunswick, and to-day of the city of St. John, in the Dominion House of Commons, the hon. Andrew G. Blair. But further, at page 118, Mr. Blair is reported as saying:

The speeches of the opponents of this Bill sought to create the idea that the building of the short line would injure St. John and not benefit York or Westmoreland. No evidence had been adduced to prove this. If St. John with its great natural advantages, cannot hold its own against Halifax, 200 miles away, then he would say that the energy which has distinguished St. John in the past has departed. He did not think St. John was less enterprising than formerly, and he would have to conclude that those who had spoken against the Bill did not voice the best sentiments of the people of St. John.

I commend the words of the hon. member for York (Hon. Mr. Blair) spoken in 1889 to the hon. member for St. John city (Hon. Mr. Blair) spoken in 1903.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what follows. The next phase in the history is that we find a delegation left Halifax, a very important delegation, in May, 1890. They came to Ottawa, they interviewed Sir John Macdonald and presented to him this memorandum:

We have been instructed by the Board of Trade of Halifax to proceed to Ottawa and represent the views of that corporation to your government, respecting the application of the Maritime and St. Lawrence Railway Company.

The Maritime and St. Lawrence Railway Company mark you was an adjunct of the Grand Trunk Railway, and was to operate from Edmundston to Moncton. Towards the end of the memorandum they submitted the following in reference to a line from a point on the Canadian Pacific Railway to Salisbury and stated as follows:

That it was the declared policy of the government of Canada in 1884 to subsidize and cause to be constructed a line of railway connecting, by the shortest and most practicable routes the ports of Montreal, St. John and Halifax.

That to effectuate that policy $250,000 for twenty years was voted by parliament, and of this sum $187,000 actually expended in constructing a line of railway by the shortest and most practicable route between Montreal and St. John.

Now, they conclude this memorandum as follows, and I want you to pay particular attention to this, Mr. Speaker:

The difficulties which prevented parliament favouring the construction of the Harvey-Salisbury line——

What do they mean by difficulties? They meant the pressure of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

——have led us to consider favourably the proposition of the construction of a line between Edmundston and Moncton as a substitute.

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals is the man who never heard the idea suggested that there should be a line from Edmundston to Moncton. He said it was madness. I am now reading the solemn declaration of the Halifax deputation representing the Halifax Board of Trade and the city council in May, 1890, in which they say they had favourably considered the proposition of the construction of a line from Edmundston to Moncton as a substitute.

We understand that application has been made to parliament for a cash subsidy to aid in the construction of this line, and that if granted the Grand Trunk Railway Company will operate the same in conjunction with its own line and the International Railway, as part of a through short line between Montreal and Halifax, and that when the said through line is completed the distance between Halifax and Montreal will not exceed 710 miles.

They asked that the government of that day should make an appropriation for the construction of this line by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. So much for that, Mr. Speaker, now we find that in 1891, the Grand Trunk Railway had an understanding with the then government that they were to be paid $10,000 a mile for the building of this very line from Edmundston to Moncton. In the meantime the survey of Mr. Davey had been made which showed the practicability and the feasibility of this route, but pressure from the same source was again brought to bear and this project was nipped in the bud.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I interrupt the hon. gentleman for a moment? It seems to me that all these efforts at building a road which failed would rather suggest the impracticability of the scheme. Now, if he could give us any information that would justify the belief that it is a practicable scheme and could be built without unreasonable expense it seems to me it would be more to the purpose.

Mr. FRASER. Why did you vote for it?

Mr. SPROULE. I am only drawing the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Logan) to this with the desire to get out the information if he has it.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is not satisfied with the vote that he gave many years ago, I cannot help him at the present time. But, Mr. Speaker, I am now endeavouring to prove that the demand for this road from Lévis to Moncton has been almost a unanimous demand from the maritime provinces and I propose, Sir, to show that this demand had its storm centre within the confines of the city of St. John, represented by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals.

The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said the other day:

It is a curious question as to the origin of this idea. We never heard of it until the session was half over. The proposition is absolutely unjustifiable. Who wants it? I have yet to hear the first man in the province of New Brunswick asking that this road shall be constructed. They have never asked for it, and I would decline the gift with thanks.

The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) surely has not been asleep. His mind is the mind of an active man. I am going to read from the report of Mr. Jarvis, the president of the St. John Board of Trade, at the annual meeting of the board held on December 1st, 1902. In his address, the president said:

He hoped they would agree with him that if the aid was given it should be only and strictly on the condition that the proposed Grank Trunk Line was in some sense an all-Canadian route and that the Grand Trunk carried their line from Montreal to Edmundston and thence over Canadian territory until it tapped the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Moncton; and further that the Grand Trunk Railway in establishing its terminus at St. John, provided its own terminal facilities as well.

I am sorry the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) is not present, because I find that this matter was discussed in the Truro Board of Trade at a meeting and the board passed a resolution as follows:

Resolved, that this joint meeting of the Board of Trade and citizens of Truro, having considered the question of another transcontinental railway, on Canadian territory, is of the opinion that the same is immediately necessary on account of the immense and rapidly increasing productions of the North-west, which the existing railways are entirely inadequate to transport.

Sir, I have quoted from the Moncton Board of Trade. I have quoted from the Board of Trade of the city of St. John, I have quoted from the Board of Trade of Truro. I could go on further and quote from the resolution of the county council of the county of St. John, from the resolution of the county council of Queen's and Sunbury in reference to the transcontinental line being built into the maritime provinces, but I am going higher and I will quote from the resolution passed by the highest authority in New Brunswick. If the legislature of New Brunswick does not speak for the province of New Brunswick, who can speak for the province. I find that in the New Brunswick legislature on the 8th of May last, it was moved by Mr. Robertson, who is a prominent supporter of the government——

Mr. EMMERSON. He is member for the city of St. John.

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, he is member for the city of St. John, and that resolution was seconded by Mr. Hazen, the leader of the opposition, and carried unanimously. It is as follows:

Moved by Mr. Robertson and seconded by Mr. Hazen, and carried unanimously:

Whereas, The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is now making application to the federal parliament for the granting of a charter enabling the said company to build and operate a railroad extending from the Pacific seaboard across Canada to the Atlantic coast, and in said application the city of Quebec is named as the eastern terminus of said railroad in summer and no mention is made as to where the eastern terminus of said railroad is to be during the winter season ;

And, whereas, in the opinion of this House, not only the interests of the eastern provinces, but the Dominion as a whole, imperatively demand that the said road should be an all-Canadian route, both in summer and winter, and it is highly proper that all necessary conditions should be attached to the granting of such charter, so as to secure beyond question the carrying out of this national idea ;

Therefore, resolved, that the legislature assembled do strongly urge upon the federal administration that in any charter so to be granted to the said Grand Trunk Railway Company, it be specifically expressed that the winter port of such transcontinental railroad line, be in the maritime provinces of Canada, and that said railroad be an all-Canadian route from ocean to ocean, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by His Honour the Speaker of the House, to His Excellency the Governor General through the Secretary of State for Canada.

Sir, that is something more than a whisper; that is a voice as loud as Niagara calling on the Minister of Railways and Canals to see that this road shall be an all-Canadian road and shall go through the maritime provinces. The people of St. John became so agitated at this time that the Board of Trade met and sent the following telegram to the Minister of Railways and Canals :

Hon. A. G. Blair, Ottawa.

Grave apprehension is felt here as to Grand Trunk plans regarding maritime provinces. Strong feeling that if Dominion assistance of any kind to transcontinental road is given, stipulation that railway find a terminus in maritime provinces, and further, that all freight originating in Canada, or received along the line, should be shipped through maritime terminus, shall be an absolute condition. Can you assure us that in case of assistance being given the Grand Trunk will build through maritime provinces and ship freight thence ?

(Sgd) W. M. JARVIS, Pres.

Now, Sir, in order to show that the minister received this telegram it is only fair that I should read his reply, which was as follows :

W. M. Jarvis, St. John, N.B.

I believe that in case government gives financial assistance the Grand Trunk Pacific will be obliged to enter into a satisfactory traffic agreement, binding itself to hand over at Quebec its ocean winter traffic to Intercolonial or build a line through to a maritime port. Have been doing everything possible to bring this about.

(Sgd) A. G. BLAIR.

Now, Sir, I have quoted from the St. John city council, and from the New Brunswick legislature, and the St. John Board of Trade, and I will now quote from the newspapers of St. John. Here is an extract from the St. John 'Sun' of May 20th, 1903 :

On May 19th, the council of the board of trade, met to consider further action with reference to the extension of the Grand Trunk Pacific through the maritime provinces, and a telegram was sent to Mr. Blair, stating that the signers did not believe that any arrangement could be made between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk which should prevent the latter from shipping practically every ton of export freight via Portland. The telegram concluded by saying 'We urge in the strongest terms that no government assistance be granted to any transcontinental railway that does not undertake to build their line through to some maritime province port.' This telegram was signed by : Walter W. White, mayor ; W. M. Jarvis, president, board of trade ; D. J. McLachlin, W. H. Thorne, T. H. Esterbrooks, W. S. Fisher, Jas. Manchester, Wm. Thompson & Co., Robt. B. Emmerson, A. W. Adams, T. B. Robinson, Troop & Son, Jas. F. Robertson, Jos. Allison, W. H. Barnaby, T. MacVeitty & Sons, T. H. Somerville, W. Frank Hathaway & Co., John Sealy, Thos. Gorman, C. M. Bostwick & Co., Merritt Bros. Co., Limited, per G. W. Merritt, manager, Geo. Robertson, M.P.P. and MacCauley Bros. & Co.

Mr. McLachlin is one of the most prominent Liberals in the city of St. John. Mr. Thorne is, I think, the president of the Conservative association, Mr. Hathaway was a candidate at the last local elections; and the signers of this document are all leading business men of the city of St. John; and yet Mr. Blair says that he never heard the first man in the province of New Brunswick asking that this road should be constructed. I read from the St. John 'Telegraph' a telegraphic despatch from Ottawa dated May 28th last, which reads as follows :

In reference to clause 13 for extension of the line to Moncton, Mr. Blair said that he had not the slightest objection to the extension to Moncton, but that would not have the purpose of shipping the products of the west by this road to the seaboard. Halifax was adapted for passenger service, but it was 200 miles distant. It would hold the passenger service, but provision should be made to take the production of the west to the nearest seaport in the maritime provinces.

According to this despatch, Mr. Blair stated in the committee that he did not object to the connection, but that there should be provision made to reach St. John so that there should be a nearer Canadian port to which to bring that traffic from the west. At a later date in the Railway Committee when the hon. member for Sunbury and Queen's (Mr. Wilmot) moved that the city of St. John be substituted for the city of Moncton as the Atlantic terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the hon. Mr. Blair voted at that time in favour of the terminus of the railway being at St. John. Now, I come to the St. John 'Sun,' a leading Conservative paper. In an editorial on May 8th, it says :

It has been already shown that the Intercolonial Railway route by the north shore cannot by any possibility be a competing line for winter export business. Nearly six years ago Mr. Blair declared he would be prepared in a few years to do a winter export business.

The editorial referred to Mr. Blair buying the Drummond County Railway, and making contract with the Grand Trunk Railway for that alleged purpose. 'To that end he made his contract with the Grand Trunk.' Mr. Blair's policy for the first five years of his administration was to set up export winter traffic competing with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The scheme is a failure. The St. John and Halifax elevators have been empty, as they were last year. The Intercolonial Railway terminus at St. John has hardly been used at all for through-traffic and would have been used still less if it had not been engaged to accommodate Canadian Pacific Railway freight.

The Intercolonial Railway route would be useless for the winter business of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

On May 14th last, the St. John 'Sun' had the following editorial:

The strong resolutions sent from the different legislative, municipal and commercial bodies in the east are clear and explicit. They ask one and all that the Grand Trunk Pacific shall get no public assistance unless the company shall build to the maritime provinces and make a terminus at a maritime province port. The boards of trade and other bodies know that an undertaking to deliver freight to the Intercolonial Railway is no good for the purpose they have in view.

The Grand Trunk people, the Intercolonial Railway people, and the winter port people, all know that export and import trade between the Canadian west and Europe can never be handled by the Intercolonial route.

The people of the maritime provinces, and we believe the people of Canada, do not propose to compromise on a traffic agreement with a road that cannot profitably handle the traffic. They insist on one thing and one only. They say that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway itself must be built to a Canadian winter port. This is the message of Mr. Jarvis, and the St. John Board of Trade. That is the resolution of the city council and the county council of St. John, of the legislature of New Brunswick, of the other bodies which have made declarations on the subject.

On May 15th, the St. John 'Sun' editorial was as follows:

It is natural that Mr. Blair should desire to protect from competition the railway under his charge, but that anxiety is carried too far if it leads him to join Mr. Hays in objecting to terms compelling the Grand Trunk Pacific to build to a maritime province port. Mr. Blair has himself laid down the rule that railways may be chartered to run parallel with each other forty miles apart in the west. He should not object to the construction of a railway by a natural route down the St. John valley 100 miles west of the Intercolonial Railway. In this province there would be no competition with the Intercolonial by that road for local traffic. The Temiscouata and Canadian Pacific Railway would be the roads to suffer. There would be competition for the traffic between St. John, Quebec and Montreal, but these are already competitive points and there is no possibility of establishing a monopoly as to the through export and import business between the maritime provinces and the west. The north shore route never got the trade and never can handle it except at great expense to the owners of the Intercolonial Railway.

I could read many other resolutions adopted in the maritime provinces; but surely I have read enough to convince you that there has been a demand there for this line from Lévis to Moncton. The Halifax board of trade adopted a resolution on July 22nd, in which they say:

We further maintain that the construction of the road west of Quebec without insuring its continuance east through Canadian territory would be manifestly unjust to the maritime provinces.

This board is also of the opinion that the building of the shortest possible line through Canadian territory from Quebec to Moncton, N.B., would be of immense advantage to the maritime provinces, as well as to the rest of Canada, and would secure for the road a large share of through freight and passenger business, which at present is done through United States ports.

This is the resolution of the board of trade of the city of Halifax, which is represented in this House by the distinguished leader of the opposition. It is no wonder that he squirmed a little in reference to that Quebec to Moncton section.

Now, let us trace for a moment the history of the proposition before the House. I am not ashamed, and I do not think the members from the maritime provinces on either side of the House, are ashamed of the part we took in discussing the Grand Trunk Railway Bill before the Railway Committee. I had a mandate from my constituents to oppose the granting of aid to any transcontinental railroad that would not have its terminus in the maritime provinces, and the fight which I put up in the Railway Committee was simply carrying out a duty which I owed to my constituents. The first proposition was to build the railway from the city of Quebec westward, and the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) said that a traffic arrangement could be made with the Intercolonial Railway by which the winter business of the road would be handed over to the Intercolonial Railway. We claimed, not only on the evidence of Liberals, but on the evidence of the St. John 'Sun,' that this proposition was moonshine, that such an arrangement could not be made, and that if it could be, the trade would not be carried over the Intercolonial Railway, but would go to Portland. We insisted that the Grand Trunk Pacific should be extended into the maritime provinces, and we succeeded. Moncton was chosen as the central point to which it should run, and from which communication could be got with the various maritime province ports. I may say that a caucus was held of members

supporting the government from the maritime provinces. It was not a caucus of all the members from the maritime provinces, but only of the government supporters, which may have been a mistake. It has been alleged for some years that there is some jealousy between St. John and Halifax, and we wanted the road constructed to a common point. We had the statement of Mr. Hays, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, to the effect that there would be enough traffic coming over the Grand Trunk Pacific to the maritime provinces to fill half a dozen ports. We have not only St. John and Halifax, but we have Country Harbour, White Haven, Louisbourg and Sydney—all magnificent ports on the Atlantic sea-coast. Therefore, we agreed to make Moncton the central point, from which traffic should go in different directions. It was also agreed that the company should be given power to build a line from Chipman to St. John. That caucus was well representative of the government supporters from the maritime provinces, and among those present was the then Minister of Railways and Canals. We did not hear anything then of objection to building the line to Moncton. There is no doubt that a large amount of the heavy freight of the Grand Trunk Pacific will find its way out through the port of St. John. It will make the port of St. John the New York of Canada. The passenger business, as well as the parcel freight, and the fast freight, will pass through Halifax, and thence on over the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific to the west. Why do I say that the passenger business will go to Halifax ? Because anybody who has crossed the Atlantic knows that when passengers reach the city of Halifax, they will not stay on board to go 250 or 275 miles further, when they can go on a railway and be at the city of Montreal or further west before the ship reaches the city of St. John.

But, Sir, we are told that we should not build this line to the maritime provinces because it will parallel the Intercolonial Railway. I regret that the newspapers misrepresented a statement which I made in answer to the hon. leader of the opposition a few days ago. What I said was that if I believed the arguments of the opposition, I would be opposed to building the line he mentioned ; but, as a matter of fact, nobody imagined that I believed the arguments of the opposition. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that the proposed railway will parallel the Intercolonial Railway. We did not hear anything about paralleling the Intercolonial Railway when the Canadian Pacific short line railway was built, or when that very useful line from Oxford to New Glasgow, which cost over $1,000,000, was built to develop a magnificent part of the country, part of which is in my own constituency. We did not hear anything about paralleling the Intercolonial Railway when the government gave a large bonus to the Restigouche and Western Railway to build a line from Campbellton down to Edmundston, and on into the state of Maine to connect with the Bangor and Aroostook Railway. What did that mean? It meant that a large part of the trade of the Baie des Chaleurs country was to be taken away from the Intercolonial and carried to the United States railways. We did not hear anything about paralleling the Intercolonial Railway when the Midland branch from Truro to Windsor was subsidized by this government.

It has been stated that the distance will not be materially altered by the construction of the proposed line from Moncton to Quebec. We have had a good many figures of distances given already, but I venture to give just one or two figures more. I want first to give the distance from Halifax to Montreal. The distance from Halifax to Montreal via the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway is 756 miles; the distance via the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Intercolonial Railway will be 723 miles; and the distance by the Intercolonial Railway alone is 837 miles. In other words, the new road will bring Halifax 33 miles nearer to Montreal than it is at present by the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and 114 miles nearer than it is by the Intercolonial alone. The distance from St. John to Montreal via the Intercolonial is 740 miles, and the distance via the Canadian Pacific Railway is 481 miles, whereas the distance via the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific will be 535 miles. The new route would only be 54 miles longer from St. John to Montreal than the Canadian Pacific Railway through the state of Maine, and would be shorter than the Intercolonial Railway by 205 miles. We hear a good deal said about the distance being shortened only some 40 or 50 miles, but what is the fact ? We are building a line into the maritime provinces which will bring the products of the west to a maritime province port, and save 205 miles. You can go to the port of St. John and save 205 miles. Let me take some of the distances from the Chaudière. From the Chaudière to St. John, by Edmundston and the west side of the St. John river is 403 miles. From the Chaudière to St. John via the proposed route is 383 miles, and via the Intercolonial Railway 588 miles, thus making a saving in distance by the new route of 205 miles as compared with the Intercolonial Railway. A saving of 205 miles on a journey of 4,000 miles does not amount to much, but what does this mean ? It means a saving of 205 miles on a journey of 588 miles, or 35 per cent. From the Chaudière to Moncton via the Intercolonial Railway is 486 miles. Via the proposed route it is 380 miles, making a saving in distance of 116 miles, or 25 per cent. Are

we going to compel the maritime people to travel over a road 35 per cent longer than another simply because it happens to have been built in the wrong place some thirty-five years ago ? From Moncton to St. John, the distance is 90 miles. From Moncton to Montreal via the Canadian Pacific Railway the distance is 512 miles, and by the Grand Trunk Railway and Intercolonial Railway, 537 miles. So that the only difference between via the Intercolonial Railway and Grand Trunk Railway to Montreal and via the Intercolonial Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway to Montreal is 25 miles. I know that these figures are wearisome, and I shall not quote any more, but I only want to show that we are building a line which will bring a maritime province winter port 205 miles nearer western Canada, over Canadian territory, than any road we have at present.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, was somewhat bothered over this Quebec to Moncton proposition. I suspect that that was the cause of his delay in addressing this House. He was between the devil and the deep sea, and the deep sea, I may say, is at Halifax. Finally he concluded that if a road is to be built at all from Lévis to Moncton, it should be built by the government, and owned and operated by the government as part of the Intercolonial Railway. Before this proposition was submitted by the leader of the opposition, the building of any line at all from Quebec to Moncton had been condemned, in all the moods and tenses, by all the hon. gentlemen opposite, more particularly by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). The hon member for South Lanark said :

> We have accumulated deficits on the Intercolonial Railway during a number of years at the rate of $1,500,000, if what should be charged for revenue were charged to revenue and not to capital account. Now you want to make it so that the people will have to pay increased deficits on the Intercolonial Railway. A madder scheme never entered into the mind of man. It is a useless destruction of property already owned by the government.

Now, however, this hon. gentleman has to eat humble pie and follow his leader who wants us to build a road to Moncton as a government road, and operate it as part of the Intercolonial Railway. By the proposition before the House, the government propose to build the line to Moncton and lease it to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, who will pay 3 per cent on the cost of its construction, and who will bring over it the transcontinental freight of the country—freight from all the northern part of Quebec and Ontario, not to speak of the products of the west. This scheme the hon. member for Lanark described as a mad one. But if it be an insane project, what will he have to say of the project of his leader ?

The ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) said that there would be no local business for the road in connection with any other road. I may say that our proposition is to make this road part of a transcontinental line, and to give running powers over it to the Intercolonial Railway. I would like to know what more benefit the leader of the opposition could get from a road which would be operated by the government ? We propose to build the road as a part of a transcontinental scheme. We propose to bring more business to the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton to be carried by the Intercolonial from Moncton to Halifax. But the scheme submitted by the leader of the opposition would bring in no transcontinental traffic and would have no connection anywhere.

What have we to-day ? We have a transcontinental railway provided for. In the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway it is provided that all freight originating upon any part of this line in Canada or its branches, shall be carried to Canadian ports, unless otherwise routed. What does that mean ? The reply was made that the Grand Trunk Railway would give better rates to Portland, and that people would route their freight that way. But the government forced the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to enter into an agreement not only to carry the unrouted freight, but all freight to Canadian ports at the same price as to American ports. Have we no Canadianism in this country ? Are the farmers of the North-west devoid of patriotism ? Have the people no national feeling ? Is it to be supposed that when they can ship their goods as cheaply by Canadian as by American ports, they will send them to the latter ? I refuse to believe that there is any such lack of national spirit in this country. But the contract calls for more than that. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Grand Trunk Railway will arrange with a steamship line to carry freight cheaper from Portland to Liverpool than from a Canadian port. But here again they are met by a clause which says that not only shall the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway carry Canadian produce to Canadian ports as cheaply as to American ports, but to the point of destination as cheaply. So that there will be no reason whatever for a Canadian whose soul is as big as a bean to send his products to Liverpool by an American rather than by a Canadian port.

We come to the question, what does this road mean to the Intercolonial Railway ? The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) says it means dismantling the Intercolonial Railway. But before passing to that, let me refer once more to the proposition of the leader of the opposition to build this road from Lévis to Moncton to be operated as a government road. Let us see what this would mean according to the figures we have before up. Let us take the

Intercolonial as an example. The cost of construction of this road was $70,000,000. Interest at three per cent would be $2,100,000 a year. The average yearly deficit since the opening of the road has been $200,000. The cost of the new line according to the estimates of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals would be $15,000,000, the yearly interest at three per cent on which would be $450,000. If the deficit on the new line were in the same proportion—and even supposing it did not take traffic from the Intercolonial—there would be a yearly deficit of $53,333. Or, adding the deficit and interest of the two roads the old Intercolonial and the new road, you find a yearly cost to the people of $2,803,333. In addition to this, there will be new rolling stock required. But, according to my hon. friend from South Lanark, the true deficit on the Intercolonial is $1,500,000 a year. The Halifax 'Herald' says it is $2,500,000. Let us take the less extreme statement of the hon. member for South Lanark. How, then, will it work out? You have the old road costing $70,000,000, with interest at three per cent, say $2,100,000. You have a deficit of $1,500,000. The new line will cost $15,000,000 and the deficit on it at the same rate will be $400,000, while the interest will amount to $450,000. So, you have a total yearly charge upon the country, on the basis of the figures of the hon. member for South Lanark of $4,450,000 for the operation of the Intercolonial in the maritime provinces. And what do we get for it? We get scarcely a pound of through-freight down to the seaboard at St. John or Halifax. Why, Mr. Speaker, the people of western Canada do not realize the condition of affairs in regard to the Intercolonial. Go to Halifax and you see there an immense elevator almost touching high heaven, a standing example of the condition of affairs with reference to the through-freight of the Intercolonial. The same thing applies to St. John. These elevators are examples of the folly of preparing for through-traffic unless we actually have a through-traffic road from the west. Our opponents may say that the Halifax elevator was built by the present government. So it was, but it was only built to supply the place of one built by the previous government, which happened to be burnt down. Now we do not want elevators as playthings, but as a part of our equipment in handling through-traffic by our own ports. Mr. Hays has stated, and he should be in a position to know, that there would be traffic enough to supply half a dozen harbours. Suppose Mr. Hays is correct what does his forecast mean? It means increased traffic over the Intercolonial from Moncton to Halifax and from Norton to St. John. It means that the line from Norton to St. John will have to be double tracked and that the line from Moncton to Halifax will have to be double tracked. I have no doubt at all it will come to this, unless, in order to avoid double tracking and severe grade, you run the line to the south of the Cobequid mountains passing near Parrsboro and thence by Five Islands, Economy and Truro. I have no doubt also that in order to shorten the line between Moncton and New Glasgow and to reach the harbours of Whitehaven, Country Harbour, Louisbourg and Sydney, there will have to be built a new line from Moncton to New Glasgow along the north shore of Westmoreland, Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou counties. This road will shorten the distance between Moncton and New Glasgow by at least thirty-nine miles.

It means that we must have lines of steamers to handle the traffic. The Grand Trunk has specifically agreed to supply lines of steamers at the maritime province ports. It means, and must mean eventually, the establishment of the fast line. It means the establishment of a great through-traffic carried by the Grand Trunk Pacific to the ports of St. John and Halifax. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has stated that this project will ruin the Intercolonial Railway. I can hardly think he was serious. I have here a statement prepared by the Intercolonial Railway officials which gives me the total amount of the earnings for last year. The total earnings for local and through traffic was $6,056,171.97. Of this, the total amount of local traffic was $4,327,626.88. Where is there a single pound of local freight that will be taken by the Grand Trunk Pacific? They cannot get any of the local traffic from the Intercolonial between Montreal and Quebec. Nor can they get any from along the St. Lawrence and the north shore of New Brunswick. They cannot take the trade now brought to the Intercolonial by local roads such as the Atlantic and Lake Superior, the Buctouche and other lines, because they will not connect with the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Intercolonial will not lose to the Grand Trunk Pacific a single pound of local traffic in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. As to the through-traffic, I have not as full a statement as I had hoped to have. The memorandum giving particulars has not reached me up to this time. But I would take the statement I have before me, which has been prepared by the Railway Department. This, mark you, relates wholly to through-traffic and does not affect the $4,000,000 and odd of local traffic which the Intercolonial now has and which will not be interfered with. The traffic originating in Montreal and vicinity amounts to $560,000. I have no data to show where that trade goes. No doubt, a large amount of it is dropped along the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Moncton, while some goes into the province of Nova Scotia. Let us assume that one-third of this will be secured by the Grand Trunk Pacific. The traffic from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to Montreal and vicinity

amounts to $304,975.20. I have no data to show where this originates. If it originates along the north shore of New Brunswick it will continue to go over the Intercolonial Railway—the Grand Trunk Pacific cannot touch it. But suppose that the Grand Trunk Pacific can capture one-third of this traffic originating in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The traffic from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to Lévis and Quebec and vicinity amounts to the paltry sum of $56,326.39. The traffic to points in Ontario and the west via Montreal amounts to $671,740.67. The freight traffic from Ontario and the west via Montreal amounts to $671,740.67; via Ste. Rosalie, $29,307.08; and via St. John, $79,938.07. The Grand Trunk Pacific would not capture the trade which at present is handed over by the Canadian Pacific Railway at Ste. Rosalie and St. John. Let me point out to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that when he took over the Drummond County Railway he entered into a hard and fast agreement with the Grand Trunk that every pound of freight coming from the west destined to Intercolonial points would have to be handed over to the Intercolonial for a period of ninety-nine years. There is an item of freight traffic from Ontario and western points via Montreal of $671,000, and that must come via the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk to Montreal. Of course, the Canadian Pacific Railway is not going to hand over any part of its trade to the Intercolonial; but the Grand Trunk must hand over all of its portion of this traffic to the Intercolonial under the agreement—and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals stated that he would stake his political future on the statement that that agreement was hard and fast. Therefore, we need not consider that, for, so far as that trade is concerned, it is bound to go over the Intercolonial under that agreement. Let us admit we lose a part of the traffic originating in Montreal. I do not admit it as a matter of fact, but let us admit it for the sake of argument. Admit in the same way that we lose part of the traffic to points in Ontario and the west. With all this the Intercolonial would be deprived of only between $400,000 and $500,000 of freight business, and this out of a total traffic of over $6,000,000. And yet the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says that the effect of the building of this line, which, at the worst, will take this insignificant part of the trade, will be to dismantle and destroy the Intercolonial Railway. Why, the Intercolonial will make more money carrying Grand Trunk Pacific freight between Moncton and Halifax in one month than it will lose on through-traffic in a year by the building of this new road. If the Grand Trunk bring to Moncton what they have promised to do, they will fill the road between Moncton and Halifax. Consider the effect upon Moncton.

What does it mean ? My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways refers to the city of Moncton as going to revert back to a small village. But this means that it will become a great city in the near future, a central point for a number of railways in the maritime provinces. It means more than that, it means that every man in Moncton, in every railway workshop, every brakeman, every railway engineer, or conductor, every dispatcher and operator and other railway employee, will have more chances for promotion, will have more chances for getting increased salaries, because there will be more work to do and more pay for doing it by means of more competition between railways. Moncton being a divisional point, the Grand Trunk Pacific will have their repair shops there for their rolling stock, they will have their divisional offices in that city. But what will it mean to Moncton if the policy of the leader of the opposition is adopted, to extend the Intercolonial to Georgian bay ? How long does he suppose that Moncton would retain the general railway offices and workshops ? How long would it remain the headquarters of the government railways of Canada ? Under such conditions of affairs, not one year would pass before Moncton would suffer a severe set-back, these offices would be removed to a more central point, perhaps Montreal or Ottawa, and then would come the dismantling of the city of Moncton, and the people of that whole section would have cause to regret that such a policy had been adopted.

Now, these are some of the local advantages that would come to the city of Moncton if we built this road. I said a few moments ago that if the policy of the leader of the opposition were adopted it would mean more money to railway magnates and railway companies. Now, it has been stated that there will be spent in this country, in five years by the government, between Moncton and Winnipeg and by the Grand Trunk Pacific, between Winnipeg and the coast, between $100,000,000 and $200,000,000. What does that mean ? Sir, if there is one industry in this country struggling for existence, it is the iron industry. I am not going to discuss the question of the iron industry, but I will say this, that if all the iron concerns in Canada were to work night and day from this time until the completion of the Grand Trunk Pacific, they could not supply the rails and iron and structural steel required for the construction of the road. According to the terms of this contract, all their supplies must be secured in the Dominion of Canada. It means that more money will be paid Canadian workmen and Canadian artisans ; it means a great demand for supplies of all kinds of the products of the farm and the forest ; it means a great demand for lumber, a great demand for ties, a great demand for hay, for grain, for beef, for pork ; a great demand for engines and boilers ; a great demand for building material ; an immense

demand for woollens, for building stone, for cement, for boots and shoes ; a great demand for rolling stock ; a great demand for cars, passenger and freight ; a great demand for car wheels. Why, Sir, I have not the slightest doubt that within a very short time the car works in the town in which I live will be quadrupled in size to build the cars that will be required for the Grand Trunk Pacific. At the present time the Grand Trunk Company are not able, in its own shops, to produce the rolling stock required on their old line, and how could they produce the rolling stock required on this additional line which with branches will be over 4,000 miles in length ?

It means a great demand for an article of supreme importance to us in Nova Scotia, because it gives us our provincial revenue—it means a great demand for coal. In this northern country between Quebec and Winnipeg, while almost everything else is to be found that is for the advantage of man, there does not seem to have been discovered yet any good coal. There has been found some good lignite, but no good bituminous or anthracite coal. To-day in Nova Scotia we are not able to send our coal west of Montreal, we are not able to send our coal into the province of Ontario ; those places get their coal from Pennsylvania. Manitoba also gets its coal from Pennsylvania. But by the construction of this road from Moncton to the city of Quebec we will decrease the distance for coal carriage over 100 miles to that point. When we come to the northern country further away from the Pennsylvania coal fields, I believe as much as I believe that I am living that within a short time we will be supplying, not only the city of Quebec with Nova Scotia coal, but also that whole northern country, clear away to the city of Winnipeg, in competition with the Pennsylvania coal mines. What does that mean ? It means that in the operation of this road alone from Moncton to Winnipeg there will be required nearly 1,000,000 tons of coal per year ; more coal than is produced to-day in the whole county of Cumberland will be used upon this road alone for locomotives. This road is particularly important to the county of Cumberland, which I represent, because that county will be the best able to supply the Moncton and Quebec division all the year round with coal. We can compete for Quebec with the mines of Cape Breton and Pictou, and we can compete for the trade as far west as Winnipeg. It means another thing, so far as coal is concerned, and that is an immense quantity of bunker coal for St. John, Halifax and other ports to supply the steamers employed by the Grand Trunk Pacific. It means better wages for men on the Intercolonial, and a greater demand for labour all round.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to complete the remarks that I did not intend to make so long. But somehow none of us seem to be able to make short speeches upon this proposition before the House. I have had some experience as whip on the government side of the House in arranging for the speeches, and I have not yet been able to find any one who did not exceed the time he said he was going to speak by at least 100 per cent. I think I am following the example which has been set for me by those hon. gentlemen. I have only one thing more to say, and that is in reference to the bonding privilege, the necessity for which we are endeavouring to avoid. We do not want in this country any privileges from the United States, we want always to be able to stand on our own ground. Some of our friends opposite have been trying to make merry with the contention that we should have an all-Canadian route, in order to get rid of the need of this bonding privilege, the abrogation of which the Americans have been holding over our heads for so long. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we are on very good terms with our American friends to the south of us, and that there is no danger of their withdrawing the bonding privilege. I do not deny that we are on friendly terms, but if we are going to remain a part of the British empire, we must take certain eventualities into account. We must expect that whenever the British empire gets into trouble in any part of the world the very first people who will hurrah for her enemies will be the people of the United States. We have found that in the Boer war, we have found it in every war in which Britain has been engaged. We need go back no further than the Venezuelan affair and the Fenian raid. They are in that state of mind that it only needs a match to set them aflame. I have the greatest possible respect for the American people and American statesmen, but there is a feeling in that country which is anti-British. We are on good terms with them, but we do not know how long we can continue to be on good terms. As the Prime Minister said, the best way to remain on good terms with our neighbours to the south is to become independent of them. They refer to us continually as the spoiled child of the empire. They refuse to deliberate with us on a fair and reasonable basis. Take the present Alaska Boundary Commission. The proposition was made to them to appoint an arbitration commission so constituted that a majority of the commission should make a final decision. And that the majority report should be final. Did they agree to it ? No. Because they imagine that with an equal number of arbitrators in the tribunal there would not be a majority report and nothing would be done and they would eventually secure the territory in the north-west of this country that they are endeavouring to obtain. What are the facts to-day, Mr. Speaker, we have been imagining all along that we owned the country north from Hudson's Bay clear to the north pole.

But, now we have the astounding statement made by American newspapers that they have a right over parts of this country and propose to maintain it. We have to-day a party going to these northern climes —what for? To assert the right of the British empire against the United States if they endeavour to encroach on our lands. We must be independent of the United States. Let us not be in the position that we fear all the time that something is going to happen that will interfere with the prosperity of this country. I belive the policy of Canada for the future to be that we should not only have Canadian ports for Canadian traffic but that we should have a preference not in tariff alone but a preference in ports as well. Two or three years ago, I put on the Order Paper of this House a resolution to the effect that the British preference should only apply to goods coming into Canada by Canadian ports.

Mr. HENDERSON. You never moved it.

Mr. LOGAN. I put it on the Order Paper and I will tell you why it was not moved. It was not moved because pressure was brought to bear on me, not by the government, but by certain parties who feared the bonding privilege would be removed if we granted a preference to Canadian ports. Every day American newspapers printed articles saying that if such a policy were adopted the bonding privilege would be taken away from us. I am not in a position to convey to the House the representations made to me at that time from official quarters, not of this country. I think I could produce evidence to prove to the House that the time has come that we should not have to ask the United States if we can give a preference to Canadian ports.

I believe when this road is built, and we have an all-Canadian route to Canadian ports that that will be the time when we should adopt my resolution, and that the principle of that resolution will form a part of the policy of the Dominion of Canada. Let us have a British preference and let us have also a preference for Canadian ports, let us endeavour to build up our Canadian ports, to build up our Canadian trade and to develop Canadian territory.

You tell me the United States do not think anything of this bonding privilege and that it does not amount to anything. Let me read to you a paper, the New York 'Scottish American,' a paper that is reliable and well known to many members of this House. Referring to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, it says :

> First and foremost, such a railway—one from the Atlantic to the Pacific entirely on Canadian soil—would make Canada absolutely independent of the United States, so far, at least, as regards those bonding privileges upon which this country and its people generally calculate so very much. In this sense the proposed railway may be said to be indispensable to the proper maintenance of Canadian manhood. The threat of removing these bonding privileges has been held by this country over Canada to obtain any desired concession. Even advocates for annexation are fain to handle it. Mr. Andrew Carnegie said, in effect, the other day, that Canada had better become annexed to the United States or the latter would remove the bonding privileges now enjoyed by the former ; and in saying this he was only voicing the sentiments of the people here generally.

Mark these words :

> Once she had this proposed transcontinental railway Canada could afford to tell the United States to remove its bond privileges whenever it pleased, as she no longer needed them.

Now, Sir, in conclusion let me say that I am in favour of building this road for the reasons I have endeavoured to lay before this House. Sir, I represent a constituency which gave to Canada the man who was big enough to lift the curtain and look into the future of the Canadian west and to be the foremost mind in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway which has done so much to develop that part of Canada. I am here to-day to say I admire Sir Charles Tupper for the part he took at that time in the building of that road. It is only just and fair and manly on my part if I believe that, to express my thoughts. The people of Cumberland, I believe, are behind me when I say that they favour at the present time as they favoured in the past the opening up of the west ; that they favour at the present time the opening up also of the great north land of this country to assist in making Canada a mighty nation. To-day we are described as a mere fringe along the United States border. We want thickness in this country. In a few years, Sir, we will have west of Lake Superior, probably ten millions of people and ten millions of people on the east of Lake Superior, but for a thousand miles between you have a mere ragged backbone of country without population. Let us while we are developing the west, while we are bringing people into the western country, at the same time fill up the middle of this country, let us have this country so developed that it shall have breadth from the Atlantic clear through to the Pacific.

I, Sir, am heartily in favour of the proposition which is before this country at the present time. I believe, that when this government does go to the country whether it be this year or next year or the year after they can appeal with confidence to the people when they say to them that they propose first to become independent of the United States of America, secondly, to convey Canadian goods to Canadian ports over a Canadian railway and thirdly, to build up the northern part of this great country, to put the people in that land which is to-day waiting for development, waiting for population, to add to this country, which is to-day so dear to us, a new empire to the north that will be as large as the whole of the New England states of

America. I know we can appeal with confidence to the people on this ground. We will go to the country, when we do go, with the words inscribed on our banner 'Laurier, progress and victory.' Our opponents will go to the country with the words inscribed on their banner 'Borden, blue ruin and Gamey.'

Now, Sir, let me conclude with the words of a distinguished Nova Scotian. The words of the late principal of Queen's University, Rev. G. M. Grant, who, having travelled from Cape Breton to the Pacific ocean, wrote :

> In all this vast expanse of 4,000 miles there is everything that man can desire and the prospect of a mighty future. If we do not build a nation out of such material it is our own fault and our sins will find us out.

Let us, Sir, devote our attention to the upbuilding of Canada, and let us above all things, endeavour to roll back the Canadian map to the northward.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, there are some very material points in this contract and agreement under discussion which it would not be proper for me to refer to. If I discussed them, quite naturally and properly, I might be accused of discussing them from a partial point of view and I propose therefore treating of the general policy of this proposition and to pass that over with a very few remarks. There are other points which it will be my duty to reply to. The Prime Minister in his speech entered into a glowing description of the wonderous, the future that this road would open up, and he emphasized its simplicity and its cheapness, and gave us dismal prophesies as to what would happen if we did not build the road. He talked long on the bonding privilege, but he seemed to forget that this question has been before the country for years, although it had only struck him at this late date that the bonding privilege was a serious menace to our prosperity and to our nationhood. The right hon. gentleman apparently was not aware that we had the Intercolonial Railway which gives us connection all through Canadian territory from the Atlantic to the Pacific ; and the most advantage he could claim for the new scheme, over existing railways, is, that it would shorten the distance some 140 miles, although we have good authority for saying that the distance will be shortened only 40 or 50 miles, Speaking as to the Intercolonial Railway the right hon. gentleman said :

> A good many who oppose this scheme pretend that there is no need whatever of extending that railway from Quebec to Moncton because, between Quebec and Moncton, there is already the Intercolonial Railway. Sir, the answer which we have to make to this objection is plain, obvious, categorical, peremptory and paramount ; the answer is that the Intercolonial never was intended, and never was conceived, and never was built for transcontinental traffic. The Intercolonial was first conceived as a military road. It was built and located for political reasons, not from any commercial considerations.

This is a very strong statement from the Prime Minister, but a short time afterwards he made this statement in reference to this same scheme :

> Most of our critics look upon this scheme as a commercial venture to be judged by the only rule of profit and loss.

You will remark that the Prime Minister's first idea was that the Intercolonial Railway was merely a national necessity and not a commercial road, and he claimed distinction for his new scheme because the Intercolonial Railway was built on sentimental lines. However, the hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten that in his flights of oratory, because shortly after he made that statement, he said :

> Most of our critics look upon this scheme simply as a commercial venture to be judged by the only rule of profit and loss. We look upon it as a work of a national character necessitated by the status of Canada in the year 1903, just as the Intercolonial Railway was necessitated by the status of Canada at the opening of confederation.

Here he claims that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not a road built for commercial purposes, but that it is a road built for national and sentimental purposes, just as was the Intercolonial Railway. Now, Sir, permit me to point out that whoever drew the Order in Council appointing the transportation commission knew what was required in this country. The programme laid down in these documents is a wise programme, and if it had been followed it would have been of great benefit to the parliament of Canada and to the country in judging how the transportation problem was to be solved. But the Finance Minister in his speech stated that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme had been discussed by the ministry and practically approved of six months before it was submitted to parliament. If that be so, then the scheme was accepted prior to the transportation commission being submitted to the House, and consequently the appointment of a transportation commission must have been meant simply and solely to mislead the House, for what was the use of that commission, if the government had already adopted a transportation scheme of its own ? The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in defending this project said that if we could have a road 21 feet grade, if we could have a road on which we could run 50 cars of 30 tons ; if we could have engines hauling on 90 pound rails, then we could carry grain to the seaboard at a cheap rate. Well, there are a lot of very big 'ifs' in that. The hon. gentleman reminded me when I was listening to his speech, of the saying we had in childhood :

If 'ifs' and 'ands' were pots and pans
There would be no work for tinkers' hands.

And, Sir, the word 'tinkers' in this connection would seem very appropriate in its application to those who devised this railroad scheme.

The Minister of the Interior in his speech used with much show a map which to my mind was absolutely condemnatory of the proposals he made. That map showed long lines running north and south at wide distances apart, and each of these north and south lines was intended to represent the route of an exploring party. Each of these lines showed in the vicinity of a river or a stream giving access from the height of land down towards Hudson's bay, but the minister gave not one solitary piece of evidence that the east and west lines had been surveyed, and the natural inference would be that north and south surveys had been made upon which to construct an east and west line. That is a queer mode of proceeding in the matter of surveying for a railroad. Now, Sir, we all approve of the Grand Trunk Railway Company getting into the western prairies, rivalling the existing roads, and developing that territory, with its great resources and its great energy. Letters and interviews have been quoted by hon. gentlemen opposite in an attempt to show that members on this side of the House approved of the Grand Trunk Railway getting into the west. But these gentlemen opposite forgot to point out that all these endorsations were of the Grand Trunk Railway scheme before it took its present shape. They were endorsations of the idea that the Grand Trunk Railway should get access to the west, and I do not think that any one on this side of the House suggested that this access should be obtained in any other way than by a continuation of a line from Gravenhurst or North Bay. I would endorse that proposition, and I have no hesitation in saying that I would like to see the Grand Trunk Railway in the west. But though hon. gentlemen opposite are fond of indulging in quotations to show approval of the Grand Trunk Railway getting to the west, they have not been able to produce any evidence to show that public opinion is in favour of the scheme which is now submitted. I was much struck with an article by 'Don' in 'Saturday Night,' who is a strong supporter of the government and who winds a very able article by saying: 'Preserving cans are numerous in all households, and we could keep the scheme for another year and not be injured.' He winds up with these words: 'Altogether there seems to be too much haste, too much enthusiasm, too little knowledge.' To my mind, Mr. Speaker, that most graphically and briefly describes the position we are in, and that is from an editorial written by one of the strongest supporters of the government.

Now, the contract before us is practically a secret bargain made by the government with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the building of this road. We had all the farce of the discussion on the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill gone through in the Railway Committee when all the time there was an understanding with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as to what the government were to do. In the olden days, the Liberal policy, as I recollect it, was to build railways in the west slowly—to concentrate population, instead of scattering it over large areas, so that school buildings and everything else could be easily provided. The present scheme, as outlined, runs altogether counter to that idea. I propose in my remarks chiefly to criticise the contract which has been made, and not the scheme as submitted. I notice that very few words have been used by members on the government side in defence of the contract or in support of the scheme in principle or in its details. Clause 8 provides that 'the construction of the eastern division shall be commenced as soon as the government has made the surveys and plans.' Clause 9 provides that 'the western division shall be constructed by and at the cost of the company.' Clause 10 provides that 'the work of locating and constructing the said western division shall be commenced forthwith.' The western division will therefore naturally be completed some years before the eastern division—probably before the surveys of the eastern division are completed. The Grand Trunk Company will then be obliged to transfer all the business which it collects on the prairies to its connections running through the United States, and on to Portland. That is self-evident from this contract. If you divert the trade for several years in large volume through such a channel as that, I tell you, from a railway and business point of view, that it is going to be a very hard matter to divert that trade afterwards to other channels where the cost of carrying it will be greater. Clause 11 provides that the company shall lay out, construct and equip the western division according to the Grand Trunk standard. The Prime Minister made a great deal of that point; but the Grand Trunk standard is not that of to-day. It will take fifteen years to bring up the best road you can build to the Grand Trunk standard of to-day. Therefore, that clause is absolutely worthless; it means nothing. Clause 12 provides that the company shall deposit with the government $5,000,000. That is simply an advance payment, which will be returned to the company as they build the road. With regard to the meaning of clause 15, as to whether the $20,000,000 worth of rolling stock is to be purchased or leased, for my part, as I read the contract, I believe it means that it shall be purchased; but when I hear hon. ministers and lawyers on the other side take one view, and

when legal gentlemen on this side say that there is a doubt about that, and that the clause might be read either way, that is evidence that the contract has been drawn loosely, and without proper supervision by the government; and when such an important clause as that is loosely drawn, we may be sure that other clauses, if carefully scanned, will also be found to be loosely drawn.

Clause 17 has been drawn by an expert. I would almost imagine that the hon. Minister of Finance, and the remaining free trade members in the House had put their heads together and had drafted a clause which they thought would at all events leave a sting behind it, in case their favourite policy of free trade should be swept away a little later on. I want to bring that clause to the attention of every member of this House, because it is a more serious clause, as effecting the interests of this country, than anything else in the contract. That clause reads:

> No addition shall be made to the cost of construction or to the capital of construction account in respect of customs duties in cases where there is direct importation of material or supplies by the government.

This is a case of a government building a railroad. This road is to cost at the least estimate $80,000,000. The whole of the materials used in the construction of the road shall come into this country at all times free of duty. That represents one point. The Intercolonial Railway, on its completion, cost $21,500,000; that was about 1876. Twenty-six years after that, the additions to capital account had brought the cost up to $71,000,000, or $72,000,000, or nearly three and a half times the original cost. We may, I think, safely assume that there will be a similar increase in the cost of construction of this road. This is to be a road owned by the government, on which the government are to spend all the money that may be necessary for relaying the road, and all additional expenditures on capital account for fifty years. Therefore, for fifty years all the supplies that come into Canada in connection with this road will come in free of duty. If we take twenty-five years only of this lease, and say that the capital account will be increased three and a half times during that time, we shall have a capital account at the end of twenty-five years of $280,000,000. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) drew a glowing picture of what this great railway building was going to do for the merchants, manufacturers and people of this country. Let me tell you what it will do for the merchants and manufacturers. I have jotted down a few of the ordinary supplies that are necessary for the building of a railway, and for its continuous betterment. Apparently the section to be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not to be exempt from the duties on the materials and supplies used in its construction, showing very clearly what the intention is, so far as the government road is concerned. I may say here that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, as I recollect it, they were to bring in free of duty for the original construction of the road the steel rails and fastenings and certain supplies, but we made no steel rails in this country in those days, and that was a reasonable proposition. But under this contract, we bring in steel rails and everything to be used in the construction of the railway free; yet, the hon. member for Cumberland says that if this contract be carried out the rolling mills of this country will be so full of orders that they will treble their capacity. Let me tell him that if this contract is carried out, there will not be a steel rail rolled in Canada for fifty years. The hon. Minister of Finance laughs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I must apologize, but I cannot treat the hon. gentleman seriously.

Mr. OSLER. Then, the hon. minister does not understand what the clause means. If the English language means anything, the clause means what I am saying. I am not simply giving my own opinion, but have submitted it to able lawyers——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let us have the names.

Mr. OSLER. I have no objection. I shall not weary the House with reading extracts from newspapers and quotations from old speeches. The Prime Minister took up eleven columns of 'Hansard' with quotations from the New York 'Sun' and other journals. Surely he had sufficient faith in his scheme to introduce if off his own bat and not off quotations from the New York 'Sun.' According to this contract, the government, if they construct this road themselves, or through contractors, or under the supervision of commissioners, are to bring in everything free of duty. Among these things are tents, camp equipment, provisions, flour, pork, tools, scrapers, ploughs, steam ploughs for unloading, picks, shovels, spades, sledges, axes, saws, hammers, nails, spikes, crowbars, rails, semaphores, signal lamps, electric supplies, telephone supplies, wheelbarrows, carts, wagons, harness, all kinds of rubber goods, bedding, clothing, in fact, everything used in the construction of a railway or in keeping up its supplies during fifty years. It is not simply the quantities that the contractor brings in for the railway, but this will enable him to bring in double or treble that quantity at a lower rate of duty, and thus swamp our manufacturers. I contend that no one could read that clause and put any other interpretation upon it. But as that clause is only applicable to government work, the Finance Minister may say that the government will let this by contract, and in that

case the contractor will bring in the supplies and charge the duties upon them. I contend that the clause has been put there for the very purpose of preventing anything of the kind being done. The Grand Trunk Railway Company are supposed to pay 3 per cent interest—they do not bind themselves, but they are supposed to pay it —on the capital that may be expended on this railway, and they naturally will claim that the capital cannot include any duties paid. This clause can only be treated in that way. I can only believe it was put in by the Finance Minister as a sort of dying kick to show his belief in free trade. It would have this effect, further, that if at any time during the fifty years the Canadian government should alter its fiscal policy and increase the duties—as I hope it will before a year or two are passed—we would have no power to alter this contract and charge duties on these goods.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway are supposed to lease the eastern division, and to put up security on that division in the shape of rolling stock. If my contention is right, they put $20,000,000 rolling stock on the whole road, of which $5,000,000 is to be on the eastern section. The $20,000,000 is covered by a mortgage to secure the government guarantee on the western section, and on the $5,000,000 the government have a second mortgage as their sole security for the operation of the eastern division by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Every railway man knows that when rolling stock has been in use one year its depreciation in value, as a second hand article, is 20 per cent, and after four years it is 40 per cent. If well renewed after that, for many years it may be worth 40 per cent of the first cost. In four years' time this $5,000,000 of rolling stock will be worth at the outside $3,000,000. Upon that the government have already a first mortgage in connection with the security for the western branch, and they have a second mortgage of $5,000,000 on rolling stock worth $3,000,000, as security for operating the eastern branch. That is to say, they have a second mortgage for $5,000,000 applicable to the eastern branch, secured upon rolling stock which is worth only $3,000,000. That struck me as being so extraordinary that I submitted it to one of the ablest lawyers I know, and asked him to give me a written opinion as to the security, which the government will have for operating the eastern section, either by the Grand Trunk Railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. He writes me as follows :

I have considered the Act relating to the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway to ascertain what 'security' the government will have that the company (to use the language of section 41 of the agreement) 'at all times during the terms of the said lease—shall continuously and efficiently operate both divisions of the railway' to the satisfaction of the government. In my opinion, the only 'security,' apart from the mere promise of the company, is the second charge on five million of equipment bonds of the eastern division, authorized to be created by clause 22 of the agreement, and by subsection (c) of clause 35, made a security for the rental and operation of the eastern division. The other parts of the Act or agreement having any bearing upon the subject are section 2 of the Act ratifying the agreement and binding the government and company to do what is necessary to give full effect to it.

By clause 6 of the agreement, the company agrees to take a lease of and maintain and operate the eastern division upon the terms thereinafter set out. By clause 20, the company are to take a lease of the eastern division for fifty years, the first seven years subject to payment of working expenditure, as defined, and forty-three years paying a sum equal to 3 per cent on cost of construction, calculated and mentioned—with a right of renewal ; section 21. By clause 23, the lease is to contain necessary and proper provisions required by the government for securing maintenance and operation of the division, and by clause 24 proper and usual provisions as to certain running powers and haulage rights.

By clause 25 the lease is also to contain such other covenants and provisions deemed necessary by the government, including proper indemnity to the government to secure the proper carrying out of the agreement. The above clauses 23 and 25 are about as vague as possible. Assume that these clauses will justify stringent provisions in the lease looking to the resumption of possession by the government of the eastern division, it can hardly be said that any such provision would be a 'security' in any sense of the term unless the lease contains a provision authorizing the government on default also to enter into possession of the western division and subject to the rights of the bondholders, to operate and, after continuous default, to dispose of the line as a whole. Such a provision, it seems to me, would require authorization by the Act which it does not at present contain. Without it the government would be left to operate the eastern division alone with such rights as to damages as it would have against the heavily bonded western division. It may be contended that the company can be compelled specifically to perform the contract, but the courts have as a rule declined to enforce performance of a contract to operate a railway. I think, therefore, with the exception of the second charge on the equipment bonds of the eastern division, there is nothing that can be called a security for the operation of the eastern division.

By clause 20 the company are to take a lease of the eastern division for fifty years, the first seven years subject to payment of working expenditure as defined and forty-three years paying a sum equal to three per cent on cost of construction, calculated as mentioned, with a right of renewal ; section 21. By clause 23 the lease is to contain necessary and proper provisions required by the government for securing maintenance and operation of the division, and by clause 24 proper and usual provisions as to certain running powers and haulage rights.

By clause 25 the lease is also to contain such other covenants and provisions claimed necessary by the government, including proper indemnity to the government to secure the pro-

per carrying out of the agreement. The above clauses 23 and 25 are about as vague as possible. Assume that these clauses will justify stringent provisions in the lease looking to the resumption of possession by the government of the eastern division, it can hardly be said that any such provision would be a 'security' in any sense of the term unless the lease contains a provision authorizing the government on default also to enter into possession of the western division and subject to the rights of the bondholders to operate and after continuous default to dispose of the line as a whole. Such a provision it seems to me would require authorization by the Act which it does not at present contain. Without it the government would be left to operate the eastern division alone with such rights as to damages as it would have against the heavily bonded western division. It may be contended that the company can be compelled specifically to perform the contract, but the courts have as a rule declined to enforce performance of a contract to operate a railway. I think therefore with the exception of the second charge on the equipment bonds of the eastern division there is nothing that can be called security for the operation of the eastern division.

Mr. WADE. May I ask the hon. gentleman the name of the writer ?

Mr. OSLER. Yes, I will hand it over to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Give it to us in public.

Mr. OSLER. It is Mr. J. F. Smith, of Toronto, one of the ablest lawyers in this province. I think he stands high enough to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He does not appear to have a very positive opinion.

Mr. OSLER. It is a pretty strong and square opinion. While on that point, I must say that no one reading that contract, bringing to bear upon it any knowledge of railway affairs and some little common sense, can come to any other conclusion than that there is absolutely no security for the government, and no way of compelling the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate the road if they don't like to do it. Now what will happen ? The proper security suggested there is the security of the western division, but because these two roads are split in two the security of the eastern division becomes valueless. Now, Sir, I tell hon. gentlemen opposite, if they do not know it, why it is that the two contracts are separated, and why the eastern division is kept separate from the western division : It was simply because the Grand Trunk Company forbade their general manager absolutely to sign any such contract. He could not commit himself, and his board of directors would not have kept him one week as general manager if he had recommended the signing of such a contract. The Minister of Trade and Commerce could not have been there. I do not think he could have had much to do with it. Now as to the haulage clause and running rights, there is this to be said about it : We will suppose that the Canadian Northern asks for running rights. They send out a trainload of stock or grain over that road, for Moncton. After they start out from Winnipeg they come to a steep grade where they have to drop off some of their cars, because on all roads there are certain grades so heavy that you have to drop off some of the cars and let them wait for the next train to pick them up. It takes a train about 264 hours to make the round trip from Winnipeg to Moncton. When the cars of the Canadian Northern get to Moncton and are emptied, they have absolutely no return freight, because all the return freight is handed directly over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway through the government road. Therefore, these cars have to be returned empty, at a minimum cost of over $1,000 for actual haulage of 40 empty cars. Now can any one imagine business being done by any road under those conditions ? It is simply absurd. The annual rental will be charged, a portion of the actual money the Grand Trunk have to pay, the cost of maintenance, the cost of fuel, which is very large in that northern section—all that has been borne by the cars returning empty. They would get no return freight, and as a natural consequence, shippers would send no grain that way, and no cattle.

Now it may be said that the Grand Trunk are not getting a bonus for this road. The Grand Trunk are getting on the western division a bonus in the shape of a guarantee which will enable them to get their money at 3 per cent. Suppose there were a condition of things which enabled them to get their money at 1½ per cent less than they could borrow it in the market on their own credit. Assuming that the Grand Trunk western division has $40,000,000 spent upon it at the end of 50 years, the sinking fund of 1 per cent would be a bonus to the Grand Trunk Railway of $62,000,000, or 50 per cent more than the cost of their road, enabling them to set aside a bonus of 1 per cent, and to redeem their bonds, and give them 50 per cent over at the end of the period. Both the Finance Minister and the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) said that the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) was against railway bonuses. Now I do not need to use very strong language, but I can say that I have not changed my opinion as to railway bonuses. I find in the Liberal platform of 1896 the following language respecting the bonusing of railways :

The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, speculation and corruption. Under its operation favourites of the government have become enriched. Appropriations have been made for the sole purpose of purchasing the support of constituencies, and vast sums of public money have been voted without regard to the public interest, while millions of acres of land that should have

been held in trust by the government for the future homes of the hardy and deserving settlers, have been handed over without consideration or justification, to charter-hawkers, whose intervention actually retards the construction of the land whose franchises they control, for the purpose of extorting money from the ultimate builders of the roads. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in parliament by the Liberal party, and this resolution is in harmony with the attitude of the Liberal party upon this question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the hon. gentleman reading from ?

Mr. OSLER. From the Liberal platform adopted in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He may be reading from some document which was used, but I can assure him that the Liberal platform does not contain the words he has read.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a letter written by the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the Patrons, drawing attention to the fact that the platform of the Patrons is exactly the platform of the Reform party.

Mr. OSLER. I find at the bottom : 'See resolutions 3 and 6, Liberal platform.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If, as stated by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), this is a quotation from a speech by a member of parliament, it should be given as a quotation from a speech, and not as an extract from the Liberal platform.

Mr. OSLER. It does not alter the facts, but I apologize if I have brought it before the House in the wrong manner. The quotation given me has the memorandum, 'See resolutions 3 and 6, Liberal platform.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But it is not that.

Mr. OSLER. It is not now, I quite agree. The platform of the Liberal party now is so far from this that I do not wonder at hon. gentlemen repudiating it, and even forgetting that such a platform had even been approved by them. I can hardly understand that the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the other ministers, could ever read this now without feeling that they must have been entirely changed, and wondering at the state of mind which must have been theirs when they put before their followers such a programme as this. I have not very much to add, but rather more than I can finish before six o'clock, so I will ask leave to stop here.

At six o'clock. House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Speaker, I am not so used to public speaking that I can without disadvantage break off before I have finished and then resume. I think I can, without any ill-feeling, ascribe to my friends who preceded me, the fact that I had to break off before I had finished my remarks. I will rather go back a little from where I was at six o'clock, because I wish to emphasize very strongly the point I took that the contract which the government has made is one that will entail serious and abiding loss to the manufacturing community of Canada. It strikes a blow, and a blow below the belt, at the national policy and at the principle of protection, which is the platform and principle of the Conservative party, and which has been, in an underhand manner, adopted by the present government. Now, let me read some portions of this contract, as to the meaning of which the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs seem to be quite uninformed. Section 5 of the contract says :

The eastern division shall be constructed by, and at the expense of the government, upon such location and according to such plans and specifications as it——

That is, the government——

—shall determine, having due regard to directness, easy gradients and favourable curves.

And section 7 says :

In order to insure, for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to, and approved of, by the company before the commencement of the work, and that the said work shall be done according to the specifications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government, and the chief engineer of the company, and in the event of difference as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work, the questions in dispute shall be determined by the said engineers and a third arbitrator, to be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

Now, this is a declaration setting forth absolutely that the government undertake to build the eastern division of this railway. This division is to cost, at the least estimate that I have heard, $80,000,000. My own belief, and in this I am within the figures given by some, is that it will cost at least $120,000,000. The contract goes on further to say that the government from time to time during this contract of fifty years shall pay, and add to the capital cost of this eastern division, whatever sums may be expended on it beyond the original cost. I have quoted you the case of the Intercolonial, which is also a government work. But I may say that the figures shown by the Intercolonial reports are not very exceptional. No railway on this continent is carried on as a paying road of which it is not true that, after being taken over from

the contractor who built it by the company that was to own and run it, it has been necessary, within ten or twelve years, to expend upon the road, on capital account, from 50 to 100 per cent of the original cost. I learn from Sir Sandford Fleming's history of the Intercolonial, published in 1876, page 234, that up to that time the total expenditure on the Intercolonial was $21,659,136.79. This included surveys, branch lines and rolling stock. I have not the figures here, but I think I am safe in saying that the expenditure on the Intercolonial on capital account now amounts to about $71,000,000. So, no hon. gentleman will contradict me if I say that from 1876 to 1902, a period of twenty-six years, the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial has increased from about $21,500,000 to $71,000,000, or between three and a quarter and three and a half times the original expenditure on capital account.

Now, I am perfectly safe from a business point of view, if I base my figures upon $80,000,000 of original cost of this section of the government railway, in saying that within 25 years the cost of that railway will be $280,000,000. Now, that is the amount of capital that would be expended on this railway under ordinary conditions, not under conditions of government supervision, but under ordinary railway conditions, and when we arrive at 26 years to be quite right we will still have 24 years of a government liability to pay for all the money that is expended on capital account on that railway. If you take it that at the end of twenty-six years the capital of that railway is $280,000,000, and I am quite sure I am within the mark, I will not take the same relative proportion but I will double that for the twenty-five years. Now if the visions of those who have promoted this scheme are attained at all, these amounts I say are far within the mark as to the amount of capital that will be required to be expended on that road before fifty years have expired, when the government will have the right to take it over. If at the end of twenty-five years we have had an expenditure of $280,000,000 or a doubling of the debt of Canada, then at the end of the fifty years we will have an expenditure of $560,000,000, and if the Grand Trunk Pacific Company carry out their agreement of operating this road, which I am very happy to say I do not believe they will do, we will have an expenditure of $560,000,000 upon this road, the Grand Trunk Pacific paying to the country three per cent of the cost.

Mr. BROCK. The minister will have to get his actuary to work again.

Mr. OSLER. This is a rule of thumb matter and does not require an actuary. Now then following that out I will read again the clause in which I have no doubt the Minister of Finance or the other members of the government, if I was wrong in assuming that the Finance Minister is the originator of this clause, was trying to leave a particular branch of free trade in Canada for fifty years as the record of his principles. If I am wrong in assuming that he drafted this clause, I am quite sure he did not know the meaning of the clause when he and other members of council passed it. Now, the government have agreed to build this road as a government road; they have agreed with the Grand Trunk Pacific and through them in a roundabout way with the Grand Trunk Railway that the Grand Trunk Pacific are to pay three per cent on the net cost of that railway and no more. Now, then, the clause that follows, and this is the final clause I think in connection with the government building the railway, because this clause is left out of the clause concerning the Grand Trunk Pacific building the western division. This clause (clause 17) provides that no addition shall be made to the cost of construction or to the capital construction account in respect of customs duties levied where there is direct importation of material or supplies by the government. Now, a bargain between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific is the same as a bargain between any two men; each one will hold the other as far as possible to the bargain. The government have agreed with the Grand Trunk Pacific that they shall build this road and that so far as imports by the government in connection with the road are concerned there shall be no customs duties levied. Suppose the government take this technical point and say we are not going to import these things, there is no court in the land that will not say to the government that is the meaning of your clause, you have the power to import without duty, therefore you must import without duty. I do not think a man, the least familiar with business, can contradict or can disagree with the assertion I make that that would be the interpretation of that clause. Now, then, if it was affecting only the original construction of this road it might be said to be a matter that was only temporary, but this includes all the expenditure to be made by the government during the fifty years of this lease and of this contract. We will assume, because there is nothing in the contract apparently defining how it is to be built, we will assume that this road is built under a commission appointed by the government, that is by the government itself. The government perhaps may let out certain contracts, the contractors before they make the contract or the Grand Trunk Pacific before it consents to that contract will say the contract must contain a clause that if the contractor brings in materials they shall be free of duty. No other meaning can attach to that clause; it covers the great bulk of the rough manufacturing industries that are now in existence in Canada. It covers steel rails. The minister will say that steel rails now come into Canada free of duty, but I

hope that when wiser and better fiscal ideas rule in this House instead of having that abortion of bounties we will have a correct and a proper system of protection where the individual manufacturer is protected on all the articles that he makes. We will, I think, without looking forward with too great hope, within a very short time—I think myself within a shorter time than my friends opposite will agree with me—find that those who have the sound fiscal policy of this country at heart and believe in protection will rule, and they will bring in a protective tariff. If this clause passes all the materials necessary for this railway in future will come in free and no law that can be passed will alter it, and all the supplies will come in free. Now, I read to-day a few of these supplies and this list will be extended indefinitely. It extends to all the rougher manufactures of Canada. I am not lawyer enough, I am not a lawyer at all, to say, that in connection with this very bounty that the government has established, if that clause was submitted to a court the government would not have to refund to the contractors a proportion of the bounty they give on steel rails if without the bounty they could buy steel rails elsewhere. It strikes me that is probably a very reasonable thing, but I am not able to say whether that is so or not. However, I assume that under that clause we will have admitted into Canada all the materials required for the construction of the railway, and all the supplies, all the pork and the beef and the blankets, and the rubbers and the boots, and it may be the clothing of the navvies who work on that road if they work under a government contract, because what is an easier matter than to put in a contract with a body of men that they shall be paid so much and shall be provided with their clothing and supplies which will be cheaper if they are imported free of duty. It would not affect all the supplies brought in for this railway, but the Minister of Customs is business man enough to know that if I have a contract for supplying $50,000 worth of materials, which I can get in free of duty, and another contract for $50,000 on which I have to pay duty, I can very easily compete with the local manufacturer and crush him out. That must be the effect of this contract if it is carried out. I think I have made myself as clear as possible on that point.

I want to repeat the statement I made in connection with the direct bonus which the government gives to this railway. I assume that the portion built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will cost $40,000,000 which the government guarantee at three per cent, and that will save to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway one and a half per cent per year for fifty years. A sinking fund of one per cent a year for fifty years at that amount would realize at the end of that ime $62,446,000, or more than enough to pay the whole bonded debt of the company, and with the practical result that the government hand over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the western section of the road free of cost. I am well within the mark when I say that the benefit to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway of the government guarantee is at least one and a half per cent per annum, because I can state as a positive fact that no railway on this continent has yet borrowed a sum of money like that at a less rate of interest than 4½ per cent per annum. I say that no railway on this continent can now borrow the sum of money that is required for the construction of the western section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway at a rate as low as 4½ per cent per annum. The New York Central, probably the railway with the best credit on this continent, has lately borrowed money at 5 per cent per annum paying one per cent commission for the loan. Now, if I take 4½ per cent as the interest the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would have to pay for the money if it were not guaranteed by this government, then at the end of the fifty years' term—which is a quite legitimate calculation because they can use that as a sinking fund to pay off their debt—the bonus you give them would amount to $93,000,000. And yet this government says that the whole cost to this country is only $13,000,000. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Finance that he should take this scheme as it is in its entirety, with all its contracts weak as they are, and ask the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company from whom this money is to come that is put in under second mortgage for the construction of the western section, and suggest to them that he will give them a bonus of $20,000,000 in cash if they will carry out the scheme which the government now proposes on all its lines, and I will be bound the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway directors and shareholders will turn it down without five minutes' discussion.

I do not like to see a misstatement made in this House and endorsed by a man of the position and the reputation of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), who I am sure will be the last man to countenance a statement which is outrageously wrong. The hon. gentleman quoted from the 'Weekly Sun.' It has struck me during this debate that the greater part of the arguments made by the government and its supporters are arguments from the newspaper press of the country. It is not so very long ago that we heard the Prime Minister state in this House that he absolutely paid no attention to letters or articles in newspapers, and yet he himself in his speech took up nine columns of 'Hansard' quoting from the New York 'Sun' and yellow journals. I do not for a moment suggest that the hon. member for Cumberland did not quote from the 'Weekly Sun'

in perfect good faith, but he certainly quoted a misstatement. It is a farmer's paper and has often very good things in it, but it often shoots off things which exist only in the imagination. This is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) quoted from the 'Weekly Sun :'

The Candian Pacific Railway has just declared a dividend at the rate of six per cent per annum upon the original issue of $65,000,000 common stock. Of the proceeds of this stock not more than $8,500,000, according to Mr. Blake, ever went into the construction of the road. The remainder went to swell the profits of the shareholders. The dividend that has just been paid amounts to nearly fifty per cent of the actual cash expended by the shareholders on the construction of the railway.

That is an absolutely false statement. The original $25,000,000 of Canadian Pacific Railway stock was bought and paid for under an agreement with the government, and of course you cannot blame individuals for making the best bargain they could, although they did not make a good bargain in that case as it happened. They paid 25 cents a share or $6,250,000 for the original $25,000,000 of stock. All the other stock that was issued from that date to this has been issued on the market at the fullest market price. I am speaking from memory now as I had no time to verify the actual figures, but there was one case where a syndicate took $20,000,000 of stock at 55 cents or 60 cents on the dollar, and when the time arrived for the payment of that stock under their agreement, the stock was worth 10 per cent or 20 per cent less than the amount they agreed to pay. They had to pay for that, however, and that money went into the company's hand, and every other dollar of Canadian Pacific Railway stock issued after the original $25,000,000 loan was issued at the fullest market rate. The last $20,000,000 which was issued under the authority of this parliament was sold to the shareholders and produced par, and that money has been expended during the last year and a half on the road. Of the original $65,000,000 I think I am quite safe in saying that over $50,000,000 was put into the road in cash by the shareholders ; not the original men who took it, but the shareholders in England, Germany, America, Canada, and all over the world. I know that the member for Cumberland will be glad that I have given this explanation, although I have a great dislike to referring to anything connected with any company I am interested in. The hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) made a very strong appeal in favour of this contract because of the great benefit that would accrue to the manufacturers of this country by reason of the money that will be expended. I say that if this contract is carried out in its present shape it will be the greatest blow that the manufacturers of Canada ever have experienced, not excepting the abolition of the reciprocity treaty.

The bonding privilege question has been so often referred to that perhaps it is almost superfluous to refer to it again. But I have an idea on that subject which I believe is a sound one. It is something which I would not like to see carried out; I should very much regret if the occasion should arise to necessitate it. If under any unfortunate circumstances causing friction between the two countries, the bonding privilege should be done away with, it would do more to make Canada a nation than all that the Prime Minister of this country has done since he came into power. What we have lacked and what this government has lacked more than anything else, has been the ability to grapple properly with the transportation question. Where are we weak and where are we strong in dealing with that question ? We are proposing to spend $120,000,000 to shorten the route from Quebec and Lévis to our sea ports, 120 miles according to some, forty miles according to others. In constructing that line we do not improve our position with reference to the bonding privilege one iota. We have now an all-Canadian route by a government road. All Canadian products to be shipped through Canadian ports can go over the Intercolonial Railway, if it is provided with sufficient rolling stock. What we want is to improve our waterways and lake ports, instead of building duplicate railways. These are very well in their place, but they are not the first needs to be considered. To make Canada free and independent we must make our ports as good as any on the continent. Building a hundred railways across the continent will not improve the St. Lawrence route, the harbours of St. John and Halifax or the Georgian bay and Lake Superior harbours. Go into the Department of Marine and Fisheries, where I suppose you can see a marine map of the upper lakes and the Georgian bay ; look at that, and then be ashamed of the position we occupy and the little we have done to improve our ports. We shall see on the map three or four stars representing lighthouses on the Canadian shores from Port Arthur to Sault Ste. Marie, and from the Sault to the Georgian bay ; you can count them on your fingers. Look on the other side, and you will see lighthouses so thick that you can hardly count them. We have not a life-saving crew on our northern waters, and no attempt is made to put one there. No attempt is made to develop our natural channels for international trade. Make Fort William, Port Arthur, Midland and all the ports on the Georgian bay so perfect that the larger vessels can enter them, load and unload and tranship their cargoes at a minimum cost; and then improve the grades of your railways and double track them if you like. But, after all, the key of the situation is the St. Lawrence route. Make the channel so safe, and the ports of Montreal and Quebec so good, that our ships can safely use

them. What has happened since we came to this House this year ? Vessel after vessel has gone ashore, partly because we have not proper lighting, partly because we have not sufficient foghorns, and partly because we have not a proper pilotage system, for all of which the government is responsible, and all of which can only be remedied by the action of the government. Let us first provide what we know will bring immediate returns, and then will be time enough to spend money for developing the interior and far off portions of the country. I agree thoroughly with my leader in saying that the Conservative party are not and have never been afraid of spending money, so long as it is spent properly. The people who have been afraid of spending money up to the time they came into power, are our friends on the other side of the House. They spend it now, but they do not spend it properly.

With regard to this contract, I do not like to speak harshly; I do not like to impute motives; but if I were to judge it by the weakness I see in it, though not being a lawyer and not understanding its intricacies, I would say that it was drawn by the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Let me make a suggestion to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, that if ever they have another contract to make—and I hope they will not for many years—let them remember that the first principle of business between two contracting parties is that the party doing the favour should draw up the contract, and that the only modifications made in it should be those suggested by the other side. This contract has the appearance of having been drawn up by the solicitor of the men who were receiving the favour. It may have been supervised by the government and the government officials, and point after point may have come up and been conceded ; but the main points in favour of the contractors are still embodied in it. I am quite sure that this is the basis on which this contract was drawn. It was the basis on which the contract for the Yukon railway was drawn; it was the basis on which the contract for the Treadgold concession was drawn; it was the basis on which the contract for the bottle nosed ships was drawn; and it is the basis on which the contract for this enormous expenditure has been drawn.

The Minister of Finance objected to the statement I made quite innocently, as to the principles and platform of the Reform party. Now, I find the platform of the Liberal party set out by Mr. Davin in 'Hansard' of 1899, at page 9,338 :

> The policy of bonusing railways by cash and land grants from the Dominion government has become a fruitful source of jobbery, peculation and corruption. Under its operation favourites of the government have been enriched. Appropriations have been made for the sole purpose of purchasing the support of constituencies, and vast sums of money have been voted without regard to the public interest, while millions of acres of land that should have been held in trust by the government for the future homes of hardy and deserving settlers, have been handed over without consideration or justification to charter-hawkers, whose intervention actually retards the construction of the lines whose franchises they control, for the purpose of extorting money from the ultimate builders of the roads. The policy of granting these subsidies has repeatedly been condemned in parliament by the Liberal party.

Since I came into the House, and since I have had the pleasure of setting on this side of the House, the present government have granted money bonuses which to my personal knowledge were only granted for the purpose of purchasing constituencies. I could refer to many of them.

So far as I know, the quotation which my hon. friend found in the Winnipeg 'Tribune' of a few days ago, taken from a statement made in 1896, at the time of the general elections, never received any official confirmation on this side.

It then goes on :

> Principles, Policy and Platform of the Liberal Party.
>
> Copies of this pamphlet can be had by Liberal candidates from Alexander Smith, secretary Ontario Liberal Association, 34 Victoria street, Toronto.

I notice that the machine has been moved to Ottawa from Toronto, and consequently this gentleman is now very much in evidence.

> This pamphlet is intended as an aid to young men and others who wish to work on behalf of liberalism and good principles.

That ought to have been in heavy faced letters.

> No one can suppose that in so limited a space more than a small fraction of the shortcomings and misdeeds of the Conservative party can be alluded to. While some attention is paid to the system that has prevailed at Ottawa for the past fifteen years and more, the chief place is given to a short sketch of the principles, policy and platform of the Liberal party. There are also hints for organization, a few remarks upon the Patron platform, and a very brief sketch of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, the Dominion Liberal leader. In compiling this little document, parliamentary reports and debates of the session of 1894 have been resorted to, but where later authoritative facts could be obtained they have been used. This point should not be forgotten, so that when later, blue-books and parliamentary reports are produced there may be no misunderstanding.

These statements are put forward so that if the Blue-books come out afterwards and contradict them, the Blue-books are not to be taken as correct.

> This pamphlet is not for general distribution. It is for speakers, committeemen and other workers on behalf of the cause of Liberalism and good government. Copies of the platform, however, for general distribution can be had upon application to
>
> ALEXANDER SMITH,
> Secretary Ontario Liberal Association.
> 34 Victoria street, Toronto.

Mr. WADE. Whose speech ?

Mr. OSLER. This a pamphlet from which I am quoting. It goes on to say——

Mr. COWAN. What are you quoting from ?

Mr. OSLER. From a better man ten thousand times than the one who sits opposite me now.

Mr. COWAN. If that be the case, he should not be ashamed to give his name.

Mr. OSLER. Does the hon. gentleman want to get into trouble ? The pamphlet goes on to say——

Mr. WADE. But whose speech ?

Mr. OSLER. This is a report of the Liberal Association.

Mr. OSLER. But whose speech ?

Mr. OSLER. It is a speech by one who was a better man than the hon. gentleman who interrupted me—Nicholas Flood Davin.

Mr. COWAN. Peanut politics.

Mr. OSLER. That pamphlet is signed by Alexander Smith, who is now to be seen every day in confab with members of the government and the Liberal party, and I have no doubt that he is concocting another pamphlet on the same lines to distribute to their following.

The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) twitted me upon my opposition to government railway bonuses. I am not ashamed to say that as a rule I am opposed to these bonuses, but there are circumstances and conditions in which they may be properly given. In the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick, where it may be necessary to open up colonization roads into the public domain, in those sections where the country is not settled, and where there are timber or agricultural lands which will warrant the expenditure, it is good policy to aid the building of railways into such districts. Such a policy gives the government both an indirect and direct return. Many years ago, long before I was in politics, I was struck by the stupidity of the Ontario government in giving bonuses where they were not needed—in giving bonuses to aid the duplicating of railways —and I have studied up this question of government aid to railways. The hon. member for Hants gave many authorities, among others the United States, for the granting of bonuses. It is quite true that in the early years of the American republic, the state governments did grant bonuses, but not to the extent suggested by the hon. member. Over a year ago, I obtained the following report from one of the leading railway lawyers of the United States, with regard to the position of the various states of the union in this matter of railway bonuses. This report is headed 'State and Municipal Aid to Railways in the United States; Powers of Legislatures and Municipalities.' It states as follows :

In considering the subject of state and municipal aid to railways in the United States, the following legal principles adopted by the courts with reference to the powers of legislature and municipal corporations should be borne in mind: (1) That the legislature has full power over the municipalities, and may, unless the constitution prohibits, authorize municipal corporations to aid railways by issues of bonds and otherwise. (2) That the municipal corporations have no inherent right to issue bonds or grant aid to railways. Such power must come from the legislature.

Perhaps it may weary you a little, but it will be interesting for future reference if I give a few more extracts from this report :

In the state of Maine, the constitution of 1820, article 22, was amended in 1877. By this amendment the credit of the state shall not be directly or indirectly loaned. Municipal corporations are not prohibited from aiding railway companies, but no debt or liability can be incurred which, with previous debts, shall exceed five per centum of the last regular valuation of the municipal corporation.

New Hampshire—Constitution of 1874, part 2 article 5, amended 1879. Neither this state nor any subdivision can aid any private association or corporation.

Vermont—Constitution of 1793. No constitutional prohibitions.

Massachusetts—Constitution of 1780. There are no constitutional limitations for debt for state, county or city purposes. Aid to railways may be given by either.

Connecticut—Constitution of 1818, article 25, amendment adopted 1877. No county, city, town borough or other municipality shall ever subscribe to the capital stock of any railway corporation, or purchase its bonds, or make donations to, or loan its credit, directly or indirectly, in aid of any such corporation.

Rhode Island—Constitution of 1842. No prohibition against such aid, but restrictions.

Now mark. In nineteen cases out of twenty, the original constitution of each state authorized it to grant aid, and almost in every case the amendment to the constitution prohibits the granting of aid absolutely.

Mr. COWAN. Have you the mileage of the different states and their population at the time they ceased to bonus railways ?

Mr. OSLER. No, but I shall give the hon. gentleman what he wants. In New York and New Jersey, the amended constitution prohibits aid to railway companies. In Pennsylvania, by the limitations to the constitution, neither the state nor a subdivision can aid a railway. In Maryland, municipalities are not prohibited from aiding a railway, but counties can give or loan their aid only when authorized by an Act of the general assembly, which shall be published for two months before the next election for members of the house of delegates. The state cannot, directly or indirectly, aid a private corporation. In Delaware there is no limitation. In the Virginias, the state

cannot assist a railway. In North Carolina, the municipalities may aid a railway, with the consent of the taxpayer. In South Carolina, state aid requires the consent of the people. In Florida, the state is prohibited from granting aid to railway companies and the legislature from authorizing any county, city, borough, township or incorporated district to become a stockholder in, or aid or loan its credit to any company or individual. In Georgia there is the same prohibition as in Florida. In Alabama neither the state nor any of its subdivisions can help a railway. In Mississippi the state is prohibited from aiding by pledge or loan, any person, association or corporation, or to become a stockholder in an association or corporation. The legislature is prohibited from authorizing municipalities to loan money or to grant aid to railways.

In Tennessee, the municipalities may aid railways, provided the proposition is submitted to the voters and receives a three-fourths majority. In Kentucky, the credit of the state can never be given to aid railways. The next state on the list is Illinois, and this is the state which the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) quoted as having been so greatly benefited through railways. It was my little knowledge and interest in the state of Illinois which caused me to take an interest in the question of municipal and state aid to railways. Large grants were made to various railways in the state of Illinois, not only by the state, but by the towns, cities and townships. Bonds were issued to the extent of millions of dollars, and these bonds were, to a very large extent, brought to Canada and sold. The late Mr. E. H. King, general manager of the Bank of Montreal, who had great knowledge of the west, bought $500,000 of Illinois county bonds to pay him 14 per cent, although at that time our bonds in Ontario were selling to pay 6 per cent. The scandal connected with railway bonuses in Illinois caused them, in 1870, the earliest time when it could be done, to amend their constitution, and they provided that neither the state, nor the county, city, town or township, or other municipality, could issue bonds to pay for the stock of a railway or other private corporation, or in any way aid such corporation. This provision did not appear in the previous constitution of 1848. The constitution was amended in this respect because of the absolute demoralization caused by this public bonusing of railways.

Indiana.—Counties are prohibited from subscribing to the stock of railways or issuing bonds to assist them.

Ohio.—The state is prohibited from aiding railways, nor can the legislature authorize municipal corporations to do so.

Michigan.—The credit of the state cannot be granted to or in aid of any person or corporation.

Wisconsin.—The credit of the state shall not be given to any corporation or railway.

Arkansas.—The state or any sub-division of the state is prohibited from lending its credit for any purpose whatever.

California.—Prohibits the bonusing of railways.

Colorado.—Prohibits the state or any division of the state from bonusing the railways. Under a prior constitution of 1876, state aid could be given.

Idaho.—This state was created in 1889, and had no previous experience to guide it. But from the experience and knowledge of others, in its constitution, it prohibits the state from lending its credit to or bonusing or becoming a stockholder in any corporation.

Kansas.—The state shall not be a party to carrying on any work of internal improvement.

Louisiana.—Prohibits the state from loaning its credit.

Minnesota.—Prohibits the giving of the credit of the state for any internal improvements.

Missouri.—The state is prohibited from loaning its credit.

Montana.—The constitution was adopted in 1889, and it prohibits the granting of aid to railways.

Nebraska.—This state was constituted in 1875. The constitution provides that no municipality shall make donations to any railway, unless authorized by the electors, and under certain restrictions as to amount.

Nevada.—There is no limitation.

North Dakota.—This is a comparatively new state, and when its constitution was granted it was not in anything like the condition of prosperity of our western provinces to-day, Manitoba, Alberta and the others. Its constitution prohibits the granting of aid to railways.

South Dakota.—This is not nearly so valuable a state as our Manitoba. Its legislature has never authorized aid to railroads.

Texas.—The constitution contains sweeping provisions against granting any municipal aid.

The Territories.—Are prohibited from aiding railways by Act of Congress.

Now, I call attention to these facts which, I think, are interesting and ought to be very useful. If the states to the south of us, with all their long experience, have come to the conclusion that it is a vicious thing for the state to aid in the construction of railways, we may be pretty sure that there is good reason in favour of that conclusion. That good reason was this: During the time of the early settlement of the western states, when the state government and municipalities granted bonuses to railways, there existed such a state of corruption as to absolutely demoralize the electors, insomuch that they have hardly got over it to this day. The results of that corruption were so serious that, in every case, after 1865, that is, after the close of the war—the great wave of railway building swept

over the United States from 1862 to 1868—almost every state amended its constitution, and almost the first clause put in was a clause prohibiting aid to railways. I do not go so far as that. But I have said that, on general principles, state aid to railways was wrong. I do not believe there is a single dollar of aid needed for the building of railways in the prairie portions of Manitoba and the North-west. The railway companies there will build as fast, or even faster, than the requirements of the people demand. This has been the case all over the western states. I believe that if you do not grant a dollar of aid to the Grand Trunk they will build into the North-west faster, and be there sooner than if you do grant the aid.

But the Prime Minister, all through his speech rang the changes on the idea of a crisis. Now, we have not yet had any outside explanation as to what this crisis is. I can only think that probably the crisis is the near approach of a general election and the discovery, on looking into the treasury of the various machines required for running an election, of balances which will not satisfy all demands. Is this government scheme, this magnificent expenditure of money, to be the government's way of meeting this crisis ?

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). The shortness of the time that I have allotted to myself to address the House will preclude me from devoting as much attention as I would like to the remarks of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler), and I hope he will not consider me discourteous if I do not attempt to refute all the arguments he has presented. He, like other hon. gentlemen on that side, insistently demand to know the meaning of the word 'crisis,' and demand to be told why there should be any call for speed in the carrying out of the project now before us. It is for the very purpose of preventing that diversion of trade into American channels that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) himself has warned us against to-night. He said that long before the government could complete the eastern section the western section would be completed by the Grand Trunk, and, for want of through connection by the eastern section, the trade would be diverted through American channels to American ports—and once caused to run through those channels it would be very difficult to bring it back again to our own side. It is to prevent that crisis and that diversion of trade that the government is now proposing to build a railway through Canadian territory whose terminals shall be Canadian ports. Our hon. friend found fault with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) reading a list of letters from boards of trade, congratulating the government upon their attempt to build this railway, and he said they were endorsations of the Grand Trunk scheme to build from North Bay to Winnipeg and into the prairie section. In that he has made a great mistake. These endorsations covered the construction of this very road that the government intend to build to prevent that diversion of Canadian trade through a foreign country and to foreign ports.

Now our friend tells us in the early part of his address that he is not a lawyer. I am not a lawyer either, but I hope I am a better lawyer than he is, and I believe I am quite as able to interpret a clause in this agreement. I differ entirely with him in his efforts to condemn the character of this agreement. If there is anything I felt pleasure in it was the masterly skill with which this agreement was drawn up, so that a layman could understand it without the intervention of lawyers. When it is necessary to get lawyers in the House to interpret anything that may be a matter of dispute, no two of them appear to agree; therefore, it is absolutely necessary that these agreements should be couched in such language that an ordinary layman can understand what they mean. Now this clause 17, that is such a direct blow to the manufacturing establishments of this country, that is such a menace to the national policy which our good friend has so much at heart, I read in an entirely different sense from what he does. But he does not go quite far enough back. If he went to clause 16, in the Bill, which explains the motive of these particular clauses, he will find it says that the eastern section shall be built under the supervision of commissioners, and that it shall be let by public tender, and given to the lowest tenderer who can assure the commissioners that he is qualified to carry on that work. Therefore, this work will be carried on by public contractors, who will buy their goods in the cheapest markets in the world, I have not the slightest doubt, but will give Canada, as Canadians, very likely the preference, all things being equal. I take it that this clause was put in there to protect the Grand Trunk Pacific from being compelled to pay an unduly large amount for the use of this road. They say that should it be necessary for the government to import goods that go into this railway, the amount of duty that would ordinarily be collected from a contractor shall not be added to the cost price of this railway and thereby increase the annual rent to the company. That is all I see that this means. It is no blow at the manufacturing interests, it is no menace to the national policy, it is a wise provision put in, I presume, at the instance of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. The whole explanation of clause 16 is given by the Minister of Finance in his speech, it says that this eastern or government section shall be built under the supervision of commissioners, shall be let by public contract, and given to the lowest tenderer.

But our friend shows the excess of his imagination when he alludes to the liberality with which the government is treating the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in actually subsidizing them, or conferring a benefit on them, to the amount of $93,000,000 for building the western section of this road. He gets at it in this way, that by the guarantee of the government they are able to borrow money at 3 per cent which in other circumstances they would have to pay 4 per cent for, and, therefore, the government is giving them an extra 1 per cent which will amount at the end of 50 years to $50,000,000. He says that the government is giving them $50,000,000, while in reality the government is not giving them a single cent. Now that is an evident proposition, to every intelligent man in this House; and I am surprised that a gentleman who is a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who has a reputation as a financier, if not as a critic of railway construction, should deliberately, in the face of as intelligent a lot of gentlemen as I see surrounding me, make such an absurd statement as that we are going to give the Grand Trunk Pacific Company $50,000,000 when we are not giving them one single cent.

Mr. BROCK. We are saving them $50,000,000.

Mr. HEYD. We are saving them $50,000,000 if you choose to put it the way my hon. friend does. But that is quite a different thing to giving it to them, is it not?

Mr. BROCK. It is just the same thing actually.

Mr. HEYD. But is it the same thing to us?

Mr. BROCK. Yes, we take the risk.

Mr. HEYD. But we do not lose the $50,000,000, and we cannot give them that $50,000,000, because we do not give them 50 cents. But our friend excels himself when he goes on further to explain this contract. Now this contract, if anything, is one of the things that he should have left alone. He might roam in the realms of imagination, he might make prophesies as to the future, but when he comes down to plain black and white, and the thing is there so that each one can see it for himself, it is so easy to refute such a statement that I am surprised our friend made it. He says we are going to construct a railway that will cost, from Moncton to Winnipeg, $80,000,000. That is the least sum that he has heard any one estimate as the probable cost. He could not have heard the Finance Minister, he could not have heard others speak from this side of the House. But assuming that he deliberately closed his ears, there are none so deaf as those who will not hear; it may be that he heard no one estimate the cost of this railway at less than $80,000,000. But assuming he got no more accurate information than that, was he justified in telling us that this $80,000,000, before the 50 years will have expired, will reach the magnificent sum of $560,000,000? Because he said a railway when first constructed does not represent what that railway will actually cost, that it requires continuous improvement, and that improvement will go on for 50 years. I presume that is true, but that is all provided for in this contract that he intended to explain, because it says that when this road is handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific, from that time they must keep up its maintenance, they must make constant changes, and when that 50 years shall have elapsed, they shall turn it over to the government in a first-class condition, in harmony with the condition of railways, not now, but what they may be 50 years from now. And, therefore, that statement that a railway that was going to cost according to his estimate $80,000,000 now will represent a loss to the government of $560,000,000 is absurd because the very conditions that are to bring this about, according to the hon. gentleman, are all provided for in this agreement and after we once turn it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific and they accept it, from that time not a dollar can be added to it without the consent of the government, and when we do insist upon substituting say an iron bridge for a wooden bridge, it must be added to the capital and on that capital the Grand Trunk Pacific must pay interest.

I could devote more time to answering certain objections that have been advanced, but I think it is hardly necessary. We on this side have arrived at that stage when we do not take the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) seriously, especially when he goes into the domain of prophecy. We have had experience before of what he is capable of saying on certain occasions, especially when it is a matter of politics. We remember that only five years ago we had an important discussion in this House as to the advisability of giving 3,750,000 acres of gold lands to the Mackenzie and Mann syndicate. Now, our hon. friend made a speech then magnifying all the dangers to the government and minimizing all the advantages that might accrue. Well, now five years have gone by, and we have an opportunity to-night of ascertaining whether he was then a true prophet or a false prophet, a prophet of Baal. Now, let us see what he had to say five years ago:

> The man who has not the cash to pay, always pays more. I make the statement here and I defy contradiction, that if I went to London to-day with the contract which has been offered to these gentlemen, of the pick of 3,750,000 acres of the best mineral lands in the Yukon region, I could sell that land to-morrow for more money than the 25,000,000 acres of land granted to the Canadion Pacific Railway.

He made that statement in all seriousness in this House. He was applauded to the echo by his friends who sat around him. That 25,000,000 acres of land will certainly

bring $75,000,000, and five years after that prophecy was made we have still got that 3,750,000 acres of rich gold land, and it is not worth 3,550 cents. I do not think our hon. friend would venture to say to-night that that land was worth $75,000,000, and five years from now, if his speech of to-night is referred to on some important question that may present itself for solution, he will be found just as far wide of the mark as we find him to-night with respect to a prophecy or a statement he made five years ago.

But, Sir, an important task presents itself to my mind. I shall try as briefly as possible to find out just exactly what we have got in this government scheme and just exactly what there is in the other proposition advanced by the leader of the opposition, which was so vociferously applauded by his followers the other night, and to which to-day they appear to still hold so firmly. I do not intend to prove, Mr. Speaker, that we need another railway. That has been made abundantly manifest by the various speakers who have preceded me. We have the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals himself, we have a letter addressed to the leader of the government only four weeks ago, in which he states :

> I have no hesitation in stating that I am as much in favour of the construction of another transcontinental line as any other member of this parliament.

That is his very latest utterance on this question. Sir, the feeling that we ought to have another transcontinental line is not confined to a few people. There is a general feeling that we should construct another transcontinental line, and so much evidence has already been presented to substantiate that that it will not be necessary for me to do more than simply allude to the action of the Railway Committee itself. There were in the committee about 175 representatives of all parts of this country. The Grand Trunk scheme, as I understood it, originally was to go from North Bay out into the west; that at the request of members of the Railway Committee was extended to Quebec, and there was not a dissenting voice; that was extended to Moncton, and there were very few dissenting voices. An attempt was made to extend it to St. John, and that the late Minister of Railways and Canals supported. At that time he was a strong believer in the necesssity of a transcontinental railway. He says himself in the letter which he presented to the House that there were three alternative propositions which presented themselves. He used these words in the letter which was dated July 13th, and read in the House on July 16th:

> Let me state our position on the main question : My decided preference is for a government owned and government operated railway across the continent.

That is his position, but he says :

> In this view I am practically alone, and therefore I admit at once that this proposition must be laid aside.

Did the hon. gentleman know what he was talking about on the 16th of July when he said :

> In this view I am practically alone.

He had the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee). He had one or two supporters of government owned and operated railways on this side of the House, but so far as the hon. gentleman knew he was alone in the government, he was alone on that side of the House, he was alone on this side of the House. Not one voice was raised in the Railway Committee in favour of a government owned and government operated railway, and it is only now, when some political capital may be created out of it by our hon. friends on the other side, that some few of them are beginning to adopt it.

Now, I only allude to that to show where the hon. gentleman stood with respect to government owned, government constructed and government operated railways, that he stood practically alone. An amendment has been moved in this House to the resolution that is before it by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) affirming the principle of government owned, constructed and operated railways. It may develop a stronger sentiment in its support than any of us were previously aware of. It might influence some gentlemen on the other side of the House to support it who a week ago did not know that they were supporters of government owned and government operated railways. We have heard of sudden conversions. I do not object to a sudden conversion if it is the result of conviction, but I do object to these sudden conversions that are not the result of a process of reasoning where conscience enters and dictates the course that a man should follow.

Mr. BROCK. You should not rub it in to the member for North Norfolk so hard ; be easy with him.

Mr. HEYD. The late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) said that when the government scheme was first propounded there was a sigh of relief among the supporters of the government. I am willing to confess that he exactly represented the state of my mind. I did heave a sigh of relief that his views did not predominate, and that the government did not commit themselves to construct and operate this railway from Quebec to the coast. There are others who entertain the views that I entertain. A resolution has been moved in the Senate by a Conservative Senator who has the confidence and respect of our friends opposite, and while I do not endorse the whole of his resolution there are certain clauses in it that are absolutely true, and this is one of them :

Resolved that governments do not operate railways as economically and with the same necessary close business attention as private companies ; that the country has had an object lesson before it in the partial failure of the Intercolonial Railway ; that this House should object in the most unqualified manner to railways being constructed and operated by the government.

I endorse these statements, and I breathed a sigh of relief when I found that these sentiments had prevailed with the government, and that the late Minister of Railways and Canals was alone in the possession of his sentiments. As an ideal sentiment, government ownership and operation is all right in itself, but I do not think the Canadian people have arrived at that stage of development where we can safely trust the management of so large a corporation into the hands of either the political parties in this country. I remember that for eighteen years every Liberal in Canada believed that our Conservative friends were running the Intercolonial Railway as a political machine, and we have applauded the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) here when he alluded to the time when the old Intercolonial Railway issued their bundles of 'passes' not to advance the pecuniary welfare of the railway so much as the political interest of their party. And for the last seven years we have heard our friends on the other side crriticising the management of the Intercolonial Railway ; charging it with falsifying the books and putting down to capital account sums of money that should be properly charged to working expenses. They have charged us with running the whole organization as a political machine ; and that belief is as widespread in this country as are Conservative principles. Let us extend the operations and the opportunities for running a railway of that kind as a political machine, and what would be the result ? How would our Conservative friends regard it if we the Liberal party were to run an organization of that kind ? They could find no words strong enough in the English language to condemn it. But, Sir, when the Conservative party have arrived at that stage, that such men as Sir John A. Macdonald, John Abbott, Sir Charles Tupper are revered no more, and even the present leader of the opposition is incapable to be the bright and particular star at Conservative picnics ; when they shout great is the new Diana of the Conservative party ; when the leader of the opposition steps aside and allows one of his lieutenants to explain, that the hon. Mr. Borden is absent to-day because he is making the effort of his life down in Ottawa (and I don't think we ever saw him that day in the House ;) when in the meantime our friend from Manitoulin is exalted in his place, and the Conservative party bow down and worship him—a man who does not posses the confidence of the judges at least ; a man who has been accused of peculating documents from a bank, and a man who admits that he was inaccurate in his statements—when the Conservative party can worship that kind of an ideal, they are not in that mental condition to give us credit for the proper management of a large railway like this.

There has been no criticism of the government scheme so effective as that made by the late Minister of Railways and Canals. There is no man on the other side of the House who is so well qualified to do it; who has so great a personal object in doing it and who, owing to the position in which he has placed himself, has so much to gain by doing it. Therefore we can assume that everything that can be said against this road has been said by him. He was obliged to confine himself somewhere within the limits of truth, because he had still some reputation for veracity to lose, and he would not and did not make such wild statements as have since been made by speakers on the other side of the House, who were not railway men, who were not financial men and who absolutely knew nothing about this business.

Now, what has our friend the late Minister of Railways and Canals called this scheme? He called it a hybrid scheme. He said :

At best it is but a hybrid scheme compromising to antagonistic principles. It will be difficult to explain why the government should build and own the lean section of this railway and provide the company with credit to enable them to build and operate the fat section.

Our friends on the other side enthusiastically applauded that. I want you Mr. Speaker, to bear in mind the word 'hybrid,' because we have had a counter scheme presented by the leader of the opposition. This word 'hybrid' was most enthusiastically cheered by our friends opposite, but we will be able to show by and by that this scheme that they are now enthusiastically applauding should not be entitled even to the appellation of 'hybrid', but, that we might properly call it a mongrel scheme and be within the limits of the truth.

In what sense is this railway lean and fat ? The ex-minister told us that we are going to own the lean section and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the fat section. If the government was going to operate and own the lean section, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway own and operate the western section, it might be a true definition. But, just as soon as this railway is leased, it becomes the absolute property of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for fifty years—as much their property as though they had built it and owned it ; and it ceases then to be either lean or fat, and becomes one proposition for at least fifty years. And who will say that when the fifty years shall have elapsed the western section shall be the fat section and the eastern section the lean ? May the conditions not be reversed ? In any event,

we are not in a position to brand either portion as fat or as lean.

Now, I would like to get down in 'Hansard' what I think this railway will cost. I am not in a position to give any expert opinion. I am simply going to quote the opinion of a man whom I have looked up to with respect for the past seven years; a man who has never during that time deceived us in what he stated would take place with respect to financial matters; a man who has had the opportunity of being advised by the financiers of the government and also by the Railway Department of the government. I am quite satisfied to take the opinion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) on this question in preference to that of any other man in this House. He has a reputation to lose. He does not speak without the knowledge and the wisdom that are associated with his office. For seven years we have tried him, and when he has prophesied surplus after surplus, they have come with unvarying regularity, and always a little larger than he prophesied. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we have a right to assume that the same caution which has characterized his utterances in the last seven years still characterize what he says to-day. If he errs at all he errs on the safe side. We have seen with what liberality he has been prepared to increase his figures to make it absolutely certain that he was right; because he cannot afford five or six years from now to be confronted with statements showing him to be incapable of discharging the duties of the position he holds, and to be made such a spectacle of as some people would be were we to quote their speeches made five years ago.

What does the Finance Minister say that this railway will cost? He says the portion from Moncton to Quebec, 400 miles, will cost $10,000,000; the portion from Quebec to Winnipeg, 1,475 miles, $41,300,000; interest during construction, $3,390,000; or, a total of $54,690,000, which will be due in about fifty-five years from now. As bonds will be issued upon which we will pay three per cent—and after seven years the Grand Trunk Pacific Company agrees to pay that interest—that is the capital that we put into this scheme—not $80,000,000, as our friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) said; not $500,000,000, as he afterwards said it would grow into; and, if he had been speaking yet, it would have been by this time $15,000,000,000—because these things grow. The Finance Minister tells us that during those seven years the interest on the Moncton-Quebec section will amount to $2,334,000; on the bridge capitalized, to $324,000; and on the eastern section, to $8,853,000; or a total of $11,512,000 of a direct subsidy, as I would call it, to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That disposes of that question.

Mr. WILSON. Very cheap.

Mr. HEYD. That is what the Finance Minister said, and I would rather believe him than the hon. gentleman who interrupts me. If I wanted some advice as to how to buy merchandise, I would certainly take the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Wilson's) opinion: I would think he had a training in that direction; but on this subject he knows no more than I do, and I am willing to take the Finance Minister as my guide.

According to the hon. minister, the government guarantee on the prairie or fat section amounts to $16,900,000 and on the mountain section, to $14,400,000. These together amount to $31,300,000, which, together with $54,690,000, the cost of the eastern section, gives a total of government bonds and those of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, amounting to $85,990,000. Now, if my hon. friend has never heard before that the eastern section of this railway will cost not less than $80,000,000, he can go home and say he has heard it to-night, because I have certainly made it plain.

Are we safe in our investment on that western section? That is the next question. We are guaranteeing the bonds of the company on what? On the mountain section, which at $40,000 a mile will cost $19,200,000, and on the prairie section, which at $18,000 a mile will cost $23,400,000; interest during the period of construction, amounting to $2,400,000; and equipment, amounting to $20,000,000; or $65,000,000 of Grand Trunk Pacific money, which is in that road, upon which we have a mortgage of $31,300,000, leaving us a surplus security of $33,700,000. That is what the contract says, and we are dealing with the contract. We are not dealing with an imaginary contract, into which men can read whatever they like; but we are dealing with the actual contract which we interpret according to our understanding of the English language and the intent of the parties to the contract. We do not need to worry over that end of the undertaking, that is sure, We have no anxiety about it. That is the fat end, and in addition to the fatness of the security we have a margin of $33,700,000.

That is not the only estimate that we have. That is the estimate of the Finance Minister, who is responsible, in consequence of the position he holds, to tell us what he believes to be the facts, and he is surrounded by those who are qualified to give him information that would justify his statement. But we have had another valuation of that road, that is, by the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). Did he make that valuation while he was Minister of Railways and Canals, and while a certain amount of responsibility rested upon him? Not at all. But he said something after he had ceased being Minister of Railways and Canals, and while he was still friendly to the present government, which will justify us in believ-

ing that he did not think at that time the road would cost more money.

On the 16th of July, speaking in this House, he quoted from his letter addressed to the leader of the government—not the first, but the second letter—and after he had plenty of time to consider the matter. In that letter he deliberately expressed himself as follows:

> As I have said, I am in favour of the whole line being built and owned by the government, but having abandoned any expectation in that regard, I am equally in favour of the whole line being a company line. I am prepared——

I want you, Mr. Speaker, to listen to this particular clause:

> I am prepared, since Council has determined, to go forward with this undertaking at once,——

No need to investigate or to make surveys, no need to fritter away two or three years, he was ready to go on at once. He proceeded to say:

> I am prepared, since Council has determined to go forward with this undertaking at once, to co-operate with my colleagues in guaranteeing the bonds over the whole line to an extent not exceeding three-fourths of the cost of constructing the railway.

He there deliberately wrote to the First Minister, and read the letter in this House, that he was prepared to support a policy of guaranteeing the bonds of this railway from Quebec to the coast to the extent of three-fourths of its actual cost, and that at a time when, according to his later opinion, we knew nothing about those regions except that it was an absolute wilderness. I do not think he could have thought so then. He only learnt that afterwards, because had he believed it then, he was certainly betraying the interests of this country in offering to guarantee the bonds of the company which was to build a railway through an unknown wilderness. Was he sincere? Did he believe then that we had sufficient information to justify the construction of this road? He must have, or it would have been dishonest on his part to advise his colleagues to guarantee the bonds to the extent of three-quarters of the cost of the construction of that railway. He evidently did not think then that this scheme was going to cost as much money as he afterwards found it convenient to say it would. At what did he estimate its cost later when he was interested in increasing the difficulties which the government would have to surmount? He said that the road would cost $121,000,000, and as I have shown, he had previously been prepared to approve of the policy of the government guaranteeing the bonds of this railway to the extent of three-fourths of its cost. Well, three-fourths of $120,000,000 is $90,000,000, which is a greater amount than the government guarantee by their present scheme, so that the government are not doing very badly in connection with this matter. The guarantee which the hon. gentleman was prepared to support amounted to $90,000,000, whereas that given by the government does not exceed $84,000,000. But, says the hon. ex-minister,——

> The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is being aided to a most generous extent. It cannot build its road without very liberal assistance. In giving aid the government might very properly impose terms looking to some financial advantage to the country in the future, and therefore I would insert that a share of the earnings—I would not say one-half, but I would not think it ought to be less than a third of the net earnings, or that portion of the net earnings which would not be required for the improvement or betterment of the road.

And he proceeds to say:

> My decided preference is for a government owned and government operated railway across the continent, and my chief reason for favouring it is, that it will have an equalizing and regulating influence upon all other railways throughout the western territories.

So that he puts himself on record as being willing to guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Quebec to the coast to the tune of $90,000,000, and then to put his hand into the treasury of the company to the extent of one-third of their net earnings, making this country a partner in the enterprise, interested in the amount of dividends paid by that company, interested in keeping up high rates in order that we may have high dividends, and, by that very method, frustrating the chief object for which he is a supporter of the policy of government ownership of railways. Is his position as good a one as that adopted by the government? He wants his pound of flesh. We are not so grasping. All we ask is the right, when the earnings of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will justify it, to insist on a reduction of rates. We will reduce the freight rates instead of taking one-third of the company's earnings. That one-third of the earnings we intend shall remain in the pockets of the farmers in the west and the manufacturers in the east, and in that way we shall regulate the freights on other railway systems. When the rates of freights on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway are lowered, the Canadian Northern Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and other competing railways will have to follow suit. We are looking to the regulating and lowering of freights and not to dividends and high rates.

Our hon. friends opposite say that this railway will cost $121,000,000. The Minister of Finance says it will cost $84,000,000, and a subsidy of $12,000,000. There is only about $20,000,000 difference, but anybody who goes beyond the estimate of the ex-Minister of Railways can hardly fail to be charged with using reckless language. On the other hand, I do not think we should go below the estimate of the Minister of Finance, for although his estimate of the length of the road from Quebec to Winnipeg is 75 miles longer than that of the ex-Minister of Railways, his estimate of the cost is only

$20,000,000 less, which shows with what care he has spoken.

We have heard many speeches made in this House decrying the country through which this road is to be built, and I can quite realize the position in which the manager of the road will find himself when he stands before the directors and stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway and explains to them the reasons why they should go into this scheme. They will say to him: We have been reading the speeches of leading members of the opposition at Ottawa, and they say that this railway will pass through a barren wilderness, an unexplored country, a land of muskegs, that the scheme is a wild, mad one, and yet you come here and ask us to endorse it. It may be a safe scheme for the government of Canada, as they come first, but where do we come in? We are behind the government. They will have a railway costing $54,000,000 and $5,000,000 of equipment, and the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Pacific for the eastern section. They will have $3,300,000 surplus as security for the western section. We will be obliged to run that road fifty years and assume all that responsibility and loss. It is all right for the government of Canada, but what about the stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway? We have read the speeches of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the other leaders of the opposition. Well, Mr. Speaker, what do you suppose Mr. Hays will say in reply? He will, no doubt, say in effect: You are paying me $50,000 a year for running the Grand Trunk Railway. I have been with you some years, and have raised it out of the mire into the position of a first-class railway. My opinions are backed up by all the officials under me. We pledge our reputation as railway men, who thoroughly understand the situation of affairs, that this is a good scheme for you to put your money into, and these men who are condemning the scheme are not familiar with railway matters and besides have a political interest in decrying it. Listen to the man to whom you are paying $50,000 a year, and do not listen to lawyers and farmers and merchants and politicians, who can not tell an air-brake from a steam engine. I suppose he would be justified in referring to some speeches made by these hon. gentlemen. He might take, for instance, our friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He might say: Why, he is a very honourable man. He is. There is no doubt about his honour or about his profound wisdom. But when it comes to a matter of politics, wisdom leaves him and he becomes absolutely blind. Mr. Hays might say to his stockholders: I will read you some of the utterances of this hon. gentleman. He has condemned this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, but on what ground? The language he used to-day he has used before. Let us go back five years. By referring to page 1665 of the 'Hansard' of 1898 you will see that this hon. gentleman advised the government to abandon the Mackenzie & Mann scheme in the Yukon, and five thousand miners would go in and locate——

An hon. MEMBER. Five hundred thousand.

Mr. HEYD. Yes. But I was almost afraid to mention that. Five hundred thousand miners would go in and locate. Two years would be the very moderate estimate of the time required for this according to the hon. gentleman. Only two years, and in that time 500,000 miners would come in and locate. Remember, Mr. Speaker, this is Mr. Hays reading the speech of the hon. member for East Grey to his stockholders who want to know what kind of men these are. The hon. gentleman went on:

> Now, 500,000 miners, at $10 apiece—what they want for a free miner's license—would be $5,000,000 for the right to go there and begin prospecting. This same amount would have had to be paid the following year. In order to take up this amount of land each miner must locate eight claims, making four million claims. At $15 each for locating claims, this would be $60,000,000. If they continue to work these claims the second year, they would pay $60,000,000 more. If they took an average of $100 of gold out of each claim—and that is moderate when you consider that men have claims that they can sell for $2,000,000, the royalty as compared to what Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann would pay, would amount to $9,000,000. This makes a total of $139,000,000.

—from 500,000 miners, I would like to ask the Finance Minister if he has got that money?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the surplus is not quite so large as that.

Mr. HEYD. I would ask the Minister of the Interior where those 500,000 miners are? They are still in the imagination of these gentlemen. But other hon. gentlemen who spoke concerning whom Mr. Hays might be asked. There was the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He told us that the railroad would suffice to carry in the 60,000 or 75,000 people—incoming miners, I suppose—but the question was whether there would be boats enough to carry them. Then he quotes from an interview with a Mr. Bellew, whom he endorses as a practical miner, who says that the 3,750,000 acres of land given to this syndicate would make 750,000 claims, which, at $25,000 each would make $18,000,000,000. This is deliberately stated to the House as given on the authority of a practical miner. What will the stockholders of the Grand Trunk say when the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) with regard to the Bill now before us is read to them? But this estimate is a little too much even for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk). He confesses that this is a high estimate, but

says that $5 an acre is a low estimate. This same gentleman in condemning this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme only three or four days ago, stated that the 25,000,000 of acres of land given to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the Canadian government years ago, were not worth anything, because there was no railway to develop them. But the land to be given to Mackenzie & Mann, which was away up in the Arctic regions, was worth $5 an acre though there was no railway. What do you suppose Mr. Hays would say when he was asked about that? But that is not all. He might quote Mr. McDougal, who told us that the value of this concession of 3,750,000 acres at $30 an acre was $112,500,000, added to which there would be the licenses and royalties of $37,000,000, or the total of $149,500,000. There is worse than that, but because of the friendly feeling I have for these gentlemen, I am ashamed to read their speeches. But there is one I will read. There was one sensible man in the party, a man who told the truth, though he is one whom we do not usually regard as one of the leaders of the party. I refer to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin). He said:

> What happened once may happen again, with that snowshoe road that you are talking about building—I do not care whether a Liberal government or a Conservatve government is building it. I may call it a snowshoe road and nothing else. It is of no use to any one only to those who want to swindle the government. They put before the House that they will build a road, but who will operate that road? They cannot do it. Remember, I am going to give you truth, right and left; I have got the medicine right here. Very well, they are going to build a road. After that road is built, what will they do with it? They will just say, 'To hell with the road!'

Mr. MORIN. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) paid for acting as a monkey tonight?

Mr. HEYD. Why, I say the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) made the only sensible speech that was made on that side. He told the absolute truth. He manifested more wisdom than all the gentlemen who valued this concession up in the hundreds of millions of dollars. The hon. gentleman was called to order.

> I will withdraw it at once and apologize. What will they do with that road? Why, they will give a man five cents to take it off their hands.

I think I am paying the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morin) a compliment.

Mr. MORIN. I do not thank you for it.

Mr. HEYD. If I quote his words exactly, I do not know why he should find fault. He is responsible for what he said, not I. I think these hon. gentlemen whose utterances went so wide of the mark have more cause to complain than has the only man who told the truth among the whole party.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have found a mare's nest in the contract. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) spoke of it. In some mysterious way, the Grand Trunk Railway is to get possession of $25,000,000 worth of that common stock. We are told that they may buy it cheap. Of course, in some mysterious way, these hon. gentlemen do not seem to know how the Grand Trunk is going to be in this deal. That is quite easy to me. And it was just at this stage that our friend the late Minister of Railways and Canals showed his animus by alluding to the Grand Trunk as 'the red-headed boy.' Without 'the red-headed boy,' this road cannot be built. We are dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but that company has not the means to build this road. They could not issue a dollar's worth of bonds and realize in the market unless somebody was to guarantee those bonds. And so the Grand Trunk, the yellow-headed boy, comes into this deal. The Grand Trunk Pacific guarantee that the Grand Trunk Railway shall take $25,000,000 of the stock. What for? I take it that that will put them in a position to raise the money to build the western section of the railway. But the Grand Trunk will require to guarantee $20,000,000 of preference stock which will be sold to put the equipment on the road. I see in this quite plain, businesslike transaction. They become the custodians of this common stock and guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific, giving that company hard cash. How much money will they have in this road? With their share of building the western section and with the equipment, they will have over $31,000,000 in the road.

They have got to provide terminals, shops, hotels, ships, loss of bonds, if sold at a loss. They have got to provide to run their road for six or seven years before it becomes productive. I do not see that the $25,000,000 security they have to give will more than compensate them for guaranteeing at least $33,000,000 of bonds of this Grand Trunk Pacific, and no one else will do it. Behind that they have got to pay interest at three per cent. Now he says this is a bad scheme. Our friends on the other side, who are absolutely irresponsible, who do not apparently understand the agreement itself, have not the slightest idea of the actual cost, or if they have, they have got beyond the range of ordinary reason. We have them on the one side, and on the other side we have Mr. Hays, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Wainwright, Mr. Bell and the men that manage the Grand Trunk Railway in this country, telling their stockholders that this is a good scheme, and if it is a good scheme for the stockholders it cannot be a bad scheme for the people of Canada.

But, if you do not like this scheme, the leader of the opposition is prepared to give you a substitute. When he gave that substitute scheme he was vociferously applaud-

ed by our friends opposite. Let us analyze that scheme, and the same moderate figures that the Minister of Finance used in valuing the Grand Trunk Pacific will apply to this scheme. What have we got? The leader of the opposition did not move it as a resolution, he did not like to commit his supporters to the quality of the scheme. They could talk without limit and no particular harm would be done, but if it was crystallized in the form of a resolution and they had to vote yea or nay they would have to proclaim themselves as something that I do not like to characterize a man that I have the least respect for, therefore I shall keep it to myself. He says: We will extend the Intercolonial to the coast, and begin by extending it from Montreal to Coteau a distance of 38 miles. Then he will unite with a little road down there, the Jacques Cartier, I think the road is called, some 38 miles of road, to meet the Intercolonial. Now to give a value to that 38 miles is a very difficult job. But as we know, a large portion of it will run right through the city of Montreal, if they built it, it cannot cost less than $2,000,000. He says we will expropriate the Canada Atlantic Railway from Coteau to Depot Harbour. He tells us that the Canada Atlantic Railway paid five per cent interest last year upon its capital stock. Now, looking into the railway book, we find that the actual cost of the Canada Atlantic Railway was a little over $20,000,000, that includes a branch that runs into the states. I presume if the government wanted that portion of the road from Coteau to Parry Sound they would have to pay just as much for it as if they took the whole outfit, for without that part the road there would be no good. Now, is that worth $20,000,000? for that is the actual amount of money that has gone into it. I think we can safely leave it there, because there were nearly $600,000 of a net profit last year. It is a good road, and will constantly increase in value. We will throw in the Canada Atlantic Railway transit line of boats, because they will have to be acquired, and that will help to make up the $20,000,000.

Now, we will take a little summer trip through the lakes in boats belonging to the government, and when we get to Fort William we find 431 miles of railway to Winnipeg in bad condition, with bad grades, with bad curves, not one, but two such railways. Now our friend proposes to modernize both these railways, to lower the grades, to straighten out the curves, and make them first class railways. But how much will that cost through that rocky region? Is $30,000 a mile for bettering those two roads running through that rocky region a high figure? If it is not, you will pay for them $12,930,000. Then we have got to give the Grand Trunk and all other rival roads running rights over it. We are told by our friends opposite that it is impossible for one company to own a road and allow a rival company to run over it. On this particular section the title is going to remain with them, but all other roads are to have running rights. You say that is impossible, but you applaud the leader of the opposition when he says it can be done. What are we to believe? When are you sincere and when are you fooling? That is what we want to know. Well, when you get west to Winnipeg you find that one of these roads unfortunately runs through American territory, and you are actually going to expend more of our money in improving a road that does not all lie in Canada. We come now to the hybrid part of the scheme, we are owning a road from Montreal to Parry Sound, from Fort William to Winnipeg, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern come in. When we get to Winnipeg we are going to guarantee the bonds, I presume, of the Grand Trunk Railway who are going to build from Winnipeg to Edmonton, 690 miles at $13,000 a mile, making $11,700,000. When you get to Edmonton you are going to adopt another system. The Canadian Northern being in the field first, they are going to build a road from Edmonton to the coast, and if they cannot agree to let the Grand Trunk Pacific have running rights over it, the same old scheme that is impracticable to the Minister of Railways and Canals becomes quite practicable now when some irresponsible persons propose it. If they do not agree we will build it ourselves, and that will cost us the magnificent sum of $19,800,000. Over the prairie section to the coast, 480 miles at $40,000 a mile, represent $19,200,000, and from Edmonton to where the Grand Trunk section begins, 300 miles at $18,000 a mile, representing $15,400,000. Up to this time we spend $69,000,000, and we have not enlarged the spout. We are piling up the money, we are buying old roads, but we are not opening out a foot of fresh territory, because we can go to Edmonton by two railways already, and they tell us the road from Edmonton to the coast is not needed.

But if you do not take a summer journey, you find the lake frozen, and you have to deflect your road, and you are going to get over the difficulty, the leader of the opposition says, by expropriating the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to North Bay, 634 miles. Now what is that railway worth? That railway has arrived at that condition that it is worth twice as much as it was when it was built. Our friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler), who is a railway man, says that it increases in value, and at the end of ten years will cost double what it did when we built it, owing to improvements. This has cost $70,000 a mile, and if his statement is true, it will cost us $140,000 a mile. I will take the moderate estimate of $50,000 a mile. I suppose it could not be replaced for a good deal more. That is $31,700,000 more. But they will not need the road to North Bay, and they are buying an

extra mileage in order that the Grand Trunk may connect at that point. But from Sudbury to North Bay there is 81 miles of road that we do not need even for our own purposes. Now from Sudbury to Scotia, that is the point where the Grand Trunk Railway running from Toronto to North Bay crosses the Canada Atlantic Railway on its way to Depot Harbour—from Sudbury to Scotia we have a distance of 120 miles. That is all to be a new road, and to cost $30,000 a mile. We have there $3,600,000. Up to the time, we have spent $104,000,000 and still have not enlarged the spout. Still, we have not enlarged the spout, we have a new road from Winnipeg to Edmonton and from Edmonton to the coast and a cut-off from Sudbury to Scotia but we have $104,000,000 put into the scheme and what is the result ? The distance from Winnipeg to Fort William is 431 miles, from Fort William to Sudbury 553, from Sudbury to Scotia 120 miles, from Scotia to Montreal 330 miles, from Montreal to Quebec 162 miles or a total of 1,596 miles, being 196 miles longer than the road objected to by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals between Quebec and Winnipeg and to carry it on to St. John over the old Intercolonial Railway will be 2,174 miles, while our proposed road that will have really opened up 1,800 miles of new territory from Moncton through Quebec and through Ontario will only be 1,889 miles long, and if you run by the cut-off at Chipman 1,802 miles long or 372 miles shorter than the scheme which is now propounded by the leader of the opposition.

Do you suppose that can be justified by the people ? They talk about the fat side and the lean side, but we have not got through, because the hon. gentleman having accomplished all this, says we will make surveys and at once, as soon as it is determined that it is feasible, build the Quebec section, we will start from Quebec, and we will spend $44,0000,000 on that. Up to that time we have $168,000,000 stuck into it, and if we leave out the Quebec end, $124,000,000, and have not enlarged the spout. Our friends will have a government owned railway there, a government operated railway there; they have got a hybrid scheme owned by one railway and operated by another, and you can hardly tell what nomenclature to apply to their scheme. They call this a hybrid scheme. I will let some one else invent a name for their scheme. He says : What is the use of 100,000 farmers building 100,000 barns ? Let us build elevators so that instead of building barns, they can put their grain into elevators. Well, the owners of 100,000 barns raising 1,000 bushels of wheat each will give 100,000,000 bushels of wheat, and they are going to store their wheat in elevators. The ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) says that an elevator for 1,000,000 bushels of wheat will cost $1,000,000, so that we have $20,000,000 more there for elevators, but he has not yet finished, because he is going to have the government guarantee all the warehouse receipts to the farmers, but they do not need any such guarantee, any man with a warehouse receipt for 1,000 bushels of grain can deposit it in the bank and get all the money he wants. But we are going also to provide terminals all along the Georgian Bay, we are going to make free the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax, or any other ports that anybody chooses to bring along. We will make them all free. Where have we got at the end of all this ? Two or three hundred million dollars dropped at the Quebec end, and he is spending on this scheme millions more than we have, and has not enlarged the spout, and what has he got on his hands? We talk about the lean and the fat. He has no tenant, he has no lease, he has the whole government responsibility, he has no guarantee that the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk Railway will take advantage of the road or will pay interest on the investment. It is an absolutely blind venture, and he has built a railway from Montreal to go through a lean section at $2,000,000, he has bought the Canada Atlantic Railway for $20,000,000, that is fat; he has bought or subsidized the road from Fort William to Winnipeg, $13,000,000; he has built from Edmonton to the coast, $24,600,000, and he has bought from Fort William to North Bay, $31,700,000, and from Sudbury to Scotia, $3,600,000, and he has got $95,000,000 spent there. $20,000,000 is fat, the Canada Atlantic Railway, and $75,000,000 is lean, and it is not only lean, it is tough. Those are the actual conditions of his scheme as compared with ours.

Now, which would any reasonable man endorse? I have not exaggerated the cost of a single foot of that railway, the actual values that I put there harmonize with those given by the Finance Minister, not the exaggerated figures of our friends on the other side.

If our scheme goes through, and it will go through, because there is no legitimate argument that can be used against us, we are absolutely safe in building the railway now from Quebec to Winnipeg, the risks of which will be taken by the Grand Trunk Railway for fifty years, and when it has been made valuable it will come back to us. We control the situation after that and we control it until then. We can prevent rival roads going through there for fifty years, and for fifty years afterwards, and this very railway that may now be lean and may be run at a loss, which may be compensated for by the profit on the more productive sections of the railway in the west, may fifty years from now be one of Canada's most productive assets, and if the whole thing is a failure and the Grand Trunk Railway fails, we have got the government road that some of these gentlemen want, with

$39,000,000 of Grand Trunk Railway money in it. But the most important point is: Can we afford to go into this scheme? We must not look at it from the standpoint of the present, but from the standpoint of fifty years from now. Have we any reason to suppose we will not be in a position to meet the obligations maturing then? Fifty-four millions, 64 millions, 74 millions, what is an increase of $70,000,000 to the debt of Canada fifty years from now when we compare it with the marvellous growth that has taken place during the past few years. I do not need to go back far? Are we justified in going back and judging from the past what the future is likely to be? I will not assume the role of a prophet, but I will quote a few facts, and each can apply them for himself.

Take British Columbia that we have heard extolled so enthusiastically to-day. Twenty years ago it had a population of 36,000, now it has a population of 178,000, not distant from us, separated from us by uninhabited wildernesses, but by a magnificent country, traversed with railways in every direction.

Take Manitoba, when it entered confederation thirty years ago, with its 2,000 whites and 10,000 half-breeds, and compare it with the Manitoba of to-day, with a population of 350,000, producing last year 100,000,000 bushels of grain. Take Fort Garry, into which years ago 117 immigrants plodded their weary way from Port Arthur. To-day that distance is spanned by two magnificent railway systems, and Fort Garry is almost unknown, except as an historic relic. In its stead we have the magnificent city of Winnipeg, with its population of 60,000. The North-west territory, which 20 years ago was but the home of the buffalo and the wild Indian, last year produced 25,000,000 bushels of wheat and is populated by 300,000 people. We have these two provinces, with their cultivated area of 3,500,000 acres producing 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, and what will it be when the other 200,000,000 acres becomes cultivated by a hardy and thrifty people?

But we need not go so far as that to look for progress. There is a later day when our progress became marked, a day that has impressed itself on the mind of every member in this House. Let us take the last eight years only and let us see what progress has been made. Take our population, take our railway development, take the progress of the trade of our country just for eight years, and see what is the result. Eight years ago the import trade of Canada was $105,000,000; last year $224,000,000; the increase, $119,000,000 or 113 per cent. Eight years ago the exports of the products of Canada amounted to $109,000,000; last year to $214,000,000; an increase of $105,000,000 or 97 per cent. Eight years ago the total trade of Canada was $215,000,000; last year it was $439,000,000; an increase of $224,000,000 or 104 per cent. Eight years ago our revenue was $36,000,000; last year it was $66,000,000; an increase of 90 per cent. Eight years the railway earnings were $50,000,000; last year they were $83,000,000; an increase of 60 per cent. Eight years ago exports, the products of the mines, amounted to $8,000,000; last year they amounted to $34,000,000; an increase of $26,000,000 or 325 per cent. Eight years ago our export of manufactures was $9,000,000; last year it was $20,000,000; an increase of $11,000,000 or 120 per cent. Eight years the bank assets were $316,000,000; last year they were $581,000,000; an increase of $255,000,000 or an increase of 80 per cent.

But the only thing that has not maintained a proportionate increase has been the national debt of the country, which during this marked period of prosperity, after we have spent $55,000,000 on capital account and subsidizing railways, has only increased from $258,000,000 to $265,000,000. And yet, with these facts before us and with such a future in store for us as we can easily foresee, are we afraid of spending $50,000,000 in fifty years from now? What will happen when these 16,000,000 acres of good clay soil are being tilled in New Ontario; what will happen when the magnificent land in northern Quebec is opened up by that railway which shall be studded with towns and villages from one end to the other? Will we be afraid of adding $50,000,000 to our national debt, which if we quietly cease subsidizing railways for four years we can pay off out of our surplus without adding a dollar to our indebtedness? I am not afraid of this scheme. Looked at from every standpoint I see in it a scheme that will redound to the welfare of this country and to the glory of this government. There is nothing in it that does not commend itself to me. We have heard our friends opposite say that the clause in the agreement which diverts trade to our Canadian ports is not worth the paper it is written on. Well, it might not be if it were only a statute, but this road which is intended to divert the trade from the west through our own territory to our own ports; this road is actually shorter from Winnipeg to St. John than any other railway that runs over this continent, and there will be no reason for the Grand Trunk Railway not to carry out its bargain. It is bound by the statute to do it, it is bound commercially to do it, it is bound geographically to do it; the Grand Trunk Railway cannot help itself unless it is willing to develop American ports at its own loss, and to carry its freight a longer distance than on its own road to Quebec and thence to St. John.

I look forward with hope and I look forward with confidence to the accomplishment of this project propounded by the government. I look forward with more hope and more confidence to it than our friends on the other side entertain, for this scheme to

which their leader has pledged himself and which will never be endorsed by the people of Canada.

Mr. G. W. GANONG (Charlotte). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) has well followed the Minister of Finance, who seems to have been his mentor, for the hon. member quoted almost the identical figures which the Finance Minister gave to the House the other night, glorying that the country ought spend all the money we had made. The member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) is not at all afraid to expend money; he is cheerfully willing to add $125,000,000 to the debt of the country. There are a few things in his speech to which I would like to call attention, and one is that the hon. gentleman had better go home and sleep over the proposition with immediate returns of the leader of the opposition. If he does, he will learn that the proposition of the leader of the opposition is a live proposition, while the proposition of the government is a dead one and will be for years to come. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Heyd) talked about a crisis. I wonder if he knew what he was talking about. He did not explain where the crisis had come in between the 27th of May and the time this contract was signed. And notwithstanding that we have heard many things from hon. gentlemen opposite, not one indication has come from them as to why this contract was signed, or why this crisis had been so suddenly discovered. I also wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. gentleman threw in the face of Manitoba an insult that he should be ashamed of. He made a charge against the character of the Prime Minister of that province who is just fresh from the people with a majority that nearly swept every Liberal out of his seat. That is refutation enough of the hon. gentleman's statement as to the character of the Hon. Mr. Roblin. We heard considerable from the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) this afternoon, and do you know that I expected him to shed tears, because the pathos in his voice was somewhat alarming when he began to tell us of the sufferings of the people of the maritime provinces because they could not get to the west. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) and other members opposite, have quoted Sir Sandford Fleming whom they are very anxious to quote as an authority but whom they never quote when he tells them that this line will only lessen the distance eighty miles to the city of Montreal. If this road is ever built, I will guarantee that the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) will never travel over it, but that he will still travel over the Canadian Pacific Railway if he wants to get to Montreal.

He intimated that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways had insulted Senator Cox. There was but one mention made of Mr. Cox in the speech of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways, but scarcely an hon. gentleman on that side of the House has risen since without talking Cox. It is quite evident that Mr. Cox needs defence, or they would not mention his name. The hon. gentleman ended with a grand peroration in which he complimented Sir Charles Tupper as one of the greatest statesmen of Canada, as one to whom was due the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and then he drew himself up and said, I, as member for Cumberland, proposed this in the Railway Committee—behold a greater than Sir Charles Tupper. Then he had a suggestion or two with regard to the bonding privilege. The government apparently has been fairly alarmed recently. They have been seven years without any fear; but, according to the hon. member for Cumberland, we are liable to wake up to-morrow morning and find the bonding privilege done away with. The hon. gentleman quoted from the 'Scottish American.' I will not repeat the quotation; but I would advise him to have the correspondent of the 'Scottish American' come over and learn a little more of Canada. If he does, he will learn that we have two railways by which we can be independent of the United States, if they should cancel the bonding privilege to-morrow morning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you are aware that for a number of years the question of improved transportation has been before this House and the country. It has been brought up here from time to time, and has been discussed by hon. members on both sides of the House—discussed more perhaps as it affected their particular constituencies than from a broad national standpoint. It has been constantly brought to the attention of this government, perhaps with more persistency by the late Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) than by any other hon. gentleman. It has been the persistency of that hon. gentleman on this question as well as on the question of adequate protection that has probably forced the government to take even the action that they have taken at this late date. The press of the country has also been discussing the problem of transportation, from one point of view and another, until the government should have seen that it was necessary to take up the matter in some practical form. There has been not only this feeling in the country in regard to the transportation business, but there has been a very widespread feeling in regard to the way in which the people's money has been expended in years past without any adequate return in the form of a national scheme of transportation. We have expended money in a good many directions—some on harbours along the Georgian Bay and the great lakes, some in dredging the St. Lawrence, and in other ways trying to make that great waterway what it should be, and some for terminal facilities in other parts of the country. But these expenses have not been made with

any view to a general system of transportation. They have been made, some times wisely perhaps, but more frequently in the interest of some member who is a friend of the government, for the sake of saving his constituency to him at the next election. In addition to these expenditures, we have recently abolished the tolls on the canals. This in itself has been quite an additional burden on the tax-payers of the country, who, besides paying to keep the canals in proper condition, have now also to pay for their maintenance, which was very largely paid for in former times out of the tolls collected. So that the tax-payers have now practically to pay the amount of the tolls which have been abolished. But we have had no complaint from the people on account of this additional expenditure, because they believed that it was along the line that they wished to see adopted. They believed that it was along a line that would eventually lead to some national transportation scheme. I say that the present government, with the possible exception of the late Minister of Public Works, took very little interest in this matter. They seemed to lack the initiative in this, as they do in a great many other matters. They seemed simply to drift continually, without any prospect of change. But when this House was called to meet this year, we fancied that under the pressure of the late Minister of Public Works, there might possibly be some change; for in the speech from the Throne, delivered on March 12, 1903, after reciting certain things that seemed to be necessary, they put these words into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General:

> The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

They had at last awakened to the fact that the country was looking to them to do something. Then, we had a return which perhaps supplemented this announcement. The first sounded something like business, and the second a little more so, and I am going to read a few extracts from this. By the way, I note that this report was made by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland). It will be interesting to know where that hon. gentleman is. He has not put in an appearance since the present resolution has been before the House. It may be, as has been suggested, that he is on strike, or possibly he may be away loading his gun to shoot at the dictation of his leader. This report says:

> The minister submits that it may be assumed that grain and other products will naturally seek their markets by the cheapest routes, and therefore the method of attaining the object desired should be to make the Canadian routes cheaper and more convenient than competing routes.

It will be very desirable for hon. gentlemen who are backing up the present scheme to demonstrate to this House and the country how this all-rail route can be made a cheaper route, and it will be especially desirable to make that appear to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

> The Minister further states that the questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.

Further on he says:

> It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding the conditions of general shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding these shipments.

Further on the hon. minister says:

> In making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but if necessary new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.
>
> Diversion of Canadian products through eastern outlets to Boston, Portland and other United States ports, should be investigated, and the best and most economical methods used by our competitors should be carefully studied and reported upon.
>
> The minister apprehends that in these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its own products, and it is thought that the most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts who may be appointed and authorized under the provisions of chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

The right hon. gentleman then recommends three gentlemen, Sir William Van Horne, Mr. John Bertram and Mr. Harold Kennedy, as suitable to be appointed. He then proceeds to say:

> I further recommend that such commission be authorized to employ such scientific and professional assistance as its members may decide.

You will readily see that it was not professional railway exploiters, but gentlemen who had some knowledge of the railway business that the government had then in view. I may say that after this policy was announced in the speech from the Throne, and repeated in this report, there seemed to be throughout the country a spirit of thanksgiving that the government had at last awakened to a sense of their duty, and I am confident that every hon. gentleman in this House will agree with me when I say that had the government carried out that pledge to the people, made in these two do-

cuments, even had the route selected by the commission not satisfied particular localities, there is sufficient spirit of loyalty in this country to have induced the people as a whole to look on it with favour. I believe that the spirit of loyalty which has bound these different provinces and races into a great nation would have led every county and province to rise above any feeling of local jealousy and combine in giving every aid to the accomplishment of whatever proposal the commission would have suggested as the best solution of the transportation problem.

But, although in the speech from the Throne, the immediate appointment of this commission was promised, as the session progressed the government did not seem at all anxious to implement that promise. When asked repeatedly why they did not put it into effect, they gave all sorts of evasive reasons ; and finally, instead of the thorough and comprehensive inquiry which the taxpayers were promised, we had this scheme—not a hybrid but a triple scheme—sprung upon us. They are dangling before the electorate three baited hooks, with which they hope to catch the popular vote in the near future. The three baited hooks are hung out for the three divisions of this country—one to catch the west, another to catch Ontario and Quebec, and a third to catch the maritime provinces. If these hon. gentlemen were sincere, why did they not carry out their pledge to the people ? If they were not sincere, they acted a most disloyal part in putting that falsehood into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General ; and the hon. ministers who prepared the address and this report advising the immediate appointment of a commission should hide their heads with shame. What does this report say ? The situation was so grave, there was a crisis demanding the appointment of a commission. The questions to be considered—were what ? They were complicated, and involved a thorough and comprehensive inquiry. By whom ? By railway exploiters ? Oh, no ; by competent and experienced specialists, to be assisted by scientific and professional experts. What does that mean? If it means anything, is it not an absolute acknowledgment by the government that they had not the ability to cope with the conditions, that they were in complete ignorance ? Nothing can be plainer than that acknowledgement. We know nothing, they say in fact, about railroading, and we ask that a commission be appointed which will know something. How comes it now that they, who were so helpless, who had to call upon a commission to decide for them, suddenly became possessed of all the information necessary to launch a huge and expensive project on the country ? We have the evidence of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), given before he was loaded up to fire at the order of the First Minister, that the government were not competent to deal with this question of transportation. He said :

With regard to this matter of transportation we are not in a condition to-day, even if we decided to improve the Ottawa valley route, to decide what are the proper conditions upon which to proceed. For this reason, I think the appointment of a commission to take the whole question into consideration is, in the highest degree, not only desirable but necessary.

That hon. gentleman knew his own ignorance, as the government has recognized theirs ; and at that time, the 26th of May last, he was willing to put the whole matter into the hands of a reputable and competent commission. Further on he says :

We cannot do it here in an expert and scientific manner. We must rely on the services of men of the character of those who are to be appointed on the commission.

No hurry then.

Let us wait until we have the decision of these men as to the proper course to pursue.

Why, if that hon. gentleman would say what was in his mind and conscience when he made that statement, he would oppose this outrageous scheme that is being put before the country. Up to the time I have referred to, the government had absolutely conceded that they were unable to cope with the question. But, Sir, a magician came along—one whom they had seen perform aforetime ; one who could turn opportunity into ducats. And behold, this government, that knew absolutely nothing, took on at once the attributes of gods. They saw all things different. Yes, they could even discern election funds in sight. Such is the effect of coming into contact with a great magician. What did they do ? They settled the question and settled it right quickly and, in their opinion, settled it for all time. Was it by experienced experts with scientific and professional knowledge ? No, Sir, it was settled by financial and political exploiters—and the House knows it and the country recognizes it, too. Why, the report to which I have referred recommended the appointment of Sir Wm. Van Horne and other gentlemen as commissioners. It would be interesting to know whether the First Minister told these three gentlemen that they must be prepared to follow him. Possibly that is the reason they refused, being men of honour. And gentlemen who have sat in this House and spoken in favour of delay in this matter should be ashamed of themselves of being forced under the party whip to swallow what the First Minister says and shoot as he directs. There seems to be a very wide difference between these hon. gentlemen who knew nothing about railroading on the 27th of May, and those who do know something about railroading. The Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) knew nothing about it, by their own report, but immediately this matter

came up they claim to know everything but the very gentlemen whom they endeavoured to get to serve on their commission, comes out and makes a statement, I refer to Sir William Van Horne. Let me read a little extract, so that the House and the country may compare the statement made by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of the Interior with Sir Wm. Van Horne's statement, the statement of the man who probably is the best authority on railroading in America. Referring to the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, he said :

> The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or any other all-Canadian route will never voluntarily carry a carload of wheat by the all-railway route around the great lakes to an eastern Canadian port for shipment abroad, for the simple reason that it will never pay any road to do so.

You will remember the elaborate argument of the Minister of the Interior about the carriage of this grain to St. John for about 10 cents a bushel.

> Nor will the transportation problems in the west ever be solved by the construction of an all-Canadian route from coast to coast.

And further on he says :

> The long haul around the great lakes was dreaded, because it was unprofitable, and the bulk of the grain brought by that route was carried during the winter months, and used by the millers of Ontario to keep their mills in operation during the cold season. There was altogether too much talk of an all-Canadian route by people who were entirely ignorant of the situation.

He knew whom he was talking about ; he was talking about the government, men who, on the 27th of May, acknowledged that they knew nothing about this question. Now, Sir, that there was need, and is need yet, of a commission, can be shown in a hundred different ways, outside of the question of the government proclamation, outside of their report, which is still fresh in the minds of the people, and even outside of what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said. I will give you just one authority, and I think it is one which will carry weight. I notice in 'The Northwestern Miller' a statement that shows that we need this problem of transportation to be taken up in a logical way. That journal states that of the grain exported by way of New York last year, 21 per cent was Canadian grain ; of the grain exported from Boston last year 40 per cent was Canadian grain ; and of the grain exported from Portland last year no less than 65 per cent was Canadian grain. I do not think we need much more evidence of the necessity of a commission that will look carefully into this question, instead of a commission to sign a contract to make some of their political friends rich.

Now, will the scheme now proposed meet the requirements of the situation ? I do not believe it will do so in the least. I believe it will only increase the difficulties. The road west of Winnipeg will be completed at least from five to seven years before the eastern section. Assuming that it is possible to carry grain around the north shore of Lake Superior—which I am not prepared to admit as a matter of fact—at least this Grand Trunk Pacific, so-called, really the Grand Trunk, cannot do it. They will take grain from the heart of that country, probably double the amount that they have been able to handle in the past, and they virtually come here and say in so many words : Last year we carried 65 per cent of the grain exports from Portland out of your country. We carried 40 per cent of the grain exports by Boston out of your country, we carried 21 per cent of the grain exports by New York out of your country. Give us this road and we will more than double it. And they will do it. Are they going to carry that grain down and dump it at the head of the lakes ? Common sense tells us that they will not. It is plain that every bushel of grain they carry for the next six or seven years at least is bound to go by American channels. I notice that very few hon. gentlemen meet the argument of the hon. leader of the opposition that when the grain goes to the elevators of Port Arthur and Fort William it is out of the hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific and must be routed as the Grand Trunk says. Then, of course, they will route it to the port where they have their elevators and other facilities, especially to Portland. There is another question as to this route. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, I believe made a very strong point when he said that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was simply another corporate name for the Grand Trunk. As that hon. gentleman suggested, let the agents of the Grand Trunk go through the west, and they can corall every bushel of wheat and ship it out as they please. They can utilize the Grand Trunk Pacific if they choose and the government have no redress against the Grand Trunk. But there is another phase of the question that any business man I care not who he is will understand as a shipper, more particularly those who have had business in country districts and smaller towns. You are virtually at the mercy of the agent of the railway at that station. There is no shipper but must want small favours from these local agents. The local agents have an object in getting grain shipped in a certain direction, and unless the shipper caters to that disposition of the local agent, he will be deprived of a good deal of accommodation that would be of benefit to him. I know it myself in my experience with two or three roads. There is not a man in the country who ships goods but knows that it is an object for him to keep in touch with the local agent on the railway. That is known to any gentleman who is in business. If these

gentlemen on the treasury benches do not know anything, a gentleman who is in business knows that it is a course that cannot be over-estimated so far as routing of grain is concerned.

Now, I will not call this, as I said, a hybrid proposition. I will use the words of the Minister of Finance, who, you will remember, described the road as a system of plunges, three plunges he said. Just read his speech and you will find what he said. There were three plunges, and they were all in the dark, they were plunges of hon. gentlemen who knew nothing about railway building, so what else could they be but plunges in the dark? I think it is an admirable description of the whole scheme, a triple scheme. Well, I think, perhaps, plunge No. 1 was the western plunge. The financial and political experts of the Grand Trunk came to these gentlemen and, with a few passes, they were simply hypnotized. The result was that the scheme was completed, notwithstanding the report of May 27, that these gentlemen stated they knew nothing about railroading in any manner. Well, Mr. Hays, I imagine, in that interview told them: Now you know nothing at all yourselves, let us tell you what to do. But you want to remember a number of things. Remember that we have a figurehead, we have a friend of yours, Mr. Cox, at the head of this affair. Keep your eye on the figurehead, because you will need big figures in the impending elections if you run them on this scheme. Let us build the road for you, we will do the job in good shape. Of course, we cannot do it under our own name of the Grand Trunk, but we will give it to you under a new name, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and we will keep all the powers within ourselves. Now, Sir, I think this was plunge No. 1, and perhaps the redheaded boy that was referred to some time since. But if it was, it was a redheaded boy to suit the electors of the western division, something for them to catch on in the form of a baited hook.

But the magicians had opened up new ideas. These gentlemen had begun to dream for themselves. Here was an adopted boy for the west. But now they began to want a boy of their own, and there came to the Minister of Justice, away from those Laurentian hills, a cry, fairly a wail, for a child that they could call their own. What was the result? These political and financial experts evolved a brilliant conception, a boy for the middle section. The birth was a little premature, it is true, but then that made no difference. It is true he was launched into a cold world, among a very unsympathetic electorate, as they will find when they come to face it, but they had a boy of their own—not one to be proud of but one promising election funds. Oh, no. They knew that the boy was too much like its progenitors to be any good, and so they said to the company: We will tell you what we will do, we will let you have him 50 years for his keep. Now that was plunge No. 2 by these gentlemen who know nothing of railway building, a baited hook for the electors of Ontario and Quebec.

But, Sir, there was more to follow. There was another gentleman to be reckoned with. If reports be true, he had kicked, he had often threatened to do as the ex-Minister of Railways did. He had to be satisfied or he would not shoot straight. He was the gentleman who had to furnish the money to pay the bills to support these other two boys, the adopted one and the beloved of the Miniser of Justice. Well, Sir, he had not been idle. You will remember he told you that he had an actuary at work, and he told us that he could not only support this adopted child and the other boy that was born so rapidly to suit circumstances political, for the middle section, but he had money enough left to support another child, and why should he not have a child of his own? Sir, this birth was a record breaker. The other took two or three weeks to conceive, but this was conceived over night, and launched upon the electors, and this was the dearly beloved boy of the Minister of Finance. This boy, of course, represents that section of the road from Quebec to a seaport, down to the city of Moncton, a little town 20 or 30 miles from the Bay of Fundy, on the banks of a muddy river. That is the location of the eastern terminus of this so-called great transcontinental national highway. This, Sir, constitutes plunge No. 3, the boy of the Minister of Finance. The hook baited to catch the electors of the maritime provinces.

Well, there are some things that are rather laughable, you know, because even when children are born there are relatives who do not like them. We had ample evidence of this in the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), when we were in the Railway Committee. After these two children were brought into the cold world, he got up and denounced them vociferously, he tried to scare them to death, demanding a government railway for that western country. Well, it is surprising that he should have taken this position. Why did he take it? Why, these other two railways had had godfathers, Cox and Hays were the godfathers, guaranteeing good behaviour for both these other boys. The member for Westmoreland had a godfather, a godfather whom he had always obeyed, whom he had always followed, in the person of the ex-Minister of Railways. He was simply carrying out the same plan when he spoke in the Railway Committee and told us that ever since he entered the New Brunswick legislature he had been a supporter of the Minister of Railways, he was working at the dictation of the Minister of Railways all that time. Well, Sir, times have changed. The member for Westmoreland now dreams dreams and sees visions. He

sees himself travelling in a private palace car from Moncton through the wilds of New Brunswick, away up to the west through that plunge in the wilderness described so vividly by the Minister of Finance. Why do you find him in this position, broken away from his godfather, broken away from the hon. gentleman who made him, broken away from the gentleman who even elected him to this House without any question? —and it was rather a strange thing indeed to see some hon. gentlemen in this House when the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was charging the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) with having thrown up his position virtually because he could not get an opportunity of getting the pickings—it was certainly rather surprising to see two hon. gentlemen in this House who had depended on the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals for their political existence for years—the hon. member for Victoria, N.B., (Hon. Mr. Costigan) and the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), pounding their desks with all their might, rejoicing that their godfather had gone astray and was leaving the ministry because he could not get his hands on some of the filthy lucre that was to be had. Such is the gratitude of hon. gentlemen after their godfather has kept them straight so long. Now we have the hon. member for Westmoreland. Any one who heard him the other day knows that he is very anxious not to kill these children, but to act as dry nurse for both of them, but if the hon. gentleman makes as many mistakes as he did in that last speech in this House, it is very far away from him. I am afraid he will have to take to some other business than that of nursing. If any one can judge of these children at all by the speeches that have been made in the House, if you can judge by the speeches of the hon. Minister of the Interior, by the hon. Minister of Finance, by the hon. member for North Norfolk, there is a difference in them. There is one beloved more than the other. The Benjamin is the eastern road, because they have to defend him the most. Two-thirds of the words of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House in defence of this scheme have been in defence of the eastern road from the city of Quebec to the county town of Moncton.

The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was the only hon. gentleman in the ministry who could claim any knowledge of railway business. Not one of them has had any practical experience, though he had had some experience during seven years, but he was the one member who refused to follow these waifs in any form whatever. He believed that they were the waifs of political and financial intriguers, and he believed the country would not support him in putting at the mercy of such gentlemen the whole of the resources of this country. Some of them were surprised that he should oppose this with all his power. They were surprised that it was possible that a man could be conscientious enough and have a sufficiently high sense of honour and loyalty to his country to break away from his party, in other words, that he could not swallow whatever the First Minister had prepared for him, and without consultation, too.

Now, I do not propose to deal with the position of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He has made a defence of his own, and he is amply able to defend himself, and if any hon. gentlemen think he is not, they will probably find out to their cost that he is, as a good many of us have in the past. There is another question in regard to the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that I would like to mention, and one that has not been disputed. That is that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was not only asked to support this scheme, but that he was asked to stultify himself, he was asked to take his seat in the House and allow the First Minister to apologize to the House and to the electors for the outrageous scheme, and to be quiet and submit to it. The matter was suggested to him in Council, he relieved the First Minister of it in his speech, but he did not relieve the other members of the Council, the other ministers, from having suggested it to him. It would be interesting to have some of them deny it, but we will not hear it from them. Now, after the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals so thoroughly exposed the rottenness of the scheme, they were paralyzed, they were very anxious indeed to rush the matter through the House. They thought they could depend on more than the majority that they have behind them. They had depended on Providence being kind to them and sending the usual hot weather in July and August, so that with three sittings a day and one on Saturday they would be able to force the matter through, but Providence has been more kind to the country than to the ministry, and the country will appreciate the fact that there has been ample time to discuss this question, and to allow the people to get at the enormity of this scheme before it is forced upon them, as the government no doubt intend to force it soon. It is not surprising that the ministers were paralyzed. Why should they not be? The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the only man who knew anything about railroads, had made a defence and an incontrovertible defence. They confessed themselves that they knew nothing about it. How could they say anything ? They had not one particle of information. At that time they were self-confessed know-nothings, and what did they do? They had to adopt a makeshift, and they took the lightning change artist of the troupe, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and put him up to defend the question. They had no authenticated statements to

place before the House to offset the absolute facts that were produced by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. They had merely statements made as the hon. member for North Norfolk made them, 'in my judgment' and 'in my opinion,' without any backing of any character that could bear scrutiny before the electors of this country.

I would not like to misrepresent the hon. member for North Norfolk, I am sure, but we know what position he is in to-day by his speech, August 12, on these resolutions. We know he is supporting this scheme, yet it was only on the 26th of May that, after proving that Canadian roads could not compete with the roads of the United States, he made this remark, as will be found on the pages of 'Hansard':

> Now there are conditions which render it, in my opinion, impossible at present to compete with that route.

—referring to a United States routes——

> It is useless to think of hauling wheat from a point as far west as Port Arthur by an all rail route to Quebec or to Halifax at prices such as those I quoted with regard to the American lines.

But that is not all of his speech on this resolution. If you will read his speech you find that he proves to his own satisfaction, and apparently to the satisfaction of the hon. gentlemen who cheered him, 'you can now do the very thing that on the 26th of May he claimed was an utter impossibility.' He also said on the 26th of May:

> Let us wait until we have a decision on this motion as to the proper course to pursue.

I think I have given ample reasons for suggesting that the hon. gentleman is at least liable to change his mind. I will now read some extracts from his later speech of August 12th, and you will see that the railway this hon. gentleman is going to build is a marvellous line. He said:

> We have undertaken this construction none too soon. . . . . The government I repeat are not acting with undue haste or proceeding with an ill-matured scheme. They are not entering upon an enterprise which they are not warranted in entering upon, but on the contrary they are entering upon a scheme which is called for and called for now. . . . . Consequently delay in providing these facilities is inadvisable, and I dismiss the assertion as to the action of the government in proceeding with this railway being premature, as totally without foundation and as betraying a lamentable ignorance of the conditions that exist and the probable wants of the near future.

He had forgotten that it was the ministers themselves who had displayed this lamentable ignorance, and had acknowledged it before the House and before the country.

I certainly do commend some of the suggestions of the Minister of Finance to the public, because if there was anything ever put forward in school-boy fashion, it was that speech of the Minister of Finance. He has demonstrated to this country that it is time he went to school again. If there is anything in the world in which the Minister of Finance is proficient, it is in graceful curves, and he could give pointers to the famous skater Rubenstein in that direction. I sometimes think the Minister of Finance must be rubber-cushioned, or he would strike a corner once in awhile and injure himself. It makes no difference whether he is defending protection to the great iron industry under the name of a bounty, assisting it, he says; or whether he is figuring out of his own creation a defence of this outrageous railway scheme, he is equally at home. There must be some essentials in a transcontinental railway scheme before the public will support it. One essential is that you must have for its terminals on the Pacific and the Atlantic safe harbours of large capacity and of easy access, for, unless the harbours possess these characteristics, you cannot use them because of high rates of insurance. Any gentleman who has shipped goods will recognize that one great trouble with us in the past has been that our Canadian trade has been hampered on account of high insurance rates. Now, what harbours have we in connection with this scheme? I am willing to accept the statement that in Port Simpson we have a harbour capable of all the development that is necessary for a great transcontinental line. But what have we as a terminal in the east? We have a little town on the banks of the Petitcodiac river; a harbour in which a steamboat of any size was never seen, and never will be seen; a harbour to which no steam vessel could possibly go, and if she could, the high rate of insurance would prevent trade. Then it is necessary to have a good route of large capacity. It is useless to build a railroad over which you cannot haul any goods. On that point the member for North Norfolk said this, and if he has changed his mind since I apologize to him. The hon. gentleman said:

> If you ask a railroad man anything about the capacity of a road and whether its capacity for business is measured by the length of the line he will tell you that it is not; but that it is measured by the length of the line and by the steepness of the grades.

It is not only necessary to have a good road, but you want a route of good capacity. I am willing to admit that the Pine River pass is perhaps the best pass in the Rockies. I am willing to admit also that possibly from the Pine River pass to Winnipeg it is a very good route, but after you leave Winnipeg coming east it is the merest conjecture; we are absolutely in the dark. However, there is a little information which can be obtained. If you look at the Moose river, through which discharges Lake Abitibi, you will see seven large branches, every one of which has got to be crossed by this railway at right angles. You can imagine something of the grades and curves on a road that will have to cross these rivers. There

has been some talk about the Canadian Pacific Railway as it goes around Lake Superior, but you will find that its grades present nothing like the difficulties that there will be in getting down to the valley of a river and crawling up on the other side, and doing that seven times in 100 miles, as in this instance and these are but a few of the many rivers to cross. I have it on the authority of a good railway man that instead of this road being 1,400 miles long, that when you count in the curves it will have to take, it will be not less than 1,800 miles.

I come further east now to that other section of the road, which is the pet of the Minister of Finance. The highest elevation in the much maligned Intercolonial Railway is 744 feet above sea-level. On the Temiscouta road the highest elevation is 1,350 feet, and over this summit the Temiscouata engine can only haul seven cars at a time. Did any of you gentlemen examine the profile of the new road in the Railway Committee room ? If you did, you will find that its highest elevation is 1,424 feet. This road, which the member for North Norfolk says is to be as good as any railroad on the continent, will have to climb an elevation of 1,424 feet, and yet the Temiscouata Railway is condemned as being impracticable, where the grade is only 1,350 feet, and the highest grade on the Intercolonial Railway is only 744, or about half the highest grade on the new line. I think a two thousand ton load over that elevation, as suggested by the hon. member for North Norfolk, will be a pretty steep haul for any engine. If they get a 200 ton load over it, they will be very fortunate. From Edmundston on the west side of the river, the country is irregular. The railway will have to cross rivers at right angles. It will have to go virtually to the level of the St. John river, and then over heights of land 1,200 feet high ; and I need not tell railway experts—even the ministry, who knows nothing about it, should be able to judge—what that means. In New Brunswick it will have to cross several streams, large branches of the river St. John, at right angles. It will have to cross the Green river, the Quisibis, the Seegras, the Grand, the Little and the Salmon—all at right angles and come down the west side of the river St. John. The hon. gentlemen opposite who talk about this route do not know anything about it. It was rather laughable to hear the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) say that he had travelled all over it when he had charge of the public works of New Brunswick. If he did, it was as a fisherman and hunter, and not in any other capacity, because there are no roads through it. Then we come to quite an obstruction, the Tobique river and the Tobique highlands. Did the men who built the Canadian Pacific Railway take it over the the Tobique highlands ? No. Before they reached there they crossed the river St. John and went up the west side of that river and crossed it again at Grand Falls. rather than attempt to cross that mountainous district. Some of the professional and scientific experts slide over these elevations as if they were toboggan slides, and there will be a good many elevations in that country that will answer better for toboggan slides than for 2,000 ton trains. In saying this I am not decrying the province of New Brunswick. I have as high an opinion of that province as any other man. I was born in it, and I am a true Canadian too. But I speak as I do because when we are spending the people's money, I want the people to get value for it. I do not believe spending millions of dollars just to satisfy a few supporters of the government. The Minister of Finance tells the truth—sometimes at any rate ; and he told us the truth when he said this was not a commercial road, but a political road. We knew that before. If it were a commercial road, the government would take it down the west side of the river St. John to the town of St. Andrews. Every survey shows that that is the proper route to take if you want a transcontinental line by the shortest route from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is fifty miles shorter than any other route you can take, and will bring the railway terminus seventy or eighty miles nearer to the Atlantic ocean. The town of St. Andrews has a magnificent harbour, one that cannot be beaten in the world : and the harbour of Letang is as good and equally accessible. But these are not the considerations which the hon. gentlemen had in mind in fixing the route of this railway. The consideration was, how many men can we bring back here as a result of this expenditure ? Why, Sir, if a commission had been appointed, there is no question where the route would have gone. It might have been a little discouragement to the hon. member for Westmoreland, but there is no doubt that it would have been better for those hon. gentlemen who wished to ship grain from the west. They should be ready to advocate the shortest practicable route, and the only transcontinental route that can be built with any hope of success.

I came down the river as far as Tobique, and I want to go a little further. From Tobique to Chipman the hon. member for Westmoreland says the route will be all thoroughly timbered land. If the hon. gentleman was ever through that country—I do not believe he has ever been, even for fishing or hunting—he knows that in that section the line will be lost among what are called the Bald Mountains, so called because they are absolutely nude of trees ; and yet the hon. gentleman stands up in this House and says that he has been through that country and knows it. Well, there is only one thing that can equal that statement, and that is the hon. gentleman's sympathy with the poor people of the Gas-

pereau Valley. He will be writing a second 'Evangeline' to rival Longfellow's description of the incidents of Gaspereau Valley, Nova Scotia. If there were any timber there, any one who looks at a proper map of New Brunswick knows that this railway will never carry a stick of it. New Brunswick is too well watered, and everybody knows that water routes will beat rail routes every time, especially when the rivers down which the timber is driven are as short as they are in New Brunswick. So that the talk of this railway opening up that country to settlement is all bosh, because it is not a country adapted for settlement. There is a section of country in New Brunswick that might be properly opened up, but this railway is not going through that section; the Minister of Finance would probably not have been satisfied with the route. The hon. member for Westmoreland played a very important part in this House not long since. He was trying to rival the great comedian, Joseph Jefferson. After there had been considerable talk in regard to the two routes, and he had received considerable punching from my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler), he awoke from his dream. He said he had been dreaming about it, and that instead of the road going direct to Moncton, he would take it to Chipman, so as to accommodate St. John; but he did not suggest that until my hon. friend from King's had pounded him, and pounded him well, in regard to the matter. Well, the proposition to take the line to Chipman may be a good one. Chipman does not need this railway, but there are some that may need it. The friends of the hon. member for Westmoreland have some interest in a railway that is there, and the presumption is that that railway will be loaded on to the Grand Trunk Pacific or the government railroad. That is the special interest which the hon. member for Westmoreland probably has in carrying the road on to Chipman. He needs the support in New Brunswick, of an hon. gentleman who, I understand, is most interested in that particular line of railway and the company which is to extend it to the city of Fredericton. He gives us as a reason for this route that the magnificent mineral resources throughout that portion of New Brunswick, which will be developed by means of the construction of this line. Well, the poor fellows who have expended their money in exploring these mineral resources are still out of pocket. I hope that in the future some mineral resources may be found that will pay for their development. Among other things, he spoke of the magnificent coal area that will be developed, but he must know that we have magnificent water routes in that province, and that every chaldron of coal is carried down the river St. John from the head of Grand lake. From Chipman to Moncton is no doubt a fair country through which to build a railway, but it has no suitable port for ocean steamers and no suitable harbour for the terminus of a transcontinental railway.

We have heard some question of competing lines, but it is evident that hon. gentlemen who speak of the advantages of competition are unable to see the difference between the building of competing lines by different corporations and the building by the government of a line to compete with one it already owns. What object can there be in building a line to compete with one which has cost the country some $70,000,000? It is this competition by a new government road against the Intercolonial Railway to which we object.

The Minister of the Interior made an argument regarding the shipment of grain, which I need not combat. If I were living in Manitoba or the Territories, I would have his speech sent to every elector in those sections, to show on what little foundation the Minister of the Interior can base a wide conclusion. He takes an exceptional circumstance in connection with the Canada Atlantic Railway, he takes the lowest rate ever charged by that railway and a lower rate than can possibly be charged by any railway company, according to railway experts, and on that rate—made in very exceptional circumstances—he bases his contention that it will be possible to carry grain along the north shore of Lake Superior. If an hon. gentleman occupying the position of a Minister of the Crown cannot bring any better argument to support a policy which will involve an expenditure of millions of dollars, he ought not attempt to defend it at all. And the best condemnation of that policy would be to send abroad his speech without any attempt to controvert it. That argument would be sufficient to convince any elector that the hon. gentleman was talking of something he knew nothing about, and which, on the 27th of May last he admitted that he knew nothing about. I am not prepared to say that no grain will be carried along that route. It may be possible that some little grain may be carried over it, but only under very exceptional circumstances. On the Atlantic seaboard, we sometimes find that a vessel will bring out salt as ballast, but because a vessel, in default of being able to get paying cargo, will carry salt as ballast, that cannot be taken as any basis on which to calculate freight rates. The same thing occurs in the matter of Portland cement. Western cement has few sales down in the maritime provinces, because the Portland cement is brought there in the ships as ballast. Still if we were to follow the example of the Minister of the Interior, we would figure out that a vessel, which loads cement or salt as ballast, could carry other cargo at the same rate.

As to the cost of this railway, we have an estimate made by the Finance Minister

and also one made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, but the difference between the two is that the one was made by a gentleman who was simply figuring on something he had heard about, whereas the other was made by a gentleman who was figuring on something he knows about. We had the government admitting on the 27th of May, in this report of the committee of the Privy Council, that they knew nothing and would have to appoint railway experts to obtain information. On the 27th of May their pin feathers of information had not started, but to-day they are birds of plumage, ready to be plucked; and at the expense of the country, they will be plucked. When challenged across the floor of the House, there was not a minister who could come within ten million dollars of the cost of this proposed railway. The reason is evident. Men who know nothing can tell nothing. Had they appointed a commission, they would have been able to find out something. It is not against this railway that we are particularly objecting, but it is against the attempt to commit this country to something concerning which the government know nothing and concerning which they have admitted they know nothing.

The Minister of Finance gave out the text, which every one of his followers, even the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) has taken up. He started out with the statement that we have a surplus. When he made that statement, I felt sorry for the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Only a few years ago that hon. gentleman declared it was a crime, a most outrageous thing, to have a surplus; and to hear his desk mate announce that he had a surplus of over $13,000,000 must have been gaul and vinegar to the hon. gentleman. I expected to see the hair of his head rise in horror; but even when the hon. Minister of Finance repeated we have a surplus and we shall have a greater surplus, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce remained apparently undisturbed in his lethargy. I expected to see him rise in his indignation and heap maledictions on his desk mate——

An hon. MEMBER. If he did he would lose his job.

Mr. GANONG. Of course he would. He was told by the First Minister that he must shoot in a certain direction or he would lose the office which he now fills and which he firmly said never should have been created. But this surplus evidently worried the Minister of Finance a good deal, and he concluded that one way to get rid of it was to give some of it away. He started in by saying that they could build all this road from Winnipeg to the west—that is they could adopt this redheaded boy, and it would only take $2,334,575 of the surplus. Then he looked around, he saw that they could have their own two boys representing the road from Winnipeg to Quebec and Quebec to Moncton, and that they both could be supported by the country for $11,066.882. He found out about that time—it was a rather peculiar thing—that these boys should have been twins. And he had to afford relief to his political friends even at the expense of the poor taxpayer. He said: It will cost us $324,246 to make these Siamese Twins by taking over the Quebec bridge wrich belongs to our friends. And still we shall have a surplus, because the total will be only $13,725,703.

An hon. MEMBER. Two cents.

Mr. GANONG. We should not forget that. How did the hon. gentleman get his figures? He has an actuary. I never had an actuary in my line. If I had had one in my business thirty years ago, I suppose I could have been as rich as some of the Coxes and others. Why should we go any further? Why not give the gentleman $13,725,703—and two cents—and let them build the road, own it and run it? It would save the country great expense and trouble of managing it. I would suggest that we pay them even double that amount to build and own and run the line, and the country would be the gainer by it as compared with this contract. There is something wonderful about this actuarial business. It is fine to learn through an actuary that it will cost us just $13,725,703—and two cents—to carry out this contract. We cannot be too glad that the Minister of Finance has an actuary. The Grand Trunk Pacific ought to have an actuary too; it is a good thing to have. Let me show how this actuarial business works out. I have a clipping here from 'Hansard' of the 13th of May last. The Minister of Finance answered a question put by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). The hon. member for Bellechasse has changed his opinion somewhat. He had a little scheme of his own which has been taken out of his hands and now he is ready to shoot as the Prime Minister directs. The Minister of Finance said:

> At the time of confederation the Grand Trunk Railway owed the province of Canada, according to the accounts of that province, $25,607,393.53, and this amount was taken by the Dominion as an asset, and still remains in the balance sheet of the Dominion at that amount, no payment having been made by the railway in respect thereof.

'Still remains' as an asset. And every man knows that it is of no value. Why not wipe it out? Suppose the Minister of Finance were to put his actuary on this problem, let us see how it would work out. On the 1st July, 1867, this amount stood at $25,607,393.53. Assume that this stood at interest of 5 per cent up to 1877, at 4½ per cent from 1877 to 1887; at 4 per cent from 1887 to 1897; and at 3½ per cent from 1897 to the present time and that the interest

was compounded half yearly, these being about the terms on which the government borrowed the money, how much do you suppose this would amount to? It would amount to about $118,000,000. Why, this oppulent concern, this wonderfully strong company that is coming here to do us so much good, stands indebted to this country $118,000,000—every dollar of it owed as justly as a dollar was ever owed by one man to another. Suppose that the government had owed the Grand Trunk $25,607,393.53 on 1st July, 1867, what would have been the result to-day? Why, the actuary would have got in his work and he would have come and said: You owe us $118,000,000. And we are accepting the guarantee of this concern that already owes us this vast amount. This shows the business capacity of this business government, this combination of all the talents from the different provinces. Why, the Minister of Finance can build railways—it is no trouble to him, if his friends will pay this bill. He can build, according to his own figuring, eight transcontinental railways, and still have a surplus, if he will only collect what the Grand Trunk owes us. This indebtedness of theirs may be one of the reasons why they do not wish to acquire any more property, lest Canadians might know enough to ask them to pay their debts. I expect to see a boom in the actuarial business after this. Remember, this reasoning is not mine; it is the reasoning of the Minister of Finance, the hon. gentleman who controls the moneys of this country, as he has done for the last six or seven years. It is the reasoning of a full-fledged, competent, experienced, scientific and profesional railway expert—since the contract was signed, but one who did not know a thing about it until that time. This argument, first voiced by the Minister of Finance, has been repeated, as I said, parrot-fashion, by the rest of the gentlemen on his side who have spoken. But we have one gentleman who did even better than that. He does not propose to be outclassed even by the Minister of Finance. I refer to the hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Hughes) who worked it all out that it would only cost us twenty cents a head to build this road from the mud-banks of the Petitcodiac to Port Simpson. Will hon. gentlemen on that side, who are presumed to have at least a modicum of common sense, accept such a statement as that? Will they have the assurance to go before an intelligent electorate and attempt to cram such stuff down their throats? I hope they will, for they will get their just deserts if they do. Since the Minister of Finance has blossomed out in the actuarial business I cannot but think of the change in him. A few years ago, you know, he favoured the factory of the cross-roads and the backwoods. Those were the days of his simplicity. Now, he finds no difficulty in granting a protective bounty to assist, as he says, a great iron industry that will cover half a township. So have his ideas grown. These are hopeful signs. I hope, should Providence treat this country so unkind as to allow the hon. gentleman to continue in his present position. that he will blossom out in a new direction. If he will get in his actuarial work and give us a statement of the losses to labour and capital by his own mistakes on tariff questions, he will show where money has been lost with which we might have built two transcontinental railroads had we so desired. It is to be sincerely hoped that the government will recede from these plunges that they have made. They have followed the Conservatives in a good many good things. I hope they will continue to follow the policy of the Conservative party on the question of transportation as laid down by the leader of the opposition. If they do, they will show some signs of a higher patriotism than that which fills the pockets of political friends.

Now, Sir, it cannot be said that we on this side of the House are against a judicious scheme of improving transportation facilities. All we have demanded in any instance is proper consideration of any scheme, instead of a plunge in the dark as mentioned by the Minister of Finance. We believe that the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition is a truly national one. It conserves the public interest in that it saves the great expenditure which is proposed by this other scheme without proper investigation. It saves the people's money, it gives the people a control of transportation rates that they can never hope to obtain under the scheme proposed by the government. It gives the great west what it requires more economically and more efficiently than the policy proposed by the government, namely, a scheme by which western grain may be carried through Canadian channels, and that cannot be done for five or seven years according to their scheme. The policy of the leader of the opposition makes it possible to carry this produce over a government railway to the harbours of eastern Canada. It becomes a patriotic scheme, as it will be a people's road, built by the people's money, and controlled by the people rather than a contribution of $125,000,000 to build up a distinctly foreign corporation over which the government can have no possible control.

On motion of Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of the Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), House adjourned at 12.05., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, August 21, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the sixth report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates, be adopted, with a modification of the third clause. This clause reads as follows :

That the amanuenses to the official reporters, who at present are receiving $3 per diem for their services, be, as regards salary, placed on the same footing as the extra sessional clerks, i.e., that they be paid $4 per diem, and that the said increase date from the beginning of the present session.

It is proposed to modify this portion of the report, to make it read as follows :

That the amenuenses to the official reporters who have been employed during the present session, and who have been receiving $3 per diem for their services, be paid $3.50 per day for the term they have been employed and will be so employed, and that the said increase date from the beginning of the present session.

I may explain to the House that the object of this amendment is to cover the case of a certain gentleman who has been employed as amanuenses of one of the reporters from the beginning of the session until the 1st of July, and who has since been replaced by another man. My attention has been drawn to the fact that clause 3 of the report as it is framed would entitle the gentleman who has been employed from the 1st of July until the end of the session to receive the increased pay from the beginning of the session, while the other, who served from the beginning of the session until the 1st of July, would only be paid $3 per day. It is to cover that case that this modification is suggested. The committee recommended in the report that the salaries of the amanuenses be increased from $3 to $4 per day. Representations, however, have been made to me by the government—I think there is no indiscretion on my part in saying by the hon. Minister of Finance and the Speaker of the House—to the effect that while $4 per day was not altogether an excessive salary, it would not be in accordance with what is paid to other sessional clerks. Therefore, I suggest now that the report be modified to that extent, so that these employees will be paid $3.50 per day. With this modification, I move the adoption of the report.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). There is always a possible question as to how far a motion of this kind, dealing with money matters, can properly be brought before the House in its present form ; but I believe the practice of the House has been to allow such reports to be made, not as conclusive in themselves, but as recommendations which, in order to have effect, must be followed by the necessary appropriation in the estimates to cover the increased expenditure. I think it would be better if my hon. friend would provide that the salaries of the gentlemen referred to should be placed on a par with those of the sessional clerks, without mentioning the particular sum. There is a regular scale of salaries for the sessional clerks—$3 ordinarily, $3.50 to those qualified as typewritters, and $4 to those qualified both as stenographers and typewriters ; and it seems to me that the same general rule should be followed in this case, so that any of these gentlemen who are qualified in the same way as other sessional clerks would receive the same pay. I understand that these appointments are not made by the House or by the committee, or by the Speaker, and I think the officers who are to be dealt with in this way should be appointed either by the Speaker, as representing the House, or by the Debates Committee. I have at present no objection to the motion, but I think it should be understood that a motion of this kind, when passed, is to be taken as a recommendation, and is not necessarily conclusive. The general rule as to money matters is not easily determined, but I am inclined to think that if one wanted to be technical, objection could be taken to many of these reports. With the understanding that the motion is passed as a recommendation, I have no objection to it going.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I entirely concur with the suggestion that any expenditure can only be made on the recommendation of the government with the assent of the Crown, and of course, it is in the discretion of the House whether it will be granted or not. With regard to the other suggestion, I think now, as I did before, that these appointments should be in the hands of either the Speaker or the government and should not rest with any committee of the House. I have always held that view, and this is why I refer to it now.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of Superintendent of Insurance of the Dominion for the year ending December, 1902.—The Minister of Finance.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 232) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—The Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). This Bill was completed in committee a couple of weeks ago, but an amendment moved by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), suggesting that the Grain Commissioner should telegraph

to all country points the prices of grain from day to day, was laid over in order that I might consider it. I was not prepared to deal with the amendment at the time, because I had not sufficient information, but I told my hon. friend that I would take the matter up at an early day. After making careful inquiries, I find that the suggestion is not practicable. I referred it to the Grain Commissioner, and he telegraphed to the managers of railway companies in the wheat growing states to the south and also to the Boards of Trade and the Grain Commissioners, and he found that such a practice is unknown in the United States and regarded as wholly impracticable. So far as Canada is concerned, it is certainly impracticable, because we have no way of getting an official price, as we have an open grain board upon which official prices are bulletined. I move that the Bill be reported.

Mr. BLAIN. As the hon. member for Macdonald is absent, would the hon. minister allow the Bill to stand until Monday ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am obliged to go away to-morrow and do not expect to be here again this session. I have already held the Bill over several days, because my hon. friend from Macdonald was not here. His absence, however, makes no difference, because he left the amendment in my hands in order that I might see whether it could be worked out or not.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). There are, Mr. Speaker, in the history of nations, as in the history of individuals, red letter days. These are red letter days for Canada. The Liberal party, with the co-operation and approval of the Canadian people, is about placing on our statute-books a law, the preamble of which reads as follows :

Whereas, having regard to the growth of population and the rapid development of the production and trade of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and to the great area of fertile and productive land in all the provinces and territories as yet without railway facilities, and to the rapidly expanding trade and commerce of the Dominion, it is in the interest of Canada that a line of railway, designed to secure the most direct and economical interchange of traffic between Eastern Canada and the provinces and territories west of the great lakes, to open up and develop the northern zone of the Dominion, to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada and to develop commerce through Canadian ports, should be constructed and operated as a common railway highway across the Dominion, from ocean to ocean, and wholly within Canadian territory.

If there is anything deserving of the hearty co-operation of every true Canadian, whatever section of the country he may come from, or whatever may be his origin, it is the policy of striving to the best of our ability to develop this country and advance it in the march of progress. The span of human life, Sir, is set at seventy years. This young nation has not yet lived the average span allotted to each individual, and it is not more than half of that time since the intellectual giants, who then guided the destinies of Canada, discussed the advisability of building a transcontinental railway. To-day we are following in their footsteps. To-day we are about to repeat the lesson they taught us. Canada has made immense strides since 1871, when a transcontinental railway was first mooted, and since 1885 when it was opened to the public. The strides which Canada has made since then are without parallel in the history of modern times, and we are now facing the imperative necessity of building a second transcontinental line. This question comes before us at an opportune time, at a time when the leaders of commerce, recruited from all parts of the British empire, are meeting in our metropolitan city for the purpose of discussing the progress and advancement of that empire of which Canada forms to-day so prominent a part. It is fitting that we should realize our obligation and our duty, and it is gratifying to the Canadian people to know that the business men of the British empire realize to-day the possibilities of Canada. These men, assembled from all parts of the British empire, will shortly leave Montreal to go down to the Pacific coast. In their voyage through this country, they will see an object lesson and will learn what industry, patience and perseverance can accomplish in a few short years. The preamble of this Bill, Sir, is justified by what has taken place during the last fifteen years in the North-west. May I be permitted to read here the words of an eminent journalist, published in the city of Montreal. He thus describes the possibilities of our North-west and the actual stage which that country has reached to-day :

Canada's food producing resources, even in their present partially developed state, are giving a good account of themselves, contributing to our exports of last year a little more than one-half of the total value of goods sent abroad. Canada's total exports last year amounted to $211,640,286, and of these the food products had a value of $109,326,319, the leading articles of food exports being : grain, $32,751,400; flour and meal, $4,369,781; cheese, $19,870,072; fish, $14,187,070; animals for food, $12,342,489; meats, $14,161,565. After feeding five and a half millions of people at home the food producing resources yielded a surplus of over

one hundred million dollars. Great Britain took $81,961,000 worth, and the United States $5,023,000. The wheat crop alone amounted to 98,654,000 bushels, being 38,000,000 bushels more than were raised in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and 55,000,000 bushels more than the entire crop of Australia, New Zealand and Tasmania. Ontario, for many years the leading wheat producing province, now has to take second place, for last year her yield was only 26,904,000 bushels, while that of Manitoba was 54,750,000 bushels. And only patches of the Canadian west have as yet known the plough. Manitoba and the three territories, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta, contain an area of 270,000,000 acres, of which 135,000,000 acres are good land capable of yielding abundant harvests. Of these 135,000,000 acres only 4,000,000 acres are under cultivation. Over the other 131,000,000 acres the prairie grass still waves and beckons the people of the crowded east and the still more crowded centres of the old world to come and possess the land. And here a problem in proportion suggests itself. Four million acres of Manitoba and the three territories are cultivated, and the population is 391,000; what will the population be when one-half the tillable land is under cultivation? The answer is six and one-half millions, or one million more than the present population of all Canada. This is only a hint of the possibilites of natonal growth dependent upon the development of Canada's agricultural resources.

It is easily seen that the preamble of this measure is fully warranted and fully proved by what we have at present before us. Is Canada to stand by and allow this western country to be invaded, as it was this year, by 100,000 immigrants, a number greater than the number of those who came in during all our twenty years under the so-called national policy? Are we to allow these people to take possession of our country, to become masters of the Canadian west, as others of their kind became masters of the American west? Are we to remain satisfied with our present canal system, with our present railway system? Are we who, for five years, have heard on the part of our public men nothing but demands for the improvement of Canada's waterways, the advancement of Canada's progress and the strenuous efforts that should be made to realize Canada's immense possibilities, to remain inert while others move? I am sorry that the Conservative party, which, in the past, has done great things for this country without doubt; I am sorry that to-day its policy is limited to that which has been expounded in this House by its leader. That policy, I have no hesitation in saying, is not worthy the traditions of the Conservative party. If Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper were still in political life, men who were the pioneers of the first transcontinental railway, such a policy would never have been accepted, but we should have seen these men working with the majority of the Canadian people to-day for the building of a second transcontinental railway, which is the only natural sequence of the first constructed road.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), in concluding his remarks, used these words:

> This, Mr. Speaker, is an outline of the policy which I would submit as an alternative to that proposed by the government. It is a policy based upon an abiding and abounding hope and confidence in the future of this country; a policy which looks to an enormous development in Canada within the next few years; a policy which, I trust, is not unworthy of the traditions of that great party which made the North-west a part of Canada, which bound together the scattered provinces of Canada by a railway stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and which, from first to last, has believed in and advocated a national policy, not only for the development of our industrial life, but also for the solution of the great transportation problems of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am but one of the humble members of this House; but, in the name of the people I represent, in the name of the constituency which was represented in this House for long years by members of the Conservative party, I know I give expression to the Conservative sentiment of my county in saying that the present policy submitted to the consideration of this House is unworthy of the past of the Conservative party. We are told that the time has come when Canada must grapple with the difficulties that confront her, when Canada must decide at the parting of the ways, whether the trade of this country shall reach the two oceans, shall reach the motherland and reach Asia, through Canadian channels or by way of American territory. We have heard the system of transportation discussed in all its phases in this House. We have heard all that can be said in favour of our waterways and in favour of our different systems of railway transportation; and, after having heard the whole discussion, after having heard that question treated in all its different phases, there is an almost unanimous opinion in this House that our waterways and transportation system are not up to the times, are not what they should be. And yet we are told to-day by the leader of that Conservative party that we must rest satisfied with what we have. We are told that we must use the Intercolonial Railway, which was built at a cost of $70,000,000 for political and military service, and in the operations of which we have lost, in round numbers, $20,000,000; we are told that we must build a branch line from Jacques Cartier junction, must use the Canada Atlantic Railway to Depot Harbour, then build another branch line or use the Canadian Pacific Railway to Port Arthur and Fort William, thence utilize the two present railway systems to Winnipeg, from Winnipeg to Edmonton encourage the present railways, or help the Grand Trunk if necessary, and then give the Canadian Northern, or the Grand Trunk, or the government, power to build from Edmonton to the Pacific coast. That, very imperfectly described, is the

policy of the Conservative party at the present moment. That is not a policy which will commend itself to the approval of the Canadian people. It will limit Canada to what it is at the present time. It will limit our inhabited area. Beyond this, it has one radical and fatal effect, which is sure to bring about the condemnation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. The fatal effect of that policy is that it has no reference whatever to the new portions of Quebec, the new portions of Ontario and the new portions of the Canadian west. We are told that our immense territory in the province of Quebec of 70,000,000 acres, and that the immense stretch of new land in the province of Ontario, is to be traversed by a colonization road, to be built gradually, as circumstances warrant—to be built, I suppose, at the rate of ten or twenty miles a year, as colonization roads are generally built. Is that the policy the Conservative party approves of for this country at the opening of this new century, when Canada is merging into nationhood and is taking the proud position on this continent for which Providence destined her from her earliest days? That is not a policy that will commend itself to the people of the part of the country from whence I come. And I have a conviction that it will not appeal to the national aspirations of any Canadian, no matter what province he may belong to. This policy is unworthy of the consideration of parliament, and we must therefore consider the other policy which is before us.

We are asked to assist in the construction of a transcontinental railway. The need of that transcontinental railway has been manifested over and over again during the last few years in every possible way. The immigration into the North-west justifies the construction of this road. Let me give you some figures to show the rate at which that immigration has invaded the western country. In 1897, there were 21,000 settlers; in 1898, 31,000; in 1899, 44,000; in 1900, 49,000; in 1901-2, 67,000; in 1902-3, 125,295. In one single year, Mr. Speaker, more than all the people of the province of Prince Edward Island went into that western country. The increase that has already taken place would warrant faith in the new transcontinental project.

But there are other considerations which must not be overlooked. The trade of that country must remain to Canada, and the only way in which we can secure its remaining to Canada is by giving it access to the sea. The present Canadian Pacific Railway is not able to meet the requirements of the traffic. We have heard a good deal this session and last session about the congestion of traffic. We have therefore to face the situation, we must face the obligation which is imposed upon us. Shall we undertake the task which lies at our door? I have confidence in my country, I have confidence that the generation to which we belong is worthy of the generation that has gone before us, and that we will be able to cope with the requirements of the present. What do we ask the Canadian people to do? Do we ask them to hand over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company $100,000,000 or $125,000,000, as the Conservative party did when they first opened up that western country? We have heard the statement of the Minister of Finance, we have heard the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister, neither of which have been challenged, that all that Canada would be called upon to pay to secure a new transcontinental road of over 3,000 miles in length, is the sum of $14,000,000, equal to the surplus of one single year. Under these circumstances hesitation would be folly on our part, and if we did hesitate we would not be worthy of the position which we occupy at the present time. The steady advance in population and production in that western country fully justify the construction of this road. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) who spoke last night, referring to the scheme of the leader of the opposition, used these words:

> It becomes a patriotic scheme, as it will be a people's road, built by the people's money, and controlled by the people, rather than a contribution of $125,000,000 to build up a distinctly foreign corporation over which the government can have no possible control.

That, Mr. Speaker, is not, I am sure, the feeling of the Conservative party towards the old Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The old Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada is not a foreign corporation. Those who are old enough remember the day when the Grand Trunk Company was hailed as a blessing to this country. There is not a member of the province of Ontario who would rise in his seat and depreciate the Grand Trunk of Canada; there is not a member of the province of Quebec who would attempt to do so. I presume that our hon. friend from Charlotte, hailing as he does from New Brunswick, does not know the real advantages which the Grand Trunk have conferred upon old Canada. In a slighting way he tried to make light of the $25,000,000 which was advanced to the Grand Trunk Railway by the Conservative party, by the men in whose footsteps he is trying to walk, which sum still remains as an asset in our books, to prevent the winding up of the road altogether, and to prevent the failure of the whole undertaking. That $25,000,000 was advanced to enable the Grand Trunk Railway to carry out its undertaking, and we were told at the time that it would be a last charge upon the road. That money has not been collected, but I may say also that that money has been well invested: and to-day we are proud, we in Quebec especial-

ly are glad to know that it is the Grand Trunk Railway Company that is going to undertake this great scheme. We know that our sons and our brothers and those of our people who have left the older provinces to carve out new homes for themselves in Manitoba and the North-west will feel that they are still at home that they are still in Canada when they see the old familiar name of the Grand Trunk Railway inscribed upon the cars and locomotives that run through that country. They will see that it is a contribution of eastern Canada towards the development of western Canada, and the name alone will show them that we have undertaken this work in sympathy with them in the west as well as in the interest of eastern Canada. It would be nonsense to suppose that the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada would for ever have confined its operations to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario; it was inevitable that the time should come when the Grand Trunk Railway would invade the western prairies would cross the territories of Canada and reach out to the Pacific ocean. That time Mr. Speaker has arrived, we believe that time is now upon us. We believe that that work should be commenced now. We do not believe in putting it off one year, or five years, or ten years. We want that work to proceed now. We want the Governor General of this country to come down here a few days hence and in the name of one of the greatest sovereigns who has ever honoured the throne of Great Britain, to place the seal of approval upon the scheme which is now laid before this House for consideration. We want this year to be marked as a red letter year in the history of Canada. We want, within the next two years, to set 25,000 men at work from Moncton to Port Simpson. We want the outlay of $75,000,000 to commence now. We want the good times of the last seven years in Canada to continue for seven years longer, at least, while this project is being accomplished. That is our policy, and we should adhere to it.

One of the first gentlemen to rise in this House and criticise this scheme was the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, the hon. member for St. John city (Hon. Mr. Blair). That hon. gentleman had never previously possessed the confidence of the opposition in this House. Sir, I do not think any one can find, during all the six years that hon. gentleman has occupied a seat in this House, one single word of tribute from a Conservative to his ability as Minister of Railways and Canals. For six years no word was strong enough to denounce his management of the Intercolonial. There is not a member of the opposition whose words cannot be found in the 'Hansard' condemning the hon. gentleman who has now become the prophet of the Conservative party. I visited the county of Restigouche last fall in company with the ex-Minister of Railways, which county adjoins my own, and listened to an address by that hon. gentleman to the people there. His policy then was to extend the Intercolonial via the Canada Atlantic Railway, and to carry it up to the great lakes. There is no novelty in this policy now proposed by the government, it is the old policy of the hon. ex-minister. Therefore we are driven to the conclusion that the Conservative party have had to adopt the policy of the ex-minister since they have no policy of their own.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to think unfavourably of our hon. friends opposite, and I feel that before the final word has been said in regard to this project, there will be found members on the other side of the House who, if they do not support this scheme, will at least refrain from condemning it by either their words or their votes. There are men on the other side of the House who represent constituencies in Ontario and who know by experience what is meant by the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada undertaking a scheme like this. There are men on the other side of this House who will not condemn this undertaking when it has the approval of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House for any great length of time and I have no intention at the present time of covering the whole ground involved in this debate which has already been so prolonged and which promises to be continued during several days yet. We have heard from the members of British Columbia of the immense advantage which the construction of this railway would be in the northern part of British Columbia, we have heard the story told us of the immense riches of British Columbia, of its timber, of its forests, of its fisheries, which are unsurpassed in the whole world, we have heard the story of the North-west, we have heard that of Manitoba, we have heard that of Ontario and Quebec, but the story of Quebec has not all been told. There is an hon. member sitting in this House who is styled by his colleagues the Conservative leader for the province of Quebec. That hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, lays claim to occupy in our province the proud position that was once held by Sir George E. Cartier. Sir George E. Cartier would never have come before this House in 1903 to ask for the construction of a colonization railway in the northern empire of the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has laid before us a policy of that kind. I know, understanding as I do, the sentiment that exists in the province of Quebec, that the province of Quebec will not adopt any such policy. Let it not be forgotten, though misinformed people or misguided people have in the past declared the province of Quebec was the most backward province in the

Dominion of Canada, that the first link in the Canadian Pacific Railway was built by the province of Quebec out of its own resources as a provincial undertaking. The mother province of this Dominion, because Quebec is the mother province of this Dominion, the province which gave the signal for the construction of the first transcontinental line in Canada, will never go back upon the revered leader of the Liberal party who undertakes to build a second transcontinental line. I have no hesitation in saying that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will not be able to find in the province of Quebec half a dozen constituencies to support his policy, or the policy of the Conservative party, and that if that is the policy upon which he intends facing the people in the coming election, the seven members who now support him in the House will be reduced still more in number. That is my candid opinion, and it is the opinion that prevails throught the province of Quebec. As I have said, I intend more especially to refer to the province of Quebec. When we, some years ago, obtained the addition to our territory of 70,000,000 acres of land, when the limits of Quebec were extended up to Lake Abitibi on the west, to Hudson bay on the north, and to Labrador on the east, a problem rose immediately before the people of Quebec. The idea was at once to invade that land, to inhabit it, to people it and to repeat in that northern territory what the French Canadian people have done in Canada, a thing that is unparalleled in the history of the world—the sixty thousand people of 1763 who were in Canada at the time of the cession of the treaty of Paris raised to 2,000,000 people in 100 years. Where is there an example of that kind? We wish, in promoting this scheme, to repeat what has been done during 100 years by the people of Quebec. We want to invade those new lands, we want to take possession of them and we want to keep them for this country and for the flag under which the French Canadians have attained the position they occupy today. During the last thirty or forty years in the history of Canada what has become of the million of surplus of our population, what has become of that million of souls who to-day inhabit every state of the American union, who are to be found from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon, who have gone there to find the sustenance, to find the livelihood which they were unable to find in their own country, being limited as it is to within forty or fifty miles from the banks of the St. Lawrence beyond which is the wilderness We want to reverse what has been going on during the last forty years. We want, during the next twenty years, to retain the million in the surplus of our population in the province of Quebec, and we want them, instead of going south, to go north. We want to give another object lesson. When the Canadian Pacific Railway stretched its road through Nipissing and Algoma, those districts were a wilderness. Look at them to-day; look at Nipissing, look at Algoma. We wish to repeat along the line of this new transcontinental railway what has been done in Nipissing and Algoma. We want to retain in Canada the citizen of the province of Quebec, because he loves his native country. It is his native soil, in which is to be found everything he cherishes, and in which he has the liberty and protection of his institutions, in which he has prospered and for which he is willing to live and to die, and to remain, regardless of what may be said and what has been said so often, to the last ditch the most devoted and loyal citizen that Britain has at this time. The opening up of this region from Quebec to Lake Abitibi opens up for us a new area, a new vista. While the old country settler, while the Scotchman, the Irishman, the Englishman and the German will go to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and take up a farm on the fertile prairie where he can raise a crop in the first year, and where he can make a fortune in five years, the French Canadian habitant will go to the wilderness, he will go into the rough woods, he will go where he will have to cut down the trees, to hew out the timber, and where it will take him twenty years, if necessary, to establish a farm that will be a worthy counterpart of the farm that the European settler will find in Manitoba and the North-west Territories two years after he goes there. Our people are well qualified for this particular section of the country, and for this particular work. They have proved it abundantly in the past, and I believe that what we are doing to-day is one of the most patriotic works which we can do for the future solution of the question of Canadian nationality and British supremacy. There are men in this House to-day who will see in twenty years hence rise cities, towns and villages, rise on the whole course of the new transcontinental railway from Quebec to Winnipeg. We have in that country immense waterpowers, we have fertile lands testified to by our missionaries, by our explorers, and by all who have travelled through that country. We have magnificent wood of all kinds. We have pulpwood, from which we will in twenty years supply the whole British Empire. We have all the conditions that are necessary to the doubling in our own lifetime of the population of the province of Quebec, and what will be done in the province of Quebec will be done in the province of Ontario. And what we have done in Quebec will be done in Ontario, but I am speaking now more specially of the province of Quebec. The government of Ontario has realized its duty in that regard. The Temiscamingue Railway which is now building is the first stage towards the invasion of that northern

country. We wish in a word to open up Canada. We wish to develop its area; we wish to keep our people at home. We do not wish to meet young Canadians full of brawn and sinew, men of energy, who tell us we must go to the United States for our living; we must go to the United States for our work. We must find work for them in Canada; we want to develop our own resources; we want to make Canada what it should be; we want to put an end to that state of affairs which has existed for so long, when almost as many people from the maritime provinces were found in the United States as remained in the maritime provinces. We want to put an end to the exodus from Quebec which fortunately has stopped during the last five or six years and without saying one word derogatory to the hon. gentleman who has preceded me—the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong)—I would say that I was sincerely pained last night when I saw that hon. gentleman, one of the representatives of New Brunswick, one of the representatives of the people of that province, rise from his seat and blinded by party exigencies and partisan motives, stand up against a project that will be the salvation of New Brunswick. Here is New Brunswick with its magnificent rivers, with its splendid lumber, with its splendid soil, with its population drawn from the old United Empire Loyalist stock, second to none in Canada, second to none in the world. Here New Brunswick for the last twenty years has been going back and back and losing population. We shall pass in a few days in this House a law which shall deprive New Brunswick of another of her representatives. Is it not time for the people and the representatives of that province to rise to the exigencies of the hour? I was sorry to see the position that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) took, but the position he took was the natural sequence of the ideas that unfortunately prevail on the other side of the House. He was willing it is true to have a railway through New Brunswick but that railway would have to go to St. Andrews and it should not go to Moncton; that was the qualification which he placed upon it. Mr. Speaker, I represent a portion of Gaspesia. The transcontinental railway is not going to Gaspesia. It is a country which has been deprived of railways for many years. We have in the peninsula 10,000 square miles. We have there at the present time 75,000 people, 25,000 in Gaspé, 25,000 in Bonaventure and 25,000 in Matane—75,000 people and practically we are without railways. There are none in Matane none in Gaspé and a limping bankrupt railway in Bonaventure. In the name of the old settlers of the Gaspesian peninsula, they who have contributed their mite and their share to the building of railways all through Canada, I am willing to come forward now to support this scheme because I feel that it is to the general advantage of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I were to take the position in this House that was taken last evening by the member for Charlotte, and would have to go back to my people and render an account of my stewardship, I would be ashamed to show my face because the people in that part of the country realize that the advancement and progress of Canada can only be assured by the construction of railways. The railway is the modern agency; the railway is the modern lever. Blighted is the country without railways. Blighted is the country through which the shrill cry of the locomotive is not heard. There is no part of Canada which has not been benefited by a railway; lines have been duplicated between Montreal and Ottawa. They have been duplicated in every part of Ontario. In the western peninsula of Ontario the saying is that you cannot go ten miles in any direction without striking a railway. The result of that is that Ontario and especially the western peninsula of Ontario has become one of the most fertile, one of the most prosperous parts of Canada. We wish to do for other parts of Canada what railways have done there; we wish to increase our territory, and to develop it to the best of our knowledge.

The part of the scheme to which I wish to refer more especially now is that extending from the city of Quebec to the city of Moncton because it traverses the part of Canada from which I come. That portion of the road has been greatly criticised, and still it is but a small part of the undertaking. It is a small part; but it is a necessary part. From all time we have heard from experienced men that the port of Quebec was beyond peradventure the great port of Canada, but the port of Quebec unfortunately is closed for some months in the year. The port of Quebec stands second to none in the world during the summer time. You have there a magnificent frontage from Pointe-à-Carcy up to the new Quebec bridge that is building, a frontage of ten or twelve miles, one of the finest harbours you could find anywhere. We are bringing this transcontinental railway to Quebec; we are bringing it back to the point from which civilization started in this country, from which the colonization movement began in this country. We are coming back from the portals of the west and of the new land, back to the city of Quebec from which the original explorers of this continent started. We are coming back with the modern locomotive to the rock of Champlain and Montcalm from which the explorers left in bark canoes to cover this continent from end to end. We are as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said, bringing back to Quebec that which Quebec gave to this continent, but unfortunately our climatic conditions are such that we can concentrate the trade of Canada at Quebec for only seven or eight months of the year. We have to find an out-

let for the other months. There is one thing we might have done. We might have been satisfied with the Intercolonial Railway, we might have continued to accumulate deficit upon deficit as did the Conservative party for twenty years, losing probably $500,000 a year. Is there any Canadian in Canada who is not satisfied that the Intercolonial Railway can never be a commercial success ? Has that not been demonstrated by thirty years of experience ? Is there any railway man in Canada or out of Canada who will contend that a road which has to cover 700 miles when only 400 need be covered will ever be a success ?

Why should we continue any longer to struggle against nature, to struggle against distance when the Gordian knot can be cut and the problem solved ? I have not a word to say against the construction of the Intercolonial Railway where it was constructed; at the time it was necessary. The population of New Brunswick, the population of Quebec, lived along the shores of the St. Lawrence and along the shores of the Baie des Chaleurs. It had not yet penetrated into the interior of New Brunswick or the province of Quebec, but those days are long since gone by. The original settlements which were stretched along the St. Lawrence have now extended to the Maine frontier and beyond the Maine frontier and are invading the United States. We wish therefore to open up the rear portion of Quebec along the state of Maine. We do not wish the Canadians who live there and who have lived there for many long years to have to drive 25, 30, 40 and 50 miles to reach a railway station in this modern age of progress in Canada. That is the reason therefore, Mr. Speaker, why this new line is being built; to benefit materially seven or eight constituencies immediately concerned.

There are constituencies in that district represented in this House by Conservative members, and I am interested to know what position those members will take if they undertake to give expression to the feeling that prevails in that district. From there the railway crosses the province of New Brunswick. The exact line has not yet been defined; but we can trust to the engineers and surveyors to lay it out properly. The distance to our winter ports will be cut down by at least 100 miles, which is a great gain. From Moncton to Halifax the road will be doubled tracked, the distance to St. John will be made much shorter than it is, and we shall have at last a through railway bringing the products of Canada to the winter ports of Canada. Why should we stop at North Bay, and be content that Canada should have some of the western traffic during six months of the year, and lose the whole of it during the other six months ? We know that during the summer time a great deal of the traffic goes by the canals and the railways to Montreal, but that in the winter time the whole of it goes to Portland, Boston and New York. We have constructed elevators at Halifax for the Intercolonial, in the hope of filling them with grain, but they have remained empty. We have spent money to improve the service at St. John ; but the task has been beyond us, because we are struggling against nature and against distance, like a man struggling against the current. We want to solve this problem once and for all by taking the shortest and most direct route to the maritime provinces after the port of Quebec is closed, and the proposed railway will take it. We want the people of the maritime provinces to know that they are still part and parcel of this Dominion. We want them to help us to build up our country, and to share in any benefits that may come to the country.

But there is another feature of the scheme which has been overlooked by our Conservative friends and by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman seems to have conveyed to the members of this House the idea that has prevailed for many years that the Intercolonial Railway was built solely for the purpose of connecting the maritime provinces with the old provinces of Canada, and that the sole object of the management of that railway was to see in how short a time a train could be rushed from Halifax to Quebec and Montreal. In the Matapedia valley, in my own constituency, we have Intercolonial trains running at the rate of forty or fifty miles an hour during the night, and stopping at only two or three stations in a run of 100 miles. Thirty years of experience have demonstrated that the Intercolonial Railway as a through line has been a dead failure, and that it should be used for other purposes. Speaking in the name of the people who inhabit that district, I say that we want the Intercolonial to be used for the benefit of the district through which it runs. We want to abandon this phantom race, this attempt to make time and to cover endless distances uselessly. We want the Intercolonial Railway to benefit the district through which it runs. The main line of the Intercolonial Railway is about 837 miles in length, and it has about 500 miles of branches in different parts of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Hon. members would not probably imagine, but the fact is, that we have not one mile of branch line or of feeders to the Intercolonial Railway in the province of Quebec, although we have more of the main line in the province of Quebec than there is in the maritime provinces. The distance from Matapedia to Montreal is 452 miles, which is greater than the distance from Matapedia to Halifax. We want, therefore, to use this short line which we are about to build for the purpose of local and through-traffic, and we want to utilize the Intercolonial Railway for the development of local and through-traffic where

it can be found. In the Gaspesia peninsula there are at the present time 75,000 people. Build the Matane Railway from St. Octave to Metis, to Matane and ultimately to the Gaspé Basin, assist in completing the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, on which $1,600,000 of the public money of this country has been wasted; assist it to reach the Gaspé Basin, and to secure at once the traffic of a peninsula of 12,000 square miles, rich in fisheries, rich in farming lands, rich in pulp wood. You have there a local traffic which will more than duplicate any through-traffic which you may obtain for the Intercolonial Railway. Build the short line from Fraserville to Matapedia and open up over 100 miles of splendid country in Temiscouata, Rimouski and Bonaventure. Mr. Speaker, that is the first condition that should not be overlooked. Then, the Intercolonial Railway has been brought by the Liberal party up to its present state of efficiency. It is now a railway second to none on the American continent. Its bridges have been strengthened and improved, and some of them have been replaced by new ones. The steel rails have been replaced by larger ones; the whole roadbed is in prime condition; and the equipment of the line is in first-class order. It no longer stops at Lévis, but runs to the city of Montreal, where it has a binding agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway for 99 years for the transfer of traffic. The future of the Intercolonial Railway is assured. But are we to rest satisfied with what our fathers did thirty or thirty-five years ago? We want to improve on their work. We want to develop that portion of the country through which the Intercolonial Railway passes. We built the eastern extension to Sydney and to Cape Breton when there were not 100,000 people in the whole of Cape Breton. We have now 75,000 in the Gaspesia peninsula without any railway at all. Develop that district. Develop the whole district along the south shore of the St. Lawrence, where you will find lumber mills and other industries every few miles, as well as on the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs. At present the peninsula of Gaspesia is a terra incognita to us, almost as much as the far-off regions of Canada. We have had a government railroad running through that country, but making no attempt to increase the local traffic or to develop the resources of the country, whether in agriculture, fisheries or anything else. We have had encouragement from the present government towards that end, but I hope that this House will realize that the Intercolonial Railway, when it was built, had not for its sole object the connecting of the maritime provinces with the old provinces of Canada, but that it was also the intention of the men who built it, that it should benefit the country through which it runs. That can be done, and done easily, and I know that the government of the day, and any other government that has at heart the interest of eastern Quebec and of western New Brunswick, will see that what can be done in that direction shall be done. The traffic of the Intercolonial Railway is now $6,500,000, of which only one million is through-traffic, and our local traffic could be doubled within the next five years if means were taken to develop it and if all our energies be not bent on running fast through trains over the road. I intended to give some facts and figures in connnection with the local traffic, but as these were laid before the House yesterday by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) I shall not take up the time of the House by doing so.

I am in favour of this transcontinental road because it is going to open up all parts of Canada, because it is going to develop new regions, because it will bring the west closer to the east. I am in favour of it, further, because it will develop the province in which I am more particularly interested, and also because it will give expression to the national aspirations and ambitions of the Canadian people. On the threshold of this twentieth century, with the portals of the future opening broadly before us, this is not the time for a sturdy young nation like ours to hesitate in her march of progress. This is the time for us to be up and doing, and I believe that every man who casts his vote in favour of this measure will have reason in after years to feel proud of what he has done. He will realize that he did something to break down provincial barriers and prejudices, to bring the various provinces nearer together, and to hasten the advent of that day when a citizen of the province of Quebec can go to Fort Simpson and feel that he is still in his own home. I shall not, like the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), look merely at the mercenary side of the question. I shall not stop to calculate what the extent of our dividends may be or the amount of our earnings. A government which is worthy of its mission, has other things to do than earn dividends. It does not exist for that purpose It exists for the purpose of advancing the interests of the country confided to it, and there is no project which can be laid before this House which would do half as much for Canada as this will. It can no longer be said that the Liberal party is nothing but a party of critics who spent their time criticising the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Liberal party, Sir, in the days when that great transcontinental railway was being promoted, were not opposed to the idea, but to the methods employed. There were no more patriotic Canadians than the Dorions, the Blakes, the Haltons, and our present leader, who took part in the debate on the Canadian Pacific Railway project. What the Liberal party is now doing is to give expression to the wishes of the Canadian

people. It is putting another entrenched camp in British North America. Our present transcontinental system is within twenty-four hours' march of any American army which would invade this country, but by the projected system we shall be able, in case of necessity, to maintain our communications from ocean to ocean, which we cannot do at present. Ask the Minister of Militia what would happen between North Bay and Winnipeg if difficulties should intervene. Who would guard that immense territory to the north of Lake Superior, that hinterland which divides eastern from western Canada ? But once build this new railway, open up that northern region to the children of our soil, let the Canadians from our eastern provinces invade it, let them know that it is their home, and we shall have nothing to fear. We shall see then in that country what Martha Craig so graphically described in Western Ontario. Martha Craig uses these eloquent words:

> On either side, from the placid shore to the foothills of the protecting mountains, stretched fertile lands on which hundreds of thousands of fruit trees flourish. In this earthly paradise live a happy, rich and prosperous people. As we wander through the orchards in the springtime and inhale the delightful perfume of the breezes laden with drifts of apple blossoms, we can hardly realize that a hundred years ago this fertile land was a trackless forest, the abode of the Indian and the savage beast. But the hand of time has worked this transformation, using as its instruments the energy and perseverance of the Saxon. Those men who have made the wilderness blossom as the rose are true heroes. Theirs was not one dash of bravery and then victory. No, the battle they fought was waged from day to day from year to year, in heat and cold, without flinching and without turning back. These are true noblemen and heroes that all men delight to honour.

Those are the men we should imitate. It is in the fields of peace, of human activity, that we must use the energies of our young Canadian nation, and if the time should ever come when we must shoulder the musket, Canadians will be found ready to answer the call. But militarism is not the idea which we must foster in this country. What we require to develop are the arts of peace, and we can never do so more effectively than by putting through this measure, which will double the present inhabited area of Canada, almost double its resources, and unite our provinces in one great and happy land.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). I have very little fault to find, Mr. Speaker, with the tone of the address of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. Of course, there are many things on which we disagree, but I may say that in his anxiety to have the young men of his province kept in our own country, I am in full sympathy with the hon. gentleman. I should like to see our people kept in our own country and would do anything in my power to help the development of our country and institutions in such a way that our enterprising youth would find here more profitable employment than anywhere else. But I fear that my hon. friend is supporting a government that is not doing what it should to keep the young men in this country. I fear that the building of one transcontinental railway will do but little to find employment for the million settlers that he talks about as coming into his province during the next ten years. If he would support the Liberal-Conservative policy and give us protection, so that, instead of importing very much more per head of our population than, perhaps, any other country in the world, much more than the United States, we should manufacture in this country the goods we require, we should keep the money in our own country, and furnish employment for our own people. I think that is a sound doctrine. The hon. gentleman is the first Liberal I can remember having heard say that the Liberal party did not oppose the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Hon. G. W. Ross, who is premier of the province of Ontario, said, in a speech he made in this province not long ago, that the Liberal party had opposed the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that they regretted having done so. He said that Sir John A. Macdonald had been more far-seeing than they. These hon. gentlemen seem to be continually going astray and that is why the people of this country, I believe, will lose faith in them.

The hon. gentleman spoke about the $25,000,000 that was loaned to the Grand Trunk. I shall have something to say about that later on.

The hon. gentleman says that he cannot wait, that the Conservative policy is too slow, that our policy does not develop the country rapidly enough. If, instead of supporting the building of this transcontinental railway, he would support the policy proposed by the leader of the opposition, I am sure he would not have to wait nearly so long for the development of the country. If we were to build the Intercolonial Railway to connect with the Canada Atlantic and go on through to North Bay to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway, we should make the connection through much more quickly than can possibly be done under the government's policy. Why, we should be able to have this through service inside of one year. I do not see any reason why the government should have been in such a hurry to make a bargain before considering what they were making a bargain about. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) the other day said that they knew much more about the route through which this road is to run than the Conservative government did of the route for the Canadian Pacific Railway when they made the contract for the building of that line. I totally disagree with the hon. gentleman, and think that I can show in a moment

that he is altogether wrong. The bargain with British Columbia for the entrance of that province into confederation was finally settled on the 20th of July, 1871. And, on the 10th of April, 1872, the government had a report—I have a copy of it here—of the surveys of the whole length of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Mattawa to the Pacific coast. In contrast with this, the lack of information in possession of the government as to the route of this new road proves that they have shown undue haste in the matter.

Then, we come to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). He says he supports this railroad because it is not local or provincial, but national, and will tend to devlop a national spirit among Canadians and give us national aspirations. I did not know before that we were lacking particularly in these respects. I thought that every Canadian was feeling more and more strongly from day to day an honest pride in his country and was learning to see more clearly that we have as good a country as any other people in the world, and a great deal better than most.

Several of the hon. gentlemen on the other side criticised the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). I thought this criticism came with very bad grace, especially from the younger men, men who had followed the ex-minister through thick and thin, and who, if he had stayed in the government, would have been delighted to follow him still. I would like to know how they can justify their criticisms of the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair). What motives could have actuated him in the step he took ? He left a high position, one in which he wielded great influence. He was second to no man except the Prime Minister. He came into contact with the leading spirits of this country from one end of it to the other, and exerted great influence and wielded great power. Not only that, but in resigning his position he gave up his salary of $7,000 a year. What motives could he have but high and patriotic motives? He could not hope to do so well in opposition, at least for the present. Why should he have sacrificed so much if it were not that he had conscientious scruples and felt that he could not support this scheme, he believing that it was not in the best interest of the country.

We all remember very distinctly the great fight there was in the Railway Committee over the Grand Trunk charter. There was great opposition to many of the proposals made. The first application of the Grand Trunk was for a charter to build from North Bay to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and it did not want to build east of North Bay. But influences were brought to bear to bring them down to Quebec. Then the maritime provinces men said : You cannot get this charter unless the maritime provinces also participate in the benefits of this road. The government were in a dilemma. There was the Canadian Northern pressing them for support, and the result was that they guaranteed the bonds of that company. Then there was the Trans-Canada, which was making a big effort to build a transcontinental railway, and which had the backing of a large proportion of the members from the province of Quebec, the province that gives the government, practically, the whole of its majority. Then came the Grand Trunk with its demand. The government knew very well they could not give substantial aid to three lines, for the people would not stand it. The feeling in this country, I think, is positively and strongly against the bonusing of railways. The government had to do something, and I think they did, perhaps, the very worst thing they could do. if they had had enough backbone, they might have said to the millionaires who want to build railways in this country: You will have to do as the millionaires in the United States have to do. If you go into a business enterprise, you must depend upon your own capital and your own brains to make it pay. I am personally strongly opposed to bonusing railways or any other kind of company, because I think the time has passed for that sort of thing. In the United States, so far as I have been able to learn, no railway bonus has been granted by the federal government since 1871. I shall have more to say on that subject later on.

As I have said, we want to know what the haste was about. We have the word of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that this project loomed up and became part of the policy of the government only after half this session had passed away. Even when the First Minister announced the policy of the government in this House, I believe it came upon his followers like a bolt out of a clear sky. So careful were the government to keep it so that nobody should know anything about it that, when the leader of the opposition complained of want of courtesy on the part of the leader of the government in not giving him a copy of the Bill in advance that he might have an opportunity to look it over and be prepared to answer, the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) said that not a single member of the House outside of the government knew anything about the Bill or had even seen it. I do not know what there is about any public business that should make it necessary to keep it so secret. I thought the business of the parliament of Canada was to be done by the representatives of the people, that there should be no secret, that everything should be done openly and above-board. That is the doctrine I preach everywhere, that is the doctrine I hope I shall always be able to preach, because I think it is the proper doctrine. I do not see why that Bill was

not distributed like other Bills, why the resolutions were not placed on the Order paper in the ordinary way. I have not heard any excuse for it up to the present time, either from the First Minister, from the Minister of Finance or from the Minister of the Interior, all of whom have spoken. When the First Minister brought down his Bill to this House, he said :

To those who tell us, wait, wait, wait ; to those who advise us to pause, to consider, to reflect, to calculate and to inquire, our answer is : No.

Now, Sir, that does not seem to me to be a very sensible view to take of this great question. I think in view of the instructions of the good old book which says that every man should be able to give a reason of the hope that is in him, we would have been in better shape to follow them if he had not been keeping things so closely to himself. Then he goes on to say :

This is not a time for deliberation, this is a time for action. The flood tide is upon us that leads on to fortune ; if we let it pass it may never recur again.

Well, now, I would like to know what signs there are of a flood tide being upon us, or what need there is of this great hurry. I cannot see anything within the range of my vision except that these railway magnates have been chasing them up and down, here and there, and pressing their claims upon them.

If we let it pass the voyage of our national life, bright as it is to-day, will be bound in shallows.

Well, what a pity.

We cannot wait, because time does not wait. . . . . It is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late. . . . and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land.

Now, Sir, we have entered into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. We have agreed, as I understand, to build from Moncton to Winnipeg at government expense, while we give a charter to the Grand Trunk Pacific to build from Winnipeg west to the Pacific coast. Now it has been presented to this House by several hon. members that the Grand Trunk Pacific will have their share of the road built long before the section can be built from Winnipeg to Moncton ; and it has been pointed out that there is no provision in the contract whereby the Grand Trunk Pacific will operate the eastern part of the road until it is all finished. Now the question is : What will they do with it ? Will they keep it lying idle, put the rails on, and let them rust, and have nothing to do with it ? Not only that, but the Grand Trunk Pacific will be busy gathering its trade in the North-west, they will be bringing it to Winnipeg and finding an outlet for it. As was pointed out very clearly the other night by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), after they find it they will carry it into the United States, where they have lines running to St. Paul, and they can easily make their through-connections with that system so that they will ultimately take it through the United States to the seaports. In that case what will become of the all-Canadian route ? Now, it seems to me that after all, the ex-Minister of Railways took the proper position. He says that if you want to go into this arrangement, let us say to parliament, we are prepared to build another transcontinental railway if it is found to be necessary. Let us ask for an appropriation to explore the country and to survey a route, then we will be in a position to act intelligently. I think that was the proper course. I understand that the government tried every means possible to induce the ex-minister not to retire, but to retain his position, and he laid down the principles on which he would stay, and they were very strong ones, and they were pretty sensible, in my judgment. The letter of the ex-minister of the 16th of July, 1903, you will find in the 'Hansard' on page 6743:

I would require that the government should abandon its present intention :—

1st. Of building or authorizing the building of a line of railway to Moncton, which would be paralleling and destroying the Intercolonial; or building or authorizing the building of any other line of railway more remote from the Intercolonial, until the need of such latter railway becomes apparent, and proper surveys and an estimate of its cost are first made and thoroughly considered.

Now, we have been spending, as everybody knows, a large amount of money on the Intercolonial, I believe since these gentlemen came into office they have spent $15,000,000. This very last year they had an appropriation for $3,260,000 more to be spent on the Intercolonial. Before they had made up their minds to go into this new scheme they brought down in their estimates another appropriation for the present year which, if they are going to build a new railway and destroy the usefulness of the Intercolonial, I do not think they will require. They ask this year for $2,054,550 for repairs on the Intercolonial, yet some of the hon. members opposite have said that if they built this road it would ruin the Intercolonial altogether, and in a country such as that through which the Intercolonial passes I think one railway can do all the business that is to be done. Then the ex-minister lays down his second proposition :

2nd. The idea of immediately proceeding with a railway from Quebec to Winnipeg. The government should be content with declaring itself in favour of the policy of building a government line from Quebec to the prairies, and across the prairies to the Pacific coast, as soon as the need shall arise ; and in the meantime

that parliament be asked for an amount to enable a thorough exploration of the country to be made, so that it might be possible to judge whether or not a suitable traffic producing route could be found through this district, and its cost and the character and conditions of the country through which it is to pass ascertained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that statement commends itself to the common sense of every business man. But I want to say one thing more. While the Railway Committee was fighting hard to get a charter through, supposing they were honestly providing a charter for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, it appears that the First Minister was making a bargain with Mr. Hays, the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway. I think any person who knows the two men will agree with me that while the leader of the government might be a better statesman in some respects than Mr. Hays, he is not in any way equal to him so far as railway matters are concerned, and I think it was absolute folly for the First Minister to try to make a bargain. I think it is evident, as was pointed out by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) the other night, that this bargain was very one-sided, and evidently the contract between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific was drawn up by the solicitors of the company.

Now, Sir, no man in the government pretends to know anything about railways, except the ex-Minister of Railways, who has had a large experience, and who is well known to be an able man. The idea of the First Minister ignoring him and trusting to his own knowledge, in pretending to be an expert and to be a good business man, is absurd. I know that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said that the right hon. Prime Minister had a perfect right to ignore his cabinet, or any member of his cabinet, if he saw fit. Nobody disputes that, but the question is was it wise, was it in the best interests of this country, was it in the best interests of the government itself ? My own impression is that it was not. I think if you have an expert at any particular thing, connected with any business you have to do, you had better use his knowledge and influence to keep you right. That is my view, and that is the course that every successful business man must pursue. If he does not know how to do a thing himself he calls in the best assistance he can find. But, Sir, there was no calling in about it. The minister was on hand, and he was prepared to do his part and do it well. Everybody who knows him will admit that. There was another request that would have had to be complied with if he had stayed in the government :

That the policy of giving a present guarantee or other aid to the company to build a railway and continuation of the Quebec-Winnipeg line through the fertile prairie district, the most valuable and promising section of the whole system, should not now be entertained, and that the final decision of the matter be deferred until it became reasonably clear that settlement along the probable route of such railway would justify its construction.

I think that is just as sensible as the rest, and that it is on the right lines. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals points out the folly of pouring money into this enterprise, notwithstanding these surpluses we have had year after year, of which the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) is so proud. But it is not difficult to have a surplus if you only keep your books in the right way. All you have to do is to charge enough to capital account and then you will have a surplus, because you can take the balance out of income. The government has been particularly fortunate since they came in, because they have had an overflowing treasury, but I am afraid they have not been able to make very good use of it. They have listened too much to the demands of what are called the grafters and the wire pullers. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has told us that the government must adopt these terms or he would retire from the government. I admire his pluck, I admire the courage of a man who will sacrifice, not only social position, but a large salary in the interests of the country. There was an effort made by the government, or by some member of the government, to induce him to stay in. The hon. gentleman said in his letter that there was a proposition made in Council, or by some of his colleagues, to him that if he could not endorse their policy he could simply sit by and allow somebody else to put the Bill through the House, and he would have nothing to do with it. I admire the pluck of a man who would stand out against any such insinuation, because, as the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said, if he had done that he would have been worse than the others. He would have been dishonest through and through. But he took a more courageous and more manly course. He has thrown all the responsibility of this policy upon the right hon. Prime Minister and his ministers, and they have to bear it. I think if the government had carried out the policy announced in the speech from the Throne, that they were prepared to appoint a royal commission to investigate the transportation question, they would have had the support of both sides of the House, because this has been a burning question and it has been discussed in this House for a good many years. That was a proposition that was worth considering, and not only was it worth considering, but the transportation question should have been submitted to the men who are the best informed upon that question and upon the wants of the country in that regard. That was a promise that was made by the whole government, but the right hon. leader of the government did not seem to be nearly so anxious about his own promises as he pretended to be about a promise which he said was made by this parliament on a former occasion.

He said that there was a promise to build a railway from Salisbury to Fredericton made in 1885, and that it was to implement that promise that he introduced this Bill. As the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) pointed out very clearly the other night, the Bill providing for the construction of the Salisbury-Fredericton line passed this House, but it did not pass the Senate, and that consequently there was no promise contained in the Bill as far as this parliament was concerned. It was only a promise that the House was willing to fulfil, provided the other Chamber agreed to it. The right hon. leader of the government told us of a resolution that he had moved in reference to the short line going through Maine, which was as follows :

In the opinion of this House, additional surveys are requisite in order to a sound decision for the short line railway, and it would be premature to adopt any line before further surveys have been made.

Why has the right hon. gentleman gone back on the views that he held in 1895 ? He considered it necessary that the route of the short line, which had been surveyed once or twice before, and perhaps oftener, should be again surveyed ; yet he has completed a bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company before he knows where the line is to be located, or before he knows how much it will cost, and which is going through a country of which he himself has no knowledge whatever. But there are other promises which he and his party have made. I recollect reading a speech that he made in Winnipeg, I think, in 1895, when he said that when the Liberal party came into power they would submit a plebiscite, and that if it carried they would give the country prohibition if it cost the Liberal party power for ever. He did carry out part of that pledge. He took into his cabinet a gentleman who he thought would give him weight with the temperance people. He took in the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher). He also submitted a plebiscite to the people, and it was carried by good majorities in every province except one. Why is he so anxious to carry out the pledges made by Sir John Macdonald and by the Conservative party and to ignore his own ? These are things for the right hon. gentleman to explain, because these are things that it is difficult for the people to understand. I recollect that he made a speech at Toronto, in which he said: We are going to reduce the public expenditure year by year from one, two, three, and the Hon. Mr. Mills says $4,000,000 per annum. Has the right hon. gentleman and his party implemented that promise ? Have they reduced the public expenditure ? It is about $20,000,000 per annum more now than it was then, and still they were howling on every platform all over the country about the extravagance of the Conservative party. Now, the right hon. gentleman went to Winnipeg—I think it was at this same time, in 1895—and he said : I come to preach to you a new gospel, the gospel of free trade as they have it in England. I would like to know how he has implemented that promise. These are only a few of the promises made by the Liberal party. They talked about superannuation ; that was one of their hobbies, and I recollect that Mr. McMullen, now Senator McMullen, used almost to weep on every platform about how the public money was being spent, and he said that civil servants who had been superannuated, and who were able-bodied men, were walking around the streets of Ottawa drawing larger salaries than they could earn if they were working at any ordinary calling. He said : When we come into power we will change all that. Since the Liberal party have come in they superannuated a great many more civil servants than we did during the same number of years.

I just want to refer to a resolution and I think the Bill passed through the House the other night. The judges previously had been allowed superannuation at two thirds their salaries. Well, Sir, that was not sufficient for these gentlemen. These men had had the best of it all their lives at least since they had been on the bench where many of them were making two or three times as much as they had made before they got on the bench and the other night a Bill was passed by which they are allowed to be superannuated at full pay. It does seem to me that these people have entirely forgotten their principles.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker. When you left the Chair at one o'clock, I was speaking about the question of superannuation and about some of the broken promises of the government. There is another important matter to which I would like to refer and that is the promise that was made in the speech from the Throne, that was put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General. In that speech the government pledged itself to appoint a commission to investigate the transportation question. Now Sir, that promise has not been fulfilled nor has any one of the speakers on the government side so far as I am aware explained any reason why it has not been fulfilled, or what has caused the change of front. I think, as I said before, that I regard this as one of the most important things they could have done, and one that would certainly have met with the unanimous support of this side of the House, because I think whether we are in opposition, I mean the Conservative party, or whether we are on the government benches, there is one thing you can always depend on, and that is that we are for the best interests of Canada. We have not taken up the popular

cries and deserted our principles which we advocated when in power. Although the government has largely adopted protection and has forsaken their principles and their promises we have stood true to the principle of protection and we intend to do so, and I think that perhaps before another session the government itself will find it necessary to adopt the course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a document here, a copy of the Order in Council assented to by His Excellency on the 19th of May, 1903. It is very important and although it has been read by other hon. gentlemen in the House still, as I desire to have it in my speech in order that it may be read by those whom I desire to read it, I shall ask permission of the House to again place it on 'Hansard':

On a report dated April 6, 1903, from the Minister of Public Works, stating that he had under consideration questions affecting the transportation of Canadian products to the markets of the world through and by Canadian ports with a view of placing the Canadian producer in a positon to compete, and compete successfully, through all Canadian channels with the producers and exporters of other countries.

The minister submits that it may be assumed that grain and other products will naturally seek their markets by the cheapest routes, and therefore the method of attaining the object desired should be to make the Canadian routes cheaper and more convenient than competing routes.

That, the development of North-western Canada has manifested the inability of existing Canadian transportation agencies to take care of Canadian products.

That our agricultural exports can only command the prices over seas to which their natural excellence entitles them when they cease to be confounded and confused with the inferior and often adulterated articles produced elsewhere; and to preserve their separate identity they must go through Canadian channels.

The minister further states that the questions to be considerd are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.

This particular part, Mr. Speaker, of this order or report of the Privy Council looks particularly to the export of our products in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and I think that is what the government had in view at the time this report was made. I think that is what they had in view when the Grand Trunk Railway asked for their charter from North Bay into Manitoba and the North-west, but the force of circumstances apparently caused them to change front, and they went in for the all rail route from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

This involves the consideration of their transportation:—

From place of production to Canadian seaports.

From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.

From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.

From Canadian seaports to Europe.

From place of production through Canadian ports on the Pacific.

As it affects the products of the eastern provinces of Canada it involves their movement:—

To the seaports.

From the seaports to Europe.

It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding:—

The conditions of original shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding such shipments.

The storage requirements of lake, river and ocean ports.

The harbour facilities of the inland lakes, rivers and Atlantic and Pacific ports.

The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally, any improvement, enlargements, or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.

The minister further states that in making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

The forces operating against the attainment of all Canadian transport, namely:—

Competition by United States railways;

Competition by United States vessels from Lake Superior ports;

Diversion of Canadian products through eastern outlets to Boston, Portland and other United States ports, should be investigated, and the best and most economical methods used by our competitors should be carefully studied and reported upon.

The minister apprehends that in these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its own products, and it is thought that the most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts who may be appointed and authorized under the provisions of chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

The minister recommends, therefore, that a commission be appointed consisting of Sir William Van Horne, John Bertram and Harold Kennedy, of whom Sir William Van Horne shall be chairman and convener, for the purpose of making such inquiry, obtaining such evidence and information and making such reports and recommendations as in their opinion (and subject to any further instructions which may be given by the Governor General in Council) the exigencies of the reference may require.

That is a report to which I attach a good deal of importance. We have not yet heard it satisfactorily explained, and I would like if possible, to impress upon the other side of the House the importance of explaining why these experts were not chosen to give us the necessary information. The right hon. the First Minister, when he laid this matter before the House, said:

Most of our critics look upon this scheme simply as a commercial venture to be judged by the only rule of profit and loss. We look upon

it as a work of a national character necessitated by the status of Canada in the year 1903, just as the Intercolonial Railway was necessitated by the status of Canada at the opening of confederation, and just as the Canadian Pacific Railway was necessitated by the bargain made with the province of British Columbia.

The right hon. gentleman told us in another place that he did not expect that this would be a commercial road—that it would not be able to carry grain all the way from the North-west to the seaboard at as low a rate as it could be carried by utilizing the waterways. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), in his speech, laid great stress on this all-rail route on Canadian soil as a commercial railway, which, if properly equipped, would be able to compete with the part rail and part waterway routes. Now, it is a very serious question whether such a road as has been advocated by the hon. member for North Norfolk and by other hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House can be built. I can quite understand the position taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk, because he has spoken so often upon so many sides of almost every question, that he is getting a little more guarded as he grows older. He specified a kind of railway which I think he must have known it would be almost impossible to build through the section of country through which the proposed road is projected.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman had better be careful about assertions that he does not know.

Mr. WILSON. I only give my opinion ; the hon. gentleman is not obliged to take it unless it agrees with his. The suggestion is made that perhaps the hon. gentleman has changed his opinion again. However, that is not a matter of very great concern just now. Another thing that I think surprised every person when this great scheme was launched on this House and the country was that the First Minister told us that it was only a matter of paying interest on the cost for about seven years, and that the total outlay that the country would be called on to make would be $13,000,000. Well, Sir, that was a most astounding statement to make. It was nearly as bad as the statement once made by an hon. member of this House to the effect that the government would be able to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway for a dollar apiece. I did not just understand what he meant by that, nor do I understand what the right hon. First Minister means when he talks of building a railway through this country from ocean to ocean at a cost to the country of only $13,000,000. That was the statement he made, however ; and it was largely backed up by the hon. Minister of Finance, who, when he comes down to details, gives us reasons for believing that it will cost a good deal more, and that it will involve a considerable increase to the national debt. The hon. Minister of Finance first gave the cost as follows :

Cost of Winnipeg to Moncton section	$54,609,677
Interest for seven years	11,468,030
Share of cost of the Quebec bridge	2,000,000
Interest on that for seven years	324,246
Guarantee of bonds on the Mountain section	2,334,575
Total	$70,736,528

Now, this is what will be added to the public debt. There is another matter that all the speakers on the government side seem to have overlooked. The government made a bargain with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company under which that company shall have the use of the railway for seven years from the time of completion for nothing. That is to say, we will pay the interest on the cost of building the road during that time, and if it cannot earn money enough over working expenses to pay the interest for the next three years, that will be added to capital expenditure, and will be charged up against the company. But I have not heard that there is any provision for the time of building the road. I do not see how they can possibly commence building the road until it is surveyed, and it will not be surveyed, under any circumstances, in less than one year and the shortest computation made by any person for the building of the road is five years. So that you may easily add to the ten years for which the government is providing the interest, the interest on say one-half the cost of construction for two and a half or three years more. This would add considerably to the cost of the railway, even taking the figures which the hon. gentleman has given us.

I have another authority, who not long ago was considered a very great authority on the other side of the House—a gentleman who probably knows more about railways than any of those whom he left behind in the cabinet or perhaps than any on that side of the House. I refer to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He made a speech in this House in which he estimates the cost of this railway. Here are his figures :

Cost of the Winnipeg to Moncton section	$65,000,000
Interest during construction	7,800,000
Ten years free rental	19,500,000
One-half per cent loss on interest during term of contract	18,500,000
Interest guaranteed and to be paid on mountain section	4,050,000
Guarantee on prairie section	9,750,000
Guarantee on mountain section	13,500,000
Interest on prairie section during half period of construction	750,000
Total	$138,850,000

It is just possible that there is one item which should not properly be charged, because it is to be hoped that the government

will be able to borrow money as cheaply as they lend it. If not the country will have to pay the difference. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals put in $18,500,000 for the loss of one half per cent, which he expects the country will have to pay, over and above what it will get from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

I have here an estimate made by a newspaper, which some people say was started for the purpose of defending this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme. I refer to the Toronto 'News.' There is one thing certain, that it has been very favourable to this scheme, and I think on the whole, has put the best side out, and it has done so in such a way that while it does not come out straight for the road, its criticisms led people to believe that it is all right. It cavils a little here and there, but concludes that after all, the scheme is the best one that could have been devised, under the circumstances. The newspaper gives the cost of construction as follows :

From Moncton to Winnipeg..	$54,000,000
Interest during construction..	4,215,000
Interest during ten years in operation..	14,233,320
Interest on mountain section bonds, ten years..	4,744,440
Total..	$77,193,450

In this calculation, the interest is made up favourably to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and the total amount of interest they allow is $23,193,450. That is pretty well up to double the amount the First Minister said it would cost.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question ? Does he not know that that paper is owned by well known Conservatives of Toronto ?

Mr. WILSON. I know that, but I know that he is a very intimate friend of the man who is very much interested in this work. He is the bosom friend of Senator Cox. And the hon. gentleman will remember that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said that Senator Cox would not wait.

I wish to give another extract from a paper which is not so favourable to this road. I refer to the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.' That paper has made a statement of the cost of this road to the country, and its figures are as follows :

From Moncton to Winnipeg..	$ 72,000,000
Seven years without rent..	17,640,000
Three years without rent..	7,500,000
Forty years at 3 per cent rental—less of one-half per cent..	12,640,000
Seven years interest on bonds of mountain section..	5,040,000
Total	$114,880,000

This calculation made by the Toronto 'Mail and Empire' shows that we will pay the interest during the duration of this lease, amounting to $42,888,000, but it is just possible that we will get the money at three instead of at three and a half. If we do, we will have to reduce that amount by $12,640,000. In any event suppose we borrow the money at the same rate as we lent, the interest alone will cost $20,180,000.

After carefully looking over the 'Globe' from day to day for an estimate of the cost of the road, I have failed to find any. The best it would do was to give the figures on the Moncton and Winnipeg section, estimated by the First Minister at $13,000,000 then it said that on the mountain section we will have to pay interest $3,780,000. But even that calculation brings the cost up to $16,780,000.

I cannot see any good reason why we should give any bonus at all, especially on the prairie section. Why should we pay a bonus or pay anything on the debentures of this road, which is to be owned by this company. It is a well known fact that the United States since 1871 have not been paying bonuses. Does anybody pretend to say that the United States have not been going on developing their country, that they have not been building railways. I do not think so. I am of opinion that the United States have got down to a business basis. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) gave us last night a lot of information about what the constitution provides so far as the giving of bonuses to railways by the different states is concerned. Many states have no power under the constitution to give bonuses, and others are so hedged about that it is almost impossible for them to grant aid to railways.

This scheme is, as the Finance Minister said, a leap in the dark. I cannot see why he was in such a hurry, because we cannot have the surveys immediately ; and until we get the railway built, we will get nothing from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I would like to know if anybody thinks that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would not lease the road three or four years from now just as well. Why, I think, it is folly. No business concern would attempt to do business on these principles ; or, if they did, I think they would soon find themselves in the position of some institutions which are now receiving bonuses from the hands of this free trade government to help them float their enterprise.

I wish to say a few words on a subject which I intended to refer to early in my address—the proposed Yukon Railway. This was referred to last night and a good deal of sport was made of statements made by some members of this House a few years ago about the number of people who would go into that country. I have shown you that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said it was not the policy of this government to give land grants to the railways. I can remember when it was their policy, and not very long ago either. Every hon. member who has been in this House through two parliaments can remem-

ber the bargain made with Mackenzie & Mann for the building of the Yukon Railway. That bargain was made only a few days before meeting of parliament. The government did then as they have done in the case now before us—they signed a hard and fast bargain for the building of a railway for a certain subsidy. But the result in the case of the Yukon Railway was that the road was not built, and this country was mulct in damages to the extent of $300,000. One would think that this government would have learned a lesson from this experience. Under this bargain made with Mackenzie & Mann in 1898, the government agreed to give 3,750,000 acres of land in the Yukon district for the building of the road. On the 7th of July, 1898, the government passed an Order in Council fixing the minimum price of the land to be sold there at $10 per acre, and they would only sell 40 acres to any one individual in the same place. According to their own figuring then, the bonus they were giving to Mackenzie & Mann amounted to $37,500,000—and this for the building of a short narrow gauge railway. That is the kind of business men we have in this excellent business government.

The hon. gentleman from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) compared this bargain with the bargain for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think there is any ground for such comparison. Before the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway we had only entered upon confederation. Previous to that time we had been a few scattered provinces that had not much to do with one another. Circumstances arose which made it to the interest of all the provinces to federate. That involved the buying of the North-west Territory from the Hudson's Bay Company, which was done for about $1,500,000. It was very desirable that we should have British Columbia enter the confederacy, and they did enter it on the 20th of July, 1871. As a matter of course, it was part of the bargain with British Columbia that we should build a railway to connect that province with the others, just as it was part of the bargain with the maritime provinces that we should build the Intercolonial Railway. We could not have had confederation without these two railways. And when the Prime Minister speaks about the necessity for this proposed railway being as great as that of the Canadian Pacific Railway when it was built, it seems to me he is plainly and entirely mistaken. I do not see the necessity for this road, nor do I hear any outcry for it from any part of the country. The ex-Minister of Railways says there is no demand from his part of the country, and certainly I have not heard of any demand for it from Ontario, except on the part of interested persons. It is said that we made a bad bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We gave them $25,000,000 cash, 25,000,000 acres of land, and a piece of railway we had built. I am credibly informed that the Mackenzie government offered even more than this, and could not get a taker.

Now, I would like to give the opinion of a gentleman who is fresh from the electors of his own province. I refer to Hon. Mr. Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba. At a convention in Toronto the other day, he spoke on the subject of this Grand Trunk Pacific project. He said he believed that he spoke for the people of Manitoba—and he is a railway commissioner of that province. He could not see any great benefit that this road was going to do to Manitoba more than any other road would do. He does not doubt the patriotism of the right hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in proposing this scheme, but when that right hon. gentleman proposes to spend $100,000,000 to benefit the farmers of the North-west, Mr. Roblin failed to see where that benefit came in under this scheme. He pointed out that it now costs to carry grain to Montreal by rail, 19 cents per bushel, while it can be carried by rail and water for 14 cents per bushel. He believes that he himself and the people of Manitoba are as patriotic as Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his friends, but they cannot see any good reason why they should be compelled to send grain by all-rail route to the sea-board at a cost of 5 cents per bushel more than it would cost them by the other route. Nobody believes that they will do it. You can make any law you like, but commerce knows no law but its own; and it is absurd to expect commerce to go by the more costly route. This principle is manifested in all the walks of life.

I spoke a short time ago of the Toronto 'News' being rather favourable to this railway. But that paper begins to sound a warning as to the route through New Brunswick. It says:

> Warnings have begun to come from New Brunswick that the building of a commercial route through the wilderness is impossible. Abundant evidence exists as to the nature of the country. In 1865 the whole question was debated with great thoroughness. The projectors of the Intercolonial Railway were anxious to find a practicable line across central New Brunswick. They were fairly driven to the alternative of an extreme frontier or an extreme coastal route.

If this were fully discussed in 1865, and no route that was thought feasible could be found, what is the use of talking about it now? The country is not changed so that you could make to-day a commercial road such as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) talks about. And we do not want to spend a mountain of money simply to save a few miles of railway. While our time is very valuable, I do not think it is so valuable as that. Here is another extract from the same paper:

> Central New Brunswick is a mass of rugged and irregular hills, from which flow numerous

rivers to empty into the Baie des Chaleurs, the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy, by way of the St. John River. Some of these hills are 2,000 feet high.

I would like to know how we are to make a practical railway over hills of that description.

Now, I would like to give a little attention to an old parliamentarian, a gentleman who has been in this House a long time, and who, as I think hon. members who have been in this House for two or three parliaments will understand, has been on almost every side of every question at different times. I speak of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He issued an address to his people in the last general election, in which he said:

I feel called upon to announce it as my firm conviction that our public improvements are now as far advanced as the interests of the country, in the near future, are likely to require, and that the time has arrived more fully to redeem the pledges of the Liberal party by practicing greater economy in public expenditures and by reducing the public debt.

The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

The expenditure shall not in any case, in my opinion, exceed the amount of the revenue, and the public debt should be reduced each year to at least the extent of the sinking fund.

This hon. gentleman—I am sorry to say he is not here—has never failed to shoot as the First Minister asked him, and to vote in the same way, irrespective of whether it was costing this country a great deal more than it ought to. That was no part of the consideration.

The government was fortunate in assuming office just at the beginning of a period of prosperity, which not only applies to us, but to all commercial nations, and which it is well to realize has been due to the blessings of Providence, and to causes beyond the control of the Canadian government.

It is the duty of the government under such circumstances to follow the example of a wise ruler of old, and in years of plenty, provide for meeting the exigencies of succeeding years of scarcity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that was good advice, that was the right kind of an address to the people, if you are going to publish anything, because the people are very fond of hearing public men say that they are looking after their interest, and seeing that the public moneys are not wasted. But when the people come to realize as they must, that under this economical government there has been a vast increase in the expenditure, they will begin to consider that such men as the hon. member for North Norfolk have not carried out the pledges made to them. Now, Sir, this same hon. gentleman made a speech which has been referred to a good many times in this House, on the 26th day of last May, in which he pointed out the impossibility of carrying grain on an all-rail route in comparison with that from Port Arthur by water. He gives us figures, and he tells us that wheat can be carried from Duluth or Port Arthur to Buffalo, and put in an elevator for 1¼ to 1½ cents per bushel, and 2 cents is more than an average rate. He said:

So you have the possibility of carrying wheat from Port Arthur to New York for three cents a bushel, or at most not more than four cents a bushel.

Now, I would like to know if anybody believes that this new railway that is to be built by the government will be able to carry grain at that rate from Port Arthur, or west of that, to Quebec, or St. John, or Halifax. I do not think there is any man in this country believes it, I do not believe that the people who are promoting this scheme believe it. He says further:

Now these are conditions which render it in my opinion impossible at present to compete with that route. It is useless to think of hauling wheat from a point as far west as Port Arthur by an all-rail route to Quebec or to Halifax, at prices such as I have quoted with regard to the American lines.

Now, the hon. gentleman apparently has made this route his study, but when he made that speech defining the government's policy on this railway, he did not take into account the kind of country over which the road was passing, and he knew that he was perfectly safe in saying that if they build a railway such as I have described, and put on cars and locomotives such as I have described, there will be no difficulty. But he knew, I think, that it is utterly impossible to build such a railway, and it is just as impossible to carry wheat, or grain, or other products from the west at prices such as those charged by an all-rail route. He went a little further in that speech on the 26th of May and said:

I do not believe that we are in a condition to-day, even if we decided to improve the Ottawa river valley route, to decide what are the proper conditions upon which to proceed. . . . Let us wait until we have the decision of these men as to the proper course to pursue.

Now, I agree with him fully in that part of his speech. Then this government, when they were looking around to get commissioners to investigate this transportation question, the very first man they approached was Sir Wm. Van Horne, and I would say a wise choice, but it seems he refused to act. Sir Wm. Van Horne has made a statement, and I will read from it.

The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or any other all-Canadian route, will never voluntarily carry a carload of wheat by the all-railway route around the great lakes to an eastern Canadian port for shipment abroad, for the simple reason that it will never pay any road to do so.

Now, I think that no matter what we may think of this route, we all respect the opinion of Sir Wm. Van Horne, and I feel

that here he states the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Then the Montreal 'Gazette' comments on his views :

In these few words are summarized all the necessary objections to the proposed government railway. If it cannot haul wheat there is not the slightest use spending $75,000,000 on its construction. It cannot haul wheat because the rates it will be compelled to meet will render it necessary for it to make its charges as low as a fifth of a cent per ton per mile, a rate utterly out of the question. With grain eliminated there is not sufficient traffic available and will not be in a score of years to pay the cost of maintenance.

Now, that is a fair proposition in reference to this railway, that if it was built to-morrow we could not get freight for it at a rate that would pay expenses, I do not think we could get freight that would pay running expenses. I cannot tell though, strange things happen sometimes. I would not like to venture the statement that many a Liberal member ventured in the old days when the Conservative government were promoting an undertaking to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, namely, that it would never pay for the axle grease. I am not familiar enough with railway business to venture an absolute opinion of my own on this question; in fact I think I am in the same position as most other members of this House. Now, there was a very good article in the Montreal 'Star' on this question, the heading of which was 'How much ?—Where ?—When ?—What for ?'

The debate on the government's 'trunk line' scheme ought not to close until some one has told us authoritatively what it is going to cost, where—exactly—it is expected to run, how long it is expected it will take to make the surveys, and when it is expected to be ready for use.

I don't think that so far we have been told that from any quarter.

It is a most remarkable situation—a vast government proposal laid before the country, including the spending of many millions and the building of a railway half way across the continent; and yet no statement as to how many millions are to be spent, or precisely where the railway is to be built.

I think if such a proposition as this had been brought down in the old days when the hon. gentlemen opposite sat on this side of the House, we would never have heard the last of it, indeed I do not think that the government could have got their estimates through the House unless they had given a great deal more information than we have been given in the present case. I feel that that would be a proper thing, because, after all, we are only the custodians of the people's money. We are here to do their business and we ought to do it in a business like way. We ought not to beat about the bush, we ought not to take any byway, but we ought to be prepared to deal frankly in all such matters as this. I have several other quotations but I will defer them to a future day.

Now, I want to deal a little more particularly with the bonus view of the question. We have been spending in this country very large sums of money in assisting railways. Cash bonuses have been granted amounting to $201,372,591. Loans have been made on favourable terms to the extent of $24,027,800, and grants of public lands have been made amounting in all to 52,064,650 acres. Allowing $100,000,000 as the value of the land and neglecting the advantage of government credit we have the sum of $300,000,000, as the total cash value of subsidies in land and money granted by the federal, provincial and municipal governments of Canada, chiefly within the last twenty years.

If the railways of the United States had been as highly subsidized per mile as the Canadian roads have been they would have got $3,500,000,000 from their government, but they got wisdom earlier apparently than we did because they have stopped it almost altogether. The Dominion government has bonused railways in this country to the extent of $9,166 per mile, the provincial governments to the extent of $1,757 per mile, and the municipalities to the extent of $873 per mile, or a total of $11,796 per mile of railway in this country. It seems to me that is a considerable amount of money to be paid out by the Dominion of Canada. I would like to give the House the opinions of some men who have had some experience of railway business in reference to bonuses. Mr. James J. Hill is a well known railway man in the United States whose name is almost a household word in this country as well as in the United States ; in fact, I may say that this is his country because I understand that he was originally a Canadian and I am sorry that we have lost him, because I think he is a pretty good man as he has done a good deal to develop the country in which he now lives and at the same time he has done a good deal for himself. Mr. Hill, in an authorized interview, declared that any railway that needed a subsidy before being built was not needed in the country through which it ran. If Mr. Hill could build a railway and pay his way across the continent without a dollar of bonus I do not see why we should be so free with our money as to give every tu-penny ha'penny railway in the country a bonus of $3,200 a mile no matter whether it parallels another line or not. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy is opposed to granting subsidies to railways. He excuses the Canadian Pacific Railway because it was built at a time when such an undertaking could not hope to pay within twenty years. If a Grand Trunk Railway subsidy is given then, he says, the Canadian Pacific Railway will ask subsidies for its various branches building or to be built. Subsidies are a gift from the people, for a railway

when built cares not for the wishes of the people. The fact is the people practically rear up the railway which when finished gets away from their care. The principle is wrong. All right to aid in the construction of a railway, but every dollar of aid should be returnable in full if not with interest. The doing away with subsidies would do away with jobbing in railway charters and railway promoting. There would be nothing in the railway but what a business man could get out. A railway would be a business proposition. Railways would then be built where they were needed and not where there would not be sufficient traffic to warrant their building. There may be places where it is desirable for one reason or another to have a railway that could not be run as a successful business proposition. Then the government should build the road itself. That is what they are doing now. They are building the lean end. That is what the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals says. I shall now deal with the changes that the government have made in the law respecting railway bonuses since they came into power. Bonuses were very unpopular in the country when they came in and some of their leading men were pledged against the bonusing of railways. They therefore came to the conclusion to put the bonus in another form. I shall quote from 60-61 Vic., chap. 4, of the statutes of 1897, sec. 7 :

Any company receiving a subsidy as aforesaid, in excess of $3,200 per mile, shall be bound to carry Her Majesty's mails for a term of ten years free of charge over the portion of the railways subsidized.

Then they amended this in 1899 by 62-63 Vic., chap. 7, sec. 8 :

Every company receiving a subsidy under this Act, its successors or assigns, and any person or company controlling or operating the railway, or portions of railway subsidized under this Act, shall each year furnish to the government of Canada transportation for men, supplies, materials and mails over the portion of its line in respect of which it has received such subsidy, and whenever required, shall furnish mail cars properly equipped, for such mail service, and such transportation and service shall be performed at such rates as are agreed upon between the minister of the department of the government for which such service is being performed and the company performing it, and in case of disagreement, then at such rates as are approved by the Governor in Council ; and in towards payment for such charges the government of Canada shall be credited by the company with a sum equal to 3 per cent per annum of subsidy received by the company under this Act.

As nearly as I can make out and I am not quite sure of the year 1901, the last year for which I have the figures as I took the statement from the Year-book for that year, hon. gentlemen opposite have voted in subsidies the following amounts :

1897, subsidies voted by parliament ...			$7,671,683
1899	"	"	6,957,487
1900	"	"	3,493,000
1901	"	"	8,491,966
Total amount voted..			$26,608,136

The last is from Year-book, 1901.

They have paid out on account of these subsidies the following amounts :

In 1897..	$ 480,156 11
" 1898..	2,641,040 77
" 1899..	1,253,559 67
" 1900..	1,509.119 99
" 1901..	2,512,329 00
" 1902..	2,093,439 00
" 1903 to April 1st	1,368,480 34
Total..	$11,853,624 88

I took occasion to ask a question with reference to whether this interest was being paid or not and this qustion was answered on the 3rd of June, 1903. The question was :

1. On what part or parts of the bonuses or subsidies, voted in 1896 and up to 1st of May, 1903, was interest payable ?. How much of each of the said bonuses or subsidies, on which interest is payable, has been paid ; and what are the details with reference to each railway ?

2. What is the amount of interest paid in each of these years by each of the said railways on the bonuses or subsidies they have received ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The answer to both questions is that no interest has been paid on these accounts.

The point is this : If we pass Acts of parliament and the government perfectly ignore them and do not enforce the conditions on which money is paid out, how are we going to remedy such a condition. There is only one way, to educate the people up to see that these people are not to be trusted and to put them out. I say that when public men are elected to represent the people when they fail to carry out their pledges they should be dealt with just as you deal with a man with whom you are doing business. When he does not do as he agreed to do, quit dealing with them, and if you have suffered damages you can collect them from him. Now, Sir, I asked another question on this point or nearly the same point. I wanted to know if mail matter had been carried free by these roads and this question was answered on the 9th of July, 1903, by the Postmaster General and I do not think his answer is much. I think it was one of these off-hand answers which he gave without even asking his department about the matter. The answer is :

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir Wm. Mulock). It is not the case that any railways that have received aid from the government, under legislation passed since 1896, have not complied with all the conditions attaching to such aids, but they have rendered the services required to be rendered under the terms of any aids granted to them.

Now, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, how anybody is going to reconcile these two answers ? One said that no interest has been paid, although that was the condition on which they got the money. The Postmaster General on the other hand says they have fulfilled all the conditions. Now, they cannot both be right, and I prefer taking the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the reason that he brought an answer from his department and gave it to the House and he did not give an off-hand answer as did the Postmaster General.

Now, it has been said by some people that we cannot build railways in this country unless we give a bonus, that people will not build without aid. A question was asked by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the House the other day, and the answer came that we had built 150 miles, nearly 151 miles of railway in this country without bonuses. Let me tell the House that the Canadian Pacific Railway alone has built 1,100 miles of railway without bonuses in this country. Now, Sir, that is a statement which knowing, as I do, that it is a fact coming from an authoritative source, I think ought to be a pointer for the government that the time has come when railways will be built whether they are bonused or not, and I certainly think the government ought to quit giving bonuses. With reference to the loan that was made to the Grand Trunk Railway, the hon. gentleman who preceded me this morning seemed to make light of it. He looked on it simply as $25,000,000 that had been loaned by the government long ago which did not amount to anything. Now, Sir, I have here a statement which as been read in the House but I think it is worth reading again as it is a thing that people should know. It is the statement of the Grand Trunk Railway debenture and interest account :

Taking the amount of the debenture accouat and interest account, which were $15,142,633 and $10,457,458 respectively on July 1, 1867, making in all $25,600,091, as principal on that date, and taking the average interest paid by the government as five per cent from that time until 1877, four and a half per cent for the ten years, 1877 to 1887, four per cent from 1887 to 1897 and three and a half per cent from 1897 to 1903, and compounding the interest each half-year (as the government has to pay for its money), the principal and interest would now amount to about $118,000,000.

I have got a method to suggest to the government by which they might get this money. I think if they can only get the Grand Trunk Railway to build this other road and build it on account we would be all right. I make that suggestion and although there is only one member of the government in the House at the present moment, I trust he will make a note of it and perhaps he will speak to the Prime Minister and they may make a deal with the Grand Trunk Railway to build that railway on account. And we would be glad to have it done if they do it in that way.

Mr. WILSON.

I have been very anxious to know what the farmers in my section of the country thought of this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme since it has been introduced into this House. We have in our riding a farmers' association which is composed of men of both sides of politics and they are watching carefully what this government is doing. When I was home I sent word to the secretary of that association that I would like to see him and have a talk with him and gave him a copy of the Bill. I did not see him, but my son saw him and gave him a copy of the Bill, and he wrote me his opinion with reference to it and I think his opinion is worth putting on 'Hansard.' This, Sir, is from a gentleman who hitherto has been a Liberal. The president of this association has heretofore been a Conservative so you see they are a mixed lot and they are anxious that the business of this country shall be done in a straightforward manner. It is as follows :

Napanee, August 17, 1903.

Dear Sir,—I found it impossible to meet you on Saturday night till a rather late hour, and as your son, Mr. U. M. Wilson had explained matters to me, I decided not to disturb you so late in the evening.

As to the matter in question, that of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, I shall in a general way give my objections to the Bill. At the outset, I do not think it has been conclusively proven that a great necessity for the building of such a road exists. Were such the case, the profits from the carrying trade of the road would amply recoup the promoters of the scheme without looking to the government for aid.

And if a new transcontinental road were needed, and a private company like the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company would not undertake the construction of a road unless aided by the people, then I would say let the government build the road, but let it remain the property of the state and be operated for the benefit of the whole people of the state, not be turned over to a railway company such as the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other railway company for their sole benefit. But there should be no doubt of the existing necessity for a railway before undertaking the construction.

In the light of past experience the evils of bonusing railways are in evidence, and I think we have a striking object lesson of the loss to the country from the guaranteeing of the bonds of a railway company in the case of the Grand Trunk Railway. The reasons given for the building of a new transcontinental road are founded largely on sentiment. There would be ample outlet for the produce of the northern country by extending branches north from either the Canadian Pacific, the Northern Pacific or the Canada Northern.

The railway requirements in Quebec and the maritime provinces can be amply met by the railroads now existing or by short lines from time to time as the necessity for them arises. The building of a shorter paralleling line to the Intercolonial will mean a large addition to the public debt and an unnecessary addition. Then too the leasing of the road to the Grand Trunk Pacific will rob the people of any possible gain which might obtain from the building of the road at least for fifty years. Of course it may

please national pride to regard Quebec as a connecting railway centre. Then again the guaranteeing of the bonds of the western division is not in the public interest, and is in marked contrast to the terms on which the Northern Pacific secured a charter from the Roblin government for the building of branch roads in Manitoba.

I have not attempted to criticise the Bill in detail. That it would require some time and a thorough study of all the clauses of the Bill, not a cursory examination such as I have been able to give it. Besides I do not feel that I have the qualifications which would enable me to deal exhaustively with it. And of course you are asking for a criticism of the principles underlying the Bill.

I believe the views I have given regarding aid to railways are largely held by the people here of both parties and the position you have taken on this railway question should stand to your credit.

Yours very truly,

W. R. LOTT.

Mr. Uriah Wilson, M.P.

This gentleman is the secretary of the farmers' association in my riding. This association passed the following petition to the House of Commons :

To the honourable the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada in parliament assembled.

The Lennox Farmer's Association are of opinion and hereby unanimously resolve, that the time has come to discontinue the practice of subsidizing railways by grants of public lands or public money.

The great prosperity which the railways of Canada are now enjoying warrants this association in protesting against further aid being given them by the parliament of Canada.

And your petitioners respectfully ask that your honourable body grant no subsidy to any railway at the forthcoming session of parliament.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed on behalf of the Lennox Farmer's Association.

R. M. BRISCO, President. W. R. LOTT, Secretary.

I have still a later resolution passed by the same association on June 20, 1903, as follows :—

The Lennox Farmers' Association, at a meeting held to-day passed a resolution re government aid to railways, to the following effect, viz.:—

That the association is strongly of the opinion that the further granting of aid by the Dominion government towards the construction of railways by companies or individuals, whether the aid be a land grant or money, is not in the public interest, and should be discontinued, and futhermore, we as an association protest against government guarantee of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am about through. But I wish to call the attention of the House to this one fact. We had last night standing before us the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who is a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and who is strongly opposed to bonusing or giving public aid to railways. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has already built 1,100 miles of railway without any public aid, and I have read to you an extract from an interview with the president of that company, in which he says that the time for granting bonuses to railways has come to an end, and I believe that is the general opinion of the people of this country.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas). Mr. Speaker, as the government and their friends have already got out of steam on the new railway policy, it falls to my lot to say something without being obliged to reply to the previous speaker. I suppose that as the difficulty of getting coal into the country through which the new railway is to run will be so great, and as it will be necessary to have coal at every 100 miles along that line, it is no wonder that they have got out of steam. That factor in the requirements of the new railway is worthy of serious consideration at the hands of the government. I do not appear here as the apologist for the Conservative party in regard to their policy of opening up the country, which has made Canada what it is, against the oposition of hon. gentlemen opposite. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends was such that it became necessary for the Conservative party, in the interest of the country, to build that road, as the ancient city was built, with the sword in one hand and the trowel in the other. That will never be the condition of things in this country while the Conservative party may happen for the time being to be in opposition. They will stand, as they have always stood, on the patriotic side. But that cannot be said of hon. gentlemen opposite. If they were in our places to-day, they would pursue the same unpatriotic course they have pursued in the past.

I want to make reference to the speech of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), who eulogized to the skies the memory of the late Sir John Macdonald. I, for one, would rather have men put a few blossoms in my way while I am alive. It ill becomes men who laid in Sir John Macdonald's way nothing but thorns and briars and brambles during his life, to come after he is dead with their arms full of wreaths of flowers to lay on his grave. It ill becomes them now to justify that great man and his policy, which they are trying to emulate; for they will be as Lilliputians compared with Gulliver when they get through.

The hon. Minister of Finance was good enough to say the other night that his party, in the folly of their youth, had opposed this great scheme, but that, in the light of the experience of twenty years, they had found out their mistake. But is there any analogy between the two questions ? What

was the condition which called for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? Upon the building of that transcontinental road the integrity of this country depended. It was a question whether or not British Columbia should become a province of this Dominion, and hon. gentlemen opposite were prepared to follow their leader when he said : Let British Columbia go rather than build the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister of Finance has told us that was the time of their youthful folly, that they were all children, but I doubt whether hon. gentlemen opposite have yet outgrown the infant stage. I believe they are children yet. What was the conduct of that hon. gentleman at a more recent date, when he had reached more mature years, and one might suppose that he had acquired some common sense ? It was said by a prominent man in England that it was no crime to be young, as that was a fault that could be outlived, but that it was a crime not to learn by experience. We might say of hon. gentlemen opposite that experience does not appear to have taught them anything. They are apparently as immature as they were years ago, and are continually making mistakes to-day as they did in the past. What did the hon. Minister of Finance do in 1887, when he was no longer in the first flush of youth, but had reached maturity, and was the premier of his province ? When the late Mr. Mercier, premier of Quebec, called together the premiers of all the provinces in the Dominion to consult on federal matters, and the position of the various provinces with regard to the federal authority, where did we find the Minister of Finance ? At that conference, where he was present as premier of Nova Scotia, what was his attitude with reference to the integrity of this Dominion ? I am going to read from the report of the conference to show what his attitude then was. Let me here remark that at that conference the only Conservatives present was Mr. Norquay, then premier of Manitoba. Among those present were Sir Oliver Mowat, Hon. G. W. Ross, Hon. A. M. Ross, Hon. C. Fraser, and Hon. A. S. Hardy, from the province of Ontario, and the serious part is this, that whereas one would expect from these men sentiments of loyalty, nationalism and patriotism, sentiments in favour of the integrity of the Dominion, we found just the opposite. We find that these men, the leading Liberals from every province of the Dominion, consented to the resolution which I am about to read being placed on the minutes of that conference. And when we find ministers of the Crown to-day proclaiming that they are looking after the great national interests of this Dominion, and taunting the Conservatives with laxity in that regard, it is time we should ask them to take a retrospective view of their conduct in the past. Here is the resolution entered on the minutes, at the request of the Finance Minister and his colleagues :

> The representatives from Nova Scotia present at this conference desired the following minute to be entered upon the record of the proceedings and the conference agreed to the entry being made accordingly ;
>
> In view of recent movements in the province of Nova Scotia, the representatives of that province desire to place on record that they participate in the deliberations of this conference upon the understanding that, while they join the representatives of the sister provinces in seeking reforms in matters which are of common interest, they do so without prejudice to the right of the government, legislature or people of the province of Nova Scotia to take any course that may in the future be by them deemed desirable with a view to the separation of the province from the Dominion.

That was the position then taken by the Finance Minister of Canada, and which was endorsed by the premiers from the other provinces—all Liberals but one. These were the sentiments of the men who preach loyalty in this House of Commons to-day. Who were the representatives of Nova Scotia who took part in that conference ? They were : W. S. Fielding, Prime Minister ; J. W. Longley, Attorney General ; A. McGillivray, of the executive council. That was the position which these men took in 1887, when they were children. It would be well if they had never been born.

Let me say that there is no analogy whatever between the proposition to build the Canadian Pacific Railway and the one before this House to-day. The great question before this country demanding solution, and which will not be solved after this measure has received the sanction of His Excellency the Governor General, is the question of transportation. Cheaper transportation is what the people require. The transportation rates are a tax on the energy and industry of our people, and you relieve them of so much direct tax when you make the rates cheaper. Is there a man on the opposite side of the House, from the right hon. gentleman who leads it, down to his most humble supporter, who is able to show that in the slightest degree this proposition will lessen the charges of transportation in this country ? Why, the furthest extent to which they have gone is to provide that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway shall not charge any higher freight rates to St. John or Halifax than to Portland. The Grand Trunk Railway has a line to Portland to-day equipped with every facility. All the government ask is that the Grand Trunk shall not charge any more to carry freight to our Canadian ports than they do to Portland. That is the utmost they ask, and that does not involve any cheapening of rates. Any scheme which ignores our waterways in connection with railways is not a feasible scheme by which you can give the people cheaper transportation. And the difficulty is that when we impose the large obligation upon the shoulders of the people,

which this contract calls for, we shall not have solved the question of transportation. This road will be simply a colonization road. Nobody made that clearer than the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), and the right hon. gentleman who leads the House had to admit that he did not look upon it from a commercial view only, but from a national point of view. In this connection, let me read what the right hon. gentleman said in 1898, on a subject that affects perhaps the question of transportation and the lessening of rates more than does the one before the House. In 1898, the position which he took on the construction of the Georgian Bay canal was far different from the one he takes now. But hon. gentlemen opposite will support any proposition which their leader may submit to them without the slightest regard for their past record or principles. Replying to Mr. Poupore, who introduced that resolution with reference to the Georgian Bay canal, the right hon. gentleman said that the government were simply asked to endorse the bonds of the company and would not be called on to disburse any money until the canal was in operation. And he added :

> My answer is this, and I submit that in this the government will have the support of both sides of the House ; the government should not give either its sanction or approval to any scheme unless it is satisfied in advance that the scheme will be a commercial success.

They only have the support of one side. The other side is against them on principle. He said further :

> The government should not give even its sanction or approval to any scheme, unless it is satisfied in advance that the scheme shall be a commercial success.

Apply that to the present proposition, and where are you ? What about your commercial success in this case ? Why, isn't it perfectly clear that opportunism, and not principle, guides hon. gentlemen opposite ? There is no talk of commercial success now. All we hear of now is colonization, and sending people into that northern country. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) opened up a fine prospect through his speech to the men of his race. He would send Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen and Germans to the North-west country, where they could get rich in five years, but he wants to send the Frenchmen up to the woods, where they will be poor all their lives. He wants to send the Frenchmen up to that country timbered with spruce, tamarac, jack-pine, poplar and white birch. I do not decry my country ; I am too good a patriot for that. But the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance stigmatized that region as a poor country for agriculture, when they told us, as they did, that this was the kind of timber growing there. When they said that, every sensible man who knows anything about soil, knew that there was a poor soil there. And when the hon. member for Bonaventure spoke of sending the Frenchmen up there, I thought his own countrymen might well pray : ' Deliver us from our friends.' And the Minister of Finance, when he told us what timber grew there——

Mr. TAYLOR. He didn't know the difference.

Mr. BRODER. If these gentlemen do not know the difference between pine and basswood, they should not talk about these things. They stigmatize that country as the possessor of inferior soil. That is on ' Hansard,' and there it will remain. Now, while I am on this subject, I would just like to point out one or two things to show what the building of this road actually means. It means that if a man gets on a train at Winnipeg to come through by that road, he sees no further sign of civilization until he reaches the city of Quebec. Suppose he wants a bag of flour, suppose he wants a pair of boots, suppose he wants to see his clergyman; why, he must go through the 1,800 miles to the city of Quebec. That is a glorious position to put the poor Frenchmen in in that country. Why, the only proper colonization system for us is to run railways from the main lines out to the north country as fast as settlement requires, so that the people may have the nearest possible way to the centres of our country throughout its whole length and breadth. If you carry out this policy, you will do something in the interests of civilization. The Liberals had a policy on that matter. I would like to read to you what they told the country in 1896. Of course, if there is anything they do not want to see it is their own tracts.

Mr. SPROULE. They are not like the Indian who was lost.

Mr. BRODER. I have here the campaign book issued by the Liberals in 1896. That ought to be good literature.

Mr. HOLMES. Fine.

Mr. BRODER. Then, why don't you live up to it ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) has not lived up to it an hour since it was sent out. The Prime Minister has not lived up to it for ten minutes since he came into power, nor has any follower he has got. This book was sent out with a request to the reader to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest. It was for campaigners, speakers, candidates, and so on. It was not for the ordinary readers—too profound for them—but only for the intelligent and brainy men who are to instruct the people. The common man was not to interpret this for himself. On page 43 I find this :

> The Liberal party have always favoured dense and continuous settlements.

What about this road, removed hundreds of miles away from present settlements ?

> They have opposed the adoption of a policy which is annually spreading the population over

distant districts and sections of country which necessitates further railway construction, further land grants for that purpose, enhanced prices of land to the settler, without affording to the existing railway lines that amount of travel and of traffic, which will enable companies to pay the expenses of operation and management, without excessive burdens upon the people who may reside in the country through which they run.

That is fine, is it not? But where are these hon. gentlemen now?

Mr. BELL. In the bush.

Mr. BRODER. Yes; and the jack-pines ain't high enough to hide them. What are the people going to do up in that country through which you are to run this road? I have read your principles in 1896. Of course, I do not expect you to have them now. But there was strong reason why these gentlemen should attempt to do something before they met the country. When they look over their political nursery they find not a single child that belongs to them—every one of them adopted. They do not want to go to the country without some offspring of their own, and so they have brought this measure before the House. And who is the godfather of it? The Grand Trunk. But the Grand Trunk will only become responsible for the head, while the rest has to be fathered by the government. But the hon. gentlemen are bound to go down to history as having done something during their seven years of office. Now, this road does not mean successful settlement if it is a colonization road, for the simple reason that you leave the people too far from the centres of the country, and the rates on this road will be too high. Why do I say that? Any railway that ignores the necessity of passenger traffic to help in securing lower rates on freight ignores a principle that should form the very basis of its calculations. Do you suppose that a man leaving Winnipeg coming east will want to come down through that country where he will see not a single town or village? No; he will want to come down through the settled parts of the country. As to passenger traffic, this road cannot successfully compete, and wanting passenger traffic, its freight rates on the products of the country must be high. Another point is that this road will not be built in a day. The right hon. Premier says there is no time to lose. But he will have to wait seven or eight years before he gets the road. And, before he gets it, the easily built western portion will have been finished and put in operation. And the peculiar idea of this idea is that the Grand Trunk people do not take that road over until it is completed. So the government will have the expense and trouble of taking care of and running it until the whole road is built. In the meantime the Grand Trunk Pacific built in the western part of the country west of Winnipeg, will have large quantities of grain brought down to Winnipeg and will be obliged to find an outlet for that grain. What are they going to do with it? Are they going to send it down over the Canadian Pacific Railway? No. Are they going to send it down over the Mackenzie & Mann system? No, they will see that it finds its way to Chicago. That is what they will do, they will see that it finds its way to Chicago, their business connections are there now, and they will continue there for some years, while you are trying to build this difficult part of the road which they are really not obliged to accept after it is built. What will happen then? The large dealers in Chicago, the grain kings, will go into that western country and build their elevators and buy your grain, and when you get your road built these gentlemen will be the routers of your grain and not the railways, and they will send your grain by the Chicago route. Why? Because the route from Chicago to New York is the cheapest freight route in the world. I do not ask you to accept my word for it. I will give you the reason why it is the cheapest freight route in the world. I will read from a book published very recently entitled 'The Canal System of England,' but it has some reference to the American canals and to this particular route:

The following extract on the subject is from an address by Mr. E. R. Johnson, instructor in political and social science, Haverford College, U.S.A.

The cheapest freight rates by rail to be found in the world are those for grain between Chicago and New York. And why? Because the cheapest inland water transportation rates in the world are between the same points.

That is the crucical question:

The following table showing the wheat rates per bushel from Chicago to New York for the years 1868, 1870, 1880 and 1881 by water, by water and rail combined, and by rail, indicates very plainly how freight rates have fallen, and how this movement has been led by the waterways.

	By Lake and Canal.	By Lake and Railway.	By Rail.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1868..	22·79	29·0	42·6
1870..	17·10	22·0	33·3
1880..	12·27	15·7	19·9
1891..	5·96	8·53	15·0

Still nearly 10 cents difference. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen opposite, in their scheme, ignore altogether the importance of any water route in connection with their proposed development scheme by rail. The cheapest grain route in the world is where they have water and rail connected, the water portion commencing the route. Now, 200,000,000 bushels of grain come to Buffalo alone. Do hon. gentlemen say that this proposed road will take one bushel of that grain away from Buffalo? It will not come by your road. There is another factor which they overlook altogether. Any man who has any experience in shipping grain or

products of any kind to the old country, or to any foreign country, knows that a great factor in the freight rate and consequently the route, lies at the very door of ocean freight. The port that will give you the best ocean freight connected with the through route is generally the port that gets the business. That is lost sight of altogether by hon. gentlemen opposite. Not a word of that, they ignore the very difficulty that will determine to a large extent the route which the grain will take, supposing it goes over that road, and they cannot get away from it.

There is another matter I shall refer to as I notice that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) has just come in. He talked very wisely about this Bill. He said he was glad that it was written so plain that anybody could understand it; in fact he could shut his eyes and read it. Now, Sir, the Minister of Justice is not so wise as the hon. gentleman, because the Minister of Justice had to admit that he had to call no less than three lawyers to find out what the clause meant. Sir, I want to say this, that it is a humiliation, not only to the government, but to this House, that the Minister of Justice, who ought to be the last resort as to the meaning of this Bill in a legal sense, had to send out and bring in lawyers to help him find out what it meant, a contract that he is supposed to have drawn up himself. That is the position of things. Well, the Minister of Justice made a mistake when he sent for these three lawyers to consult as to the meaning of this contract, he made a mistake in not sending for the hon. member for Brant.

I am not going to say that the Grand Trunk do not deserve well of this country. The Grand Trunk has been the pioneer road in Canada, and deserves well at the hands of this country. It has served the people well under difficult circumstances; but we have a perfect right, when we are dealing with an individual or with a concern, to inquire into the character of their business, to ascertain what their policy has been in reference to matters which concern the people of this country. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have been very slow in extending their line. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as was mentioned by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), have built, within the last twenty years, 1,100 miles of road, including four important bridges, at an outlay of $35,000,000, without one dollar of aid from the government of this country. Now I want to refer to their mileage. They have a very recent history, they are not an old road. Their main line was 2,905 miles long from Vancouver to Montreal; but since their inception as a road their total mileage has increased to 8,646½. Well, what about the Grand Trunk? The Grand Trunk Company have increased their mileage very slowly in this country, and I want to point out that the policy of the Grand Trunk that has prevailed in the past in this respect is very likely to continue in the future. No one who looks into that agreement but must see that the fact of their getting $25,000,000 of stock will give them a control to that extent that nobody else will have the right to interfere with. The old Grand Trunk will still be the dominant influence in reference to the new road, and if they are still the dominant influence in the policy of the new road, there will be nothing like the branch lines reaching out into new sections such as the Canadian Pacific Railway system has constructed, notwithstanding the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to put obstacles in their way. This is a very important matter for us to consider. What is the condition of things? Why, go back to the 80's, and see what the Grand Trunk were doing? When there was a charter granted for a road called the Ontario and Quebec Railway, upon which there were grants by governments and municipalities of no less than $1,000,000, what did the Grand Trunk do? They bought that charter, if I remember correctly, at a cost of some $34,000, notwithstanding that there were $1,000,000 attached to that charter by way of bonuses and grants which they allowed to lapse. What for? For the purpose of hindering the Canadian Pacific Railway getting from Toronto to Smith's Falls. When you travel over the Canadian Pacific Railway in the neighbourhood of Perth you will notice a road graded, but which never went any further, that is the road I refer to.

Who was the man who helped to do that mischief? Senator Cox was the man who came in to buy up that road and kill the interests of the locality between Smith's Falls and Toronto. The Canadian Pacific Railway built the road at their own expense notwithstanding the fact that the Grand Trunk tried to block the undertaking. We have a perfect right to consider these things and to consider how far the influence of Senator Cox may permeate this new proposition. We find from their report of 1884, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company owned 1,530½ miles, that they part owned and had under lease 538¾ miles and that they had under lease 843 miles of road. In 1892 they only owned 2,981 miles, and I want to draw the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that the largest outlay in improvements and extensions has been made not in Canada but in the United States. Their enormous outlay has been made in American territory in making extensions in order to carry out their business. Does anybody pretend to say that with that great outlay the proposition that the government are now making is going to remedy all the difficulties that exist in this country in reference to railway rates and railway busi-

ness ? The Grand Trunk Railway have gone very slowly in the matter of railway extension in this country and now the government are building a road and giving it to them. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) was good enough to say, that we ought to be thankful to be able to unload this scheme on the Grand Trunk Railway which means that if this turns out to be a bad bargain it is ours because we stand behind it. If the horse is lame we must keep it; that is what it means. After we do unload it it will come back to us, if it is no good to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The guarantee that the government proposes to give to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company by this measure carries with it an obligation which the government cannot say does not amount to anything. Why do you give them a guarantee if this road is any good ? Are you not giving them a guarantee in order that they may finance the undertaking and because of the possibility that they may not be able to meet their obligations ? It is because of that contingency that the government steps in and gives them a guarantee. I want to call the attention of the House to the form of guarantee which has been given by the French government to the railways in France. They have changed their system in France because of political changes and of the financial difficulties of 1881. They have about six companies which control the railways of France all converging at Paris and each company is allowed a certain territory in the country. The policy of the government has been to guarantee the earnings of these roads and not the interest on the bonds which means virtually that the roads will always be in a position to pay their obligations as far as interest is concerned. There is only one road and that is the Northern road running through a portion of France that represents fifty-three per cent of the population that has not called upon the government to carry out the guarantee. What does any sensible man think of this proposed road running through a country where there are no people ? Does any sensible man mean to say that this obligation assumed by the government does not mean anything ? To show how little idea the government and their friends have as to what it means, we have only to refer to the argument used yesterday by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) who compared the interest charged on the road to be built under this proposed scheme with the total cost of the road under the scheme proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). He represented that the cost of one would be $13,000,000 and that the other would be $200,000,000. If the hon. gentleman would figure out the total outlay involved in the scheme proposed by his friends he would be surprised at the result to which his arithmetic would lead him. No reasonable man can claim that you can go through the province of New Brunswick and construct a suitable road ten or fifteen miles north of the present railway where there is a difference between the valleys and the tops of the ridges of from 1,000 to 1,200 feet. If you are going to give cheaper freight rates you will have to construct a road that will cost $75,000 per mile. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the water-powers on the height of land. Even the right hon. leader of the government and the hon. Minister of Finance talked about the water-powers away up on the height of land. Who ever heard of water-powers where the rivers start upon their courses ? What rubbish to give the country ? Water-powers away up the height of land where the rivers take their rise. Water-powers ? You can go out from the city of Ottawa only a few miles and find enormous water-powers undeveloped. Why do not hon. gentlemen give their attention to the water-powers nearer home ? Right on the Ottawa river thousands upon thousands of horse power are going to waste and nobody is saying anything about them. Yet, these hon. gentlemen are proposing to spend millions of money to reach the water-powers away up in the north country when nobody wants to use them. The only reasonable solution of the question to my mind is to utilize the railways that we have now in existence. We have now no less than seven different roads running from the main lines northward between Lake St. John and Lake Nipissing. These roads have received considerable government aid. Why do not hon. gentlemen opposite adopt the policy of extending these roads into the northern country and encouraging people from the present settlements to go up into that country ? Bring them nearer the source of supply and let them procure their supplies and send out their products in this way instead of running a road 1,800 miles from Winnipeg to Moncton. That is a great scheme. It is a great national scheme and no great nation would ever touch it. The great national scheme ought to be the solution of the transportation question in the interests of the people of this country. Then, there was a bugaboo raised about the bonding privilege. The right hon. leader of the government based his whole argument upon the fact that the bonding privilege might be taken away. Let anybody go and look up the interstate commerce report and find what they say about that matter. Then we have in the other House a gentleman who has but lately been elevated from this House to the other by the right hon. gentleman. He is talking about war with the United States. He says that the United States want to go to war, that they are getting ready for it. It occurred to me that if the hon. gentleman is serious, and the government, of course, endorse him as one of their supporters, we ought to get a minister of war instead of a

Minister of Militia. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) is too peaceful and kindhearted a man for that. He will never be able, to fill that place properly during this terrible war that is coming on us from the United States

An hon. Senator talking in the other House only yesterday about the United States going to war insisted on the building of this road. The need for this road is that the United States is going to war. What are you going to do with that road in war time? Are you going to send your troops out there to meet the United States? The probability is that the hon. gentleman wanted to take to the woods if there should be trouble and wanted that road to get there. Most of the hon. gentlemen opposite would do so after all the loyalty we have heard about. Such nonsense to be talked by serious men; war, taking away the bonding privileges! Does not any reasonable man know that there is no one as much interested in the bonding privileges as the United States. New England particularly, and the railways of the United States also are more interested twice over than Canada. If we look at that aspect of the question the only true solution of our position is to run lines north and and give back to the front settlements that now exist. The only possible way—and I am speaking of peaceful avocation, I am not speaking of war—the only successful way to compete with the influence of American commerce is to give more breadth to the present country; is to give feed to the centres that now exist from the north country in the rear and you can only do that by running railways into that northern country and opening up settlement. Hon. gentlemen propose to run a road from Moncton away to the north of the height of land to Winnipeg and in that way they will create a north and south in this country. Any serious candid man will see the reasonableness of that proposition as opposed to the one the government propose. Are the lumbermen and the men who are interested in the timber of this country anxious to see a road run up there long before the timber that is there will be taken out and utilized? There are millions of cords of wood between this and where you are proposing to go. It would do this country and the pulp business a great deal more good if hon. gentlemen would have the courage to put an export duty on pulp wood. An export duty on pulp wood would do more to develop that industry than three railways such as hon. gentlemen propose to build and yet, Sir, with one stroke of the pen the Finance Minister could bring that about, but he has not the courage to do it, nor has the government the courage to back him up. One stroke of the pen would do more to develop the pulp business of Canada than this railway will do. Put an export duty on pulp wood and what do you find? Paper mill after paper mill brought over into this country from the United States. Why? Because Canada owns nearly all the pulp wood on this continent. Travelling through the country you will find agents of American large manufacturers of pulp wood machinery going into this country and building mills for Canadian people. One of these gentlemen said to me the other day, a man who has been in London putting in machinery for the Lloyds and men of that class, that if Canada put an export duty on pulp wood the American mills would move over to Canada. They could not do anything else. Why do not hon. gentlemen do something of that kind. They could save their $300,000,000 with one stroke of the pen and do Canada more good than all their proposition will do. But they dare not do that; they could not do that; that would be businesslike.

Before I sit down, I want to say that the government are obligating the country to an enormous outlay and are not solving the question. You would think to hear these gentlemen talk that there was no road now across this country. No way of getting down to a Canadian port. That is the only inference that can be drawn from what they say, that there is no outlet and there is no grain brought over a Canadian route. Who can say the traffic they talk about will go over the road they propose to build after it is built, and there is this to be said further that the western people must get to the lakes, that is the important factor to them. Once they get to the lakes, competition will take care of the grain and we have the best waterway on the continent. Yet, Sir, hon. gentlemen do not realize the importance of making it any part of the grain route and the traffic route of this country. They are married to this scheme. They think that they will never have a name if they do not build this road. It is a question if they will ever have it, after they get through with it, but, I want to say this that they will realize before they are through that the difficulties in carrying out a proposition of this kind have not been provided for in the agreement submitted to the House. Who is going to run the road when you get it built? Who is going to run the part you complete before the eastern section is completed? The Grand Trunk Railway are not obliged to take it until it is all built, and I do not know if there is anything that will oblige them to take it then unless they think it is a paying scheme. The Grand Trunk Railway do not become responsible for the eastern end of the road and that is the important part to find responsibility for. The government are taking all the responsibility in reference to that and are giving the paying part, the part that will be able to take care of itself, up through the Peace River district one of the most fertile in this country, to the company.

Referring to what the leader of the government has said in reference to the wheat section of the country, it will be remembered that he traced the develpoment of wheat growing in this country, first on the St. Lawrence then in the Genessee valley, then Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin and Dakota and now it has gone over from Dakota into Manitoba. Who ever dreamed of raising more grain than the United States? Who ever dreamed of raising more than the Americans? He said it has left Minnesota and Dakota and gone to Manitoba and the reason for building this road is that the centre of wheat growing will leave Manitoba and go to the Peace river. What will Manitoba think of the fertility of her soil being exhausted in two or three years? Surely the right hon. gentleman did not talk seriously. Yet that is what he said, it appears in 'Hansard,' and the wheat growing section of the country has moved over into Manitoba and it is surely going to move into the Peace river district; hence the necessity of the road. Well, Manitoba will be raising wheat I think long after that road is built and her fertile soil will be still growing wheat when many changes will have come to pass in this country.

We cannot, for a moment, consider the condition of things in the west without seeing the necessity of giving them an outlet to the lakes and then using the water-ways to the markets of the world. The ocean freight will largely control the route of the grain and that is what the government has not provided for, and I think that if they are going to make this scheme a success that is something that ought to be considered in the undertaking. There ought to be some obligation in reference to that. But I wish to show that the true solution of this question will not be accomplished at all even if this road is built. It will not lessen the shipping of grain by American ports one solitary cent, because it is only stipulated in that agreement that they will not charge more than somebody else charges. What does that give? It gives to the company which carries the grain the alternative of going to the other place. We do not charge any more for going to Halifax than they charge for going to Portland—you can go to Portland. I do not see that any other construction can be put upon it. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) understood all about the contract last night, but that is something which I am afraid he has not looked into. The Minister of Justice will have to bring in a few more outside legal gentlemen to see what it means. He has already had to do it. It is evident that the Minister of Justice, in dealing with the question the other night, did not feel at home. It is easy to see that he did not get all he wanted in the agreement, and he did not like to talk about it, for fear he would make a mistake. I do not believe there is one in the cabinet who got what he wanted. They got what the Grand Trunk would give them, that is all. C. M. Hays, as general manager of the Grand Trunk, just gave them what he thought the Grand Trunk could best get along with; and now they are obliged to try to justify it. That is the position they are in, and they cannot get away from it. The Grand Trunk people would not touch the eastern division; they would not sign any guarantee for it. They would only guarantee the part that was sure to pay. They have not a particle of responsibility for the eastern section. The government are going to build that, and hand it over to them, and maintain it for fifty years. Nobody knows what it will cost. The road will have to be run or go to the bad, and the government will have to face that responsibility. There is nothing to oblige the Grand Trunk Pacific to run that road, if I understand the agreement. Then, who is to run it? It is your road; it is your capital that is put into it; all they agree to give you is a certain interest. Suppose they refuse to touch it, what recourse have you? You can take what belongs to you; that is all the security you have got. It is like a man giving a mortgage on his own farm, and thinking he has made a splendid bargain. The Grand Trunk have a controlling interest in the stock, and will dictate to the Grand Trunk Pacific what they must do about this, that, and the other; and you cannot help yourself. That is why they do not touch the eastern division. They feel safe with the western division, because it is going through a country that will develop rapidly, and will yield large receipts both for freight and passenger traffic. But that does not apply to the eastern division, which is going through a country where there is nothing but trees and lakes. Where is your traffic to come from? The only traffic you can get is from the far west. But it is said that we will bring down a lot of timber by rail. The history of the past does not prove that you will bring the timber down by rail. You will bring it down the rivers, if you bring it down successfully and at the lowest cost. Then, where is your railway business to come from? Logs are floated down the Ottawa river for hundreds of miles, and that is the cheapest way to bring them down. You can easily see why the lumbermen will not saw their lumber in the woods and bring it down by railway. They prefer to float the logs down the streams and saw them near the centres of population, where the haulage will be short. Then, this idea of the railway getting a large business from pulp wood is all in the air. That is not the way the business will be developed. Your passenger traffic is not there, because, as I said before, no sensible man will travel from Winnipeg to Quebec and through Halifax on this road, when he can go on others

which will take him through the centre of population. Then, your freight rates have to be higher, or your road will not pay.

Now, I have detained the House long enough; but I wish to say, before I sit down, that I think the government ought to consider, and consider seriously, the question that is at the door of parliament seeking for solution—the question how to reduce freight rates most effectually. You cannot afford to pay fifteen or twenty cents a bushel to carry sixty cent wheat to market. If you want to encourage immigration to the North-west and make the people happy and contented, the way to do it is to give them lower freight rates. If you do not do that, you will have irritation, disaffection and trouble. This road will not do it, and I do not believe the government think it will. As the Premier said, it is not a commercial scheme, but a national scheme. The idea of building up a great nation has seized that gentleman, and they are going to run this road through, not in the interest of the country, not in the interest of the settlements now clamouring for relief, but in the interest of people whom they say they are going to send into the new country. The question has occurred to me whether the hon. gentlemen have the idea of bringing in some people from northern Europe, such as Finns and Norwegians, and settling them there. They do not pretend to say that they are going to settle that country with people from Ontario and Quebec; and if they are going to such an enormous outlay, I suppose they are doing it with the intention of putting some people on the land along the line of the railway. The strongest advertisement that can be put out against this railway as a colonization road is the statement of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), that if you send a man to the North-west, he will get rich in five years, while if you keep him where he is he will be poor all his life. So that, according to this statement, you are building this road to keep the people poor all their lives. I think the hon. gentleman's compatriots will resent that sort of treatment. We have built a railway into the Lake St. John district, yet it takes a good deal of trouble to keep the people there. They get tired of the place after they have been there a little while, and move out; and I think that the hon. gentlemen who are cognizant of the facts realize that the same difficulty will exist along the line of this railway; the people will move out, and you cannot hinder them. The Lake St. John country, I understand is a good country. That country is not settled. The Lake St. John Railway has cost money. We have no less than seven roads running northward from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other lines between Quebec and Lake Nepigon. My idea is that the proper system would be to push out these roads into the new country and let settlement go in from the present settlements northward, instead of running the line as the government proposes. The question really before the country is the giving of cheaper transportation by means of utilizing our great waterways. We have a great waterway, intended by nature to be a thoroughfare between the east and the west, and, Sir, whatever scheme of transportation or development overlooks our interests in that respect, overlooks the real interests of the people of this country. You cannot solve that question if you ignore that great system of lakes waiting for the legitimate business that ought to cross it. Why can Chicago send grain around Lake Michigan to Buffalo and then carry it to New York, so much cheaper than we can? We have a better route if we will only take care of it. The government took the tolls off the canals this year, which was good policy. We only got about $43,000 per year from these tolls, and what has been the result of taking them off? The result has been that down the St. Lawrence this season over 7,000,000 bushels of grain went to Montreal, while less than 2,000,000 went to New York. That shows you how a very little lessening of the cost of traffic will affect the trade. If the government are anxious to lay out a lot of money anl control the outlay of millions of dollars, let them put the money they propose to expend on this road into a twenty-five foot waterway from the Georgian bay. That would not only give an outlet for the grain and other products of our great west, but the products and grain of the south-western states as well. All the grain of the western country on the American side would come down our route. If you are anxious to lay out millions, there is a proposition which will give you some return for your outlay. I am opposed to the government handing over our waterways to any company. They ought to be held by the government in the interests of the people and developed along the line that would best suit the interests of the people generally. You can best settle this country east and west by making it the best country in the world to live in. But this proposition before the House will not solve the question. Neither the government nor its friends can say it does. What do they do? They wave the flag. There is nobody in the country more pleased to see them loyal than I am. There never was anything they needed more, judging by their past? Why, in 1891, they were willing to go right into the arms of the United States. The United States, they said, was the only natural market for this country, and the hon. gentleman who declared war the other day (Mr. Charlton) was the greatest advocate of that policy. But now they are the direst enemies of the United States. What was the reason they gave to the people, why the people should elect them at that time? Their main rea-

son was that because the Conservative party were not friendly with the American government, that party could not get anything from the Americans. But inasmuch as the Liberal party were the friends of the United States, they could get all kinds of good things from that country for Canada. Well, they have now been in power seven years and have not got anything. They went to Washington and came back as empty as they went. Consequently to-day they are declaring war upon that country. In my opinion the best thing we can do is to mind our own affairs and solve what questions come before us for solution with regard solely to Canadian interests. We have questions to solve which require a good deal of patient study, a good deal of research, a good deal of careful looking into before we can reach a proper solution. But these gentlemen rushed into this important undertaking without a moment's consideration or warning and cast it into the arena of public discussion. If there is one thing more than another which this government ought to do, but which they have not the courage to do, it is to appeal to the country on this scheme and get the verdict of the country upon it. They intend instead to send their friends around after the session to feel the pulse of the people, and if they think that pulse beats favourably, they will likely go to the country. But if the pulse does not beat just as they think it should, they will wait a little while longer. But they ought to have the courage of their convictions, and appeal to the country, and let the great tribune of the people decide whether or not this scheme is to the interests of Canada. I do not wish to detain the House further except to say, as a humble member of the Conservative party, I do not intend to take any lecture from the other side as to what kind of loyalty I should have. Just think of hon. gentlemen opposite lecturing this side on the quality of loyalty. I am aware that new converts are always most enthusiastic, and I can therefore quite understand the strong enthusiasm which permeates the ranks of these new converts to the sentiment of loyalty to Canadian interests. But the people will be justified in watching them carefully. They remind me of a man who was cutting down a tree and was not sure of how it was going to fall. He came to me, about 150 rods away, and asked me to go with him and show him just which way it would drop.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are waiting to see which way the tree is going to fall. But it is not down yet. I do not propose to be lectured by that side as to my loyalty. We have had on this side to fight for the Canadian interests against hon. gentlemen opposite. We had to fight in the London market, the Grand Trunk Railway influence when we were financing to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. We had to fight the influence of hon. gentlemen opposite on the London market as well, when they were decrying Canadian interests and declaring that the Canadian Pacific Railway would never be a profitable undertaking. We had to fight all these influences before we could push the great Canadian Pacific Railway to completion and make the Dominion what it is to-day. These gentlemen climb on top of the House that Jack built. They think themselves very tall, as they stand there and say: 'Look at the house we have made.' And if they were not on top of the house that Jack built, nobody would ever see them or know about them. The right hon. Prime Minister wants his name to go down to posterity linked with some great scheme as Sir John Macdonald's was linked with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He hopes that it will be Sir John Macdonald and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Grand Trunk Pacific. But the hon. gentleman had better be careful how he carries out his idea. He does not know who is to own this road when it is completed. Who will it belong to, anyway? The government cannot own it, for the road will cost $100,000,000 or more, and the Finance Minister says that the only cost to the government will be about $8,500,000, if I remember well, while the leader of the House says the cost to the government will be $13,000,000. It will hardly be pretended that the government can own the road when it pays so very little, and the Grand Trunk is not very likely to admit their claim. But does any man in Canada consider seriously this statement of the Prime Minister that the cost of this road to the country will be only $13,000,000? The right hon. gentleman says that we are only going to pay the interest on the money. But who is to pay for the bonds in fifty years? If the calculation of the government is right and this road is going to cost the country only $13,000,000, then, there never were in public life men deserving of stronger condemnation. If they have the secret of building roads for one-eighth of what they are worth, then, there should not be a square mile in Canada to-day which they had not provided with railway accommodation. They are going to get this road according to their story for less than one-eighth of its cost——

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand). That is pretty cheap.

Mr. BRODER. Very cheap. But if you get the goods at that rate you may be certain they are pretty poor. But nobody supposes that the right hon. Prime Minister is serious when he says that the expense to the country will be so small as this. Like myself he likes his little jokes once in a while, and this is one of his jokes. Otherwise, he has not been true to Canada in not using this secret of his to provide railways everywhere. Why, on the basis of the hon.

gentleman's figures our public debt really amounts to very little. Hon. gentlemen opposite went up and down the country for years talking about the rascally Tories increasing the public debt. Now we find there is nothing in it, for we only pay the interest on that debt. These hon. gentlemen are going to reduce the debt by $3,000,000, and they make a great deal out of that statement. But three millions, according to their figuring is only a few thousand, so they have nothing to brag about. When I was a boy at school I studied a certain kind of arithmetic. But these hon. gentlemen seem to have a new style. It has no multiplication table in it, and no addition—just subtraction. In the old Irish arithmetic of Foster & Goff that I studied, there was what was called the rule of false. You solved a problem by supposing something which was not so and working from that supposition. It seems to be that is how this road is going to be built. A man who knew the dark corners of Foster & Goff, in my early days was supposed to be able to do anything. It is evident that the government have studied the dark corners of Foster & Goff, and they are going to build this road on the basis of an arithmetic not known to most of us. Still, they are not able to tell us who will own the road when it is all done. I think they will find that the western end, which will pay, will belong to the Grand Trunk, and the eastern end, which will cost something to run, will belong to the government. The Grand Trunk does not touch your eastern end of the road at all—they have no responsibility for it. They know too much about railways for that. The ministers are under the impression that they know all about railways. They went to bed one night knowing nothing of the subject and they woke up next morning first rate railway men. Still, they cannot get Mr. Hays to have anything to do with the eastern end of this line. The right hon. leader will have the eastern end of the road as a monument to the folly of this House and of the government, if he does not look out. It is not going to pay, and I have already quoted what the hon. gentleman said in 1898 to the effect that the government should not touch anything that would not pay in a commercial sense. He does not pretend to say that this will pay, but tells us that it is not altogether a commercial, but a national undertaking. But I will not even give it that credit. It will be left as a national undertaking with the Dominion government simply because no one else would have anything to do with it. But the western section will pay its way right along, and the Grand Trunk will take that end of it.

I have spoken at greater length than I intended. In closing I merely express the hope that the government will consider the larger proposition that has been laid before parliament by the leader of the opposition, a proposition which will help to solve the question of cheapening freight rates for the people of the country, a thing which cannot be done by the policy of the government.

Mr. THOMAS MACKIE (North Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything on this question until I heard my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) giving such awful descriptions of the route over which this road is to run. He spoke of mountains two thousand feet high and other obstacles just as great. I think, perhaps I can enlighten the hon. gentleman as to a portion of the route. As to the extreme eastern end, I do not pretend to know anything about that; but as to the central portion, from Quebec to Winnipeg, I have been over a good deal of that country, and possibly I know a little more about it than almost any other member in this House. Well, I want to tell them that the height of land on this portion of the road is as level as it is on either side, or nearly so. There are no mountains or hills.

Mr. BRODER. I did not say that it is not a level country along all the height of land, but that is where you will have to go to get a level country, it is not level outside of that.

Mr. MACKIE. There is no doubt that when this road leaves Quebec it starts off in a north-westerly direction, and it will not touch the height of land for 300 or 400 miles. I do not see any reason why it should cross the height of land until you get into Ontario, not in Quebec, because the country is as level there on one side as it is on the other. The member for Dundas says that people won't run railroads into that country for fear of setting fire and burning up the pine, and he wants to know if we are going to take pine timber out by railroad. I do not know what corner of the earth the hon. gentleman lives in if he has not seen timber coming down the Ottawa river here for the last thirty years and carried off by rail, millions of feet. I can tell him that there is a great quantity of pine in that country, part of it in Quebec, that we cannot get out in any other way.

Mr. BRODER. Did not that timber largely come over the road owned by Mr. Booth, to his own mill?

Mr. MACKIE. No, the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. He will be safe in talking about woollens but not about lumber. Millions of feet of lumber have come down over the Canadian Pacific Railway from a region 200 or 300 miles on the other side of North Bay, and that is brought down and rafted from Ottawa. Now, Sir, we have heard it said that the country through which this road is to run from Winnipeg to Quebec is a worthless country. Well, I am well acquainted with the country on both sides of the height of land, for a length of 500 or 600 miles, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is not worth-

less. There is some of the finest pine grown there in the Dominion of Canada, on both sides of the height of land, especially on the south side. There is a large tract of country around Grand Lake Victoria, on the Ottawa river, containing thousands of miles of limits, and which cannot be got out except by railway. We have been trying to get a route by the Gatineau river to strike into that country and get a railroad built there, but we have never succeeded. When this new road goes in there I think it will touch a bay of that lake. The lake is forty or sixty miles long, very large and wide, and it has one bay that runs twenty miles north, right up to the height of land. I think it would pay well to strike that bay with this road, and if it does, there is pine enough in that country to keep that road running for ten years, giving it all it can do. There is as fine board pine there as ever went into the English market, and it must come out by railway. The country is a forest country, there is hardly any burnt land in it. It is forest from 100 miles of Quebec, I suppose, away into Ontario about 300 miles. I venture to say that when that road is built there will be more sawmills along it than there are on the Ottawa river at the present time. There is tamarack, yellow birch and pine; in fact you will hardly find any part of that country on either side of the height of land that has not pine, though perhaps not in as large quantities as we used to get out years ago.

Mr. CLANCY. The report of the Ontario surveyors says there is no white pine to speak of north of the height of land.

Mr. MACKIE. The report of the surveyors possibly refers to the Abitibi and Moose river regions, that is the route they all take. But I am talking about the bush, away in the interior where there are canoe routes beyond the lake. I do not think there is any pine in that country the surveyors speak of, but there are other large rivers that start from the height of land, and you do not have to go many miles before you reach large quantities of white pine. Talk about the engineers going into that country to find pine, I think the lumbermen, outside the Indians, know more about it than any other people in the world. I have travelled over that country myself, and I have paid thousands of dollars to explore it. We get reports from our bushmen; we keep bushmen travelling all the year round in that country. I have a report book at home that will show the character of the country north of Ontario and Quebec, showing whether it is level or rough, and the character of the forest. But of course that is private information. That is not to be given to the hon. gentleman. Each lumberman is supplied with a report showing where the best pine is, and on what river it is, but this information is not given out to the public. Hon. gentlemen might get information from some lumbermen that would not cost them anything, but they could go there and locate the timber as well as I can. I think the lumbermen know more about the route this road is going to take than most of the engineers. You will hardly find a lumberman in the city of Ottawa that has not a report book dealing with some parts of that country.

We hear it reported that the land is no good, that it won't raise grain or anything else. Now, I have seen as fine potatoes, cabbage and turnips and all such things grown at Lake Abbittibbi as I have seen in any part of Ontario. That is near the boundary line between Quebec and Ontario. The boundary line is at Lake Abbittibbi, about 400 miles from Quebec. I am speaking of the country this side of the line, in Quebec. There are blocks of a thousand acres, or two or three hundred acres—it may be broken a little—of as fine land as there is anywhere within 500 miles of the city of Ottawa. I do not know but that it will raise as good crops, it may be a little far north for wheat. But Manitoba at one time did not raise good wheat, wheat used to get frozen there, but now it does not, and farmers understand better how to regulate their crops. But my intention was only to give a description of a part of this country that this road will run through, and I do not think that there is a better country in Canada for a railroad than a region 500 or 600 miles long that will be traversed. I do not see why there should be any fault found with a road being built there. It is a direct route from Quebec to Winnipeg, and you cannot get a more direct route. The idea of going away around by Toronto, and I suppose by North Bay, to get to Winnipeg—why, the thing is ridiculous. When you have such a country as that you want to open it up, and I think Ontario will get more benefit from this road than any other part of the country. That is a new country, the lumberman has never got back that far because it costs too much to get in supplies. It means taking them in with canoes in summer, and drawing them in winter over miles and miles of snow. Any man who has worked up there don't make much out of the run, because it costs too much to take in his supplies. This pine I speak of on Grand Lake Victoria, is about 200 miles above where any lumber has been cut.

Mr. CLANCY. Is that in the district of Nipissing or Algoma ?

Mr. GRANT. It is in the Lake Abitibi district.

Mr. CLANCY. But I mean this Lake Victoria ?

Mr. MACKIE. I am not talking about the Nipissing district. I am talking about the route of this proposed railway. The district to which I am referring now is at the head of the Ottawa river. The railway will

have to run parallel with the Ottawa river for about 200 miles until it crosses the boundary between Quebec and Ontario. That portion of the Ottawa river has never been improved and it is not likely that it will be, and the pine in that country will have to come out by rail. The square timber will be made with the axe and the logs will be sawed up there. The lumber will be taken out by rail. Lake Abitibi is near the watershed. It is on the canoe route to Hudson's bay. You cannot get any transportation by steamboat within about 300 miles of it. You have to go in your canoe, and that is the reason why that country is not settled. This railway will open up the region to which I refer. No branch railway can open it up as well as a through line, because the proposed line follows along the boundary and a country in which fine agricultural land is found. There is as good farming land on this side of Lake Abitibi, in the province of Quebec, as there is to be found in any portion of that province, and when you get across the boundary line into the province of Ontario you will find that settlers are located right up to the boundary line. The boundary line follows the Ottawa river until it gets to the head of Lake Témiscamingue, when it strikes due north towards James bay. Settlement on the Ontario side extends away northward along the boundary line, and there are some settlers near the height of land now. There are twenty good townships in that region that are filling up very rapidly. This road will go very close to these settlers, and the Témiscamingue Railway, which is being constructed by the Ontario government, will go right through the settlement, and the two will likely join at some point in that neighbourhood. I do not speak only from my own knowledge, but I base my statement also on the reports which we have received, that there is as fine land in the townships to which I have referred as there is in any part of Ontario. I am also told by the Indians and trappers that the land for 200 or 300 miles beyond is equally as good. This road is going to be a great benefit to the northern portions of Ontario and Quebec. I do not know of any other proposition that would confer as great a benefit upon this portion of the country. The government road running from North Bay will tap the transcontinental line somewhere in this vicinity, and there will be roads running from Port Arthur, from Quebec and other places, which will also connect with it, so that important centres south of the railway will have the benefit of branches connecting with the transcontinental line, which will also be an advantage to the settlements along the route of the road. As to the route below Quebec, I cannot say anything, as I do not know very much about that country. But I can tell the House one thing that surprises me, and it is the contrat that the government have made with these railway people. I think it is all a one-sided contract. I do not think there ever was a contract in Canada like it before.

Mr. CLANCY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKIE. It is all in favour of the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKIE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) was shouting before he was out of the bush. I think this scheme will confer a greater boon upon Canada than anything that any government has ever done. I know that some of the strongest supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite in their own counties have told me that if they oppose this road they need not go back for re-election. Of course, we do not expect some hon. gentlemen on the other side from western Ontario and around Toronto to do anything else. They will oppose any road that is not going into Toronto, or at least into Ontario. That is their general policy in this House. I think that some hon. members opposite from the province of Quebec, and especially the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), do not know anything about the north-west portion of their own province. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier does not think that that country has any value at all. I am surprised that an hon. gentleman who occupies the position of a leader of his party should not know anything about his own province. I do not think he is qualified to represent the province of Quebec.

Mr. CLANCY. He may have obtained his information where the hon. gentleman did—from the Indians.

Mr. MACKIE. I do not need to go to the Indians or to any white man for any information that I have. I am, I think, well qualified to speak upon this subject. I have travelled through that country with my pack on my back and slept on three feet of snow every night. When you are travelling through that country it is impossible for you to tell when you have arrived at the height of land until you see which way the streams are running. If the streams are running northward, you know you are over the height of land. I do not want any hon. gentleman to tell me that this is not a good country to run a railway through. I never saw a better. Travelling on the Canadian Pacific Railway around the north shore of Lake Superior a man is in danger of his life going around those curves. I never want to go back to the North-west until there is another road built, and I think I will wait for this one, because this road will traverse a level country. Some hon. gentlemen have said that there are no water-powers on this route. There are the greatest water-powers on the Ottawa river not far from the proposed line of this road that I suppose there are any place in Canada. Of course, you cannot find water-powers byond the height

of land unless you go quite a distance from it. I do not see why this road should go beyond the height of land. I think it should be built on this side, because then it will open up a large tract of fine agricultural country. Any man who opposes this scheme who lives in Ontario is not doing Ontario justice, and I will say the same of any man living in the province of Quebec who adopts a similar course. There is no other proposition that can open up the country as advantageously as this. I hope that when the time comes some hon. gentlemen opposite will change their ideas a little. When I was in Quebec the other day I met a strong supporter of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who asked me about this railway and who expressed the idea, strong Conservative as he is, that the hon. leader of the opposition should not oppose it. Possibly, when the vote comes that hon. gentleman will not be here, because we do not see him about very much. This railway will run through twenty-five or thirty townships of as good farming land as can be found in any part of the older province of Ontario, and it will open it up. I do not know that I have much more to say, except to express the hope that hon. gentlemen will consider the matter well before they vote.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RAILWAY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 147) to incorporate the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

On section 11,

Mr. BARKER. With regard to clause 11, I notice that the word 'communication,' an unusual word, is used there. Now that is certainly a word that is not common in Canada, and I would suggest that it should read 'or other public communication or place without first obtaining the consent.' That would make it quite clear. I do not know what a communication is in regard to a street or anything else. It may have a significant meaning. I have no objection to using the words 'street or other public communication' if the words 'or place' are added after it. I cannot see any objection to that alteration, and it might happen that a square in the middle of a city or a park, might not be called a communication; it would be a place, however.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I may say, that this Bill, as everybody knows, was very carefully considered in the Railway Committee for several days, and the amendments that were made to it were mutually agreed on by both parties and it went through the committee unanimously, without any discussion, after this agreement. I do not like to see any changes made in the Bill now, and I think so far as those two words are concerned, 'communication' or 'place,' they mean identically the same thing. The word 'communication' means, I suppose, a park, a square, a street, a highway. If you look at the dictionary you will find that the word 'communication' in this sense is derived from an old English phrase, and it means a place such as a park, a square, a street, a highway, where people communicate with one another. I understand the object Mr. Barker has in view, that the city of Hamilton wants to take precautions that this railway shall not have the right to go through a park. Well, I think the word 'communication' will fairly cover that, so that it cannot possibly do that, and any way there should be no objection to it, because under this clause, you will see that the railway has no right to run along any street or highway in any city or town without the consent of the municipality, and the municipality in giving their consent to run along any street or highway can easily stipulate that it shall not run through any park or any where else they choose. I have not had very much time to consult the promotors of the Bill, and I trust that my hon. friend will not press the alteration.

Mr. BARKER. I quite admit all that the hon. gentleman has said. This Bill as it stands to-day was, as I understand, agreed upon at one o'clock in the morning, between the solicitors, but I have a duty to perform to my constituents, and I am not quite clear that notwithstanding the words 'public communication' this railway company, if they get into the city of Hamilton, may not be able thereafter to run across two public parks in that city, which the citizens regard as so important that rather than have them interfered with they would keep this railway out altogether. I may mention that a short time ago a proposition was made to construct a railway from Galt into Hamilton, and the one point upon which the railway was prevented from going into Hamilton was that they wanted to run through the parks of the city, and get off the street. Now I understand the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) to argue that 'communication' does cover in the broadest sense a public place. All I desire is to make it quite clear that a public place is included. I do not desire to force the question unnecessarily, but it is an important matter to the citizens of Hamilton, and I submit that when the hon. gentleman says that the word 'communication' will cover the word 'place' he cannot have any objection to the words 'or place' being inserted in the Bill, so that there may be no doubt about it. That is all I contend for, and I do not want to hamper the hon. gentleman now in his Bill in the least. Personally, I am opposed to the Bill from first to

last, but the Bill having been agreed to I am content to allow it to pass. I want simply to add 'or other public communication or place,' that is public communication or public place. I have no objection to striking out the word 'communication,' but if they desire particularly to have that word in, I want to add the words 'or place,' and I do think the House will see the reasonableness of what I ask for. I would therefore, Mr. Chairman, move, that after the word 'communication' in the third and sixth lines of clause 11, the words 'or place' be inserted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would suggest to the hon. member for Hamilton that as there is no difference of opinion as to what is desired and my contention is simply that the word 'communication' covers all that is required. If my hon. friend thinks that it does not, I would suggest that you strike out the word 'communication' and insert the word 'place' in its stead.

Mr. BARKER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. BLAIN. This is a new clause, which was not printed until to-day. I think this is the first time it has come into my hands. The first part of it reads, 'notwithstanding anything contained in the Railway Act.' Why should that not be, 'notwithstanding anything contained in this Act'? It seems to me that the clause was wide enough to give the company the right to construct their line of railway along the highways under the General Railway Act without the consent of the municipality.

Mr. BARKER. I was present in the committee when this alteration was discussed. I think that if the words, 'notwithstanding anything contained in the Railway Act,' were left out, the streets would be protected as against everything in this Bill. These words were inserted because some hon. gentleman in the committee thought that although this Bill might not permit the construction of a railway on the streets, the general Railway Act might do so.

Mr. FRASER. I think there will be greater security by leaving the words in, otherwise there might be some clause in the Railway Act which, despite the words in the Bill, might allow a railway to come in.

Mr. CLARKE. The intention was to prevent any possibility of that.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended, agreed to.

On the question that the Bill be reported,

Mr. BARKER. Before you report the Bill, I desire to say in the House what I said in the Railway Committee upon the subject of this Bill. I consider that this Bill is totally outside the jurisdiction of this parliament. I have not opposed it in the House, because it was assented to by the parties immediately concerned on both sides. They, in good faith, as between themselves, agreed upon the clauses of the Bill; and although perhaps my objection and my voting against the Bill may be somewhat inconsistent, I desire to repeat here what I said in the committee, that I do not think this parliament has any power to pass this Bill at all. My motive for stating this in the House is this. One of the legal gentlemen who acted for the promoters of this Bill said, when the Bill passed the Railway Committee, that if the municipalities were unreasonable in refusing the permission under clause 11, it might be necessary for them to come back to the committee. In view of that statement of the counsel who was acting for the promoters of the Bill, I desire to say that I protest, and strongly protest, against such measures as this as an infringement upon provincial rights. I think it is wrong, extremely wrong, for this parliament to assume jurisdiction, contrary to the terms of the constitution under which we sit here; and whenever such a Bill as this comes up, I will always vote against it, as I would desire to vote against this Bill. I do not know that I need say anything more. I simply make this statement now to protect myself, and I think to protect other gentlemen, perhaps on both sides of this House, who are opposed to such legislation as this, against the idea going forth that by passing this Bill any precedent is created under which other Bills of a similar character can be brought forward. I think it is necessary to say this, and to say it very emphatically, because all through the discussions of this Bill in the Railway Committee, we were met at every step by statements that similar Bills had already been passed by this House. For my part, I am not going to sit silent here and allow without protest a Bill to pass which may hereafter be brought forward as a precedent to authorize similar legislation in the future. I am very glad to be able to say here that in what I assert I have been endorsed, and very strongly endorsed, by the acting Minister of Railways and Canals, who expresses substantially the same view.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why this Bill conflicts with provincial rights. He has not made that very clear.

Mr. BARKER. I have simply entered my protest. I do not wish to occupy the time of this House in re-discussing a principle which has already been fully discussed. When the measure was up on a previous occasion I went into that question, stating my reasons for believing that this measure does not come within the functions of this House, and I do not think it neces-

sary to occupy the time of the House or 'Hansard' in repeating what I then said.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is one observation of the hon. gentleman which I think perhaps he did not mean. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman intended us to understand that he thinks this measure is beyond the power of this House ?

Mr. BARKER. I think it is beyond the power of this House, for this reason, that we state in this Bill a fact to give us jurisdiction, which fact I believe is contrary to the opinion of every hon. gentleman in the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean that any court would hold that this Bill is ultra vires ?

Mr. BARKER. No, I believe not, it would be precluded from so holding, by our misstatement of the fact.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was my only purpose in asking the question ; because the hon. gentleman's statement was beyond what he really intended. On the main question, I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman, that we ought to have that fact proved in a general way to the satisfaction of any committee of this House before we assume jurisdiction over purely local and provincial matters. As far as the general principle is concerned, I wish to express my agreement with it.

Mr. BARKER. I quite agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell). He has stated the legal position, I think accurately. I have no doubt whatever in my mind that if this House chooses to state as a positive fact in a Bill that a work is for the general advanage of Canada, there is no remedy—it follows, from the statement of the fact, solemnly made by the parliament of Canada, that the work is for the general advantage of Canada, that the Bill relating to it comes within our jurisdiction. But what I contend for is this, that when those words are used as a mere-pretense, when there is no possible foundation for the state ment, we have no more moral right, sitting in this House, to enact such a measure, than we would have for supporting a Bill to authorize the construction of a village pound because we should choose to state that such a pound was for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. I just wish to emphasize what the hon. member for Hamilton has said, by remarking, that there have been a great many measures similar to this passed through the Railway Committee and the House. The abuse, if I may use that expression without giving offence, of the privileges of this House has been carried to such an extent that the municipalities have had to make a very special and very strong appeal to the sense of justice and fair play of members of this parliament to stop this class of legislation. With the co-operation of hon. gentlemen on both sides, this measure has been shorn of its most objectionable features. As the hon. member for Hamilton has said, a compromise was reached which we are bound to stand by, but I hope that this will be the last Bill of this kind which will ever be presented to a Dominion parliament. This is an invasion undoubtedly of provincial and municipal rights. The intention of the promoters in coming here was to evade the obligations which would have been imposed upon them had they applied to the Ontario legislature.

Mr. FRASER. While I agree in much that has been said, I would not like to say that a special case could not be made out. The general principle is correct, but I can understand, for example, that in the case of a city which a railway crossed and re-crossed, a great continental line, it might be necessary that we should assume jurisdiction in the interest of the travelling public.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure that my hon. friend, the senior member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), when he spoke of the practice of passing Bills by this parliament, which were of a provincial character, had no reference to this particular parliament or to any particular session, but to the Dominion parliament, speaking in the broadest sense of the word.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I well remember, as far back as twenty years, when this abuse of the British North America Act began ; and year after year since then, measures have been passed through the Dominion parliament which should have been dealt with by a provincial legislature. This was done by declaring such measures to be for the general advantage of Canada when they really were not. On many an occasion, in days gone by, I have protested against this practice. I raised the same protest which has been raised in this case by the hon. member for Hamilton and others. It is well that parliament has been brought face to face with the situation resulting from this lax system of legislation. It is well that this measure has been thoroughly discussed in the Railway Committee, as we have thereby arrived at a clear idea as to how similar applications should be treated in the future. I would not venture to lay down a rule, but it seems to me that if I had to determine the policy and practice of the Railway Committee in a question of this kind, I would think it proper, if we are to give a fair interpretation to the British North America Act, that we should, in the first place, assume that every work which

is within the confines of a province is prima facie subject to the jurisdiction of that province only, and let the onus rest on those who seek to obtain legislation here to prove that the work is properly the subject of Dominion legislation. Unless they can establish that point clearly, the committee should not proceed to deliver judgment and give a federal charter to a work which it does not possess. This debate will not prove unprofitable if it results in educating members to the consequences of continuing the practice which has so long prevailed. As has been remarked, where are you to stop, if you are to declare, without inquiry or reflection, that any work that may be in existence in any nook or corner, municipality or parish, of this broad Dominion, is a work for the general advantage of Canada, and thus remove it from the jurisdiction of the local legislature, which ought to deal with it. Although this measure may become law, I venture to say that it will be many a year before parliament will be asked to pass legislation of a similar character.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No doubt whatever that the clause of the British North America Act has been given a scope it was never intended to have. It has been used over and over again, as a matter of course so that a declaration is made more as a matter of form than anything else, and I am inclined to think that probably it will be good policy for this parliament in the future to insist that any measure of this kind, by which it is intended to bring within the jurisdiction of this parliament an undertaking which is prima facie within the scope of provincial jurisdiction, should be either referred to a select committee of the House, in order that the question of a fact may be absolutely proved, or be submitted to the determination of some judicial authority. There are of course many cases in which parliament itself would be the best judge. The Railway Committee or the Committee on Private Bills possibly might be the best judge. Those promoting the undertaking should be put into the position in which the promoters of private Bills in England are placed. If I understand the practice there, it is practically a judicial inquiry and a judicial determination upon important questions of fact involved in the preamble of the Bill. They are very much more strict than we are in such matters, and so far as this particular question is concerned, it would be very desirable that in the future we should adopt some such principle with regard to measures of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. It is interesting, after the lapse of many years, to see parliament coming back to what was the intention of the framers of the British North America Act. I remember away back in 1879-80-82 and 1883, when the French Canadian members in this House were the only parties who objected to our legislative interference with what are undoubtedly the rights of the provinces. I remember very distinctly men who were regarded as eminent lawyers giving their opinion in the Railway Committee to the effect that although the declaration be made that the work is for the general advantage of Canada, unless the other conditions existed which brought it within the legislative authority of the federal parliament, it would not be held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be such a work. I have often regretted that these discussions did not take place in the House instead of in committee, as we then would have had a record of the debates. But I remember distinctly Mr. Hector Cameron and Mr. MacMaster, of Montreal, and several other prominent legal authorities, and Sir Hector Langevin as well, frequently expressing the opinion that we could not bring a work within the legislative jurisdiction of the federal parliament by the simple statement that it was for the general advantage of Canada, and that if the question came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council it would so decide.

It seems that since that decision has been given which leaves the impression that a declaration in the Bill that the work referred to is for the general advantage of Canada, of itself brings the subject within the legislative jurisdiction of this parliament. What I think ought to have been done with a great many of these Bills is to submit the question to the Supreme Court. This is one of the objects for which the Supreme Court was established—to advise parliament on these questions of jurisdiction as between the provinces and the Dominion. A case could be stated at any time and submitted to the Supreme Court. We should have at least the advantage of their judgment, and if it was deemed advisable to carry the case further, that could be done. But it seems that we are getting back to where we were twenty years ago, with the added difficulty that this decision has been given which seems to show that the mere declaration, in a Bill, as I have said, brings the subject within the jurisdiction of this parliament. But, because of this very fact, it is all the more necessary that we should surround these measures with safeguards that will secure to the provinces the right of control over provincial corporations. When we deal with Bills relating to works that extend beyond the bounds of one province or with corporations that have rights or interests in more than one province, there may be some justification for our dealing with them. But surely a short electric railway, even though it may cross lines of railway which are within our jurisdiction, can hardly be fairly called a work for the general advantage of Canada

and so removed from provincial to federal jurisdiction.

Mr. BARKER. The discussion is very interesting, and I think, very important. I do not go quite so far as to say that Bills of this kind should be referred to the Supreme Court, or to a judge of that Court. I am afraid it would interfere with the practical working of parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. But we have done it before.

Mr. BARKER. I know it. But I doubt if we could do it in all these cases. But I would suggest that in all cases where a Bill contains a declaration that the work is a work for the general advantage of Canada, there should be a report from the government or from the Minister of Justice to the committee having charge of the Bill, giving the opinion of the government or of that minister, as to the propriety of the declaration in regard to the particular work dealt with in the Bill. That would not preclude the committee from deciding the question, but it would put upon the government of the day the responsibility of saying whether they thought parliament had jurisdiction in the matter or not. I believe that if the present government had had this question referred to them under such a rule, they would have reported to the Railway Committee that the work referred to in the Bill was not one for the general advantage of Canada. The subject was brought before a committee of the government and they heard statements of counsel representing the province of Ontario and other provinces. But the government saw fit to refer the matter back to the Railway Committee. Considering that such matters affect the working of our constitution, the committee should have the benefit of an opinion from the government or the Minister of Justice, stating whether on the face of it the Bill appears to be one providing for works which are within the juridiction of this parliament. I would not desire for a moment that the Railway Committee should be debarred from the right to discuss or decide upon the question. But I do think the committee should have the opinion of the minister for their guidance. And I feel fairly certain that if such protection were afforded to the public we should have very little trouble on the score of such Bills as this. I doubt whether a government representing either political party would report that the work referred to in this Bill was a work for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. HEYD. I think we ought to go even a little further than the suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). There should be certain conditions agreed upon that a railway company must comply with before it could be declared a work for the general advantage of Canada. The conditions should work automatically, and not be left to a majority of the Railway Committee, for that majority is always uncertain. The meaning of this phrase 'work for the general advantage of Canada' should be declared so that a railway company, before it even aspires to be clothed with the powers vested in these magical words, it should have to comply with certain conditions. The effect would be to relieve the committee of a great deal of unnecessary work. It seems to me that the practice has insensibly grown up in the Railway Committee of granting the benefit of these words to railways that were not really entitled to use them. And many members did not know what the effect of the words was. I have asked in the House and in the Railway Committee what advantage accrued to a railway company to which these words applied, and no one has been able to tell me. The impression has gone abroad that an attempt has been made in this House to take from the provinces rights that belong to them. I am sure that no such desire exists on the part of any hon. members of this House. If we have erred in the past in granting to companies the privilege of having their works called works for the general advantage of Canada, it has not been with the intention of robbing the provinces of any right belonging to them. If my suggestion were adopted and the conditions defined, our work of legislation would be done more smoothly and consistently. It should not be left to the majority of the Railway Committee in this general fashion to say whether a work is or is not a work for the general advantage of Canada. A majority of the Railway Committee might be friendly to one promoter, and declare the work he represented to be for the general advantage of Canada, while refusing the privilege to another equally entitled to it. We should define what those words mean, so that railways will be obliged to comply with the conditions laid down, and, complying with these conditions, they would be entitled to be called works for the general advantage of Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that a clause of this kind should be subject to report from the government, I hardly think that, on reflection, the hon. gentleman will adhere to that view. The question that lies at the very threshold of the inquiry in each of these cases is one of facts, and parliament is the proper tribunal to inquire into that question of facts, either directly or by such machinery as it may invoke. When the facts are known, it is for parliament to apply the legal consequences by either bringing the work under the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada or refusing to do so. But I would not favour parliament abnegating its functions to any govern-

ment or committee. It should retain the right to deal with those questions in its own way. Difficulty has arisen in the past because——

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman totally misunderstood my suggestion. I did not suggest that the government should have the power to prevent parliament dealing with the question. I only said that when such a statement was made in a Bill coming before the Railway Committee, the Minister of Justice or some other minister should send a report to the committee for their information, stating that in his opinion he considered that work to come within our jurisdiction, that is to say, that it was a work for the general advantage of Canada. But I said moreover that I would not propose to preclude the Railway Committee or the House from deciding upon the question; I only proposed that the committee and the House should have the advantage of the ministry speaking with the responsibility of a ministry upon that question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite understood the hon. gentleman. My view is that the first inquiry is to ascertain what are the facts. Are the facts such as to warrant the statement, not within the meaning of the British North America Act in the first place, but to warrant the statement in the ordinary acceptation of the words that the work is of such general importance as to warrant its being removed from the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature and being brought under the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament. That is a question of fact in the first instance, and I do not think that the Minister of Justice is any better qualified to pronounce upon this question of fact than any other member of parliament. I was going to say that in my opinion parliament should not allow this procedure to be hampered or interfered with by a report of a government or by a report of any tribunal that is not appointed by this House.

Mr. BARKER. I quite agree.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The government is after all no better able to judge of the facts than any dozen members of this House. But I was going to make a suggestion, seeing that we are all seeking to accomplish the same end and to make suggestions that may hereafter bear fruit and cause proper consideration to be given to this point in connection with all other applications. I have not taken the opinion of my colleagues on this point, I merely give it offhand, the same as other hon. gentlemen are giving their views I presume. I was going to say that there are a number of rules in the standing rules of this House governing the procedure before Railway Committees, and it seems to me that the House itself might fairly formulate a rule dealing with a question of this kind, providing that when a Bill of this kind came before the committee the first step to be taken should be to make the proper inquiry, leaving it with the committee of course to take such steps as it saw fit. But I think that some good would come by having one of the rules of this House provide for dealing with such cases in the future.

Mr. CLARKE There is another suggestion that might be made, and it is that when legislation of this kind is being sought for which affects the rights and interests of great urban municipalities, it should be a prerequisite of such application before being considered by the proper committee, that the municipality to be affected should be specially notified that such legislation was being promoted, and the municipality should also be notified in what way its rights might be affected by legislation passed by this House as compared with provincial legislation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A rule of the House might cover that.

Mr. CLARKE. In this connection I may say that the city of Toronto has spent three quarters of a million dollars on what is known as the Don improvement. The work was constructed by the city, with the sanction of the legislative assembly. It was practically a local improvement work, but by some means it has been declared to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, and the city of Toronto is getting a rental of $750 a year for that enormours expenditure. Muncipalities whose rights have been invaded by legislation of this kind are naturally suspicious, and I think if the onus of responsibility were thrown upon promoters of notifying municipalities that were likely to be affected by proposed legislation, additional safeguards for the rights of municipalities would be afforded which do not exist at the present time.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On Monday next the House will be called upon to consider the report of the select committee on the rules of the House. It would be out of order for me now to refer to those rules further than to say that one of the proposed rules is that in connection with an application of a telegraph or telephone company for legislation, in addition to the notice being published in the 'Canada Gazette,' a similar notice should be published in some leading newspapers. Perhaps that might not altogether meet the case, perhaps the notice, instead of appearing only in the 'Canada Gazette' and one other paper, should be published in the papers of the locality to be affected by the proposed legislation. If that does not go far enough, perhaps my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) would consider this suggestion, and when this Bill comes before us on Monday next, he would suggest something of the nature he has mentioned, for example, an additional notice.

Mr. CLARKE. A specific notice to the clerk of the municipality.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This would afford a good opportunity, at all events, to discuss that point.

Mr. FRASER. We must remember that a work that may now be considered for the general advantage of Canada, ten years hereafter may not be so considered, because new circumstances will arise. I would not wish to be bound by a rule made even by the wisest House that ever sat in Canada, as to any particular work being for the general advantage of Canada. You must leave that to the evolution that takes place in all countries and societies. Growing as we are, each succeeding parliament will be called upon to deal with the facts as they then exist. You cannot deal on hard and fast lines with a clause like this, because year after year and decade after decade circumstances will change.

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

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 236) for the relief of Harford Ashley.—Mr. Porter.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a national transcontinental railway, and the motion of Mr. Puttee in amendment thereto.

Mr. J. R. LAVELL (Leeds and Grenville). We have had the pleasure of listening to the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie), who gave us his opinions on this Bill, which of course he is entitled to do, as is every other member of this House, but his opinions can only have weight according to the weight of the reasons that he alleges in support of them. We have also heard from him certain statements which we may speak of as statements of fact and which were of interest to the members of this House. Among other statements made by the hon. member was that he knew more of that country through which this road from Winnipeg to Quebec is to pass than any other hon. member of this House. I presume, in making that statement, he also included the right hon. leader of the government. He then proceeded to tell us what he knew. I sincerely trust that much of the northern portion of Ontario, as also of Quebec, is of the quality which he describes but we have to confine ourselves to the country that he specially knows and not give weight to any opinion he may form. He tells us that he has gone through the north country, that he has seen the height of land, that he has crossed it and that he has examined the country on both sides of it. For what distance has he examined it ? He tells us that he has knowledge of it for 400 or 500 miles and he also tells us that he has personal knowledge of it for 100 miles.

Mr. MACKIE. I did not say that. I said I had personal knowledge of it for 100 miles in Ontario.

Mr. LAVELL. Very well. The hon. gentleman has personal knowledge of it for one hundred miles in Ontario, and also, I presume, he has personal knowledge for 300 miles in Quebec ?

Mr. MACKIE. Yes.

Mr. LAVELL. That is personal knowledge of 400 miles of country in all. This railway covers a distance from Winnipeg to to Quebec of a little over 1,400 miles in a straight line, not an air-line, because it is impossible to build an air-line. That, I think has to be admitted. The most optimistic speaker on this proposition, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) added 10 per cent to the distance to find out how much farther the road would have to go. The least distance was 1,500 miles, according to his estimate. His estimate is altogether too small, because I think it would be easily ascertained that no railway between points in eastern Canada has even been built within a distance of 10 per cent more than the air-line. Not long ago the Canadian Pacific Railway in building a piece of line without a subsidy and desiring to get the shortest possible distance between Perth and Toronto, built the line as straight as it could, but it did not succeed in keeping it within 15 per cent of the air-line. When you add the percentage of additional distance that it would be necessary to build in connection with this proposed new line, the mileage will be more nearly 1,500 or 1,600 miles than 1,400 miles between Winnipeg and Quebec. The hon. member has been over some 400 miles of this distance. He admits that he does not know the location of the line and he has only knowledge or professes to have information of less than one-quarter of the distance to be covered by the line as to its fertility and resources. There are others who have crossed the height of land and there are various heights of land that have to be crossed all over this country. It has been noticeable that the height of land is generally level, but that by no means proves that the height of land is fertile. I know that in the days when I could find time to go on long canoe trips, I had the pleasure to cross the height of land some distance north of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I admit that the height of land was level, I admit that it was very difficult to tell even when you came to the height of land, save by the waters flowing each way, but even the imagination of the hon. member for North Norfolk could not conjure up any fertility

in that region. Of course, I was simply hunting for scenery. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) was hunting for lumber. We probably both found what we were seeking. This shows the singularly small amount of information which we have concerning that region, and the possibility of building a railway through it. I will probably touch upon that again.

Notwithstanding all that has been said upon this question, it is necessary either in starting to criticise it or in expressing the opinions of an hon. member of this House on it to review the proposition even although it has been already done. There is a story told about a certain lawyer in one of our courts of appeal. He had been defeated in the court below, and having appealed to a higher court, he commenced to lay down some elementary principles when the chief justice interrupted him and asked him if he would not give the court credit for knowing something about the primary principles of law. His answer was this: That is just the mistake I made in the court below, my lord. I think from the way in which hon. gentlemen opposite have carefully avoided some of the principal facts in connection with this whole transaction, that they should be repeated very often, for after all, we have to come down to some preliminary principles which ought to be put forth in connection with any such proposition as that which is now before the House. What is the proposition? It is one that involves, as the right hon. leader of the government said, two principles, one the granting of a charter to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to build a road from Winnipeg to the Pacific ocean, and in connection with that road to give a guarantee and a certain amount of cash subsidy for that is what the payment of interest on the bonds for a number of years means, and the other part of the proposition is that the government shall build the road itself from Winnipeg to Moncton via. Quebec, and having built it hand it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific. That is the proposition in short subject to the details as they will be found in the agreement attached to the Bill. What is the reason given for the building of this road? We have in this House heard as many different reasons as there have been different speakers on the government side. But, I presume that we may give the right hon. leader of the government credit for knowing the reason for the faith that is in him better than any of his followers, and he has given practically three reasons. I am going to quote from his own words the reasons given by him upon introducing this Bill. He said that this work is undertaken, this contract is made:

> To provide immediate means whereby the products of these new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost.

He is referring to the new settlers in Manitoba, the North-west and British Columbia. Then, here is his second reason:

> Whereby, likewise, a market may be found for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces.

It is well to look again at this second reason, and to follow the elaboration of the right hon. gentleman. He is referring to these settlers pouring into the North-west Territories in countless numbers, thousands and hundreds of thousands, he has mentioned, and he says that for one, two or three generations, the new settlers will grow cereals and probably nothing else. He proceeds:

> They will have need of everything that is required by civilized men. They will have need of clothing, furniture and every kind of manufacture. Then, Sir, what shall we do? Shall we allow them to be supplied by our American neighbours, or shall we provide a railway which shall enable our manufacturers in Ontario and Quebec to supply them with what they shall require?

I would ask the House to bear in mind these two main reasons, although there is another and very important reason given by the right hon. gentleman:

> These are the two main reasons for building the road. There is a third which I will deal with more fully and dispose of before touching on these two reasons.

And that third was the need of being independent of bonding privileges. Now, Sir, this is the argument of the right hon. gentleman that has been carefully analysed already by the ex-Minister of Railways, and has been referred to repeatedly by different speakers who touched on this matter. Attention has been drawn to the way in which the right hon. gentleman dealt with this matter. I might read his words. They are worthy of repetition. In speaking with regard to this bonding privilege, of our position with regard to the United States, and of the necessity of our being commercially independent of the United States, he says:

> What is our position to-day?

He does not say what was our position a good many years ago, but 'What is our position to-day?'

> What is our position to-day? From the early days of railway development of this country, we have been dependent on American good-will for the transportation of our goods across American territory. From the early days of Canadian railway development, we have been forced to make use of American territory and harbours.

He repeated almost this same language further in his address. He says:

> If we have used American ports and the bonding privilege it was not because our harbours were ice-bound in winter but simply because we have no railways of our own to reach them.

Now, notwithstanding the fact that the fullest prominence has been given to the

error made by the hon. gentleman in that, and that not only to-day, but for many years, we have had not only one, but two railways that connect with the harbours on the Atlantic coast; notwithstanding this, that statement has been repeated over and over again. Surely, Sir, any school boy attending at any of our schools who went up to a departmental examination and gave such an answer as that when asked about our railway connections, would be, and most certainly would deserve to be plucked. It should be something well within the knowledge of every member of this House and of every citizen of this country that not long ago the exportation of cattle through the United States from certain parts of the interior was stopped. The Canadian Pacific Railway could not carry them across to St. John, because it would have to go through the state of Maine, and the Grand Trunk Railway could not carry them to Portland, and they were carried around by the Intercolonial Railway; and not only have we the Intercolonial Railway, but, as has been repeatedly referred to, we have another route by Edmundston connecting with the Intercolonial Railway for St. John. I emphasize this, not to call attention to the particular mistake, but to call attention to the fact that that simply illustrated the vagueness of detail and of knowledge of fact on which this whole project is based. There is a lack of exactness which augurs very ill for the successful carrying out of such a gigantic undertaking. That lack of exactness and the vagueness is not only illustrated by the statements made with regard to the bonding privileges, but it is further illustrated by what is proposed to overcome this difficulty. The member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), referring to the need of our having an all-Canadian line, said the Intercolonial Railway had been built without regard to commercial principles, and was 300 miles too long. We have heard some pretty wild statements, but I think that is the largest estimate of the excess of distance of the Intercolonial Railway that has been made in this House. Well, that is one estimate, but we have on the other side the estimate of the ex-Minister of Railways, who said that 63 miles could be saved in a distance of several hundreds. We have further the estimate made by the right hon. gentleman who moved the resolution. He says that 120 to 140 miles can be saved—at least he says that in one part of his speech. I have said that these estimates of the distance by which this proposed new railway might shorten the road between Quebec and Moncton, or Montreal and Moncton, were very vague, that the figures presented disagreed, but it is not simply the different speakers that disagree. We find in the speech of the right hon. gentleman when he was moving this Bill three different statements of the distance that could be saved. When he first refers to it he says:

If the truth must be told it must be said that those who conceived and carried out the Intercolonial Railway added to its length, to its normal length several hundred miles.

That is the first statement. The next statement is that it being necessary to make the shortest possible line, a line will have to be made going direct to Edmundston, close around the north of the state of Maine and from there to Moncton. That is the shortest possible way of making an all-Canadian line. By doing this we can shorten the distance between Moncton and Lévis by from 120 to 140 miles. I might suggest that that is very different from several hundred miles, but probably it is just as clear as most of the facts that we have in connection with this new road. However, the right hon. gentleman desired to give a reason for the faith that was in him, and he referred to the knowledge that we had, and after speaking of knowledge that had been gained by lumbermen, by early explorers and others, he said that we have an exact survey, a survey of this very country that had been made under the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. He quotes from this the report of the engineer in charge, Mr. Davey, and this is the only exact report that is quoted by the right hon. gentleman, or that has been quoted by any member of this House. I am not going to quote that this session but at the close of this report Mr. Davy, according to the quotation made by the right hon. the Premier, says that the survey made by him showed that the distance from Montréal to Moncton could be shortened to 759 miles, but he said there was one place where 100 miles more could be taken off, and the total length from Edmundston to Moncton be reduced to 199 miles, which makes 749 miles from Montreal to Halifax. According to the time-table of the Intercolonial Railway, which is the only authority I have had an opportunity of consulting since reading that, it seems that the present line from Halifax to Montreal is only 87 miles more than that, so we find in the speech of the right hon. Premier three separate estimates of the distance by which the line from Moncton to Montreal may be shortened. The first is several hundreds, the next 120 to 140, and then when he comes down to read an engineering report, he is not larger than 87 miles. Well, that report is on paper, and is still a report, the line has to be built, and engineering difficulties always arise, and no one ever yet knew of a line being built in quite as short a mileage as the original estimate of the first engineer who went over it. I think we can take it for granted that the statement of the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways was correct when he said that 63 miles is probably the very utmost by which the line between Montreal and Moncton, or Quebec and Moncton, can be shortened.

And it is for the sake of gaining 63 miles,

or let us say 87 miles, out of some 836, that this project of building a new line from Quebec to Moncton and then handing it over to a rival company, is to be undertaken. The cutting off of these 87 miles or less is to be undertaken, it is said with great gusto by the right hon. the Premier, for the sake of relieving us from the bondage of the bonding privilege. Well, that is worth examining. Suppose the United States did cut off its nose to spite its face; suppose it did injure its own railroads and ports for the sake of causing injury to our Canadian railroads—because that is after all the meaning of it—what would be the result? Of course, it would mean that Canadian goods for export would have to go around the north of the state of Maine. That question is settled, and rightly enough. As all who have examined the map know, that would be a most expensive route; but what will be the best route? The right hon. gentleman says that the route proposed by this Bill will be the shortest and the best. But this route would be considerably longer than the Canadian Pacific Railway short line to St. John or the Grand Trunk line to Portland; consequently the haul over it would be more expensive per mile, and therefore it would be a more expensive route. But in the event of our railroads being attacked by means of any such hostile act as the repeal of the bonding privilege, who might better in the interests of Canada own this short route from Quebec to St. John or Halifax? Would it not be infinitely better as has been suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition, that if that route needs to be built as a better and shorter route, that it should remain in the hands of the people of Canada? Would it not be infinitely better that it should remain not only owned by the Dominion, but operated by the Dominion, so that in the event of such an act of hostility, the Dominion, if necessary, would be willing to lose a certain amount of money in order that our commercial interests should not be injured? If necessary we could make it haul from Montreal or Quebec to St. John or Halifax at as low a rate as any of the railways of the United States offer to their seaports. The country could well afford to do that in order that our commercial interests would not be imperilled; but could we compel a private corporation to do that? No legislation under the sun could compel private corporations to carry freight at a loss, though the country could afford to do it to meet that special emergency. If the proposed railway can get us out of the difficulty of the bonding privilege, it only shows that it should remain in the possession of and under the control of the government in order to serve the interests of Canada as a whole in the event of such a contingency.

There is another thing which, although attention has been called to it before, is worth repeating. If this contract is carried out, and that road is built, it must of necessity be built to the injury of the Intercolonial Railway. That matter has been treated so exhaustively by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, that I do not propose to go into it; but I do desire to answer a somewhat serious proposition made by the hon. Minister of Finance. He asked how the building and running of this road would hurt the Intercolonial Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway, he said, had built a short line to Montreal, the Canada Atlantic, did not object to it, and the two roads are running. It seemed to me that the hon. Minister of Finance must have laughed up his sleeve when he said that. He must know that the two cases are not in the slightest degree parallel. In the first place, the two roads run through a populous district between two large centres of business. It would have been a closer parallel if when the proposition was mooted that the Canadian Pacific Railway should build a short line to Montreal, the Canada Atlantic Company had offered to build the line, had entered into a guarantee to see that it was kept up to date, and at its completion handed it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway on condition that after a few years the Canadian Pacific Railway would pay a small percentage for its use. That, I admit, is an insane proposition; but it is hardly less insane than the proposition of the government to enter into a contract with a private company to build a better road than it has at present, and at the end of a certain number of years to hand it over to that private company for an annual payment of 3 per cent on the cost, without taking any guarantee that the road would ever be paid for. So much for the bonding privilege, which has been dealt with pretty freely by others.

The right hon. the Premier said that this new road would form an exit for the products of Manitoba and the North-west Territories to the ocean at the least cost. What exit is there now? One would almost imagine from the speech of the right hon. gentleman that there is no exit now, but that the farmer of the North-west grows his crop and piles up his grain, and leaves it there until some one with a dray comes along and takes it out, or until settlement grows up in the neighbourhood large enough to consume it all. We have at present, I think, some means of getting our crops out of the North-west. I should imagine that our Trade and Navigation returns would prove that. How do they come out? It seems ridiculous to have to state it; but, from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, it seems to be necessary to inform them of the fact. There are at least two main lines and a great many branch lines of railway running through the country. I would like to see a great many more; and when I first saw the proposition of the Grand

Trunk Pacific to build a line from North Bay westward, I was very glad to see it, and to give it my support in the Railway Committee; because I believe that in a country as well fitted for settlement as the North-west, into which so many thousands of people are thronging, it is all the better to have a fair number of railways so long as they do not interfere with each other, and so long as they are spread over the territories, to help to develop them properly. The grain is carried by these roads, and what becomes of it ? It has been repeated often enough here : we know that the vast bulk of it is sent to the ports of Lake Superior, and we know that it will continue to go there, no matter what railways are built across the country.

It has been so clearly demonstrated that carriage by water is cheaper than carriage by land. No amount of figures could get over the fact that even railways which extend from the furthest west to the furthest east, find it to their advantage, when they come in contact with our great central water-ways, to tranship to those water-ways. Not only the Canadian Pacific Railway, but practically all the American roads which have ports on Lakes Michigan and Superior and the other great lakes, transship their grain at these ports, and in many cases millions of bushels of grain are transshipped by railways having eastern connections. That grain is carried by water three times the distance that it is by rail, and transhipped again at Buffalo, simply because the water route is the cheaper. That fact speaks volumes more forcibly than all the fantastic theories hon. gentlemen can invent to justify the building of a railway over that wonderful prairie section between Winnipeg and Quebec, and a railway, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) described it, with no greater curves and grades than the lines from Detroit to Buffalo. Such a conception is not one which adds to the reputation of the hon. member for North Norfolk, as a gentleman who pays any attention to the fact, and it was not entertained by the hon. Minister of Finance, who referred to it in such a manner that showed he was afraid the hon. member for North Norfolk might insist on the government building a road which would cost pretty nearly as much per mile as the Finance Minister estimated for the whole distance. Beyond question there exists now two roads leading to Lake Superior and a water route from Lake Superior, over which may be carried all the grain that can reach the ports of transshipment on that lake. That being the case, I can understand the proposition of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. It is willing simply to connect with its own system in the older provinces, not for the purpose of carrying the grain, which would undoubtedly be carried by it, simply to Lake Superior, but for the purpose of having connections by its own lines between the older provinces and the western provinces.

The second reason given in support of this proposition is that it will help the workers of the older provinces to supply the markets of the North-west, that it will afford an outlet for the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec who desire to get their goods into the territories. I would like to ask those who advocate the construction of this road from Fort Simpson on the Pacific coast to Winnipeg, then north to Lake Nepigon close to the waters of Lake Abitibi, then on to Quebec and Moncton, how that line is going to benefit the toilers of the east. Are these toilers located in the vicinity of Lake Abitibi ? Are the manufacturers situated very largely in the region north of Lake Nepigon ? In the name of common sense, how are the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, save those who are located at Quebec city, to reach this road, or to have their goods carried over it to these hundreds of thousands of consumers who are going to the territories ? It will be simply an impossibility unless very expensive cross lines are built.

I believe that in discussing a matter of this kind we should consider the general advantage of Canada, not technically, as in the case of a private Bill, in which this declaration is merely formally made to bring it under the jurisdiction of this parliament, but in the broadest sense of the word. The farmers of Ontario and Quebec have consented to the aid and the assistance of the government being given to the opening up of the North-west, although such a policy operated in a sense to their direct loss. They willingly contributed to this aid and helped on the movement, but they had good and strong reasons for supporting such a policy. They were willing to suffer some financial loss in the first place because it was to the general advantage of the country that the territories should be opened up and our various provinces brought into touch with each other. It was the essence of confederation that that should be done, and those who desired confederation, desired above all things to see it carried out properly. The feeling therefore was almost unanimous on the part of older Canada in supporting a policy of opening up our North-west. There was another reason which influenced our people. By opening up Manitoba and the territories, they were creating homes for their sons and relatives, and at the same time providing direct communication with them. Further, that was being done by a government which constantly kept the general interests of Canada in view, so that while in the opening up of the North-west there was brought about indirectly a depreciation in the farm values of the east, still the government were at the same time carrying out a policy which helped to develop the east by enlarging the opportunities of the farmers and by lay-

ing the foundation of a broad and strong industrial movement. The policy of opening up our North-west and the policy of encouraging our manufacturing industries went together and constituted that national policy, which our hon. friends opposite have so frequently taken occasion to decry, and have found so much reason to copy. It was that policy which induced the farmers of Ontario and Quebec to contribute so largely out of their substance to the development of our western territories. They knew that the country as a whole would benefit, even though they should have to suffer some loss. But admitting that this proposition may help to develop a remote part of the west, in what way can those gentlemen, who have in such florid language said it would be such a wonderful help to Ontario and Quebec, justify their statement that it is going to develop those parts of Ontario and Quebec, which are now business centres and in which is to be found the great bulk of our population. I submit that when a proposition is made involving so heavy an expenditure, involving such a pledge of the credit of the whole country, it should be one that will assist the country as a whole. When the right hon. the First Minister said that this road would enable the manufacturers in the east to get their products into the west and bring the toilers of the east in touch with consumers of the west, he was stating a proposition which certainly is not justified by the measure he has submitted for our approval. I do not think that we can, in any sense of the word, be called sectional or selfish, if we insist that in any undertaking involving so heavy an expenditure on the whole country, both the east and the west should be considered. But the right hon. gentleman reminds me of a woman who spends most of her time attending missionary meetings and neglects her own home. When somebody asked some ragged children if they knew her, they said, yes she is our mother. And when asked where she was, they replied: she is off attending to the children of the heathen and leaving us children to go to the devil.

I have referred to the expenditure involved. I wish that it were possible to build a road such as the one proposed for the figures given by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance. I wish it were possible for me to persuade myself that this was one of those cases to which the statement of the old Scotchman did not apply, when he said that there were three kinds of lies: white lies, black lies, and the worst lies of all, statistics. The road will not be built for nothing; good money must be paid for it. In fact the Prime Minister not only showed this in his speech introducing the Bill, but I think he laid the foundation for most of the errors that have been made by his followers in discussing it since. He said that we should not only have to advance the money, but we should have to pay interest upon it. And what do we receive in return? We receive interest at the same rate. We pay interest and we receive interest. But we pay out the principal, and how about that? It is quite clear that the return of the money is not provided for in anything that the right hon. gentleman says. So, when this financial burden is discussed simply from the standpoint of the payment of interest, then the argument rests upon a purely fictitious basis. It seems to me it is not worthy of the position which the Minister of Finance occupies to so utterly ignore the expenditure of principal or to attempt to get round it by his peculiar actuarial method.

I have wondered sometimes as this discussion has gone on, and as the legislation has proceeded in the committee, where on earth this contract came from. Nobody seems willing to father it. We know that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) did impute the fatherhood of it to one person, Senator Cox. Apparently, there is no justification for placing it on any one else. Personally, I have no knowledge of the matter. But this much I do know—that when the first application came up in the Railway Committee such a contract as this was not suggested, and I believe it was not even thought of. It may have been dreamed of by some, but undoubtedly nothing was said to convey any suggestion of it. We found the first application of the Grand Trunk opposed and opposed particularly by a set of men who had their minds fixed on the project of a railway straight across the country from Quebec. I think I state what is well within the knowledge of members of the committee when I say that the bitterest opponents of the Grand Trunk project were members of this House who advocated the project of a railway westward from Quebec. I am not quarrelling with their right to advocate such a railway; I am simply dealing with the fact. But in some mysterious way the scene was changed. The original proposition was practically withdrawn and a proposition made that was totally opposed to the ideas of the original promoters of the Grand Trunk Pacific as set forth in their circular. According to that circular it is clear that they did not want a line running eastward from Winnipeg. They spoke of a stretch of a thousand miles of that territory being unproductive and of it being a country through which a line should not be run. I admit they are not building it. I do not know how this change of which I speak came about. President Castro of Venezuela tells of a case that arose in his own country. A certain man died leaving a will dividing his property among two distant relatives. But two friends who were near him in life, and who had expected bequests in their favour, were much disappointed. They made up a scheme to fix the bequests to their liking before the heirs

came. They succeeded to getting a notary in with them. The three went into the room where the dead man lay, tied a string to his head and gave the end of the string into the hands of one of the would-be heirs. The notary took his pen and asked, do you give so and so to such and such a person ? A pull of the string and the head nodded, so the notary recorded the bequest. And so the property was distributed until every one had been remembered but the notary. The question was then asked, do you give so and so to the notary ? But the man who held the string did not pull. The notary laid down his pen and said, 'this string pulls for everybody, or there is no will.' I do not know whether this story illustrates what went on with regard to this contract, but I do know that in some mysterious way, by some evolution, the working of which is unknown so far as this House is concerned, this contract has been prepared as we have it before the House. It is presented by the Prime Minister backed by reasons that have been almost completely dropped by those on his own side who have spoken. The right hon. gentleman failed to show that there was any emergency or any crisis justifying such a tremendous expenditure, such an extensive mortgaging on the credit of the country on information as meagre and as vague as that in possession of the government. In fact, it would not be too much to say that there is practically no information in their possession. And still, the measure is being pressed before the House. I would join my voice with the voices of those who have pressed upon the government the necessity of referring such an important proposal to the people of the country before finally disposing of it. Six months ago, as I have said, this project had never been thought of. In fact, we might say that no longer than three months ago it had never been thought of. In the general election of 1900 nobody even dreamed of such an undertaking. Yet, surely, the needs of the country were as pressing then as they are now. And, for the government now to lay such a proposal before the House, and force it through on a principle laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that because the captain says, 'shoot,' he must shoot, I submit, is carrying party government and the discipline of party to an extent that must be, if carried out, be injurious to the country. If there ever was a time when a proposition should be submitted to the electors or when the government that formulated that proposition should ask for the confidence of the people, it is a time when such a proposition as this is proposed. And it would not delay the work involved in this project to delay the legislation now before us. The government could easily obtain the consent of this House to an appropriation of money to make the necessary surveys and obtain all information to be laid before the House. That must be done before the work can go on in any case. Even the contract says that delay is to take place. In fact the contract would show that as to the eastern section, which is the one part most open to objection, that the Grand Trunk care little about it. Otherwise, they would not allow the government to stop the work whenever they wanted to. They could if they chose, before attempting that work, go to the country in the meantime under that very clause, and then act according to the mandate of the people, provided they did it in such a way as not to make the country liable for a heavy bill of damages.

There is one other thing that I have not touched upon that has been discussed in recent speeches by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that is the argument that this is a colonization road. What in the name of common sense do we want with a colonization road at the present time, when, according to the statement of the right hon. the Premier, we have more than we can do to supply the wants of the territories that are already opened up to colonization ? This road is primarily suggested to meet the wants of the North-west, to meet the wants of the people that are already settled there. No other suggestion was made by the right hon. gentleman. It is for the prairie section, for the mountain section, for the mining section, for the people that are already in the North-west, that this road is primarily to be built ; no suggestion of colonization. I do not believe for a single moment that the Prime Minister would have thought it consonant with the gravity of the situation to suggest that we should spend $120,000,000 for a colonization road in northern Ontario and Quebec. Roads of that kind should be undertaken by the provinces, and I am glad to know that the province of Ontario is building its own colonization roads, and it can well do so for a number of years. For our part, we can wait until more is known about that country, and I trust that as more is known, the people will be still more encouraged to build colonization roads, roads that will start from the centres of the older population. How on earth can this road help on the colonization of the central parts of the country ? What centres of population will it touch ? It touches the two terminals, Winnipeg and Quebec only, and everything that is carried into that country or carried out of it would have to go either to Quebec or to Winnipeg, until a few costly cross roads have been built, and these cross roads will form the best colonization roads. I hope sincerely that some day they will be undertaken, that some day we will see this road now proposed going from Winnipeg to Quebec on the shortest possible line. When that day comes, I think it will be built by a private corporation, using its own money, or better still, be built by the government, owning and operating its own road, instead of being built by the government and hand-

ed over to a private corporation who does not want it, who does not expect to make any money out of it, and who gives no valid undertaking that they will operate it. While the North-west is filling up, we will have ample opportunity to explore the routes for these colonization roads, and there will be ample time for some future parliament to discuss the question of a road from the east to the west across that northern section.

It is not because we have no faith in the country that we oppose the proposition embodied in this Bill; it is not because we have no desire to see the country settled; it is not at all because we have no desire to see trade developed, rather the reverse. The whole proposition as it stands before us is one that will give us the least benefit at the greatest possible outlay. We cannot undertake any such expenditure as this without imperilling our ability to engage in any other public work for many years to come.

Notwithstanding some of the criticisms that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite of the scheme propounded by the leader of the opposition, I submit that it is one that will appeal to every business man, and every citizen, and every person looking to the interest of the country as a whole, and desiring to see a more economical use made of our money. It is not to the expenditure of the money that we are opposed, as our leader has said, but it is to the way the money is to be expended, and the little benefit that the country will reap from it. In view of the fact that our water routes will for years to come, possibly for all time, be the regulators of railways from the North-west to the east, in view of the fact that they will be the means, probably for all time to come, so far as we can now see, of carrying the surplus products of the west to the east for consumption and exportation, in view of the fact that we have in the past undertaken the development of our water-ways and to improve the navigation of the lakes in order to secure cheaper transportation of goods, in view of the fact that only recently the government, wisely in my opinion, in order to make transportation still cheaper from the west, took away the canal tolls and made those canals to a greater extent than before a benefit to the country as a whole, and principally to the North-west—in view of all these facts, I say the immediate necessity of this proposed new railway has not been made out. Surely no person will say that we have brought these water-ways entirely up-to-date, that we have made them as efficient as possible for all the purposes for which they are required. We must remember that in years to come, if we do our duty by the people of this country, we will have to expend large sums of money in improving these water-ways in different directions. I submit that a proposition that involves the building of our own roads, to be owned and operated by the government, is one that will not only have the best results at present, but will in future lead to infinitely better results. It may be that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), though at present perhaps it is somewhat academic, can in the near future be beneficially applied. That is a principle which, sooner or later, we will have to face, and it is well perhaps that we are face to face with the general principle even now. It is with very great pleasure indeed that I heard the leader of the party to which I have the honour to belong, make the proposition that practically meant government control of freights east and west, over a government line owned and operated by the country. If there is any way by which we can get the produce of the west to our own seaports, it will be by means of the control of their transport from the time those products are put on the train. If there is any way by which we can most effectually control rates, it is by having a government road which will establish the rates for all other lines running in the same direction.

The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) said that this was a red letter day for Canada. So it is, Sir. We are now in the full midsummer of our prosperity, a prosperity that was established by the wise and fruitful work of the statesmen who preceded the hon. gentlemen now sitting on the government benches. You cannot have a harvest without a sowing, and if the sowing is not wisely done, the harvest will amount to but little. It says but little for the knowledge of national development possessed by hon. gentlemen opposite when they call attention to the spectacular results of this midsummer, and forget the work by which the prosperity of this midsummer has been brought about. It is this very fact, I believe, which makes it so difficult for hon. gentlemen opposite now to rise to a sense of their duties and responsibilities. It is one thing to enjoy a harvest from the work of the men of the past, and it is another thing to use that harvest wisely. It is to be hoped that the party now in power will use its opportunity in such a way as to help on the general prosperity we now enjoy, instead of giving it a setback. It will not use unwisely or extravagantly the revenues that come in, it will not use unwisely the opportunities that it now has on account of the great credit the country enjoys, but it will use them in such a way that development will go on upon the old lines, that the old will not be neglected for the new, that one part of the country will not be set against another, but that the development, the growth and the prosperity of the whole country will move harmoniously together. For this reason it is a matter of duty that causes one to oppose such a proposition as that which has been made by the right hon. leader of

the government in this Bill, and to support the alternative policy proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. F. SUTHERLAND (North Essex). Mr. Speaker, coming a little late in this debate I wish to say at the outset that the character of the debate has appeared to me to be higher than any I have yet listened to in this House since I became a member of it, and that I scarcely wonder at it when I consider the measure which has been introduced by the government and which is the subject of debate at this particular time. A subject that involves the expenditure of such a large sum of money and the giving of such a large guarantee, a subject that involves the building of a transcontinental line over which the freight of Canada is to go in Canadian channels and to Canadian seaports and which will not only develop new parts of Canada, but which will be a benefit to Canada as a whole, is certainly one that should invite the best possible debating talent in this House and I certainly congratulate those who have preceded me on the magnificent character of the speeches which have already been made. I desire, however, to differ from much that several hon. members on the other side of the House have said in reference to this measure. It would appear from what they have said that the people scarcely expected such a measure to be introduced by this government, but, on the contrary it seems to me that the record of the government has already shown it to be of a character that would be very apt to introduce such a scheme as this for the general advantage of Canada. When we look over the record of a few short years of this government we see how the anticipations of the people have been answered by the introduction of this scheme. It is said that every progressive government is constantly undertaking new duties or performing old ones more thoroughly and efficiently and when we look at the record of the past few years of the government which is in power in almost every direction, in almost every department we see how apt that statement is as applied to them. They introduced a tariff for revenue in 1897, and we see how that tariff has stimulated trade in this country until in this year we have the enormous surplus of $14,000,000 and we have on record the fact additional that many millions of dollars of our debt are to be paid off as a result. When they introduced the preferential tariff they introduced, I believe, a patriotic measure, when they introduced postal reduction they introduced another patriotic measure and when they perfected a successful immigration policy which is bringing people by thousands into this country they again showed their ability to grasp the situation as it in this country. So that in one direction and another, this government have shown themselves to be a successful government and I have little or no doubt that when the people learned that the government were about to introduce a measure looking to the construction of a transcontinental railway, that as the government had taken up one measure after another that had operated to the prosperity of this country, that as they had been successful in every measure they had taken up, as has been shown in the increase of trade, in the increase of prosperity and in the increase of the population, they expected that the measure which they were taking up at this time would be a measure which would redound to the present and future advantage and prosperity of this great country of ours.

Now, in the first place, I desire to correct a statement which was made last evening by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler), in regard to the question of the exemption from customs duties on supplies coming into this country for the construction of this railway. The answer to his statement last evening is set out so fully, so cogently and so definitely in the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) at page 8582 of 'Hansard' that I will not attempt in my own words to discuss the matter, but, I will give the House his statement of the matter. The hon. Minister of Finance said:

> But, Sir, as this road is to be built by contractors, and the contractors will have to tender for the work, they will receive no exemption whatever. Therefore any man who has anything to do with the construction of that road, if he imports materials, he will have to pay the duty, and if he buys the goods in Canada the Canadian manufacturer will have the benefit of the duty in so far as that is of any advantage to him. The Minister of Customs calls my attention to the fact that the government will let the construction of this road by contract and that the contractors will have to pay customs duties on the materials they import. I think I stated that. Of course, if you could imagine such a thing as the government building this road themselves, and if the government were importing materials, they would, as in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, not enter these goods at the customs house. They would be for the government service. But I say that even there we do not as respects the eastern division, take any advantage of that, because we provide that it shall be built by tender and contract, and the contractors will not have any exemption, but will have to buy the goods in Canada or else pay the duties if they see fit to import them. When we come to the western division, we deal with the company. They will build the road, and will not have any exemption in any shape or form. They will not be at liberty to import a penny's worth of goods without paying the same duty that is paid by any private individual. The grant in the way of exemption from customs duties in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was a vast privilege. I do not attempt to compute it in money, but I am sure that it would run into a vast sum. We do not give any exemptions of any sort.

There is a complete and definite answer to the statement made by the hon. member for Toronto last evening.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman give us the section under which he arrives at that conclusion ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Essex). Section No. 17 :

No addition shall be made to the cost of construction or to the capital of construction account in respect of customs duties in cases where there is direct importation of material or supplies by the government.

Now, Sir, we have been hearing during this discussion a good deal from hon. members on the other side of the House and very much to my surprise from hon. members from the province of Ontario about the condition of New Ontario. It has been sought to belittle the reports that the Ontario government had from time to time put out and the reports which are based upon the surveys of the surveyors they sent out several years ago. I have been very much surprised to see hon. members from the province of Ontario seeking to belittle New Ontario and to belittle these reports, because, if they recollect that when the provincial contest was on a little over a year ago and when Mr. Whitney was in New Ontario making his speeches, this whole question was a matter of considerable controversy in that province. I think it is well known to the members of this House that for many years past the policy of the Liberal party under the present premier particularly, has been for the development and colonization of New Ontario. Now I may say that has been the policy of both parties in Ontario, and I find what ought to be an unanswerable argument to those hon. members on the other side of the House who seek to belittle New Ontario and who seek to belittle the reports which the Ontario government has put out because these reports are not signed and because they give simply the substance of what the surveyors reported, and who on this account seek to make out that these reports are not authentic. That was not the position taken by the Conservative party a year and a quarter ago during the provincial contest. I propose to read some extracts from the 'Mail and Empire' editorials of that time to show that not merely was it not disputed that New Ontario was wonderfully rich in agricultural resources and was wonderfully rich in mineral and timber resources, but that the charge then was that Mr. Ross and the Liberal party were not realizing the extent of the riches of that country, and that they were not alive to the opportunities that were presented to them of developing and colonizing it, but that they were derelict in their duty in that respect. Here are some extracts from the Toronto 'Mail' which go to show the position of the Conservative party in Ontario at that time. In the 'Mail' of May 8, 1902, we find the following in an editorial under the caption, 'Ontario's forward movement':

In the great clay belt, stretching from Quebec to the Thunder Bay district, are 24,500 miles of unbroken farming land, where settlers would build up a new province.

Again, in the issue of May 9, we read this:

We have much to gain in business by the development of the newer parts of Ontario.

Again, under date of May 15, it says :

Nature has decreed that the expansion of Ontario must be northward, but a narrow and incompetent administration has hitherto maintained barriers against the onward march of settlement. The mistake of the government has been that it accepted the dictum of Mr. Ross that the soil of the north was barren and the climate unfavourable, and made no effort to open up the country, while at the same time it shut the settlers out of vast stretches that it handed over to the corporations. As a matter of fact New Ontario is south of a large portion of Dakota, and is more fit for agriculture and stock grazing than prairie lands of the west.

But in the issue of May 17, perhaps the most comprehensive statement appears :

The government refused to make a move until 1900, when several exploring parties were sent out.

These are the exploring parties, upon whose statement the report which was laughed at by hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate, was founded. The 'Mail' goes on :

They have reported that there is an almost unbroken stretch of good farming land, a great clay belt stretching from the Quebec boundary to the Thunder bay district, comprising an area of 24,500 miles. Until this proof was forced upon him Mr. G. W. Ross maintained that the soil of New Ontario was barren and the climate unfavourable. Yet nearly as large a province, fit in every sense for profitable development, lies in our vacant north land as we have in old Ontario. This territory is in part south of Dakota, and its climate is less severe than that of the Canadian west. The whole country, we are assured, is a network of lakes, rivers and streams, well-wooded, teeming with game, and specially adapted to agriculture and stock raising. It is, moreover, well stocked with minerals, and has abundance of water-power for industrial purposes. . . . It will be a big thing for southern Ontario to have a New Ontario in the north, growing up to contain perhaps millions in the near future. It will give a stimulus to our cities and our industries, and will afford splendid openings for our young men. We are of course glad to witness the progress of the west, but we shall be happier and better off besides when Mr. Whitney inaugurates and carries to a successful issue the policy that will populate Ontario.

These are the statements of the 'Mail' newspaper in reference to the very reports issued by the Ontario government which are sneered at by the members of the opposition as furnishing no proof of the wonderful fertility and resources of that great New Ontario which this transcontinental scheme will do so much to develop.

Since I came into this House I have heard a great deal about the development of the west, and no one desires more than I do

that the west should be developed. I am perfectly well aware that for many years past the development of the west has been perhaps more attributable to the influx into that country of people from Ontario than to almost any other cause. The province of Ontario has given many thousands of her people to the development of the west, and we are glad of it. We want to see Canada as a whole developed. But now that the North-west Territories are getting a splendid start, now that not only people from Ontario, but from the old land and the United States, are going into the North-west in large numbers, we in Ontario are beginning to think that it is time that we should look a little to the development of the newer portions of our own province.

Prior to the local elections of last year, Mr. Ross laid down his policy in a number of paragraphs, among which this was stated as a prominent feature :

> The early settlement of the unoccupied lands of the province by colonization and by the projection of railways into New Ontario.

When the legislature met he crystallized that paragraph into an Act, and under that Act the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway is now being constructed. And it seems to me that it was most opportune that that railway should have been commenced this year. When the proposed transcontinental railway shall be completed across the country, this provincial railway, now being constructed by the government of Ontario, will tap that railway, and so not only bring the whole of New Ontario into connection with the older parts of the province, but place Ontario in probably a better position than any other province of the Dominion to send supplies of all kinds to Manitoba and the North-west, and in that way serve the interests of the people of Ontario at large. Let us look at the preamble of the Act of the Ontario legislature for the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, and see how it accords with the preamble of the Act for the construction of the national transcontinental railway. The preamble of the Ontario Act reads as follows :

> Whereas exploration of the province has shown that in that district of Ontario which lies between Lake Nipissing and Lake Abitibi and north-westerly from Lake Temiskaming there are large areas of arable land well fitted for settlement and extensive tracts of merchantable pine and other valuable timber, and deposits of ores and minerals which are expected, upon development, to add greatly to the wealth of the province ; and whereas the said district is now difficult of acess from the lack of railway communication ; and whereas an increasing number of settlers are taking up lands in portions of the said district ; and whereas it is in the public interest that the said district should be, at as early a date as possible, brought into communication with the existing lines of railway.

I desire here to express my appreciation of this Bill. The province of Ontario has, we believe, for many years past been a pioneer in legislation in almost every direction. If time permitted, I could show how measure after measure which has been passed by the Ontario legislature has later on been imitated, not only by the various provinces of the Dominion, but by some of the states to the south of us. This Ontario Bill provides that the railway shall be constructed by a commission. That and other provisions in the Bill have perhaps suggested one or two of the clauses which appear in the measure now before this House. I have read the preamble of that Bill just to show, by way of comparison, how far it resembles the preamble of the Bill before this House, which reads as follows :

> Whereas, by reason of the growth in population and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada, and especially of the western part thereof, and with a view to the opening up of new territory available for settlement, both in the eastern provinces and in the west, and the affording of transportation facilities for such territory, and for other reasons, the necessity has arisen for the construction of a national transcontinental railway.

It seems to me that these two measures are supplementary of each other, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned ; that just as Ontario projected its railway for the purpose of developing the magnificent heritage which we have in the north, and which is awaiting colonization and population, so the project now before this House is brought forward just at a time to enable the Ontario railway to connect with it near the height of land, and so to enable the province to populate and colonize that splendid clay belt very much faster than she could otherwise have done. The scheme, it seems to me, so far as Ontario is concerned, amounts to this. One of these days, in the not very distant future, the province of Ontario would have had to build on its own account, and along this very direction, a railway of a colonization character. But by this scheme, many years earlier perhaps than we would have built it, and without its costing one dollar more, perhaps not nearly so much as it would have cost if constructed by the province alone, we will have this road which otherwise we would have had to build ourselves, built by the Dominion, and in that way will reap an immense advantage.

Another feature which commends it to me is this. The various provinces, except perhaps the province of Ontario, have very considerable debts to meet. The debts of some of these provinces are very large, and the provinces are beginning to look out in various directions for the means to meet them. There are methods being adopted in Ontario to-day which were not followed some years ago. One of the merits of this scheme is this, that instead of the various provinces having to build railways of this kind themselves, and in that way pledge

their credit and assume a responsibility which many of them cannot very well afford, the Dominion will finance largely the matter, so that instead of each province having to pay directly, as it would have to do, if it financed the matter itself, it will only pay indirectly its contribution to the cost by means of customs duties and the like. That will be an advantage to every province of the confederation.

I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to speak at length in this discussion at all; but coming from Ontario I considered it advisable that I should point out some of the advantages which will accrue to that province from this scheme. I recognize, as every speaker on this side has done, that this is a great scheme for the advantage of the Dominion as a whole. Much has been done in the past few years to attract attention to the Dominion. Various things have caused us to be advertised and become known. Population and capital, these two things which this young country has so long needed, are beginning to flow in more than at any period within our history, and I believe that when this scheme becomes understood, this movement will receive still greater impetus. The outside world will realize that we are alive to our responsibilities and following the example set by other nations. We find Great Britain talking about spending $15,000,000 to connect Glasgow and Edinburgh for trade and imperial purposes. In the very heart of Egypt, she is spending $20,000,000 on the construction of a great dam for the purpose of irrigation, which, it is estimated, will add $25,000,000 to the value of lands in that country. In Australia, we find that the government of that colony has commenced the construction of a transcontinental line across the whole island. In India, the British government is spending millions of dollars on canals, and in the neighbouring republic the great Panama canal scheme is being actively promoted. In almost every country we find the people realizing their responsibilities and investing large sums in gigantic enterprises, in order to attract trade and population. Canada must not lag behind. We have immense resources awaiting development. All we need is population and capital, and this scheme, coupled with the other undertakings which the government have accomplished, will attract still more capital and population to our shores, and this young country will become, what we all hope to see it at an early day, one of the strongest, most prosperous, enterprising and powerful nations in the world.

I could hardly sit down without saying a word about the railway company which is associated with this scheme. The old Grand Trunk Railway has done much for many parts of Canada, particularly the western part of Ontario. It went into that section practically as a colonization railway. It is to the Grand Trunk Railway that is due the first settlement of western Ontario, and when it is known that that section of country has become one of the most fertile, best settled and most progressive of the whole Dominion, one can realize what will result from the activity and enterprise of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in New Ontario, New Quebec, New British Columbia, and New New Brunswick. One can realize what will result when this great, strong, enterprising concern, assisted by this government, will open up these new portions of Canada. Just as it has made western Ontario prosperous and successful, so it will develop these new sections, and in this way be a great boom to the people of Canada.

We are just now having a great meeting in Montreal of leading men from all parts of the empire, assembled there to discuss imperial matters. From Montreal they will go out through the length and breadth of Canada to see this young country, and the more they learn about it, the more they realize that we have arisen to the measure of our responsibility and are seeking to construct a great Canadian transcontinental railway, which will redound to the credit of the empire as a whole, the more they will have confidence in our future and be prepared to invest their money and capital in the development of Canada.

The more I have studied this contract and listened to this debate, the more I am convinced of the merits of this scheme. In his opening speech, my right hon. friend the First Minister showed how this scheme was intended to serve broad, imperial interests. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the Minister of the Interior dilated upon the practical necessity for this railway and its utility in the interests of the country. The Minister of Finance showed, in the most practical, clear manner, that every financial arrangement was provided for in this contract; and when the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) spoke, he proved abundantly, from the weight of authority and experience, that the most efficient system of government owned railways was when the railway owned by the government was operated by some practical business concern, such as the Grand Trunk Railway. And when I heard the Minister of Justice going through the clauses of that contract—and I appreciated perhaps as a lawyer his statement of the case more than that of any of the other ministers—when I heard him go through these clauses and saw how the interests of the country, in clear, concise, plain phraseology, were safeguarded in every way, I came to the absolute conclusion that no scheme ever put forward by any government had the interest of the people at large so well protected.

Mr. HACKETT. As this is Friday evening, Mr. Speaker, and it is now half past ten, I think we ought to adjourn the debate; and with the consent of the hon. gentleman who is leading the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think we might go one hour longer.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman who is a military man is perhaps inclined to be rather strict and has more endurance than I have. After being here all day and up to this hour at night, I do not feel in a condition to do justice to the subject, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow us to adjourn. For a man of my years, it would be rather an arduous task to address the House at this hour.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Since the hon. gentleman makes an appeal of that kind, and as he is a very old personal friend of mine, I think we must give way and consent to the adjournment.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Militia and Defence, House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, August 24, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). Mr. Speaker. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call your attention to a number of incidents that took place at the Canadian Pacific Railway station in my own town of Renfrew yesterday. I do this to attract notice not to the incidents themselves but to the alleged causes of these incidents. I was taking a short stroll yesterday morning on one of our residential streets in Renfrew, in the neighbourhood of the Canadian Pacific Railway station, when I heard a tremendous cheering in the direction of the station. As our town is rather noted for its quietness and orderly conduct, especially on the Sabbath day, I thought it very strange and as the noise continued and the cheering became more boisterous, I went to the station to see what was the matter. As I approached I could see a train standing there and people running in and out of the rear end in a hurried manner, like bees from a hive, and when I reached the station, the train was moving out. I went on the station platform and as I reached it our village constable and a driver came up and having alighted the constable said that it was no use trying to stop the train then or trying to do anything when it arrived at Pembroke because you could not tell who the culprits were, and it might be dangerous to go in to arrest any one on the train. I was told that the trouble was that a number of the passengers who came off this train which was the second train going through that morning, got off the train in search of water, and not finding any at hand went across the street to an ice house belonging to a townsman and undertook to take the ice out in order to melt it down. Three or four men went up into the ice house and threw down the ice and three or four others got the baggage trucks and commenced hauling it to the train, while others carried it into the car in order to provide themselves with water. A number of others seeing a pile of dressed lumber there, belonging to Mr. McDougal, a brother of the Auditor General, came to the conclusion that it would be a good opportunity to improve their sleeping facilities in the car, so they took four or five hundred feet of the lumber into the car while the others were taking the ice. There was also a car on the siding in which a man was preparing to ship a horse and a number of these passengers took out the hay and straw and carried it into the cars in order to make beds for themselves.

I would wish to draw attention particularly to the alleged fact that the origin of all this trouble was that there was not sufficient water in the train for the passengers; it seems to me that something should be done to prevent a recurrence of incidents of this kind. As another train was expected to pass in fifteen minutes our town constable came to the conclusion that he had better remain and see that no trouble occurred on its arrival and I thought that I would remain also. In about fifteen minutes another train came in and immediately upon its arrival a very well dressed lady and gentleman came out of the train and wanted to know if there was any place where they could get water to drink. They were shown into the ladies waiting room and they got water. Then half a dozen more came out and wanted to know if they could get some. I pointed to a pump across the way, and they went across with tins and all manner of dishes. Seeing that they were really in need of water I went through the cars one after another, and I found that not one of the tanks had water in it. I went to the conductor and asked why there was no water in these cars for the passengers. 'Well,' he said I cannot tell you how it is but it has all disappeared, and I do not know what we are to do.' I said, 'but there is an abundance here.' He said. 'It would never to do to leave this train here and there are no hands to put in the water, but I will telegraph from here and see that arrangements are made at Chalk River, the divisional point, to supply the train with water. Furthermore, after I leave here I wish you would go in and see that the operator sends this telegram. After the train passed, I went in and asked the operator if he had telegraphed and he said he had. I wish to inform the House that these gentlemen

treated me in the most courteous manner, both the conductor and the operator, but they said they were utterly helpless to do anything. It seems strange to me that a train like this, leaving Ottawa at five o'clock in the morning and reaching Renfrew at 8.30 and not likely at the rate it was travelling to reach Chalk River before ten or eleven o'clock, should not be supplied with water. I believe the attention of the House has been drawn to this matter before and I think it is best it should be drawn to it once again, in order that we may see if the Canadian Pacific officials cannot be induced to do something to remedy this evil.

There is another thing to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. On Friday about forty-five persons from our town and the vicinity wished to go west, and went down to the train, but when they got there they found the train was filled and it was impossible for a single individual to get on board. They waited until Saturday and then went down again but again found the train was crowded. A number did get on but the conductor told them to get off. While some of them were being put off the train others got on at the other end and the majority of them got on board. Now, it seems to me that this is an evidence that it is time we had some more facilities for getting out into the North-west than we have now, and that it is a good argument in favour of a transcontinental railway—that, as the right hon. the Prime Minister said, this is not the time for deliberation but this is the time for action, and every one of the people there who wanted to get on that train said the same thing. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I presume the hon. gentleman does not suppose we can do more than draw the attention of the Railway Committee to the matter to which he has referred.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to draw the attention of the House to a press despatch that appeared on Saturday to this effect :

Correspondence on the subject of the publication of the proceedings at the colonial conference of last summer has been issued. In reply to a telegram from Mr. Jos. Chamberlain, Lord Minto, on behalf of the Canadian government, objected to any departure from the arrangement previously made that the proceedings should be considered confidential. Newfoundland, and Cape Colony took the same positon. New Zealand had no objection to the publication of the discussion on the trade question, while Australia favoured the publication of a full report and Natal replied that that government had no objection to publication in full.

I would like to ask the government whether or not this statement is correct so far as the Canadian government is concerned, and whether or not the correspondence will be laid on the Table of the House ? I suppose there can be no further objection to that as the papers appear to have been placed before the imperial parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Some time ago, the attention of the government was called to this subject and I informed the House at that time that there had been some correspondence concerning it, but, that we were not at liberty to lay the papers on the Table of the House, and would require to have some further communication with the Colonial Office. We have had that communication, and have permission to lay the papers on the Table, which will be done to-morrow.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the government whether or not any further steps have been taken with regard to the proposed transportation commission. On the last occasion when I brought the matter to the attention of the House, the right hon. Premier (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) informed the House that a letter had been received from Sir William Van Horne stating his inability to become a member of that commission. I think the right hon. gentleman was good enough, on that occasion, to hand me a copy of Sir William Van Horne's letter. Has the First Minister any thing further to communicate with regard to this matter ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will try to give further information on this subject also to-morrow.

QUESTION.

PAYMENT TO MR. JAMES CUMMINGS.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

How much was paid to James Cummings for remuneration, and how much for expenses in connection with his trip to South Africa ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I beg to answer the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blain's) question as follows :

The payments made to Mr. James Cummings in connection with his trip to South Africa were, for remuneration, $3,600 ; for expenses, $1,852 ; total, $5,452.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, and the motion of Mr. Puttee in amendment thereto.

Mr. EDWARD HACKETT (West Prince). Mr. Speaker, before addressing myself to the question before the Chair, I desire to thank the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Sir Frederick Borden) for his kindness in agreeing, as leader of the House on Friday evening, to adjourn the debate at an early hour. It is what I should have expected from an old friend, and as he said that he extended his courtesy to me as an old friend, I thank him for his kindness on that occasion.

When a question of such magnitude as as the one now before the House comes up for decision, it becomes the duty of every hon. member who represents any portion of the people to state his views. Therefore, representing, as I do, an important constituency, I make no apologies when I rise, to speak on this important question. Sir, we are asked now, towards the end of a very protracted session to deal with this question which involves the expenditure of scores of millions of the people's money. This session began on the 12th of March, and it was not until the 30th of July that this measure was tabled. It is only now, after the session has lasted nearly six months that we are called upon to express our opinions and give our votes on the subject. I believe that a question involving such vast consequences to the people of this country should not be decided without being submitted to the people at the polls, for their opinion and their decision. We heard nothing of this question in the last general election. It was only on the 24th of November last, when Mr. Hays, in an interview with the correspondent of the Toronto 'Globe,' stated that it was the intention of the Grand Trunk to build a railway from North Bay to the shores of the Pacific, that we had the first intimation of this project. But we now find at the end of a session lasting, as I have said, nearly six months, that the government is to come to the aid of this company, and not only assist them to build the railway, but actually build that expensive portion, 1,800 miles long, from Winnipeg to Moncton, an undertaking which must cost over $100,000,000. This proposition comes before us without due information. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) day after day and week after week asked for information with regard to it, but no information was vouchsafed him until the 30th of July, when the Bill was placed on the Table by the right hon. Prime Minister. Now, as showing the rights of the people in a matter of this kind to have the question submitted to them I desire to quote a very high authority, one that I know will be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and certainly will be approved by the right hon. leader of the House. I have here a speech delivered by Mr. Laurier, in 1880, in this House speaking to a motion made at that time he said :

> It is the basis of all free government that the acts of the administration should be judged by the representatives of the people. In this case the same rule, it must be conceded, should apply. It is a well-known principle, that the people have a right to judge, not only of the honesty of those entrusted with the managemet of their affairs, but even of their judgment in action. The people have a right to say they have erred in judgment. How are we to deal with or decide this question, or whether the government have accepted the best offer. It is impossible for the country to say ; we have only the word of the government. I am quite disposed to take the word of the government, as an individual, but not as a member of the House. As a representative of the people, I think every one of us has a right to say the acts of the government should be done in broad daylight, so that every elector may have an opportunity of judging whether or not the government and every individual member was right, not only in motive, but in judgment. This is the reason of the motion, and I think it will be the duty of every member to affirm its principle, that nothing should be concealed from the representatives of the people.

Is this being done in broad daylight ? Have the elements of this measure been worked out in broad daylight ? Why, I remember when Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson was asked in the Railway Committee : Are you going to receive aid from the government ? His answer was : That is a matter for consideration. The government would give us no information, and we certainly had no information from the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. It is only now, after we have been thus long in session, that we are placed in a position to even consider this very important measure.

It is said that the questions involved in the building of this railway are not materially different from those involved in the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I shall show you, Sir, that the questions are entirely different. The Canadian Pacific Railway was the pioneer railway of the west. For years the government had been endeavouring to secure a company to build that railway. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) the other day read from a law placed upon the statute-books of this country by the Mackenzie government in 1877 inviting companies to tender for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, laying down the broad principle that there should be a bonus of land and a bonus of cash. In accordance with the statute. notices were inserted in both the newspapers of Canada and of the United Kingdom, and in the leading periodicals

on the continent of Europe. What was the result of that ? After these notices had been given for a year the government received one tender, and that tender was of no value, it was simply a mockery, and nothing was done. In 1880, when Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper and other gentlemen, who were then at the head of the government, received this offer from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to build this great transcontinental line, it was in accordance with the statute placed on the statute-books of our country by Mr. Mackenzie, and that had not been acted upon by the Liberal party. The Conservative government succeeded in securing a company to build this railway. But the project was met with the greatest opposition on the part of hon. gentlemen now sitting on the treasury benches, then sitting on this side of the House. The most strenuous opposition that it was possible to give any measure was offered by these gentlemen to that great measure. I can well remember, because I had the honour of being a member of this House at that time, how day after day, night after night, they rose in their places and denounced this measure as one antagonistic to the interests of Canada ; as one that would eventually place the country in the hands of a great syndicate, and would ultimately result in disaster to this country. Well, Sir, what do we find to-day ? The Conservative government succeeded in carrying through this great project. The Liberal-Conservative party, under the leadership of the late Sir John A. Macdonald, having as his lieutenant and Minister of Railways Sir Charles Tupper, Baronet, having also as his colleague Sir Hector Langevin, from the province of Quebec, and Sir Leonard Tilley, from the province of New Brunswick—those gentlemen, being at the head of affairs, called parliament to meet on the 9th day of December, 1880. There was no concealment, everything was done in broad daylight. Parliament assembled on the 9th day of December, and on the 10th day of December Sir John A. Macdonald placed before parliament this resolution. He did not wait for four or five months, tampering with a company, selling the rights of the people to a company that would ruin the country. But on the second day after the meeting of parliament he laid on the Table of this House a resolution empowering the company to go on and build this railway.

Sir, these gentlemen were not satisfied, they believed that something more should be done. They assembled their friends, and they said : We are going to obtain an offer from another syndicate. So they brought other gentlemen here, and after they got here it was found out that their offer was only a bogus offer, it was only an offer on paper, made by parties who had not the necessary means, who could not produce the cash to enable them to go on and construct this great work. So their unpatriotic effort failed. Well, now, we heard the hon. gentleman who addressed the House a moment ago (Mr. Wright), speaking of the great difficulty he had in the town of Renfrew yesterday with regard to immigrants I suppose, or perhaps parties of harvesters for the North-west, and he said that their experience showed that they wanted another transcontinental railroad. The police officials in the town of Renfrew, or in the township, were not sufficient to keep order, and they must have another transcontinental railway, without which there would be confusion, rebellion, riot, murder and destruction in this country. They must have another transcontinental railway in order that these poor people leaving Ottawa in the morning and arriving at Renfrew in three or four hours, might have water to drink on the train.

Now, Sir, reference has been made to what has been done by the Canadian Pacific Railway for this country. I want to quote you a few words from a speech delivered the other evening by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson), a very good speech, a very sensible speech, in which he bestowed the highest praise on the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and indirectly on the Liberal-Conservative party, which had pushed that project through. I wish to read from it at length, because some of his words should be written in letters of gold all over this country, as showing what that great railway has accomplished for Canada. He says :

> I wish to show the House what has been accomplished by the construction of the great Canadian Pacific Railway.
>
> Prior to the advent of this railway, British Columbia was a country isolated from eastern Canada, having nothing in common other than devotion to the old flag and yielding hommage to the same soverign. It was a country which, from its isolation, had no national aspirations. But its people were men of courage and determination in that small and isolated community, and they recognized the great future of British Columbia if it could only get a railroad carried through connecting the eastern part of Canada with the west. The building of the Canadian Pacific Railway has made what was once the fishing hamlet of New Westminster a large, thriving commercial and populous city. It made a new province for Canada, one of the brightest gems in the Crown of confederation.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that I am quoting the words of a gentleman who is no doubt a strong Liberal, but who is honest enough to state his views in this way :

> It made the men who, while proud to say that they are British Columbians, still prouder to say they are Canadians. It made what was in 1883 a primeval forest into our present great city of Vancouver. It made it possible where 20 years ago stood only the Douglas fir and the British Columbia cedar, that a city of 35,000 people live to-day. Where not one dollar of customs revenue was collected 20 years ago, where the past year the sum of $1,388,709 was collected. It made possible, where banks were

unknown, where to-day stand six of the leading banking institutions of Canada. Where bank clearances were unknown, to where during the first six months of the present year the clearances amounted to nearly 29 millions dollars. It made the great seaport of Vancouver and created what last year was the fourth largest port of customs collections in the Dominion. Where ships were unknown practically 20 years ago, to-day in the harbour of Vancouver boats flying almost every maritime flag in the world can be seen loading and unloading. It has made and created a new trade with the Orient. It made and created a new trade with Australia and New Zealand. It has made and created a new trade with the United States. It made and created a new province whose inhabitants are a happy and contented Canadian people. It made possible the development of a section of our mining country, which only goes to prove that we have greater than has been found. It made it possible for us to produce in the last 16 years 31,640,203 ounces of silver, valued at $18,475,882 ; it made it possible for us to produce 280,200,845 pounds of lead, valued at $10,447,540 ; it made it possible for us to produce 92,652,480 pounds of copper, valued at $12,333,200 ; or a total value of silver, lead and copper of $41,256,603. And prior to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway this condition of things was unknown in British Columbia.

Sir, no greater tribute could be paid by any one to the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to the wisdom of the great Liberal-Conservative party of Canada, that party which have been untiring in their efforts to promote the interests of the people of this country, notwithstanding that hon. gentlemen opposite preached the blue ruin and the desolation which would overtake this country by the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which nevertheless has accomplished all that has been stated by the hon. member for Burrard. The hon. gentleman has not only paid a compliment to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but he has also paid a tribute to the energy, ability, integrity and honesty of the Liberal-Conservative party. This proposed railway is a differenet affair altogether. At the time the Canadian Pacific Railway was undertaken, it was undertaken by a company receiving, it is true, large bonuses in land and money, but it was undertaken as a pioneer railway. It was to open up those great fertile western plains that were lying unknown as a sealed book as far as the people of Canada were concerned, known only to the Indian and the fur trader. Now we find that owing to the construction of this railway, owing to the great work done by the Liberal-Conservative party 100,000 settlers have been taken into that country, each year and yet hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to take the credit for the present tide of immigration. It was said by a leading member of this House some years ago that they were only flies on the wheel and as far as immigration is concerned, they still are only flies on the wheel. It was the great Liberal-Conservative party that opened up this country by building this railway through those fertile plains and thus enable people from the congested centres of Europe and the United States to go in there and create for themselves happy homes on the soil of Canada.

One great objection I have to the resolution is that it contemplates the building of a railway without this parliament knowing at all what are the conditions of the country to be traversed by this railway. The most complete information the right hon. gentleman can give us was the statements of missionaries and explorers whose information has been gained some two hundred years ago. He had no recent surveys to guide him. We do not know the conditions of the country through which this railway passes. I am in hopes that we have as promising a country as that which has been described by hon. gentlemen opposite, and as that which has been termed by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) a great northern empire, but before we throw away millions of dollars of the people's money on building a railway, we should have some data, some facts, some surveys, something to guide us as to the nature of the country, something to show whether the country can only produce forests of spruce, pine, cedar, &c., or whether it is capable of the production of grain crops upon which the people may subsist. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) stated the other evening that he had gone over a large part of the country to the north of us. The hon. gentleman does not address this House very frequently, and I listened with much pleasure to his statements, because I am sure that he made them in sincerity and honesty, but the most he told us in regard to the agricultural capabilities of the country was that he saw cabbages and turnips growing. He did not know whether the country was capable of growing wheat or not, but he was certain that it could grow vegetables. It may be possible that, when the timber is cleared away, if you have a good clay soil, and if you have no early frosts, you may be able to produce wheat, but if the season is short you may only be able to produce short lived vegetables. The hon. gentleman said another thing that he may also have considered to be true, but, if it is true, it is miraculous. He said that the rivers flowed up hill in that country, that a great plateau existed extending for hundreds of miles—I think he said that he had explored 500 miles of this tremendous plateau—and that the rivers flowed both ways upon it. We have no further data than that. We have nothing further to show us whether we would be justified in expending such an enormous amount of money to build this railway. What we insist upon, and what the people of this country, I am certain, will insist upon, is that this question shall not be pressed with undue haste through

this parliament, but that time shall be given for its consideration, that a matter of two or three months will not be sufficient and that after threshing it out in this parliament and after every phase of the subject has been considered by the representatives of the people, the matter shall be submitted to the people at the polls for consideration and decision.

The hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) has made a computation of the cost of the building of this railway. The hon. gentleman is no doubt a good business man and you would think that when he was dealing with figures he would have some regard for the accuracy of the estimate he made. He has made a singular estimate. He has estimated the cost of the line between Winnipeg and Moncton at $65,000,000, and of the line west of Winnipeg at $15,000,000. Thus the whole cash payment and liability incurred by the people for the road, according to that hon. gentleman, will be $80,000,000. Then he tells us that that liability in seven years will amount to 15 cents per head of the population. Even taking his own figures, and he was far away from the correct figures, because, as I stated at the beginning, the liability will be at least $150,000,000, he tells us that the interest charge on even this large amount will only entail on the people of this country a liability equal to 15 cents per head of the population. That is a most singular statement. If it is true that we are only going to expend $80,000,000 upon this great project, and if it is only going to cost the people 15 cents per head for seven years, we should make the hon. gentleman Minister of Finance, and let him carry on the affairs of the country, because, if he could do it as advantageously as his estimate would lead us to believe, we would all support him. But, there is another side to this question. The interest, as the hon. gentleman will see on this $80,000,000, at 3½ per cent, which is about the lowest rate at which he can borrow money in the money markets of the world, would amount to over $3,000,000 per year. We have a population in this country of about 6,000,000, and if we divide 6,000,000 by 3,000,000 we will find that the interest charge will represent 50 cents per head of the population per year instead of 15 cents per head, which for a family of six people means an annual tax of $3. An estimate of six people to a family in Canada is a moderate one. We have families ranging from six to fifteen but if we place it at six and base our estimate on the amount which the hon. gentleman says the railway will cost, it will mean that the man living on his farm who has to work long hours to maintain his family, to clothe and feed them, will be called upon to contribute, in addition to his other taxes, to maintain municipal institutions and schools for the education of his children, to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway 50 cents per head, or $3 per family per year. This is a matter that should be seriously considered by the people of this country. The farmers of Canada have not riches to throw away in that direction. It is a matter to ponder over seriously as to whether the country can afford to undertake such a project as this. We have now two lines of railway running west of Winnipeg providing the best means of transport from the fertile plains of the west to Port Arthur. Let us then utilize our great water-ways and afford facilities such as has been suggested by the leader of the opposition. Accommodate the people of the country through means of utilizing the Intercolonial Railway and extending it to North Bay, and thus afford transportation facilities that will be equally efficient and will not cost one-fortieth part of the amount that the government are going to contribute to this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme.

I heartily approve of the proposition of the leader of the opposition. It views the affairs of Canada from a broad standpoint, and it is a statesmanlike policy. Why did Mr. Blair resign ? Why did the late Minister of Railways and Canals resign a lucrative and honourable position in the cabinet ? It was because he could not conscientiously hold his position and support a measure of this kind. Mr. Blair had a strong conviction that where the people of Canada have expended from $71,000,000 to $72,000,000 in the construction of a railway from Halifax and St. John to Montreal ; while they were paying large interest on that amount year after year ; while it meant a large addition to the taxation of the country ; he could not conscientiously support a measure that would parallel that railway for the greater part of its length and render it almost useless from the point of view of carrying freight. My hon. friend from King's, P.E.I., (Mr. Hughes) told us the other night that this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was going to be a great military line. The hon. gentleman got mixed up in his figures, because one time he told us that it would cost only $2.80 a head, and another time he told us that it would cost us 15 cents a head. I don't blame him at all for mixing up his figures because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) was seized with a fit of military enthusiasm. He imagines himself a Roberts, or a Kitchener, or a Wellington, or a Napoleon, standing somewhere at the eastern terminus of this great railway and looking along a line 3,000 miles in extent, seeing it carrying on its trains, soldiers, and guns, and armoured cars, and everything of that kind. It is no wonder he should forget his figures. Speaking of this great project, he said :

> But there is something else which commends this proposition to my approval.

This great military man ; this great warrior for King's, P.E.I. !

If the time should ever come, and it will come through no fault of ours, when we may have to stand shoulder to shoulder in defence of our country, our institutions, and our laws, just think what a sense of security this continental railway extending from the impregnable fortress of Quebec, to a fortified port on the Pacific Ocean will give us. Our troops——

Just think of his strategy; what a strategist the member for King's, P.E.I., is? He spoke about conveying our troops 3,000 miles.

Our troops could easily be transferred from the west to the east and from the east to the west, and placed at any intermediate point. Should that day ever come, is there any man in Canada who would begrudge this contribution of 15 cents a year for fourteen years, for the power and security which such a line of communication could afford.

Sir, there was the spirit of military enthusiasm inflaming the hon. member for King's, P.E.I., but what do we find? Only last Saturday evening in the good old city of Montreal, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) who sits almost at the same desk with the hon. member (Mr. Hughes), denounced imperialism, denounced spending one cent of the people of Canada for imperial purposes or for imperial defence. How can these two gentlemen reconcile their position, and each support the same government. The hon. member for Labelle called Chamberlain almost an idiot and the Earl of Minto a second to him. While this great military strategist from King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) is going to build this railway for military purposes extending from the impregnable fortress of Quebec, as he says, to another impregnable fortress on the Pacific coast; while he is willing to spend millions of money for this, his confrere from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) denounced the spending of one cent of public money for the purpose of defence in Canada. That is the kind of following the government has on the other side of the House.

I suppose, Sir, that after all that one thing which is expected from a member in this House is to speak in favour of the province whence he comes. I have said pretty much all I have to say in connection with this transcontinental line and I repeat again that the people of Prince Edward Island will expect some consideration from the government, and they will also expect that I should make reference to their claims. I had the honour of moving an amendment a few days ago advocating that Prince Edward Island should be connectel with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I presume this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be carried out. I do not know that our protest will have any effect on the government to prevent them from carrying out their views. It was my intention, if at all possible, to have the province of Prince Edward Island connected with this system of Railways. For years we have been suffering in this island province for the want of communication in the winter time. In summer time we have facilities for transporting our produce and developing our industries, but the great drawback is that when the ice forms in the Straits of Northumberland, Prince Edward Island is to a certain extent isolated and shut out from communication with the rest of the world. In 1873, when Prince Edward Island entered confederation, the government of Canada guaranteed that continuous steam communication would be established and maintained between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Very little has been done to carry out that treaty. We have two winter steamers it is true, one of which is getting pretty old and will have to be replaced soon by a better one. The Postmaster General told us that this great railway scheme of the government was going to be a great transcontinental national railway which would unite all the provinces of the Dominion together, and I thought, now was the time for Prince Edward Island to assert herself and to show that if it was going to be transcontinental and national the little province of Prince Edward Island should not be neglected. I moved an amendment to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill asking that the company should acquire the branch of railway from Sackville to Cape Tormentine, placing suitable steamships on the route between Cape Tormentine and Carleton point, constructing a pier at Carleton Point, and thus giving Prince Edward Island connection with this transcontinental railway.

While we have unexcelled fisheries around the coast of Prince Edward Island, these great resources remained undeveloped for the want of this communication with the mainland. Consequently, our young men are obliged to leave their homes in the autumn season and go to the lumber woods of Maine or New Brunswick for employment, although the waters of their own province contain this teeming wealth. Last winter a large portion of the products of the fisheries, after they had been frozen and prepared for the American market, remained at Georgetown until the month of April, owing to the fact that the government steamers were fast in the ice. As a result of that, our young men, who spent their money and their time in the fisheries, lost some $5,000 or $6,000 in cash. A petition was sent to the government asking the government to recoup them for this loss, inasmuch as it was occasioned by the want of government steamships for keeping up communication with the mainland; and I hope that the government will see their way to reimburse these people, who are endeavouring to prosecute an industry of great value to the province and to the Dominion, in the loss they have sustained, and thus encourage them to continue in the industry for another year, and keep them from going to the United States. Is it any wonder that our popu-

lation has fallen off 5,000 or 6,000 in the last ten years when our young men have so little encouragement to stay at home?

Referring again to my amendment, I was astonished to meet with the opposition of the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). When he was in the province of Prince Edward Island he was very generous. When he had a candidate contesting an election, he would promise the people all kinds of things; but when he is asked to do anything in this parliament for the people, he forgets all his promises and pledges, and will not do anything at all. But, surprised as I was at the action of the Minister of Finance, I was amazed at the conduct of the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), who said it was an unreasonable thing to ask that Prince Edward Island be connected with the mainland—that it was an unreasonable proposition that a pier should be built at Carleton Point, and that boats should be placed on the route between Carleton Point and Cape Tormentine. Sir, the fathers of confederation, the gentlemen who, on behalf of Prince Edward Island, negotiated the terms of union with the Dominion of Canada—the late Senator Hawthorne, the Hon. Alexander Laird, the Hon. James C. Pope, the Hon. George W. Howlan, the Hon. T. Heath Haviland—were all unreasonable men when they asked for this communication; and my hon. friend opposes them. I am almost ashamed to mention it, but I can only leave the hon. gentleman to the tender mercies of his constituents.

Another proposition was the building of a third steamer. I have already told you that one of the steamers, being some eighteen years of age, is growing old, and will shortly be unfit for the service, unless she is repaired. The other boat, the 'Minto,' is a newer and better boat. But we want a third steamer. The people of Summerside and of the western part of Prince Edward Island desire a steamer in that section of the country. We do not wish to deprive our friends in the east of their communication between Pictou and Georgetown; but we insist that between Summerside or Carleton Point and Cape Tormentine communication should also be kept up; and that cannot be done without another steamer. I was told by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago that the government had no intention of building another steamer for that service; but I do trust that while they are expending hundreds of millions of dollars in western Canada, they will see their way clear to do something for Prince Edward Island.

There are some other matters which I would like to bring to the notice of this hon. House, especially the right hon. leader of the government, whom I see in his place, and also the energetic and able Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), who is sitting beside him. I would like to see a branch railway built from O'Leary Station, on the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway, to the west coast of the island. I brought this matter to the notice of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals some time ago, and he gave me the answer that the question was under consideration. O'Leary Station is only twelve miles from Cape Wolfe, on the coast, which is about eighteen miles from the coast of New Brunswick, at the terminus of the Kent Northern Railway, which is operated from Richibucto to the Intercolonial Railway. I am informed by the gentlemen who own and operate that railway that if these twelve miles from O'Leary Station to the coast are built, they are willing to put on a steamship in the summer season between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and thus to furnish another connection between the island and the Intercolonial Railway.

Another branch that is required is from Wiltshire, on the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway, to Victoria Crapaud, on the west shore of the island. We also require a branch from a point on the railway to New London on the north shore. These are sections of the country that require consideration in the way of improvements.

Sir, it has been said by our opponents: You are making the same mistake that we made in 1880, when we opposed the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway; you have not learned by experience, and in opposing this measure you are opposing the best interests of the country. Sir, I deny that. As I have already said, the Canadian Pacific Railway is the great pioneer railway of the North-west. At the time the fertile plains of that country were opened up, it was the duty of every man in Canada to see that the railway was assisted. But we have an alternative proposition made by the hon. leader of the opposition. That proposition is to utilize the Intercolonial Railway, which has cost the people of this country $71,000,000 or $72,000,000, and which is now extended to the city of Montreal; to extend it to North Bay on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to the Georgian bay; to provide proper terminal facilities there and at Port Arthur, because those who have studied the transportation question know that the largest quantities of wheat and other products of the west are carried by water; to nationalize the Canadian Pacific Railway around the north shore of Lake Superior, and make it a common highway for all railways. In this way, with a small expenditure of public money, you will place the farmers of the North-west in direct communication with the people of the east, and make Montreal and Quebec the summer ports of Canada. Improve the terminal facilities at Montreal as well as at Quebec. Do the same thing for St. John and Halifax as winter ports, and you will have Canada enabled to take her

position among the nations of the world with a moderate expenditure of public money, but do not pledge the credit of our country to this enormous expenditure while we have these facilities.

I oppose this resolution and the building of this railway on the following grounds: The government has no mandate from the people of Canada to build this railway. They are not authorized by the people of Canada to build it or to expend this large amount of public money in that way. If they desire to consult the people of Canada let them dissolve the House and go to the country on this question and we are not afraid to meet them in any part of Canada on this important point. I oppose it also because no surveys, or explorations, or estimates of the cost have been made. You know nothing of the mountains you will have to pierce, or the rivers you will have to bridge, or the valleys you will have to traverse, in building this railway. It is not a business proposition that you should undertake a work of such great magnitude without first having estimates and reports by competent surveyors. I oppose this measure too because the House had been in session from the 12th of March until the 30th of July before this resolution was placed on the Table. It was not in the form of a consultation with hon. members of this House, it was simply a contract binding hard and fast the people of Canada to an agreement. I oppose it, Sir, because it is the dying kick of a moribund government, of a government that is falling to pieces day by day. What have we seen within the last year, or within the last six months? Two of the leading members of that government resigning their portfolios and going into the cold shades of opposition. The hon. member for St. Mary's Division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte), resigned because he was not in accord with his colleagues upon the great fiscal questions of this country, because he believed in protection for Canadian industries, because he believed in Canada for the Canadians and he was forced to resign his position and to leave this government. The hon. member for St. Mary's division was at the head of one of the most important departments of the government and was looked upon as one of its ablest members; it was said of the right hon. the Premier that he said: 'Anything that is not good enough for Tarte is not good enough for me.' Mr. Tarte was forced out. A short time afterwards, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair)—also at the head of an important department of the government of this country—because of his honest convictions, because of his honest desire to serve the best interests of the people of Canada, knowing, Sir, that these tricksters—if I may use the word in a parliamentary sense—knowing that this government in its dying days was about to bring to its support the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and to endeavour, by boodle and by promises of boodle, to obtain a few more years of support and power in this country, felt as an honest man, having strong convictions on this point and anxious to protect the interests of Canada, felt it his duty to resign his position, one of great honour, which he had acquitted with credit to himself. I am surprised that formerly these hon. gentlemen were willing to laud him to the skies; as soon as he resigned, they commenced to pour abuse on him. They chided us upon this side of the House because we applauded the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. Yes, Sir, we applauded him, and are always pleased on this side to applaud an honest man, always pleased to give credit where credit is due and where an honest man, because of his own honest and sincere convictions, felt it his duty to resign an honourable and lucrative office and stand alone in this parliament, I say it is an honour to this side of the House if they applaud such a man. Now, I do not know that I should detain you any longer, and I will bring my address to a conclusion.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HACKETT. My hon. friend says 'hear, hear,' it cannot be possible he wants to hear more of it, because if he does I am prepared to give him a great deal more, but I think it is better that I should stop. As an old member of this parliament, representing as I do an important constituency in Canada, knowing that this is a crucial time in the history of our country, knowing that our rights are about being sold—if I may use the word—that our liberties are about being tampered with, that the government of this country is binding the people of Canada to such an enormous expenditure that it will grind them down for years to come, knowing that the government, in making this agreement with this company, are bestowing upon it vast franchises and great privileges—privileges so great that it is going to be a question in the future who are to rule in this country, the government of the day, the people of Canada, or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I think it my duty to rise in my place and, although I may never speak again in this parliament, raise my voice against what I think a most iniquitous measure.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Mr. Speaker, it is with a certain amount of diffidence that I rise on this occasion to address the House upon the very important resolution which has already been the subject of an interesting and prolonged discussion. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has quoted at length from the speech made by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Macpherson), in which the hon. member was praising highly the undertaking of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the immense things that the realization

of this project had done for the country. Does any hon. member believe that what was done twenty years ago and what is now resulting from the construction of that immense railway undertaking cannot be now and in the future repeated by the construction of another trancontinental railway. He says also that nothing is known of the country through which the projected railway will go. I hope, that before I resume my seat, I shall have convinced even the hon. gentlemen himself that a great deal is known about that country. He also tells us that the farmers have no money to throw away, suggesting, I suppose, that by the construction of this road, the farmers of this country will be impoverished. Representing, as I do, a rural constituency, I know as well as does the hon. gentleman that farmers are too sensible to throw away their money. But I never knew a farmer who would object to investing fifty cents if he thought he could make five dollars by it. And I consider that this undertaking, although I admit that the comparison is hardly possible, will, in the same proportion, do immense things for Canada. He quoted also from the speech of the hon. member for King's, P.E. I. (Mr. Hughes) that hon. gentleman expresses his views with regard to the military value of this proposed road. I had not intended to say anything on that point, but the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) brought to my mind a conversation I had in Quebec last winter, on the subject of the Trans-Canada, with an American gentleman whom I afterwards found to be a military engineer. He told me that the Trans-Canada, built as it was proposed to build it in the northern part of the country would certainly be a great advantage to Canada in a military sense. He said: In case any trouble should take place between our country and yours, it would be the easiest thing in the world for a party in a small vessel to cross Lake Superior, blow up the bridges on the Canadian Pacific Railway on the shores of the lake at Jackfish bay and Heron bay, and, this done, the whole of the North-west Territories and Manitoba would be in our hands. This is the weak point of your country. The weak portion of the human system is in the small of the back, and it is the same way with Canada. I consider that the construction of the railway will be of the greatest possible benefit to Canada from a military point of view. It will run away north of the shore of Lake Superior and will be of great advantage for the transportation of troops should such a thing at any time, be necessary. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) also referred to the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) mentioning the hon. gentleman's speech made yesterday in Montreal on the subject of imperial defence. I am not here to defend the hon. member for Labelle; that hon. gentleman is well able to defend himself. Nor do I hold the same views as that hon. gentleman in every instance. But there is one point upon which he and I are agreed. I believe, I sincerely believe, that it is far better for Canada to spend its money in developing its own resources and building railroads such as this than in taking part in the wars of Great Britain all over the globe and wasting its energies and its resources. The hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) makes a strong appeal for more branch railways in Prince Edward Island. I know the value and the importance of Prince Edward Island; I know that that province is a terrestrial paradise, not only because of the fertility of its soil, but because of the works of improvement which have been carried out by its intelligent and energetic people. But if we study the history of railway administration in that part of the country, I think, we shall find the appeal of my hon. friend is not very strong in one respect at least. When we find that it costs $135 for every $100 which the railways in Prince Edward Island bring to the country we cannot but feel that this is a fact to be considered. And it seems to me that this fact is an answer to the argument in favour of government ownership and administration of railways in Canada. This is about all that struck me, Mr. Speaker, in the speech of the hon. member who has just taken his seat.

Very interesting and very instructive have been some of the speeches made on this question. Very wearisone, lengthy and misleading, to say the least, have been some others. Nevertheless, I am of the opinion that the government has everything to gain by this long discussion. The undertaking is an immense one and its importance and necessity grow from day to day in the minds of the people. I shall be brief, Mr. Speaker, for I shall limit myself to matters concerning my own province, and with which I am somewhat familiar. The other parts of the Dominion interested in the construction of the transcontinental road have been very clearly dealt with by hon. members on this side of the House who are more familiar than I am with their local wants and details. As to the legal aspect of the contract between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific, nothing that I might say could make it clearer than the luminous and frank explanations that have been so profusely given about it by the best legal authorities in this House.

I should say, however, Mr. Speaker, that since last fall I have devoted a good deal of my time, scanning maps and reading reports of all kinds concerning the northern portion of our vast and rich Dominion. It was also my good fortune to make a very interesting and pleasant trip, during the past winter, through Manitoba, the north-west Territories and British Columbia. In the in-

terests of the Trans-Canada Railway Company, I addressed, in the principal cities and towns of these provinces, several meetings attended by the most influential and representative business men of the different places which I visited. I am somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, when I hear hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House say that the government is hasty and premature in its present action, that no demands or expressions of opinion have come from any part of this Dominion asking for the construction of this new transcontinental road, that, in fact, the people of this country know nothing of the immense region through which this proposed line of railway is to pass. I am not aware of any city or town of importance where boards of trades or municipal councils have not framed resolutions, giving emphatic expression to the necessity of this construction. Columns after columns of the most important newspapers of Canada have been filled with the most minute descriptions of the vast and magnificent area of country to be developed by this new undertaking. There is hardly a citizen of Canada who does not, at the present time, possess a very fair knowledge of the northern and valuable portion of our Dominion. The Trans-Canada Railway Company alone has distributed many thousands of copies of prospectus and reports of the physical features and of the resources of a great portion of the territory tributary to this projected railway.

May I be permitted here, Mr. Speaker, to say that much credit is due to the promoters of the Trans-Canada Railway Company for the very effective missionary work they have performed in this connection. The gentlemen composing this company have spent considerable money in important surveys and have devoted considerable time to gathering valuable and numerous data and have published a very interesting compilation of reports from engineers, missionaries, explorers and Hudson's bay officials. Several thousand copies of this compilation, accompanied by maps and profiles made by one of the best engineers of Canada, a graduate of the Royal Military College, and second Sir Percy Girouard in railway construction, have also been freely distributed. Much credit is due to these gentlemen, for they have traced the way for a great portion of an undertaking which is now attracting the attention of the people of Canada and indeed of the whole world. For Canada, although small in population as yet, is forging its way ahead with sure and gigantic strides. I still hold the strong belief that, by the time this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is completed, the necessity of shortening the line by building north of Lake Winnipeg will be strongly felt, and instead of an immense curve of 300 miles to the south, the population of northern Saskatchewan, of northen Alberta and of southern Athabasca, will render it necessary, in my humble opinion, for another railroad to be built on the line of the Trans-Canada project.

May I be allowed here to take strong exception to certain statements that have been made in and out of this House that the Trans-Canada Railway Company have sold out to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Looking over the list of names of the promoters and shareholders of that company should be sufficient to prevent any one from making such a ridiculous and unqualified statement. The Trans-Canada Railway Company still believes in the merits of its undertaking, and in its realization in the near future. Let me quote a few words from the acting manager of the Trans-Canada Railway Company, the active manager of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and the ex-manager of the Great Northern Railway, which is now placed in the hands of the Canadian Northern. I think every one in this House and out of it will admit that Mr. J. G. Scott is a good railway authority, and I am not afraid to pit his knowledge and his authority in railway matters against those of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Last week Mr. Scott was interviewed on the subject of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and was asked by a reporter of the Quebec 'Chronicle' what he thought. Here are his words, Mr. Speaker, quoted in the Quebec 'Daily Telegraph' of August 10:

> Mr. Scott declined to express any opinion as to the policy of the government in assisting the Grand Trunk, but said that although the Trans-Canada directors are deeply disappointed that their line, which is the shortest, and, in their opinion, in every way the best for the country, has not been adopted, nevertheless he personally could not but admit that the proposed government line from Quebec to Winnipeg would be of very great advantage to this city, especially if a level location is selected.

Further on Mr. Scott gives his opinion as to the possibilities of grain transportation by an all-rail route, and here again I think his opinion will rank favourably with that of any other railway expert in this House:

> Although some high authorities think that an all-rail route cannot compete with the great lakes and canals for the transportation of grain from the North-west, he is firmly convinced that if the government select a level location with grades not exceeding thirty feet to the mile, they will not only be able to compete with the water route, but will soon cut down freight rates very considerably, and save a great deal of money to the western farmer. People are apt to forget that the water route is only open for about two months after the crop is harvested, whilst a railway is open all the year round. They also forget that although you can send a vessel from Duluth or Fort William to Buffalo or Parry Sound, drawing eighteen feet of water and carrying 7,000 tons of grain, you can only send a vessel drawing fourteen feet and carrying about 2,000 tons through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals to Montreal or Quebec. This is what makes the

water route to the St. Lawrence ports expensive, and when to that you add the inland railroad freight from the interior to Lake Superior and the cost of elevating and transhipment, it will make it possible for a railway with good grades to compete readily for the transportation.

This, Mr. Speaker, I consider a very high opinion coming from a recognized authority on railway matters in Canada. Now, Sir, much has been said in this debate that might have remained unsaid by hon. members on the other side of the House. If every vestige of shame has not been destroyed in them by ardent partisanship, they will blush when, in a few years, they read of the things they have spoken during this debate of a part of our country of which they admit they know nothing. How can hon. gentlemen who, after all, occupy responsible positions, so far forget themselves, for no other motive than the advancement of their party, as to utter such absurdities and offer such ridiculous assertions ? Self-esteem and the consideration of their fellow members, the dignity of this parliament and the respect of the citizens from whom they hold their mandate, should have been more than sufficient to prevent them from placing themselves on record with such exhibitions of extravagance and want of good faith. Mr. Speaker, I shall now deal with a few facts and figures in order to refute some of the very lame arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. First of all I shall devote a few moments to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). According to this hon. gentleman's own autobiography he was at one time engaged in the honourable profession of teaching. He also, according to his own statement written by his own hand, devoted a good many years to the development of his muscles, giving his time to athletic training. Here is what he says about himself :

> As teacher and lecturer in history, language and literature, I was a recognized success. There is none whose students have taken higher standing or are filling higher places than mine, and there is none with better record or who is more beloved by his students than I am. . . . My athletic and political victories, my successes as educationist, writer on history and geography, and railway developer, have not been the result of chance or mere blind doggedness. The head, heart, nerve and muscle have each and all been taxed, and their forces judiciously combined.

If his knowledge at that time was not any more accurate about the geography of the country he should love and know more about, I pity the pupils he has formed. It is true that my hon. friend, as well as some other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, coming from the so-called banner province of Canada, do not think it is worth their while reading about this part of the Dominion for which they seem to have had deepest contempt, and which is called the province of Quebec. It it very preciptible that what galls them in this new project is the fact that the province of Quebec will receive from it considerable benefit through relief being afforded to old settled townships and villages, and the immense development which will follow the opening of a new part of the province. They would prefer that the northern part of Ontario should remain a wilderness than to see the province of Quebec deriving any advantage from this undertaking. One can readily gather that, had the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway started from Gravenhurst or North Bay, it would have met with their unanimous approval, for they cannot reconcile themselves to the idea of Quebec and the maritime provinces securing any immediate and considerable advantage from this policy.

It shall be a somewhat arduous task to follow the hon. member for North Victoria, who, thanks to his athletic development and elevated opinion of himself, traverses the province of Quebec over the tops of the Alleghaney mountains, jumping from summit to summit, and builds a railway without any trestle work to fill the gaps between them. He so often mentions the word 'air-line' in his descriptions of the country, that one would imagine he was constructing an air road without a flying machine. I notice, however, reading the unrevised edition of 'Hansard' reporting his speech, that he has thought prudent to eliminate certain figures which he had mentioned in the House in relation to distances from points of the Intercolonial Railway to imaginary points of this new government construction. He said that 8 miles from Trois Pistoles was the starting point of the central route described by the hon. Minister of Finance, when in reality Trois Pistoles, by as straight a line as the crow flies, is 44 miles to the nearest point of the projected railway. Then he gives us what he calls the border line across the counties of Temiscouata, Kamouraska, L'Islet, Montmagny, Bellechasse and Lévis.

The figures I shall now give will simply corroborate the statement made by the hon. the Finance Minister as to the actual distance by an air-line from the nearest stations on the Intercolonial to probable stations in a southerly direction along the new projected line :

	Miles.
From River Du Loup the distance is.....	25
From St. Pascal the distance is.....	17
From Ste. Anne the distance is.....	17
From St. Jeanport Joli the distance is....	25
From L'Islet the distance is.....	25
From Montmagny the distance is.....	20
From St.Valier the distance is.....	25
From Anselme the distance is.....	20

With the exception of the last station, which is along the Quebec Central Road, the others are stations served by the Intercolonial, and the closest to the projected railway. This will answer the question

raised as to the point of paralleling the Intercolonial.

The hon. member for North Victoria was also good enough to tell us, when he gave us the different elevations in feet of the different summits of the range of mountains back of which the proposed line of railway is to pass, that he was taking an opportunity of placing on record from official reports of the surveys of the United States survey department, a statement as to the topography of our country. This House must bear in mind that this double range of mountains, between which runs an almost continuous valley, follows a direction from west to east through this part of the province of Quebec, but the unfortunate mistake that the hon. member for Victoria made was to give to this House the summits for passes. What he describes are cross-sections of these mountains taken at different points running north and south. He gave the summits as follows :

	Elevation. Ft.
Woodbridge..	1,878
River Verte..	2,231
Painchaud Centre..	1,936
Chapais..	1,868
Garneau....	1,898
Patton..	1,720
Montmagny..	1,727
Roux township..	2,358
Roux township..	1,972
Ware township..	1,995

I have only given some of those mentioned by the hon. gentleman. There is on the wall of the Railway Committee room upstairs a complete profile of the entire route made by an eminent engineer, Mr. Hoare, and if you follow that through the entire country, you will find that the highest altitude which this railway will have to surmount is 1,450 feet. Of course, it is the report of an American surveyor that the hon. gentleman has referred to. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman has made use of it in this House, because we have Canadian engineers who have reported upon this country, and if he had taken the trouble to read their reports, he would have found that it would have been more satisfactory to himself, more satisfactory to this House and more satisfactory to the country to quote from them.

I should have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman would have refrained from alluding to the construction of the St. Charles branch of the Intercolonial. The cost of this construction is a scandalous monument to the memory of the former administration. The $2,000,000 paid for the construction of that branch was not caused by the difficulties in the construction of the railway, but are due to exorbitant prices for rights of way paid to friends of the party. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, why the hon. member for North Victoria made use of an American engineer's report, when so many surveys have been made by good Canadian engineers over this part of the province from the boundary of New Brunswick to Chaudière Junction.

The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) referred to one made by Mr. Davey. He took advantage of that survey to exaggerate the difficulties to be encountered by the government in the construction of its new line. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) showed clearly that Mr. Davey's line was a diagonal one, and had no relation whatever with the new project. The same hon. gentleman referred to a line run by Mr. Crawford from Rivière Ouelle. This one is of the same nature, and also meets with the same objection. The only explanations and locations to be considered of real value are the ones made by Mr. Tetu in 1889 and 1890, and one made by Mr. Hoare in 1891. They cover the entire territory from St. Francis river, N.B., to St. Anselme, in the county of Dorchester. I shall refer more particularly to these two. I may also add that two more explorations have been made ; one by Mr. Sullivan, beginning at St. Claire, in the county of Dorchester, and the other by Mr. Light, starting from a point four miles west of St. Charles Station on the Intercolonial Railway. All of these surveys and explorations cross at a given point.

Now, in order to make this particular part of the undertaking clear to the people, and to show how possible and practicable it is, I shall read from Mr. Tetu's report, page 29, taken from the general report of the Commissioner of Public Works of the province of Quebec for 1891. These were the instructions received by Mr. Tetu from the Hon. Pierre Garneau, Commissioner of Public Works, before Mr. Tetu started this exploration :

Sir,—A portion of the information required by the report of the Committee of Agriculture, &c., adopted by legislative assembly on the 14th June, 1886, being already in the possession of the Department of Crown Lands——

Hon. gentlemen will remember that this report was adopted after a prolonged and interesting debate, in which some 15 or 20 members of the Quebec legislature took part.

—the main object of the exploration with which you have been entrusted by letter of the 31st of August last, should be to discover an easy line for a railway and to prepare a sketch of the level from St. Anselme to Lake Etchemin, and from Lake Etchemin to the frontier, passing through St. Justine. You should also explore from Lake Etchemin, taking a northeasterly direction to the frontier of New Brunswick.

At the same time, while preparing these sketches, with a view to the eventual construction of a railway, that is to say, in keeping account of the grades and curves to be overcome or avoided, &c., &c., you should take note of your observations on the value of the soil and on the different kinds of forest trees you may meet with in the course of your expedition.

Should you discover indications of mineral deposits, you should also take note of them and bring back specimens of the minerals, which you will deposit in the Department of Public Works.

The House will see that these instructions were very clear, and that they were given for the purpose, and the only purpose, of ascertaining the possibility of the construction of a railway in this very part of the country. I will read a few extracts germane to the question, anl as briefly as possible, from Mr. Tetu's reports. He made three different surveys and three different reports, and in his general observation, here is what he says about that part of the country :

Soil.—The soil in these townships is exceedingly fertile and most suitable for agricultura' purposes, the forests well wooded with merchantable timber, while almost the whole extent of ground contained in my tracings shows only much more stony land, due to its position in the near neighbourhood of the mountains.

Grade.—Although, owing to the proximity of the mountains, I was sometimes obliged to go round, I always maintained an easy grade, never exceeding one foot in a hundred, with the exception of one-half mile, where I was obliged to allow 18 inches to the hundred feet.

He goes on to describe from the first mile, giving a general idea of the country and speaking very highly of the country until he strikes that part between the 85th and the 100th mile, as to which he says :

At this point, I am at the height of 1,450 feet above the level of the sea, in a region of mountains, but the line which I have followed is in a fertile valley, well wooded with maple birch, &c., through which run numbers of small streams, tributaries to the lake.

From the 85th to the 100th mile, I followed the valley of the River Noire (which is the discharge of Lake Violon) for a distance of about 10 miles, always keeping on the north slope of the hill. The lay of the land here permitted of my running the line for a distance of 15 miles almost perfectly straight, through a forest heavily wooded with spruce timber of large size, together with a small quantity of pine. On each side of the high lands are magnificent forests of maple.

This is a general description of that part of the country over 130 miles of that line running all the way from the Etchemin river to Lac du Loup, the source of the Rivière du Loup. That was the limit of Mr. Tetu's survey, and there he was met by Mr. Hoare. Here is the information furnished by Mr. Hoare in 1890 in his letter to the Hon. Mr. Garneau :

Quebec, August 24th, 1891.

Hon. P. Garneau,
Commissioner of Public Works,
Quebec.

Sir,—Acting upon your letter of instructions, dated September 29th, 1890, for the completion of the exploration surveys authorized by the legislature, for the purpose of ascertaining the possibility of constructing a railway line through the counties of Lévis, Dorchester, Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet, Kamouraska &c. I have the honour to inform you that I have completed the surveys and plans for everything comprised in the four sections in your letter of instructions, and to report as follows on each section, in the order that the work was conducted in the field :—

A railway located only to satisfy the requirements of the country through which it passes, without regard to the position that it might take in some important through-route, when it can be so placed, will not be as successful, unless the local resources are abundant. Upon these principles the surveys have been made. Any line up the Etchemin valley to the boundary line can be constructed at reasonable cost : there are no bridges to build at any size, the crossing of the Abenakis river being the longest, which would take a span of 100 feet. The crossing of the Etchemin beyond Standon can be made with a less span. The other streams are few in number and can be crossed on low grades with 30 or 40 spans. The rise from St. Anselme to the summit is gradual, by following the River Etchemin and tributaries The summit is reached at the head of Lake Etchemin, 38½ miles from St. Anselme, at an elevation of 762 feet above the Quebec Central Railway at St. Anselme, or 962 feet above the Intercolonial Railway at St. Henri. The descent to the boundary line is very easy. The maximum grades shown are 49 feet to the mile, but with a small additional expense they can be reduced to 40 feet. I started from the Etchemin valley line, 8 miles south of St. Anselme, and half a mile from the north bank of the Abenakis river, following the same side of that valley as far as Lac Vert, then crossing over to the opposite side and following the south shore of that lake to Lac Godbout, thence the north-west branch of River du Sud, following that river to its head, then crossing over to River aux Pins, connecting there with Mr Light's Short Line survey, then continuing in the direction of the Chemin Taché, till a connection was made with Mr. Tétu's line near Lac Boilard,a distance of 40 miles from St. Anselme. This line passed through the partly settled parishes of Notre Dame de Buckland, St. Philémon, St. Damien and St. Paul de Montmagny, passing the church of the latter parish, 20 miles from the mouth of the Abenakis river.

This is what Mr. Hoare says, after having gone over the same territory that Mr. Tetu had covered two years before. I shall now quote what he says about the route connecting the line surveyed by Mr. Tetu with the Temiscouata Railway :

The line follows the valley of the Cabano to the head of Long lake, then along the St. Francis valley to the foot of Lake Pohenegomook, passing at a point close to the United States boundary line. The line so far proved to be very good for grades and alignment, the country along this course rises so gradually that no grade need exceed fifty-three feet per mile.

This covers the most difficult part of the country, of which I have here a map showing mountains running north and south on both sides of Lake Pohenegomook. Further he says :

Although the surveyed line may not have the advantages as a through route, by its position it is admirably adapted to colonization purposes and it would get a share of foreign business without a doubt.

And he goes on :

To determine more exactly which is the best combined colonization and through route, closer surveys are required of the river Noire line.

These are the reports of two first-class surveyors—reports which are very complete, and which were at the disposal of my hon. friend from North Victoria ; and if he had read them, they would have saved him the trouble of sending to the United States for reports of the surveys of American engineers. Here are the figures given by Mr. Hoare as to the distances between Edmundston and Chaudière station : From Chaudière, via Intercolonial Railway and Quebec Central Railway, via St. Anselme, 207½ miles ; from Chaudière direct, via St. Anselme, 205½ miles ; from Chaudière via Intercolonial Railway by St. Charles, 202½ miles ; from Lévis via Intercolonial Railway and Quebec Central Railway, via St. Anselme, 209½ miles ; from Lévis via Intercolonial Railway and St. Charles, 205½ miles ; from Chaudière via the Intercolonial Railway and Quebec Central Railway, via Etchemin valley through the state of Maine, connecting with the St. Francis branch of the Temiscouata Railway, 190 miles ; from Chaudière via direct line, 186 miles. This is the line I am now discussing. From Chaudière to Edmundston, via the Intercolonial Railway and the Rivière du Loup and Temiscouata Railway, the distance is 199 miles. This is the line to which the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) alluded to. These are the distances from Edmundston to Chaudière, as given in the reports of the very best engineers we have, who have made a complete and th rough survey of that country.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at one o'clock I had been speaking of the information at our disposal in regard to the country through which the Quebec and Moncton line would run and had alluded to the reports that had been made upon it. Among others, I alluded to the report of Mr. Henry O'Sullivan an eminent geographer, engineer and explorer, recognized by no less an authority than the Royal Geographical Society of England. This is what Mr. Henry O'Sullivan says, speaking of a route south of the 2nd range of mountains between the boundary of Maine and the different counties which I have already named :

That line would give access to a vast area of cultivable and well timbered lands in the counties of Bellechasse, Montmagny, L'Islet and Kamouraska and by touching the River St. John at its confluence with the St. Francis, would bring the forest wealth of 3,000 square miles of United States territory, drained by the River St. John and Allaguash, a tributary to Canadian markets and to the port of Quebec. The distance between Quebec and Edmundston by this route is estimated at 156 miles, or 30 miles shorter than by the Etchemin valley, but the lower summit (by 500 feet) of the latter route with its easy grades will make up for the increased distance.

Therefore, you see there is ample evidence that every part of that country has been well explored and thoroughly surveyed and with the exception probably of a last definite location of the route we have in our possession now sufficient data to determine that this road can be easily constructed in its entire length, at any rate from the province of Quebec to the borders of New Brunswick.

In order to give the House an idea of how far advanced are colonization and cultivation on each side of the entire length of the proposed line of railway, I shall quote from the last census the population of the different parishes which will be served by the construction of this road and which at present are deprived of any railway communication.

County of Lévis—	Population.
St. Jean Chrysostôme	1,757
St. Lambert	1,280
Dorchester—	
St. Malachie	1,372
St. Léon de Standon	1,674
Ste. Justine	959
St. Claire	1,758
St. Edouard de Frampton	1,935
Ste. Germaine d'Etchemin	1,587
St. Isidore	1,766
Bellechasse—	
Notre Dame de Buckland	1,069
St. Cajetan d'Armagh	1,741
St. Magloire	1,367
St. Damien	1,174
St. Philémon	968
St. Camille	300
Montmagny—	
St. Paul de Montminy	1,612
Notre Dame du Rosaire	661
L'Islet—	
St. Cyrille and St. Marcel	1,656
Ste. Perpétue	676
St. Pamphile	1,307

Now, Mr. Speaker, the inhabitants of several of these parishes at present have to drive from thirty to forty-five miles to the nearest Intercolonial Railway Station. I shall not weary the House with more figures in regard to the populations of other parishes, but the same remarks will apply to the counties of Kamouraska and Temiscouata. The Minister of the Interior, during the remarkable speech which he delivered in this House the other day expressed his surprise that these people, who for the last thirty years have been clamoring for a railway, had not long before this risen in arms against such a state of things. Petitions have been signed by the entire population of these parishes, resolutions have been passed by municipal and county councils asking for the construction of this railway. I have myself forwarded a large number of them to the Railway Department here,

but, they have either been pigeon-holed or thrown into the waste basket because nothing has been done. The representatives of these other constituencies have also pressed their claims, but every time we have been told that a new construction would injure the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway, after all, is only a local road, but it should be developed and it should be extended to meet the wants of the entire population. Why not follow the sound and reasonable advice given by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) in his admirable speech of last Friday, and extend the Intercolonial Railway throughout the entire peninsula, from a point near Matapedia right down to Gaspé passing through one of the most fertile and beautiful portions of the province of Quebec. Why not build a branch along the north shore of the St. Lawrence river as far as Ste. Anne des Monts. We have in these two portions of country admirable parishes which are well settled and which would furnish any amount of traffic, and I cannot understand why the Intercolonial Railway should not extend its line throughout that part of the province. I remember that a couple of years ago when we were before the Railway Committee of the House in connection with the Gaspé and North-western Railway charter, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) took very strong exception to granting the charter giving us the old song that the Intercolonial Railway should not be touched. Arguments were brought forward to prove that the Intercolonial Railway would not suffer by this construction, but on the contrary would be given a greatly increased revenue, but we made no progress and nothing could be done.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall leave the south shore of the St. Lawrence and cross over the bridge at Quebec to the northern part of the province of Quebec. I may be allowed, however, to remain a few minutes in the old historic city of Champlain and say a few words of Quebec and of the great advantages of that city as a shipping port. You will pardon me if I am somewhat partial in my references to this city. Quebec, with its great and numerous natural beauties, appeals very strongly to the heart of every citizen of the province of Quebec. Let me read the words so admirably written by Mr. O'Sullivan as to the advantages of Quebec as a shipping port. These words are found in the report of progress of explorations in the country between Lake St. John and James Bay in 1898. Here is what Mr. Henry O'Sullivan says :

Nature destined Quebec to be the emporium of trade between Europe and North America, even from San Francisco, the distance is shorter to any European port via Quebec, than by any port on the United States coast.

It is useless to work against nature. The more we denude the forests and the more we dredge and swell the channel the more the water will evaporate, and the sooner will it flow off, and the diversion of a good portion of our waters at Chicago will certainly not improve the shipping facilities on the St. Lawrence above tidal water.

We have had examples enough, last summer to open the eyes of the general public.

Nature has provided every thing for Quebec ; a deep water shore line, with very little interruption on either side of the river from the Louise basin to Cap-Rouge, a distance of nine miles ; and if more room is required, a canal may be made along the St. Charles valley, giving wharfage room on both sides, right up to Cap-Rouge, at moderate cost. This canal might be fed by the Des-Mères, St. Charles, Ancienne Lorette and Cap-Rouge rivers, making Quebec, once more, an island, as it certainly must have been in ages gone by.

The Jacques Cartier, the St. Charles and Montmorency, on the north and the Etchemin and Chaudière rivers, on the south, can furnish unlimited electric power, &c., which in this age of lightning and steam, is a necessary adjunct to a growing city.

Frontenac, on ariving in Canada, wrote home as follows:—

" Rien ne m'a paru si beau et si magnifique que la situation de la ville de Québec, qui ne pourrait pas être mieux postée, quand elle devrait devenir un jour la capitale d'un grand empire." Which translated reads thus :

'I have never seen anything so fair or so grand as the site of Quebec. That city could not have been better placed had it been purposely intended to become the capital of a great empire.'

The more we study the geography of our country the more strikingly true do we find the above prophetic words. The question may however be asked, since Quebec has such natural advantages, why has her trade languished? Why are her wharfs idle ? In a word, why is she at a standstill ?

It is the only port on the Atlantic slope that can rival New York.

It is as close as the latter city is to St. Paul and Minneapolis, 300 miles nearer to Winnipeg, the centre of North America, and 469 miles nearer to Liverpool.

With a bridge at Quebec, the winter traffic could continue on to the Canadian seaports, via the Intercolonial, or, still better, by the proposed route that would leave the Intercolonial at St. Charles and run directly by the valleys of the Rivers du Sud, Noire and St. John to Edmundston, and thence, via the Restigouche, to any point on Baie des Chaleurs, and may be chosen, in connection with the now strongly advocated Galway route.

We have also the report of 1901. I quote the following from page 78 :

Some will say : 'Where is the use of talking of Quebec ? You cannot get the freight there,' &c., &c.

What is there to hinder the canal boats and railways from bringing freight to Quebec as well as to Montreal ?

Surely, it is not the difference of 160 miles on such level railway lines as we have on both sides of the St. Lawrence, that would make freight trains, loaded in the west, and after covering thousands of miles of rougher roads, stop short before reaching Quebec.

Let the railways and canal boats have the sailings that would be made by the ocean steamers making three or four trips more of a season from Quebec, and it would make a mighty

big paying freight rate on their lines between Montreal and Quebec.

The sailing craft of the whole Atlantic seaboard, and of the world for that matter, can come to Quebec with unfurled sheets, but they must be towed to Montreal.

I appeal to the representatives of the Dominion at large, from Halifax to Vancouver, to take an impartial view of the matter, and they must decide in favour of Quebec.

Yes, let the St. Lawrence route be improved and equipped on the same scale as that of New York, which can be done at comparatively small cost, from Quebec to the ocean, and with a shortening of six or seven hundred miles in our favour even with the great city of New York, which the Americans are proud to call the 'Hub' of the world, shall not long outstrip us in the race for supplying the European markets with the breadstuffs of our country.

So much for the advantage of Quebec as a seaport. Now, as to the northern country from Quebec and on to Lake Winnipeg. I shall quote further from the reports of Mr. Henry O'Sullivan, and the admiral reports of Mr. Doucet, the eminent engineer to whom I referred this morning. From these you will see that the statement of our hon. friends on the other side that we know nothing about that country are not correct. I shall read first from the report of 1895, which is contained in the sessional papers of Quebec for that year departmental reports, page 113. This is the report of an exploration of part of the Hudson's bay slope, made by Mr. Henry O'Sullivan, inspector of surveys. He begins his report which is addressed to Hon. E. J. Flynn, Commissioner of Crown Lands, Quebec, as follows :

Sir, in accordance with instructions of your department, dated Quebec, 16th August, 1894, I have the honour to inform you that I have completed the survey intrusted to me, north of the Ottawa river, and have also explored a considerable portion of the country drained by the rivers flowing into Hudson's or James bay, on which I have now the honour to report as follows.

He then goes on to give a very elaborate description of the rivers and lakes in the country through which he travelled, and he winds up with the following general observation :

There can be very little doubt, from what I have seen, that there exists beyond the sources of the Ottawa a fertile region several thousand square miles in extent, where there is an abundance of merchantable timber, principally tamarack, of which there is a sufficient quantity to supply sleepers for all the railways in the Dominion.

Roughly speaking, this vast region extends over about three degrees of latitude, and five degrees of longitude, containing about 50,000 square miles, or 32,000,000 acres ; equal in area to the whole of England, and one-third larger than Ireland.

That such an extent of country should remain unexplored and unknown at the end of the nineteenth century appears hardly credible. Still, the fact is, that with the exception of what was learned from the explorations of my esteemed old confrère, Mr. John Bignell, in 1872, at the heads of the St. Maurice, Gatineau, Mekiskan and Ottawa rivers, and his subsequent expedition to Lake Mistassini, and the conflicting reports of the same, the government had no official data regarding that northern region.

Now follows the report of the same gentleman of 1898, addressed to Hon. Mr. Turgeon, Minister of Colonization :

In accordance with instructions from your department, authorizing me to make an exploration of the country beween Lake St. John and James bay, and to examine the shore line and take the necessary measurements and soundings to find the most suitable harbour there ; to take notes of the general topography and geology of the country : soil, timber, climate, &c., and to furnish your said department with a plan, profile and report of the same, showing the obtainable grades and alignment, in view of future railway construction, for the development of that vast region, I have the honour to submit you the following report. . .

The country between Lake Chamouchouan and the height of land is a sandy loam, well wooded with black and gray spruce, tamarack, bouleau, &c., from 8 to 16 inches in diameter, a vast improvement on the country between there and the surveyed townships of the Lake St. John basin, which is mostly all second growth, since the conflagration of 1870. . . .

We passed through several large and beautiful lakes unknown to geography on the nameless river we followed from the height of land down to its junction with the discharge of Lake Chibougamou. These will be more fully described in a subsequent report, as soon as my plans and profiles of that section are completed.

One of these lakes is about 32 miles in length, with many winding bays and beautiful islands. Its shore line measures over 200 miles, and is generally well timbered with large white and black spruce, tamarack, poplar and bouleau, &c.

Some of the spruce here is over 2 feet in diameter, and from 75 to 90 feet in height. . . .

The distance from the height of land to Waswanipi by our canoe route is about 150 miles, and the difference of elevation from the lowest summit above mentioned is 325 feet. The country is level, or gently undulating ; very few mountains can be seen in any direction, and the fall is pretty evenly divided over the entire distance ; therefore, any desirable grades and alignment can be had for railway construction throughout this section. . . .

The main object of the expedition, as far as the practicability of constructing a railway from Lake St. John, over the height of land, to Waswanipi, was successfully ascertained, and before any line from there to the seaboard could be chosen, some point on James bay where, according to my instructions, 'vessels of sufficient draught for the navigation of Hudson's bay could enter,' should be decided on. . . .

At Waswanipi post, about midway between Lake St. John and James bay, it is surprising to see the fine vegetables and grains that Mr. Baxter, of the Hudson's Bay Company, has grown. I never saw better cabbage, carrots and turnips, and he gave me samples of wheat which he had grown from seed raised there the year before, and other wheat which he had grown from seed obtained from the agricultural farm at Ottawa. They are equally good, and can compare favourably with wheat grown in other parts of the province.

The surrounding country is all level, rich clay land, and Mr. Baxter is clearing up a piece of ground, not far off, that will certainly give still better results. . . .

Myself and assistants had a swim in Lake Waswanipi, on the 9th September, and we found the water warmer than we find that of Lake Chigobiche it the middle of August. . . .

About 40 miles above Moose Factory, we passed through splendid beds of gypsum.

I regretted being unable to remain longer at Moose, as much for the kind treatment I received there, as for the interesting information they were ready to impart on every side. The Right Reverend Dr. Newnham, resident bishop; Mr. Broughton, the Hudson's Bay Company's head factor, and Captain Taylor, who has been navigating Hudson's and James bay for the last thirty years gave me every information they could, and did everything in their power to make my sojourn there as pleasant and agreeable as possible. I was pleased to see the interest the Lord Bishop has taken in farming and gardening.

Here is a list of some of his garden stuff, which the right reverend gentleman gave me in his own hand-writing, with full liberty to use it as I pleased :

'Splendid celery, tomatoes, vegetable marrows, 15 to 40 pounds each ; salsify, kohl rabi, carrots, parsnips, turnips, beets, pease, beans, all kinds of cabbage, cauliflower, rhubarb, red and black currants, lettuces, radishes, herbs : all a good size, some not to be beat anywhere.'

We have a big country to develop, and our knowledge of it is very limited.

Up to 1894, the resources of all that region bounded on the north by the Rupert river, on the south by the height of land dividing the St. Lawrence from the James bay waters, and on the west by the province of Ontario, embracing an area of 50,000 square miles, was practically unknown.

Now, I shall read from the report of 1901, 'Second report of progress and exploration in the country between Lake St. John and James Bay.' In this report, Mr. Henry O'Sullivan has divided the entire stretch of country into sixteen sections, and gives a description of them in turn. I will not weary the House with all these details, but will content myself with summarizing these accounts. Mr. O'Sullivan first quotes from Mr. Lowe, and says :

Mr. Low says spruce for pulp wood is seen along the East Main river all the way up, and that areas of the same extend beyond the northern limit of the province of Quebec. He also says that new Quebec will be found better than new Ontario for agricultural purposes, and that no doubt rich minerals will be found in the northern areas of our province as well as in Ontario.

Then he goes on saying :

Many routes have been suggested and more or less advocated to reach James bay and Hudson's bay, at least seven in the province of Quebec and probaly as many more in Ontario. . . . . Having had occasion to examine more or less during the last twenty years the country traversed by the different proposed routes, I have prepared a table of the distances of the seven possible lines, which is herewith submitted, giving the number of miles of railway already in operation that may be used, and the number of miles to be built to reach James bay by each route. . . . . I take it that in spite of all opposition Quebec must become the principal shipping port of the St. Lawrence, and that the future transcontinental imperial trunk line of the Dominion must pass close to, or touch the southern extremity of James bay, and I have therefore taken these points as terminals for the accompanying table of distances. I will now endeavour to give an outline of each route in numerical order from east to west as shown by the red lines on the accompanying key plan.

I will not read the description he gives of these different routes, I will merely go over what he says of the two principal ones :

Route No. 1 follows the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, from Quebec to Roberval, 192 miles, and thence via the Chamouchouan and Nottaway valleys to James bay.

This route was surveyed and reported on by me in 1897 from Roberval to Waswanipi and thence via Little Nottaway and Lake Namuska to Rupert House. The portion of the Great Nottaways from Gull lake to James bay was only surveyed in 1899, and the description of that section is given in the reports transmitted herewith.

With the exception of a few miles along the Chamouchouan river, there is no difficulty in getting a good line on this route. Quebec and Lake St. John summit 1,535 feet ; Lake St. John and James bay summit, 1,200 feet above sea level. Total distance 622 miles, 430 to build.

Route No. 2 follows the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway about seventy-seven miles to the mouth of the River Jeanotte, thence follow the Jeanotte and Algonquin valleys westward to Latukue ; thence following the St. Maurice to its source and westward over the height of land to the old Mekiscam Hudson's bay post, and down the Mekiscam valley to Lake Matagam ; and thence direct to James bay.

I surveyed the Jeanotte and Algonquin waters and traversed from there to the St. Maurice below Latuque in 1891-2, and in 1899 I followed the St. Maurice valley from Latuque to Kikindatch, Hudson's Bay Company post, and thence over the height of land ; and the region between the Mekiscam post and James bay was explored by me in 1894 and 1899.

I do not apprehend any trouble in getting a good railway line over this route with the exception perhaps of part of the distance between the Algonquin waters and Latuque. My line passed through Lake Wayagamack and the fall from there to the St. Maurice is too sudden to overcome with ordinary grades, but I think that by keeping farther north towards the mouth of the Bastonnais river better ground and easier grades may be had. The highest summit of this line would be between 1,300 and 1,400 feet above sea level. Total distance 557 miles, 480 to build. . . . .

Taken as a whole, a comparatively easy line can be had throughout this section and owing to the enormous distance that timber would have to be driven in following the Ottawa waters, a railway through here would secure an immense lumber traffic. Part of this line would likely be followed by the Quebec and Lake Huron projected railway.

The highest summit on this line is only 1,000 feet above sea level, the total distance 640 miles, 545 to build. . . . .

Reviewing the different routes above described, route No. 1 as a colonization road takes

first place, but as part of a future transcontinental railway system, first place must be given to route No. 2, and for the development of lumbering industries, first place must be given to route No. 2 also.

And he gives the different lengths of these routes :

In distance route No. 2 has the advantage over all the others as follows :—

Route	No. 2 is	65	miles	shorter than	No. 1
"	"	83	"	"	3
"	"	170	"	"	4
"	"	223	"	"	5
"	"	253	"	"	6
"	"	443	"	"	7

You can easily see, Mr. Speaker, that this part of the country has been pretty well surveyed, and that we have a very fair general knowledge of it, and sufficient data to justify the government in its present action. I shall now refer briefly to another magnificent report of this part of the country made by Mr. Doucet. Mr. Doucet has subdivided this entire portion to Lake Winnipeg into seven sections; the first section from the height of land, from the 375th mile to the 447th mile; the second section from the 447th mile to the 557th mile, and so on, until the 1,237th mile. Here is what Mr. Doucet says :

From Roberval to the western limit of the province of Quebec, is a distance of 375 miles. The line runs through a good farming country, the soil being chiefly clay.

Then from the 375th mile to the 557th mile, he says :

The country presents excellent facilities for railway construction. On the north side of the height of land no rock cutting is necessary, very little cutting and filling would be required, and, owing to the level nature of most of the country, the gradient would be easy. Tamarack for ties and sand ballast are to be had in abundance. The rivers and streams, more especially the Mattagami and Kapuskasing rivers furnish numerous valuable water powers with falls from ten to twenty-five feet, which can be utilized in the development of mechanical industry.

He goes on with this section from the 557th mile to the 637th mile :

Generally speaking, the climate is similar to that of Manitoba, the weather in midsummer being equally hot. No destructive frosts are experienced until the end of September and rains are frequent but not excessive.

Between the Missinaibi and Kabinakagami rivers, from mile 557 to mile 637, a distance of eight miles, the land as a whole is level, rising slightly along the water courses where it is rolling. The soil is clay and sandy loam, covered in the lower levels with boggy peat and moss, varying from two to four feet in depth. The country can be easily cleared, and for farming purposes the soil will be equal to the best in the older portions of the province. Much of the area which is at present swampy will secure natural drainage when the country is cleared, owing to the incline of the land.

The mixture of clay forming the prevailing sub-soil with the surface soil will prove rich and productive. This district is well watered by numerous rivers and streams, some of which are well stocked with fish. This district is heavily timbered with spruce and tamarack interspersed with other varieties. Owing to their density of growth, the spruce and tamarack are for the most part too small for any other commercial use than pulp wood, not being proportioned to the height they frequently attain. In some places, however, they are of larger dimensions. The spruce will yield in some places 40. 50, or even 60 cords to the acre, especially in the country along the Kabinakagami river. There is also a heavy growth of spruce along the Mattawishgwani river, which will produce from 20 to 35 cords to the acre. The dense spruce and tamarack forests of the Moise river basin are of great value and cover an immense area.

Now comes a description of the country from mile 637 to mile 687, from the Kabinakagami river to the Albany river, a distance of about fifty miles :

About half of the territory comprised within this distance is good arable land, not found in large continuous areas, but principally in the neighbourhood of streams. The trees growing along the river banks have usually attained a fair size. The best timber district is between the Kanakasha river and Lake Eskyanaga, where extensive groves of spruce and tamarack up to 36 inches in diameter are found. The poplar which grows everywhere along the river is singularly free from ' black heart ' which renders it of value for pulp wood. At Pine lake on the Kenongami river, iron pyrites occur in considerable quantities, though it carries only small traces of gold, nickel and copper. The climate is similar to that part of the North-west, being in the same latitude. Frost is unusual during the summer season and all the ordinary garden vegetables are raised without difficulty. Barley and oats can also be matured successfully.

Then the report gives a description of that portion of country along the Ogoki river, and you will see what a beautiful part of the country it is——

The total area of arable land ten miles inland on each side of the Ogoki river, for a distance of 140 miles, is estimated at 1,500,000 acres. There are great quantities of excellent pulpwood throughout the district, the principal varieties being spruce and jack pine. From the mouth of the Ambabika river to the Albany river, the land, exclusive of brulé, will yield 38 cords to the acre, or a total of 56,346,400 cords. The Ogoki river country will average 44 cords to the acre, making a total estimated output of 78,846,000 cords, being 135,194,400 cords in all from the territory tributary to these two water-courses.

I think this is sufficient to prove to any hon. member of this House what a valuable country that is and how quickly we should develop it. Now, comes a portion of the country 250 miles in extent. The exploration of that portion has not been completed. Last spring, when the Trans-Canada people found that their undertaking was not meeting with the approval that they were hoping for from the government, they suspended further explorations which were then under the direction of Mr. Vaughan Roberts. But here is a description from a

point beyond this 250 miles to Lake Winnipeg. Then the report proceeds :

From mile 937, opposite the Severn river, to Mile 1112, opposite Gunisac lake, the following description is taken from a report made by Dr. Bell in 1879 on the country around God's and Island lakes :—

The land about Island lake is level and has an average elevation above the water of apparently less than 50 feet. The level of Island lake itself is 900 feet above the sea. The woods in the neighbourhood are mostly green. The proportion of soil to rock is also much greater than in the neighbourhood of God's lake. Large areas of low sandy land occur on Oxford and Hare lakes, especially on their northern sides. The soil is very good indeed, being generally clay of a light brownish colour, mixed in most places with a little fine gravel. In nearly every case where explorations were carried on inland from Island lake the rock seen along the lake shore disappeared or was covered with soil, and the trees were of a larger and better growth than near the water. There is a very good garden at Island lake post, and certainly I have never seen potatoes look better than they do here.

The other varieties of soil noticed in the district include clay, sand, vegetable loam and sandy gravelly loam. Spruce is the most abundant wood everywhere in this region. Next in order comes aspen, white birch, tamarack, balsam, poplar and banksian pine. In many places the spruce attains a very good size and is used in the form of logs and beams for building purposes. It is also sawn into planks and boards for all sorts of carpenter work. The tamarack and banksian pine sometimes have a diameter of 20 inches. Balsam fir is common and of good size around Island lake, some of the trees measuring nearly 4 feet in circumference. The rowan and mountain ash is to be found at Island lake, as well as ground maple.

Mr. Doucet concludes his remarks on that part of the country by saying :

1. That no obstacles of a serious nature, as regards construction, exist throughout the whole route.

2. That the amount of rock work is inconsiderable.

3. That the gradients will be easy as the country is so level.

4. That the soil, composed mostly of clay or of clay formation, is fit for agriculture for the greater part of the distance.

5. That there are valuable areas of timber lands on the route.

6. That the lands and the timber will assure to the railway an immediate return in produce, lumber and minerals.

I do not think I need refer any further to this matter because I do not wish to weary the House any more than is necessary, but I was very anxious to give these facts. I was very anxious that no other hon. gentleman on the other side of the House would be able to offer the excuse that this information was not obtainable although it is in the library and although the government of the province of Quebec has published complete reports. I am firmly of the belief that we have discovered sufficient data to enable us to go on now and complete the surveys and that we will be in a position to start with the construction of this road within this year.

You will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if at this stage of the debate, I have been somewhat lengthy. My excuse for thus trespassing upon the indulgence of the House is because of the fact that even the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, in order to make capital for a party which has no following in the province of Quebec, has so far forgotten himself as to belittle his native province by calling the part of the country I have just described, a subarctic region. Having heard such an expression of opinion from an hon. gentleman who should know better, is it a surprise to any one, if the eloquent and fluent member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), his voice choked with tears, and his genial face distorted with the expression of the deepest sorrow, exclaims in the most pitiful tone that once again the great province of Ontario is being bled to death in order to increase prosperity in Quebec and in the maritime provinces. Ontario, said he, will not view this undertaking with pleasure. If the Grand Trunk Pacific should be a success, the Grand Trunk, the Canadian Pacific and the Canada Atlantic shall become impoverished. It will destroy the prosperity of our harbours, towns and villages, and 455,000 families will be loaded with a new incumbrance of $45,000,000. Jeremiah could not have been more tragical in his tone and more heartrending in this description. This new scheme, said the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, will not in any way help immigration and colonization, and prevent the exodus which is as large as ever. In answer to this statement I can say without fear of contradiction that where the exodus was the rule during the former administration it is now the exception, and far more people are coming from the States into Canada than going out of it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the government on this broad-minded policy. The government may proceed promptly and fearlessly with this great enterprise. The contract is a good one, and is surrounded by all possible precautions against fraud and default. And in answer to the challenge of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I may tell him that no hon. member on this side of the House dreads going to the country with this project.

The amount of the country's credit temporarily engaged in this undertaking is very small when compared with the immense and permanent benefits that Canada, as a whole, will derive from the construction of this new transcontinental road, and the opening of these immense areas of arable and timber land, and mineral resources. It will greatly broaden the belt under cultivation, fill in the gap which separates the east from the west, afford relief to the farmer of the western prairie, in giving him lower rates for his exports and imports, and thus

create greater demands for the articles produced by the eastern manufacturers.

And last but not least, it will stimulate better relations, social and commercial, between the inhabitants of the different provinces by means of freer intercourse and greater facilities of communication.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker. I do not propose to make any extended reference to the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) who has just taken his seat. I may say, however, that I was a little surprised that a gentleman coming from the province of Quebec should make such an unkindly reference to the distinguished leader of the Liberal Conservative party in that province. More especially when we remember that the Liberal Conservative party polled 100,000 votes in Quebec at the last general election does it not come with bad grace from the hon. gentleman, to say that the Liberal-Conservative leader and his party have no following in the province of Quebec. I noticed in the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman told us that up to last summer his opinion of the northern part of the country through which this railway is to run was that it is a wilderness. I think it fair to say that the hon. gentleman being a resident of the province of Quebec and very likely born in that province, and now having the distinguished privilege of representing a constituency in this House—I think it is quite fair to assume that the hon. gentleman learned more of the northern part of Canada up to last summer, than he has learned since and down to the time he presented his facts to the House this afternoon——

Mr. TALBOT. I do not think the hon. gentleman wishes to misquote me. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find in anything I said that I stated that up to last year the northern portion of Quebec was to me a wilderness.

Mr. BLAIN. I said the northern portion of Canada through which this transcontinental railway was to run, and if the hon. gentleman will look at 'Hansard' to-morrow he will see what I said was correct.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution which we are called on to discuss reads as follows :

> That it is expedient, in connection with the Bill now before this House, respecting the construction of a national transcontinental railway, to ratify the agreement set forth in the schedule to the said Bill, entered into on the 28th of July, 1903, between the government and certain persons on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by parliament at the present session thereof, and to authorize the government to do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said Bill and agreement.

When this resolution was submitted to the cabinet by the distinguished Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways and Canals differed from his colleagues upon this question, but not to the extent that he thought well to resign his portfolio. I read from his letter and his statement made in the House, a very special request made to the Prime Minister and the government in connection with this transcontinental railway project. The Hon. Mr. Blair made no threat against the government ; he had no disposition to leave the party ; no desire to differ from his colleagues with whom he had been working for years, but he makes this special request, and I ask the House to consider if it was not a fair and reasonable request. Here are the words of the Hon. Mr. Blair :

> That parliament be asked for an amount to enable a thorough exploration of the country to be made, so that it might be possible to judge whether or not a suitable traffic producing route could be found through this district, and its cost and the character and conditions of the country through which it is to pass ascertained.

Is there an hon. gentleman on either side of the House who will consider this an unreasonable request coming from the Minister of Railways and Canals and asking his colleagues to stop to consider before they ask the people of Canada to expend $100,000,000 in the construction of a transcontinental railway. The hon. Mr. Blair in making this request did his duty as a representative of the people in the cabinet, and after the Prime Minister and his colleagues refused to listen to him, he sent in his resignation, and I take these words from his statement made in the House :

> I am not in favour of impetuously rushing into the construction of a transcontinental line from Quebec, through an unknown country to Winnipeg and the west, until we know something about it—until we have the fullest information about it. The project is one of very great magnitude, and should be dealt with only after the maturest deliberation. . . . .
>
> The only cause which has led me to take that regretable step is because I have been unable to justify to my mind, to my own conscience, and to my own duty to my people, the support of the proposal which the government have decided upon making to this House and the asking of legislation to pass with respect to the project known as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

And he makes a conclusive reference to this matter which is as follows :

> The step which I have taken, Sir, can only be justified in respect of my duty to my constituency ; of my duty to the party ; of my duty to this House and of my duty to the country, upon the clearest and plainest and strongest grounds.

That is what was said by the distinguished gentleman who was taken into the cabinet to take charge of the Department of Railways and Canals. From 1886 down to the moment he tendered his resignation, I have heard hon. gentleman opposite applaud him, for what reason ? Because for seven years he had applied himself to gath-

ering information in respect to the railway interests of this country and the transportation question generally. When any railway question came up for consideration in this House and his opinion upon it was given, hon. gentlemen opposite applauded. I wonder what has happened ? What has that hon. gentleman done to cause these hon. gentlemen so suddenly to change their minds? I have read the request he made to the cabinet ministers to stop and consider before they plunged the country into this enormous expenditure. I have also read what he said after he sent in his resignation. I leave hon. members of this House on both sides and the people of the country, to consider whether, in the statements he made to the House in respect to the dispute he had with the government over this question, there is anything that throws any discredit upon that hon. gentleman, or whether he has not cautiously prepared every word in speaking out on behalf of the people of Canada.

I come from the province of Ontario and, while I do not say that we have any right to discuss this question from a provincial standpoint, yet I think it is my duty to say something as a representative of that province. I ask myself first, can the people of Canada afford to enter upon the construction of another transcontinental railway? I answer that question by a statement which has been prepared by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I find that when they came into office in 1896 the debt of the Dominion of Canada was for the last year given, 1895 $253,074,927. The debt has grown under this this splendid business government, until in 1902 it reached $271,829,090, or an increase in these seven years of $18,754,163, a little too much, Mr. Speaker, for a party who promised the people that they would reduce the national debt. Now, what proportion of this debt does the province of Ontario bear ? It has been stated by an hon. gentleman occupying a distinguished position on the other side of the House that on a close calculation the province of Ontario bears 40 per cent of the whole debt of the Dominion of Canada, and pays 40 per cent of the taxes. Therefore, it is not unfair or unreasonable that we who come from that province should have something to say when there is a proposition before the House to expend $100,000,000 of the people's money. If the parties holding the bonds and mortgages against the Dominion of Canada were to ask this afternoon that these bonds and mortgages be paid, the people of Ontario would be asked to contribute $108,731,636. If this Grand Trunk Pacific scheme goes on, and $100,000,000 is expended—and that is a reasonable estimate of the cost of this great work—there will be added to the debt of this country to be borne by the people of the province of Ontario $40,000,000 more, which will bring their share of the debt up to $148,731,636. With that state of affairs before us, I think I have a right to ask that the government of this country, no matter what their political complexion may be, to stop and consider whether or not a new transcontinental railway is wanted, and, if it is, what route it should take from ocean to ocean.

One reason given for the construction of this road is that it will assist the western farmers to bring their grain down to tide-water at Montreal or Quebec. Last year, according to a statement given to this House by the hon. Minister of the Interior, the total amount of grain of all kinds brought from Winnipeg was 39,264,407 bushels, of which 5,826,000 bushels, or 13 per cent, went out by all-rail routes. Here is a distinction between the two parties in this country upon this transportation question. The men who are best posted on this question state emphatically that it is not possible to move the grain from the west as cheaply by an all-rail route as it is by a route part rail and part water. Then, I ask, how is it that this government are willing to expend such an enormous amount of money for the construction of another railway for the purpose of bringing wheat from the west to the seaboard ?

Many of the papers have discussed this transcontinental question; but I will quote one, and one only. It is the 'Farmers' Sun,' published in the city of Toronto. It cannot be said that this paper is a supporter of the hon. leader of the opposition or his party. It heads an article 'The All-Canadian Falacy,' which reads as follows :

> There is an encouraging revolt in parliament against the plausible argument that Canadian produce should be sent by an all-Canadian route to the Atlantic. To carry Canadian grain around through the maritime provinces would be as absurd as to carry it twice across the continent. . . . . The object of every scheme of export transportation should be to get the grain to the British market with the least expense. . . . . There is no justification for imposing such a burden on the farmers of Ontario and the west. They have grain to sell. They must sell it in Britain. Nothing could be more natural nor more profitable than that they should seek their market by the cheapest route.

That is the leading farmers' journal of the province of Ontario, and I leave it to the hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to consider whether that opinion is valuable or not. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite frequently quote the 'Farmers' Sun,' and that is why I direct their attention to this article. Many quotations have been given in this House, from time to time, from business men of the country, in respect to the proposition that is now before the House. I will quote one, that of Mr. E. C. Whitney, who says :

> In my mind the Grand Trunk Pacific project is a most unbusinesslike proposition and I can-

not find any reason why such a proposition should be supported by the business men of the country.

This is said by Mr. E. C. Whitney, the managing director of the St. Anthony Lumber Company, and a leading lumberman of eastern Ontario. This is the opinion of a business man of this city who represents a leading business firm in the province of Ontario.

Following up the question of grain rates, I think it would not be unfair for me to quote the opinion of the hon. the Prime Minister of Manitoba, who speaking in Toronto the other day, is reported as follows :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier had said in the House of Commons that by the expenditure of $100,000,000 of the people's money the government proposed to add to the value of every farm in the Northwest by carrying the products thereof cheaper to the markets of the world.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister of that province gives his opinion, which ought to be valuable in a discussion of this kind, as he has just come from the people of that province with a handsome majority at his back, the people of that province having endorsed his railway policy. He says :

The rate at present that had to be paid on grain from Winnipeg to tide water at Montreal over the Candian Pacific Railway by way of Port Arthur was nineteen cents a bushel. With regard to this haul the Canadian Pacific Railway management declared that they had carried it absolutely and positively at a loss, therefore they did not want the business, and very little went that way. How then did the produce of the west get to the markets of the world ? It went to Port Arthur and was there transferred to steamers and carried either to Buffalo or to Georgian bay and there it was reshipped and sent on to Montreal or New York as the case might be. The rate for this journey under present conditions was less than fourteen cents a bushel as against nineteen cents by the all-rail route or a saving of five cents a bushel on the wheat. 'Now,' he continued, 'Sir Wilfrid Laurier may be more patriotic than I am but I want to say that patriotic as we are in the west are we not willing to build a railroad with the people's money and then allow our produce to be forced through a channel for shipment at a loss of five cents a bushel to us. You can understand the farmers of the west would not tolerate it.

This is an up-to-date statement made a few days ago by the Prime Minister of that province, that he is not in favour of the construction of a road of that kind, saying that that road would not be of any more advantage than any other road going into the province of Manitoba, and he points out that the farmers of that province will not thank this administration for the expenditure of $100,000,000 that will not benefit them one cent in respect to their sending wheat from the west to tidal waters.

The hon. the Minister of the Interior is an important representative from the west, and the other evening, in the course of a long speech in this House, he advanced some reasons why, in his opinion, the government of this country should construct this transcontinental railway. I have not time to go over all the points in his address, but I propose to refer to one or two and to point out to the House and to the people of this country how weak is the argument of this hon. gentleman, who among all the members of this government, should speak for the west in reference to transportation questions. In the course of his speech he said :

Grain was carried from Kansas City to Chicago at five cents per 100 pounds, a distance of 488 miles.

When that statement was made in the House, gentlemen who are conversant with this question thought it was an alarming statement to be made by a distinguished representative of the government, so telegraphic communication was entered into with the result that it was found that to-day's rate between the points mentioned, from Kansas city to Chicago, is not 5 cents per 100, but 14 cents per 100 pounds. With this condition of things, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House and the country whether that is a fair proposition for the hon. the Minister of the Interior to place before the representatives in this House, calling upon them to support this railway because a special rate from Kansas city to Chicago was only 5 cents per 100 pounds. He gives that as a reason, and there can be no other reason for his making this statement than to convey the idea to the members of this House that grain is now carried 488 miles at 5 cents per 100 pounds, when to-day's rate is 14 cents per 100 pounds between these two cities.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman deny that grain has been carried between Chicago and Kansas city at 5 cents per 100 pounds ?

Mr. BLAIN. I thought some one from the west would rise in rebellion, because some of them are always in rebellion. I quoted the hon. minister's statement in this House. It is to-day we are asking the people of Canada to construct this road, and would not the hon. gentleman regard it as a fair thing for me to give to-day's rate upon wheat ? Would the hon. gentleman like me to give him another rate—a bargain day rate, such as the Minister of the Interior gave us? Is that the kind of rate the hon. gentleman would like the people of this country to base their decision on as to whether they should expend $100,000,000 or not ? Let me give the hon. gentleman an illustration. I called up the Canadian Pacific Railway ticket office in this city this morning, and I asked them : What is your passenger rate from the city of Ottwa to the city of Winnipeg ? The agent replied : The ticket would cost $36. I said : Have you not been sending out men at a very cheap rate ? He said : Oh, yes ; last Thursday

we had a harvesters' excursion. I asked him how much the fare was, and he said $10. In the discussion of this question, do you think it would be fair for hon. gentlemen to urge that because the Canadian Pacific Railway on Thursday last took men from Ottawa to Winnipeg for $10, that with an expenditure of $100,000,000 people would be carried to Winnipeg for $10, when to-day's rate is $36 by the Canadian Pacific Railway? I do not think it is fair for the hon. gentleman to bring up some special bargain day rate in order to induce people to vote for this expenditure. The hon. Minister of the Interior was going to teach the people of Ontario why, in his opinion, they should vote for this expenditure of money. I would like the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) to listen to this argument also, because I would like him to answer it when he speaks upon this resolution. He told us that the people of eastern Canada, and particularly the people of Ontario, should be willing to vote for this measure for the reason that the new road would carry a large number of lean cattle up from the east to the west to fatten them on the grazing lands there. This is what he says:

> Why, Sir, it only needs to be stated for us to understand what a profitable business it would be for the farmers of the eastern provinces, who can raise cattle, but who are not able, on account of the want of pasture facilities, to finish them for the English market.

So, the hon. gentleman called upon the representatives of the people in this House to be satisfied with this for one reason among others that there will be a splendid carrying trade on lean cattle from the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and eastern Canada to feed on these splendid grazing lands of the west, and further he says:

> We have in that business a large and important item, which will prove a great and substantial source of revenue to the new railway when it is constructed.

This is the promise to the people of Ontario. I would like to investigate that for a moment from the point of view of the representatives of the west. I have read about this matter for a good many years, and a short time ago I had the opportunity of making some personal investigation into the question. Is it likely that the people of the province of Manitoba and the territories should be willing for all time to buy their cattle from eastern Canada, or is it not more reasonable to suppose that the farmers of the west will breed their own cattle? I notice that the former premier of that province, Mr. Greenway, has a splendid herd of well-bred cattle. Every day farmers who went to the west to settle there are coming back to buy thoroughbred cattle to take to their farms in Manitoba or the territories. The hon Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) should have known that this business of sending lean cattle to the west is not likely to continue, in fact, I understand that to-day it does not amount to very much. But, even if there is such a trade to-day, is it to be supposed that it will grow, or even that it will continue? Do the farmers who have sent their sons to populate and develop that country propose that these young men who learned the breeding of cattle in eastern Canada will be content to bring cattle from the east to be fattened? I am within the hearing of farmers representing constituencies in Ontario on both sides of the House, and I am within the hearing of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), and I venture to say neither the hon. gentleman nor any of his supporters will dare to contradict me when I say, that the time is coming, and is almost here, when the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west will breed their own cattle, and when there will be no traffic of this kind between Ontario and the west. And we were told that many other things would happen. Listen, for instance, to what the hon. Minister of the Interior said for the city of Toronto, the very heart of the province of Ontario:

> If you take the route by the Canadian Pacific Railway——

That is the route now constructed and regularly in use.

> —from the city of Toronto to Winnipeg, you find that the distance from Toronto to North Bay is 226 miles, and the distance from North Bay to Winnipeg is 1,060, or a total of 1,286 miles, as against 1,200 miles by the projected road. So that, making a fair allowance for deviations, the length of the new line will be substantially the same as that of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

There is a promise to the people of Toronto and Ontario. Coming, as I do, from the very centre of that province of Ontario, I ask myself what has been the trouble in communicating with the west? Have the farmers' sons who have left Ontario for many years past to go to Manitoba had any difficulty in getting there? You know very well, Mr. Speaker, and the House knows well, that they have had no difficulty whatever; for the reason that in earlier days the Liberal-Conservative party constructed a national highway to take the farmers of eastern Canada to the west to settle that country and now we have a promise held out, and what is it? Is it that this proposed expenditure of $100,000,000 will bring the city of Toronto nearer to the west than it is at present? Why, the hon. gentleman himself does not pretend that it will shorten the distance. The route will be a roundabout route as compared with the one we have now. The hon. gentleman's promise will hardly appeal to the farmers of Ontario. Will it appeal to the manufacturers who are sending their goods to Manitoba? Where is the manufacturing done in the province of Ontario? It is done in the city

of Hamilton, in the city of London, in the city of Stratford, and in the east, the city of Belleville, and the city of Toronto itself. Have the manufacturers of this country any trouble in getting their goods to Manitoba, the North-west Territories and British Columbia ?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. 'Yes,' says the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). Why, such a statement is unworthy of the hon. gentleman or of any representative of the west. I read an article in the hon. gentleman's newspaper condemning the Canadian Pacific Railway and calling upon them to spend millions in putting on more rolling stock. And what was the text of the hon. gentleman's condemnation of the Canadian Pacific Railway last year in this House ? Was it because there had been a call from the west or from his own town for another railway ? It was not, and the hon. gentleman knows it well. His appeal, like the appeal made at that time by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and joined in by all the gentlemen from the west on both sides of this House was, not that they required a new transcontinental railway, but that, owing to the business being brisk in Canada at this time, as it is all over the world, and owing to the Canadian Pacific Railway being taxed to its utmost to carry traffic, there was a scarcity of cars. And the Minister of Agriculture made a statement that it was not a new railway that was wanted—and I have his statement here—but what was required was the railway companies should spend money in providing new cars and engines. Of course, things have changed since then. And I think I should have referred to the fact that the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Talbot) who has just taken his seat—and very well prepared remarks they were—were prepared not to support this railroad at all. The hon. gentleman told us that he had travelled through the west and that resolutions had been passed by city councils and boards of trade in support of the Trans-Canadian Railway which has disappeared so suddenly. But these resolutions did not refer to the railway now under discussion. The hon. gentleman's influence was not so powerful as that of this new company, which is not yet even incorporated, and which is going to have a new road at a cost of $100,000,000 to the people of Canada.

I want to say one thing further in respect to the province of Ontario. That was an appeal made by the Minister of the Interior to the farmers of Ontario. I have answered that in the short time at my disposal, and I propose now to answer it on behalf of the manufacturers of the province of Ontario, and of the province of Quebec, and of eastern Canada as well, because there is no distinction in that respect. One would almost think that for all time to come cattle were to go from eastern Canada to the west, and manufactured goods too ; one would think this condition was going to prevail for ever in that country, to hear hon. gentlemen opposite talk. I think it is a fair question to ask if that condition of things is likely to continue, and if the manufacturers of eastern Canada will always want so many cars to carry their products up to the west. Sir, the time is coming when the province of Manitoba and the west will manufacture a great deal for themselves. I wrote to a leading manufacturer of the city of Winnipeg since this House opened, and received an answer dated the 5th of May. I asked him something about his business, and his answer will show the House whether the people of that province are likely to be able to manufacture goods for the wants of the people of the west. I will read only a portion of the letter :

> In reference to hands, all told, we employ about 225 in our business in the city of Winnipeg. We are now doubling our capacity for manufacturing at Winnipeg and Calgary. We buy our leather principally in Ontario, but we import some from the United States, especially our saddle leathers, and a little from England. We have ten retail stores, all our own, two wholesales and two factories. Our retail stores are situated at Macleod, Calgary, Prince Albert, Strathcona, Edmonton, McGregor, Portage la Prairie, Selkirk, Winnipeg and Rat Portage.

All these stores doing business in different towns of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Where are they getting their supplies ? From the province of Ontario and eastern Canada ? No, but from the province of Manitoba, manufactured in the province of Manitoba, in the city of Winnipeg. What was the output last year, I asked the gentleman who represents this House in the city of Winnipeg, and he replied that they sold $1,000,000 worth of harness and saddlery, all manufactured within the province of Manitoba, and almost every dollar of it sold within that province, the North-west Territories and British Columbia. Last year, I notice, there was a binder twine manufacture established in the city of Brandon, and an agricultural implement manufactory. I could name a number of other manufacturing establishments that have sprung up in the city of Winnipeg in the last two or three years, for making articles that are used throughout the North-west country. I mention these things as showing what the people of Ontario and eastern Canada may expect very soon. Notwithstanding the great increase of population going into the west, a fact of which the Liberal-Conservative party are very proud, the time will come in the near future when neither Ontario or Quebec, or the lower provinces, will have as great a market in the west as they have at the present time for manufactured goods, for the reason that the people there are beginning to manufacture their own goods, and will be able largely to supply their own wants.

Now, Sir, we are told that this new road is to go through the province of Ontario. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite say, how is it possible that any member from the province of Ontario can vote against this scheme? One would imagine, to hear these hon. gentlemen talk, that there is at present scarcely any railway communication in the province of Ontario. I have here a statement from the Minister of Crown Lands of the province of Ontario. Indeed I wondered myself when I heard so much about this clay belt in northern Ontario. In view of the fact that a Liberal government in Ontario have been for the last 25 years expending so many thousand dollars of the people's money in surveying northern Ontario, I wondered how it was that they found this wonderful clay belt only just a little while before the last general election. Of course, as a native of that province, I hope to find that we have a splendid clay belt up there, and magnificent timber limits, and everything that will tend to make that province increase in wealth. Now, starting from the western boundary of Quebec, and going up to the eastern boundary of Manitoba, we find that country divided into four parts, one called the Nipissing district in the east, the next the Algoma district, then the Thunder bay, and the Rainy river districts. Those are the four districts through which this transcontinental railway is to go, if it is ever constructed. Let us see what the Ontario Minister of Crown Lands says about that country, whether there is any railway communication now, or whether the people are suffering for the want of it. First, he speaks about the agricultural lands:

> The great clay belt running from the Quebec boundary west through Nipissing and Algoma districts and into the districts of Thunder bay. This region is watered by the Moose river, flowing into James bay and its tributaries, the Abitibi, Mattagami and Missinabie, and by the Albany and its tributaries, the Kenogami and Ogoke. Each of these rivers is over 300 miles in length, and they range in width from 300 to 400 yards. They are fed by numerous smaller streams, and these, in turn, drain numberless lakes of larger or smaller size, so that the whole country is one network of waterways, affording easy means of communication with long stretches fit for navigation.

This is the condition with respect to that district. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not claim that it is all agricultural land, they say there are timber limits. Now let me ask them what those who are engaged in the lumber business require. They require lakes and rivers, such as I have read about in the statement prepared by the Minister of Crown Lands. What do we find to-day in this very capital of the Dominion? Why we find logs floating down the Ottawa river by the hundred thousand. Why has not a railway been constructed long ere this if it is so necessary for the lumber business? Simply because the natural water-courses sufficient for the purposes are found in the northern parts of Ontario, and these afford the best means of getting the logs down to the mills. Now here is a statement in respect of railways. The Commissioner of Crown Lands says:

> The southern boundary of this great tract of fertile land is less than 40 miles from Missinabie station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

So, with the Canadian Pacific Railway main line running westward and eastward, and the clay belt lying forty miles north of this main line, what would the natural man say was wanted to develop that country? Would he say another transcontinental railway? Would he not say just what the provincial government of the province of Ontario have said: We will construct a line of railway up there to tap the clay belt, and give the people who are settled there an opportunity of getting down to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Where would they naturally want to go? Would they want to go to the city of Quebec or the city of Montreal, or down to the seaboard, or away up to Manitoba, the North-west Territories or British Columbia? Would a man living in that part of the country want to go in those directions? I ask this House that reasonable question. Every man can answer it, and every man on both sides of this House if he were asked that simple question would say: No, what the people want is to give access to that country, and it will not take seven years to build 40 miles of railway up there. What the people want in that clay belt, if that clay belt is so large and productive as hon. gentlemen opposite would lead us to believe, are colonization railways running up through into northern Ontario to bring the products of the people down to the centre of the province of Ontario, where they are required, and to take back the supplies which they need. I will briefly touch upon the different districts of that northern country. The first is Nipissing, and I will read a statement concerning it from the provincial government's report, as follows:

> Nipissing is the most eastward district of New Ontario. It is bounded by the Ottawa river tributary waters on the east, separating it from the province of Quebec, and extends to the district of Algoma on the west. Several towns have grown up in the eastern portion of this district. Mattawa, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is the principal one, and there are other smaller settlements reached by railway and steamboat. There is a branch line to Temiscamingue on the lake of that name, and in this neighbourhood a number of townships have been surveyed and are ready for settlement.

Do they need another railway? There is already a railway constructed in that locality. There are several townships surveyed, unoccupied at the present time, and waiting for settlers to go in and occupy them.

At North Bay on Lake Nipissing, a point of junction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, there is an important settlement, and from this point a railway is to be built due north, towards and eventually terminating at James bay—the southern sweep of Hudson bay—which will open a very desirable country in which a settler can find immediate remuneration for his labour, in the sale of the timber which he cuts on his holding, as well as for his farm produce. A person, desiring to reach Nipissing can do so either by the Grand Trunk Railway to North Bay—north of which there are a number of surveyed townships —or by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the same place, or to Mattawa on the Ottawa river, from which town he can choose the direction in which he will go to take up land. This is the route to Temiscamingue, where a number of people have recently gone to settle. The railway and steamboat fare from Toronto is about $13, and from other places in proportion. Arrangements can be made with the railways for the carrying of settlers' effects by the carload.

Is there any demand from that section of the country for another transcontinental railway? They have a railway now, so the Ontario government say, and the Ontario government have entered into a contract for the construction of another railway to reach the northern part of that province. Turning now to the district of Algoma the report says :

Algoma extends from the western boundary of Nipissing to the eastern boundary of Thunder Bay district. In this wide expanse of territory there is a great variety of timber for nearly all of which there is a market at the railway stations or with the buyers for pulp mills.

That is the condition of things in Algoma —a splendid market for everything they have to sell at the railway stations on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sault Ste. Marie, the point at which Lake Superior empties into Lake Huron through the St. Mary's river, is in Algoma, and is one of the rising places of the west. It attained its first importance from the canals around the rapids, but recently a wealthy syndicate have established a very large pulp mill and other works, and are about to build a railway north into the interior.

Not with government aid, not a transcontinental railway, but a railway running north to carry supplies to places to be settled.

There are a number of surveyed townships open to settlement in this district, and near the Sault Ste. Marie—commonly called 'The Soo.' The factories established at the Sault, as well as the other enterprises pending, will insure markets for everything that a farmer can raise as well as for the timber he may cut. There is a great deal of mineral in this district that has been very slightly exploited, but the construction of the Algoma Central Railway and the new life which has been imparted to that section by the extensive works at Sault Ste. Marie will result in these minerals being worked at an early date. Algoma is served by the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the branch which runs from Sudbury into the Canadian North-west, and in adition by the lake steamers.

That is the report on this part of Algoma about which there is so much talk in this House, and which is already served without the construction of another highway. Then comes the Thunder Bay district :

Thunder Bay district lies between Algoma on the east and the Rainy River district on the west. The country throughout is well timbered and watered, and possesses several water powers near the bay that will have considerable commercial value, though at present unused. The commercial centre of the district is created by two towns on the bay, about four miles from one another. Fort William is the summer lake terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Here are three immense grain elevators through which pass the greater part of the exported wheat grown in Manitoba and Western Canada. It is the divisional point of the railway and a town of increasing importance.

Port Arthur is the other town on the bay. It is the terminus of the Canadian Northern Railway, which runs through this and the Rainy River district and through Manitoba into the North-west Territories, apparently intending to reach the Pacific ocean.

These two points are also the termini of the lake steamers which run between Owen Sound, Collingwood, and ports on the United States shores of the lakes, carrying passengers as well as freight.

The Thunder Bay and St. Joe Railway will run from Port Arthur north through a country of great wealth in timber and minerals as well as through sections affording good farming land.

That is how the northern part of Ontario is being opened up at the present time. Lastly :

Rainy River district is west of the Thunder Bay district and extends to the eastern confines of the province of Manitoba. This is a lumbering, mining, and farming country. The chief town is Rat Portage, at the outlet of Lake of the Woods into the Winnipeg river. This is the chief commercial centre of the whole district, though some saw-mills and the large Lake of the Woods flour mill is at Keewatin, practically a suburb of Rat Portage.

A little distance eastward of Rat Portage is Wabigoon, the centre of a mining district, but recently found to be in the middle of some excellent farming country. The government here established an experimental farm as a guide and assistance to the incoming settlers, and as a standing testimony to the quality of the land. Wabigoon, Rat Portage, and Keewatin are on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and from their end of the lake is a steamboat service across the lake and up the Rainy river to the falls at Fort Francis. Beyond these are other steamers for points in the interior. The Canadian Northern Railway crosses the Rainy river on its way to Manitoba, and forms another outlet for produce to the markets east and west.

Now, touching upon these four districts, which comprise the northern part of the province of Ontario, I have given the report, not of the Liberal-Conservative party, but the report of a Liberal minister in the Ontario legislature, which points out that

with the present railway communication is very good, the policy of individuals who are interested in that northern country is not to build another trancontinental railway, but to build roads to the north in order that the timber and minerals shall be brought down to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I just want to say a word or two and then I shall conclude, about the Intercolonial Railway. I am free to say that, living in the province of Ontario, I do not understand so much about it as those who come from eastern Canada, but I have listened to some discussions in this House in regard to the Intercolonial Railway during the last three sessions, and I will give a statement, not of my own, but the statement of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair, and this is a statement that I want the farming representatives, the representatives of the province of Ontario and the representatives of every part of Canada where the Intercolonial Railway does not touch, to listen to. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said this in respect to the freights that are now charged on the Intercolonial Railway :

I had a careful study made and a careful statement furnished to me by the traffic officers of the Intercolonial Railway as to the general traffic of tolls and freight charges which governs on the Intercolonial Railway and those which govern on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway ; and the result of that statement, keeping well on the safe side, is that the rates upon those two railways are from fifty to one hundred per cent higher than those upon the Intercolonial Railway.

That is what the people of this country have to bear for the Intercolonial Railway. That is not my statement, but it is a statement endorsed by the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who is coming into the cabinet to take the place of the ex-Minister of Railways, and it was endorsed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) in his speech in this House. The ex-Minister of Railways says further :

The gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway on its traffic, not including passenger traffic, for the year 1902 were $3,900,000. Add fifty per cent to that and you get $1,950,000 of addition. In other words, if we could have collected on the Intercolonial Railway the minimum rates charged by other railways, we would have had $1,950,000 more freight collected than we did, and this would have brought our total earnings up to $7,600,000, including passenger traffic. Deducting working expenses, we would have had a surplus for 1902 of $2,046,000. These figures cannot be gainsaid.

I quote this statement for one purpose, and for one purpose only, and that is to show the people of the province of Ontario and the other parts of Canada who are not served particularly by the Intercolonial Railway, how cheap their freight rates are. We are not complaining about it, but I say that we are not served particularly by the Intercolonial Railway, and if the government is going to put a burden of $100,000,000 on the people of Canada to build a line paralleling the Intercolonial Railway, then it is not unfair for the people of Canada to say that the people of the maritime provinces through which the Intercolonial Railway runs for about 1,500 miles, should pay the same rates that are charged to the rest of us who have to ship our goods on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Intercolonial Railway has cost us $70,000,000, and the deficits on its operation have been borne cheerfully by the people of Ontario and other parts of Canada, in order that we shall maintain our splendid confederation. But if the people of Ontario and the rest of Canada are to continue to do that, surely we should not be asked to construct another line of railway which will take away the little traffic which is now carried by the Intercolonial Railway.

One word about the policy of the leader of the opposition, and as to that perhaps it is as well that I should give, not my own statement, but the statement of a reform newspaper which is a supporter of this government. I refer to the Ottawa 'Journal.'

Mr. HOLMES. You do not call that paper a supporter of the government.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman say that the Ottawa 'Journal' is a supporter of the opposition ?

Mr. HOLMES. I say its editor and proprietor is a well-known Conservative who was formerly on the staff of the 'Mail.'

Mr. BLAIN. Did you ever see a Liberal-Conservative editing a reform paper ?

Mr. HOLMES. If you quote the 'Journal' as a reform paper you are not quoting right ; that is all.

Mr. BLAIN. Neither the Postmaster General nor the Minister of Agriculture, who are present, will deny that the Ottawa 'Journal' is a supporter of their administration. That being so, I place the opinion of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Agriculture alongside the opinion of my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) and the House will be able to draw its own conclusion. The Ottawa 'Journal' says :

Mr. Borden's Policy.

Mr. R. L. Borden, the Conservative leader, has probably sprung a surprise upon the country by his speech of yesterday in parliament. Criticism of the government policy was expected ; what was probably not expected was the plain, strong, clear-cut definition of what might be substituted instead of the government policy. Mr. Borden shows the calibre of a leader who leads.

Let me continue further for the benefit of my hon. friend (Mr. Holmes) :

Practically, it seems to us, Mr. Borden is for immediate government ownership of a nature which would give to the people of this country a splendid check at once and for all time upon

all transportation business and rates in Canada. Practically, it seems to us, the Liberal government is for a railway scheme which may gain nothing for the people for fifty years save some local convenience along a route a great part of which is barren ; and moreover a scheme which meantime will inevitably hinder early redress of transportation grievances by any other plan of government action.

Let me quote a little further :

In brief, and apart from the many interesting details of Mr. Borden's ideas, the main thing is this : He is for immediate control by the people of Canada of the transcontinental outlet from the west, where the Liberal government is merely for control fifty years hence.

Mr. Borden says in effect Let us have at once—and it can be had at once—a government road from Halifax to Port Arthur, the head of the great lakes ; let us arrange—and it can be done—for immediate control of running rights from Port Arthur to Winnipeg ; and at Winnipeg let us offer transportation facilities east to all western roads, ready and able advantageously at any moment if desirable to carry a government road clear across the continent.

This is Mr. Borden's alternative to the government plan which would build a road from Moncton to Winnipeg to lease to a private company for fifty years, and offer enormous aid to the same private company to build further west for itself.

That is the statement of the Ottawa 'Journal.' Let me quote another paper for my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Holmes). I refer to the Montreal 'Witness.' The hon. gentleman will not deny that this paper is a supporter of the present administration. Here is the opinion of the Montreal 'Witness' :

Mr. Borden's proposal has the merit of business sense as compared with that of the government.

Let me quote again from another paper which no Liberal in this House will deny is a supporter of the present government. I refer to that king of supporters, the Toronto 'Globe.' It says :

Quite naturally the next extension of this Intercolonial Railway system would be from Montreal to the Georgian bay.

Quite naturally, the 'Globe' says. That is the statement of the leading reform journal on the policy that is announced by the leader of the opposition.

I have not much further to say, Mr. Speaker, only this, that in my humble opinion proper surveys of the country should be made before this railway is constructed. In my humble opinion, when the House is in session at least, and when a large proposition of this kind is before the people of Canada, the members of the cabinet, instead of making a binding bargain on behalf of the people of Canada without consulting this House would come forward and say—We propose to construct a line of railway. And after having made that statement, before they sign and seal a bargain for the work, they should come and ask the people's representatives whether the time has arrived when the people are prepared to spend $100,000,000 to construct a new transcontinental line of railway. I say that the members of the cabinet have taken upon themselves more power in this matter than was intended to be given them by the British constitution which governs this country. I think there can be no justification for this government pledging the people of Canada to an expenditure of $100,000,000 without first consulting the representatives of the people of Canada in parliament assembled. For myself, speaking for the province of Ontario, I say, whether my opinion is valuable or not, when I examine this contract and see how little this transcontinental railway will do for the province of Ontario; when I am told by the hon. Minister of the Interior that it will not bring the province of Ontario one mile closer than it is at present to the west or to the east, when this and other statements are made, I have arrived at the conclusion that the people of the province of Ontario, regardless of party, will say that this government should be condemned for the expenditure of $100,000,000 to construct another transcontinental line of railway.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) who has just taken his seat has spoken from such a narrow and provincial standpoint in dealing with this scheme of a transcontinental railroad, which is essentially a national undertaking, broad and far-reaching, and embracing in its scope the whole of our great Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The hon. gentleman has brought forward one or two points which in the course of my remarks I will allude to ; but, at present I prefer to take up one or two matters which I think have not yet been brought out prominently in this debate.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have alluded to what they call the inconsiderate haste and pressure with which this scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway has been brought before the House. I take exception to that characterization of the proposal of the government, because, although this particular proposal has not been long before the country in its details, it has been the undoubted feeling of the people of Canada for some time past—certainly for one year, and probably for two years—that the condition of affairs in our North-west is such as to require another outlet for the products of that country in the near future. And when I say in the near future, I want to draw attention to the fact that this scheme, or any other scheme which may be put before the people of Canada, for relieving the pressure on the railroad systems of our country, must necessarily take some years for its completion ; and that if to-day we lay the foundation for such a scheme, it will be several years, to say the least, before the congestion of freight traffic in

our North-west Territories can be relieved. I need not dwell upon the many evidences of that congestion. I would point, however, to one which I think is authoritative, although I believe it has been alluded to already in this debate ; that is, the resolution of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, passed last winter, urging upon the government of Canada the necessity for immediate and prompt action to relieve the congestion of traffic from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to the Canadian seaboard. Those who are not responsible for the conduct of affairs in this country may think that the congestion is not a matter of great consequences ; but to the government of the country, whose duty it is not only to provide for present necessities, but also to look to the future and see that the growing needs of the country are provided for as they arise, I contend that it is a crying duty to provide for the future trade of our country. By the scheme which is proposed we do provide for the creation of another transcontinental channel of communication, which will be ready for operation five years hence. Were we to delay the inception of this work, I venture to say, without fear of controversey, that we would delay it too long. If within the next five years such a channel of trade were not created, I venture to say that a condition of affairs would arise in the country which would be a menace to our national existence. We have in Canada to-day two great corporations managing the railroads of eastern Canada—the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. The Cnadian Pacific Railway has an entry into our North-west Territories, and it is able to bid for the traffic of those growing territories; but the Grand Trunk Railway has no such entry through Canada, and it is therefore hampered in the carrying on of its eastern traffic. Everybody concedes that it is right that the Grand Trunk Railway should get an entrance into the North-west Territories, and should be able to take a share in handling the products of that growing country. If we do not provide a means by which the Grand Trunk corporation may be able to get an entry into the North-west Territories, through our own country and under our own flag, we all know that the Grand Trunk Railway has its connections with the railroads of the western states of America, and that it will obtain an entry by means of those roads into our North-west, and will bring down a large portion of the traffic of that country through American territory and by American lines of communication instead of through Canadian channels of communication. It is the duty of the government of this country to see that an evil of that kind shall not arise in the near future ; because we know that the interests of the people follow the channels of traffic ; and if a large portion of the people of our North-west Territories are looking to the great railroad corporations of the American union in alliance with the Grand Trunk Railway of eastern Canada, they will be looking towards the American union for other purposes ; they will be buying the necessaries of life in that country instead of buying them in eastern Canada, who can rightly and properly supply them. With this in view, it is a crying and immediate necessity that the government of Canada, supported by the parliament of Canada, should immediately arrange that the Grand Trunk Railway corporation should have an entry into the North-west Territories, and that in doing that we should provide a new and better line, the shortest and the cheapest means of communication for these territories, not only with eastern Canada but with our seaports so that their produce may be carried to the natural market of our food products, the mother country.

In this connection let me say a word upon the development of the North-west Territories. In all the discussion of this question the carriage of wheat has been brought prominently forward, and it has almost always been treated as the only product that would have to be carried by this railroad. That is one of the greatest mistakes that it is possible to imagine. While wheat is an important product of our North-west, and one of the greatest freights which will be carried by this road, and which has been carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway, I venture to say that in the near future, when the North-west Territories and the province of Manitoba are developed in the same way as the states of the Mississippi valley and the great north-western states have been developed during the last twenty-five or thirty years, the carriage of wheat will become an insignificant portion of the freight that will have to be carried out of the western country to our seaboard and across the Atlantic to the natural markets of our food products. I have made a little calculation in regard to the development of our North-west. In taking the census a couple of years ago, it was my duty to look into this development, and if it will not weary the House, I would like to lay before the members a few actual figures in regard to this development, and what I think may be taken to be a conservative estimate. well within what may be fairly and justly expected, of the probable development of that country in the decade between 1901 and the taking of the census in 1911. In 1891, in Manitoba and the North-west Territories as now organized, there were 31,800 farms, occupyling 8,140,000 acres, while in 1901, ten years later, there were 54,600 farms, occupying 15,400,000 acres. The remaining unoccupied land in these territories has an extent of 213,600,000 acres, or enough to make 758,000 farms of the average size of the farms in 1901.

The area of improved land in this decade

went from 1,403,000 acres in 1891 to 5,590,000 acres in 1901, and during the same period the area of land under crops was increased from 1,421,000 acres to 3,600,000 acres.

I will now take the area of the main staple crops in these two years—the main staple crops only. In 1891 there was 1,010,000 acres in wheat, in 1901 there were 2,495,000 acres in wheat. In 1891 there were 64,000 acres in barley, in 1901 there were 162,500 acres in barley. In 1891 there were 318,000 acres in oats, and in 1901 there were 833,000 acres in oats.

I also desire in this connection to make a statement in regard to the live stock of those territories, and later on I will draw the attention of the House and the country to the importance of this industry in comparison with that of the production of the crude grain or the crude crops taken off our lands.

In 1891 there were 147,700 horses in the North-west Territories, in 1901 there were 305,000 horses. In 1891 there were 120,000 milch cows, in 1901 there were 228,000 milch cows; and of other cattle, in 1891 there were 343,000, and in 1901 637,000, showing a splendid development of the live stock industry.

In 1891 the population of the territory was 219,000 and in 1901 it was 414,000, being a growth in ten years of 195,000, or 89 per cent. During the same period the growth of rural population was from 178,000 to 305,000, or 70 per cent.

The records of the Department of the Interior show that in the period between the taking of the census of 1901 and the 30th of June last, 48,858 homestead entries were made in the territory, and that 158,658 settlers have gone into it. I have had a calculation made based upon these figures and upon the records of the last two years, and I have discovered, taking an absolutely conservative estimate, not dealing with any exceptional years, but going over a term of years, taking averages, we may confidently expect that when one-half of this decade has passed, in 1906, we may count upon having 970,000 souls in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and that in 1911, when the next census will be taken, we may confidently count upon 1,638,000 souls in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Should the growth of the North-west Territories continue throughout this decade as it has begun, this estimate will be greatly exceeded, and we may be quite sure that the figures I am here giving are well within the mark. Now, Sir, I wish in all this calculation to keep well within the mark, but I think that the figures I shall give will be abundantly sufficient to justify a confident hope in the enormous increase in the production of that western country, and in the greatly increased demand for transportation facilities which that production will cause. The result is that it is absolutely necessary for us to-day, now, without the loss of a single week or a single month, to take steps to bring about the building of a new railway which will make the facilities for that transportation much better than they are to-day.

Sir, I say that these estimates are very conservative. In a country like this, new and growing, and with conditions changing very rapidly, we cannot make estimates in the same way that we can in an old and settled country like those of Europe, but in these calculations I have taken that arithmetical progression of increase in population which is taken in Europe and under conditions such as prevail there. Were I to make an estimate based on the conditions in Canada during the last few years, the figures, as I shall show in a minute, would be far, far under the mark. Supposing we had taken the trade of Canada in 1896 to estimate for the following eight years what the trade of Canada would be for the next eight years and had based that estimate on the history of preceding eight years, what would the result have been? In the period preceding 1896 the volume of our imports and exports was, in round numbers, $1,733,000,000. In the latter it was $2,713,000,000. That is an increase in the latter period over the former period of $979,000,000, or an average increase per year of $122,000,000.

In other words, the trade of Canada during the last eight years has averaged $122,000,000 greater than it did in the eight years preceding 1896; and, if we had based an estimate in 1896 of what was going to happen in eight years during which this government has been in power, on what had happened during the previous eight years of the former administration, we should have been too low by $122,000,000. I have taken the lower estimate in the figures I have given. I have not based my calculations of the future on the geometrical progression which Canada has shown during the last few years, but simply on the arithmetical progression, believing that in the next few years it will be at least as great as it has been in the immediate past. I think, therefore, that the estimates I shall give are conservative estimates. In 1901, we had 2,495,000 acres in wheat. In 1906 we ought to have 3,700,000 acres in wheat, and in 1911, at the end of the decade, we ought to have 6,200,000 acres in wheat. In 1901, we had 162,500 acres in barley. This, we may expect to increase to 250,000 acres in 1906, and to 432,000 acres in 1911. In 1901 we had 833,000 acres in oats. In 1906 we may expect to increase to 1,300,000 acres in oats, and in 1911, 2,200,000 acres. Now, take the average production. I do not base my estimate on any exceptional or particular year, but on the average production of five years before and after the last census. On this basis I think it is fair to believe that, as Manitoba and the North-west Territories produced 63,310,532 bushels of wheat in 1901, we can safely count on 70,300,000 bushels

of wheat in 1906, and on 117,800,000 bushels in 1911. Of barley, that country produced 7,331,255 bushels in 1901. This, I expect, will increase to 8,000,000 bushels in 1906, and to 13,824,000 bushels in 1911. In oats, our produce of 38,909,654 bushels in 1901 will increase to 58,000,000 in 1906 and 81,400,000 in 1911. Taking live stock, and basing our calculations on exactly the same principles, I find that we had, in 1901, 418,542 horses, and I estimate that in 1906 we shall have 750,000 and in 1911, 1,240,000. Of milch cows, we have not the figures for 1901, but I expect that in 1906 we shall have 560,000, and in 1911, 920,000. Of other meat cattle, we may expect to have in 1906 1,560,000, and in 1911, 2,500,000. These figures are important because on these figures we shall have to base our calculations and expectations of what the railroads and other means of transport will have to carry out of the North-west Territories and Manitoba between 1906 and 1911.

According to the contract that is before the House to-day, the new road ought to be built five years after the contract is signed. In 1908, then, the road should be built. We may safely believe that it will be a year or so after its construction before it is at its best in the carriage of freight. What we have really to do, therefore, is to provide for the needs of the country in 1911; and the figures I have given will indicate to some extent what we shall have to provide for. I said a few minutes ago that these estimates are what the railroad would have to do, but I have not gone quite far enough in my calculations. A certain amount of wheat, barley and oats will be needed for food and seed in Manitoba and the west; only a certain number of the animals in the west will be exported. I estimate that the surplus of wheat for export in 1906 will be about 60,000,000 bushels, and in 1911, 100,000,000 bushels. We may expect also that oats will be exported, either in the form of grain or in the form of meal, to the extent of 28,000,000 bushels in 1906, and 40,000,000 bushels in 1911. As to cattle, we may expect that in 1906 about 156,000 head will be available for export, and 250,000 head in 1911. Reducing these export carloads, we find that in 1906 we may fairly expect that, in wheat, oats and cattle, there will be available for export in Manitoba and the North-west Territories 120,000 carloads, and in 1911, 165,000 carloads. In other words, in 1906 there will be an average of ten trains a day of thirty cars each for every day in the year, and in 1911 fifteen trains of thirty cars each for every day in the year. We can see what this means when I say that, according to the last census, for three years the average had been about 120 cars per day, or four trains of thirty cars each for every day in the year. In other words, in 1906 we ought to have two and a half times as many train loads come out, and in 1911 nearly four times as many carloads of these products of the North-west Territories coming out that we have to-day. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite, and the leader of the opposition amongst them, have pinned their faith to the advantages of lake and rail transportation as against all-rail transport.

Mr. HENDERSON. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) says, 'hear, hear.' I have no doubt he pins his faith to that of his leader, whatever it may be. Nevertheless, though the leader of the opposition pinned his faith to water and rail transportation, he proposes to provide for all-rail transportation and many hon. gentlemen on the other side have discussed that very favourably. The argument in favour of water and rail transportation is supported almost entirely by statements in regard to the transportation of wheat and wheat alone, upon the fact that wheat may be carried by lake and rail more cheaply than it can be carried all-rail. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in the course of his statement of programme announced that he favoured the acquiring of the Canadian Pacific Railway track from Sudbury westward to Fort William, and then nationalize the track from Fort William to Winnipeg. This must be for the purpose of providing an all-rail route and shows that the hon. gentleman appreciated the importance of that route, and sees that the water and rail route is not sufficient for the needs of our transportation. I can quite understand, if the hon. gentleman depends on the Canadian Pacific Railway line north of Lake Superior, that the argument that the all-rail route cannot compete with the lake and rail route has a good deal of force, because everybody knows the impossibility of the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior competing with the lake and rail route. We are all aware of the fact that that railroad has grades on it of one per cent; we are all aware of the fact that, spend as much money as you like upon it, do what you choose to improve that road, you never can make it, from the nature of the country through which it is going to pass, a portion of a great transcontinental railroad which can and ought to carry freight at the lowest possible figure.

But, Sir, I will take the hon. gentleman's contention that we must have a lake and rail route. Nobody on this side of the House objects to that route during a portion of the year, in summer. But I want to point out this, that while grain alone, and especially wheat, will probably be carried when the lake and rail route is available, chiefly by the lake and rail route, wheat is not by any means the only product that will be carried out, in fact is not the greatest product that,

in the near future, will have to be carried out from the North-west. My hon. friend from Peel a few moments ago alluded to the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior about the carriage of cattle into the North-west Territories from the east by this railroad route. My hon. friend perhaps is not aware of the extent of that trade. This last season over 25,000 head of store cattle were carried from eastern Canada beyond Lake Superior into the North-west Territories, for the purpose of supplying that country with stock; and my hon. friend is not aware of the fact perhaps that at the same time there was no less than 40,000 head of cattle came from Mexico into our North-west Territories. Why? Because there was not a convenient route by which to take them at a low rate from eastern Canada into the North-west. Now, Sir, I venture to say that while the 25,000 head that went into the North-west Territories last year and an almost equal number that went in the year before, came largely from the province of Ontario, in the near future the maritime provinces and Quebec, and even that northern country through which the Grand Trunk Pacific transcontinental road is going to pass, will be able to raise young cattle which can be profitably taken into our North-west Territories for the purpose of being fattened there and then sent back to the east to be exported to the mother land. My hon. friend shakes his head. Perhaps he forgets the fact that during the last few years we have been sending from eastern Canada into the states of the American west thousands of cattle for the same purpose. My hon. friend perhaps does not know that although the western states of the union have been the greatest cattle producing country in the world, notwithstanding that fact, buyers from the western states, from Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado and Nebraska, have been scouring the Dominion of Canada to get store cattle to take into the western states to be fattened there and then sent east to Chicago, to be re-exported to England. Now, Sir, if that condition of affairs obtains in the cattle industry of the western states of America which have been developing it for years, may we not expect that in the North-west Territories of Canada, as their cattle trade develops, the same thing will obtain.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman says that the export of cattle from Canada to the Unites States is increasing. Can he give us the figures for the last three years?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the trade has not been increasing. Why? Because our own people have wanted all their cattle to reproduce in this country, they have been refusing to sell them to the Americans because they have found a new market for them in our own North-west. That is the reason why our cattle trade has been increasing. But it is not because the western states do not want them, it is not because the western states are not getting them, but to-day the western states are getting their store cattle from Mexico just as our people in the North-west are doing, because they cannot get them in Canada; and it is only because they cannot get them in Canada in sufficient quantity that they have been turning their attention to the south and they are getting them from Mexico.

But the hon. gentleman has entirely supported the view which I am expressing to the House. The hon. gentleman is quite right when he says that in the near future the people in the North-west will breed cattle for themselves. They are doing it to-day, and they are going to do it much more in the future. It is just as important, and indeed more important for the development of our North-west, that the cattle and stock industries should be developed than that wheat should be raised. The people of eastern Canada know well that the live stock interest is the basis of their prosperity. They know also that those people who have gone from eastern Canada to the North-west and Manitoba, while for a few years they do without live stock by reason of the virgin fertility of their soil and the ease with which they can raise great crops of wheat on the fertile prairies, in the near future they will have to adopt what is known as mixed husbandry and establish a live stock interest. When they come to do that the amount of animal products which they will want to send out of the North-west Territornes will make the amount of wheat that is sent out pale into insignificance in comparison. Sir, we are going to have in Canada the same condition of affairs in the development of our North-west that the United States republic has had. When the people from the east went into that country and began to spread out over the Mississippi plains and further west, they began to raise wheat and corn. They afterwards took to raising cattle to such an extent that to-day Chicago is the centre of a far greater trade in animal products than it is of a wheat and flour trade. I venture to predict that while to-day the people of Manitoba and the North-west are thinking of hardly anything else than wheat and flour, they will in the near future devote their attention to the animal industry in the shape of packing houses, in the shape of abbatoirs, in the shape of a live stock trade, which will cause the grain trade of our North-west to sink into insignificance. When that time comes, as it surely will come in the near future, no part of that trade in animal products will go by lake and rail but the whole of it will be obliged to go by rail, and can go in no other way. I emphasize this fact, because in all the discuss-

ion of the transportation question, not only in this House but in the newspapers of the country, the problem has been held to hinge upon the grain trade, in comparison with which everything else seems to be considered of no importance.

I have some figures here which will show what the trade of Chicago is in reference to this matter, and I think we may fairly judge of what is going to happen in our own country by what is happening in the United States. Winnipeg is held to be the future Chicago of our country. Chicago is situated at the head of lake navigation. Winnipeg is nearly 500 miles away from lake navigation. If there is any place on the continent of America where lake transportation can advantageously compete with all rail, it is Chicago. When anything has to be sent from Chicago to the Atlantic seaboard it can only go by lake to Buffalo, and then rail from Buffalo, or by the Erie canal with only one transhipment, or it can go all rail from Chicago to the Atlantic seaboard without any transhipment at all. Now, anything that comes from Winnipeg—and Winnipeg must be in the future the centre for the gathering of all the products of our great North-west—anything that comes from Winnipeg, if it has to come by water as well as by rail, will have to come down to Lake Superior before it can reach the water. It will then have to be transferred into the ship, be brought down to some other point and there it will have to be transferred again either to the rail at the Georgian bay ports, or into the ocean vessel at the port of Montreal, or at some other of the seaports. In that respect water and rail transport is at a less advantage from Winnipeg than from Chicago. But, what is the fact as regards the transportation of the products of the west from Chicago ? I have some figures taken from the Chicago Board of Trade returns which show how the products of the great west which are assembled at Chicago go to the Atlantic seaboard. I fear I may weary the House——

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. But these figures are interesting and important to the argument. The figures which I am going to quote are for the years 1900-1901 and 1902. In 1900 grains, including wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grass and flax seeds to the amount of 3,449,000 tons were sent from Chicago eastward by the water route, and grains amounting in quantity to 2,287,000 tons were sent eastward by all-rail. There were of flour alone 109,000 tons sent by water and 614,000 tons sent by rail. I will now take animal products, including barrelled pork, bacon, dressed beef, hides and wool, lard, cheese and butter, not live animals, but only animal products. By water there were sent 20,000 tons from Chicago to the east and by rail there were sent 1,445,000 tons. If you take the three things together, grain, flour, and animal products, there were sent from Chicago eastward in the year, 1900, 3,579,000 tons by water and 4,347,000 tons by rail.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is that from Chicargo to the seaboard direct ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, direct.

Mr. BELL. Not all to the seaboard ports ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not all to the seaboard ports. The return only shows what went eastward without specifying that which went to the seaboard, but the great bulk of it went to the Atlantic ports. This calculation does not take into account the shipments of the enormous quantities of grain which go through Chicago south and east and do not enter Chicago at all but which are sent straight on without any delay. The return which I am quoting are returns only of what goes to Chicago and is sent on from there and that which goes to south Chicago goes on by all-rail. I venture to say that there are ten times as much of these as of the quantities which I have given which do not go to the Atlantic seaboard. In 1901, taking the figures from the same source. we have of grain alone, 2,169,000 tons going by water and 2,439,000 tons by rail. We have of flour 89,000 tons going by water and 724,000 tons going by rail the whole way. We have of animal products 15,000 tons going by water and 1,444,000 tons going by rail. Taking the total of these products—and these are the same kinds of products which are going to go out of our North-west and which from Winnipeg must be carried to the seaboard for export to the old country—in 1901, 2,276,000 tons went by water from Chicago and 4,608,000 tons by all-rail or over double as much.

I shall go over the same figures for 1902, because I wish to show that this is no exceptional result, but that this is what takes place year after year. In 1902 we had of flour 105,000 tons shipped by water and 463,000 tons by rail, of grains 1,760,000 tons shipped by water, and 1,609,000 tons shipped by rail, the only time that more grain was sent by water than by rail. Of animal products 775,000 tons went by water and 1,269,000 tons by rail. Of the total during the year, 1,867,000 tons went by water and 3,342,000 tons by rail, or double as much. Now, I shall summarize these figures very shortly. Taking the total for the three years, we had of grain and animal products that went by water 7,720,000 tons, and by all-rail 12,298,000 tons, or a yearly average for these three years of 2,573,000 tons by water as compared with 4,099,000 tons by rail. The average yearly excess of shipments by rail is 1,525,000 tons. The statement is as follows :

SHIPMENTS by water and rail from Chicago, 1900.

—	By water.	By rail.	Total.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Flour	109,921	614,945	724,876
Wheat	797,317	302,181	1,099,498
Corn	2,211,107	899,683	3,110,790
Oats	414,504	903,924	1,318,429
Rye	12,461	21,804	34,266
Barley	10,852	126,883	137,736
Grass and flax seeds	3,210	32,735	35,945
Total, flour, grain and seeds	3,559,384	2,902,158	6,461,542
Grain alone	3,449,453	2,287,213	.....
Barrelled pork	3,220	22,703	25,923
Bacon, &c.	57	395,453	395,510
Dressed beef	....	589,475	589,475
Hides and wool	2,341	84,744	87,085
Lard	14,462	225,423	239,886
Cheese	10	23,569	23,580
Butter	1½	104,266	104,268
Total animal products	20,094	1,445,636	1,465,731
Total grain and animal products	3,579,479	4,347,794	7,977,273

SHIPMENTS by water and rail from Chicago, 1901.

—	By water.	By rail.	Total.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Flour	89,579	724,188	813,762
Wheat	945,661	419,797	1,365,458
Corn	947,344	847,507	1,794,852
Oats	258,038	1,039,752	1,297,790
Rye	11,196	24,842	36,039
Barley	4,468	81,546	86,010
Grass and flax seeds	2,487	25,779	28,266
Total flour, grain and seeds	2,258,770	3,163,410	5,422,180
Grains alone	2,169,191	2,439,222	.....
Barrelled pork	2,515	16,805	19,320
Bacon, &c.	1,140	381,703	382,843
Dressed beef	40	540,797	540,837
Hides and wool	2,787	130,273	133,060
Lard	8,713	224,263	232,976
Cheese	9	28,467	28,476
Butter	3½	122,540	122,544
Total animal products	15,208	1,444,851	1,460,059
Total grain and animal products	2,276,979	4,608,261	6,882,240

SHIPMENTS by water and rail from Chicago, 1902.

—	By water.	By rail.	Total.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Flour	105,966	463,378	569,345
Wheat	660,857	245,706	906,564
Corn	857,081	418,542	1,275,623
Oats	174,986	811,528	986,514
Rye	59,761	19,595	79,358
Barley	7,224	76,906	84,130
Grass and flax seeds	840	37,075	37,915
Total flour grain and seeds	1,866,718	2,072,733	3,939,452
Grain alone	1,760,752	1,609,353	
Barrelled pork	.....	18,960	18,960
Bacon, &c	.....	330,340	330,340
Dressed beef	.....	524,900	524,900
Hides and wool	775	76,716	77,492
Lard	.....	191,249	191,249
Cheese	.....	26,344	26,344
Butter	.....	100,893	100,893
Total animal products	775	1,269,405	1,270,181
Total grain and animal products	1,867,494	3,342,139	5,209,633

SHIPMENTS from Chicago by water and rail, 1900-1-2.

—	By water.	By rail.	Total.
1900.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Flour, grain and seeds	3,559,384	2,902,158	6,461,542
Animal products	20,094	1,445,636	1,465,731
1901.			
Flour, grain and seeds	2,258,770	3,163,410	5,422,185
Animal products	15,208	1,444,851	1,460,059
1902.			
Flour, grain and seeds	1,866,718	2,072,733	3,939,452
Animal products	775	1,269,405	1,270,281
1900-1-2.			
Total grain and animal products	7,720,952	12,298,195	20,019,147
Yearly average	2,573,650	4,099,398	6,673,049

The average yearly excess of shipments by rail is, therefore, 1,525,747 tons of grain and animal products.

This shows clearly and distinctly that the arguments which might be brought up in detail, a little here, and a little there in the course of this debate, are not conclusive in favour of the water and rail route. I think this statement is a direct and complete answer to the statement made the other day by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in his speech, when he said, quoting the words of a rail expert:

> Not more than ten per cent of the wheat is caried by the rail route and it is so carried only in times of necessity when it is absolutely necessary to bring the grain forward at almost any cost. In the United States the rail and water routes carry over seventy-five per cent of the grain in the United States and it must be remembered that the rail competition there is over railroads which run through a thickly populated country having large commercial interests.

Sir William Van Horne is quoted as saying that not a single bushel of the grain can be carried along the north shore of Lake Superior.

Mr. BELL. I do not think Sir William Van Horne said that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know but it would be the most severe condemnation of the route of his own railway that could possibly be brought before this country and it would have no bearing whatever upon the argument on this question because the grades on the route which we are proposing are doubly as good as the grades along the north shore of Lake Superior on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BELL. Is it settled what the grades are to be?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is settled to this extent: We know that the grades of the Canadian Pacific Railway around the north shore of Lake Superior are as high as one per cent, and we know from the statements which are made in regard to the country through which this proposed road will go that instead of it being an extremely rocky and hilly country with high elevations and deep ravines, it is generally level country with a gradual slope the whole way, and I am informed that the Grand Trunk surveying parties who are now in the country have been able to secure as far as they have gone a route with grades as low as one-half per cent, or in other words, that it is double as good as the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway around the north shore of Lake Superior in the matter of grades. That is one of the weaknesses of the proposition of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, because, in comparison with the route which we propose, the proposition which he puts forward cannot compete with the lake and rail transport and will not be able to do so. If we are going to provide facilities for transporting the grain products of our North-west we must provide for the construction of a railway which can and will be able to successfully compete with the lake and rail transport, and the proposition which we have put forward will do that, and I believe that no other proposition which can be brought forward will be able to do it.

Now, Sir, I will allude to another fact in connection with the argument put forward a few minutes ago. I said that not only wheat and grain, but also animal products from our North-west must be brought forward. I will turn to the report of the Winnipeg Board of Trade and point out that in that report they draw attention to the remarkable fact that last year the Minneapolis millers obtained a concession from the United States government by which they have been able to get Canadian grain and grind it in bond for export to Europe. The board of trade says: that apparently the result was satisfactory, as it has been announced in the press that a large quantity of the Manitoba wheat of this season's crop has been shipped to Minneapolis millers for grinding. That means that a large proportion of the Canadian wheat crop, instead of being exported to Europe in the shape of grain, is being ground into flour by the enterprise of our neighbours to the south, and according to the statement of the Winnipeg Board of Trade they are making a profit out of it. Is it not reasonable to suppose, yea, is it not necessary to the proper development of our western country that our own people at Winnipeg, Rat Portage and other places in the west, shall grind the wheat of western Canada in flour, and send it as flour to the eastern parts of Canada as well as for export. I know that to-day the reason why so much wheat is brought from the west into eastern Canada to be ground into flour, is because there is no market in the North-west for the by-products. The people of the North-west have not yet got into the way of feeding bran and middlings and shorts to their cattle and hogs, but when they get to be a live stock-producing country in the North-west, and have an abundant market for the by-products of the wheat when it is ground into flour, then you will see in Winnipeg or somewhere else another centre like Minneapolis where to-day the wheat of the western states and of Canada as well, is ground into flour; you will see the erection of enormous flour mills, and the products of our western plains will be shipped to the east in the shape of flour instead of in the shape of wheat. When that comes about, the flour will come from the west to the east by rail, and little or none will be shipped by the water and rail route. Here we have another proof that an all-rail route is absolutely necessary. And that all-rail route must be the best possible one. The kind of route which the leader of the opposition has spoken of will not do. He proposes to have it along the north shore of Lake Superior where the grades are

most difficult, and through Ontario and Quebec in a roundabout way, in contradistinction to the straight road proposed by the government, which will go through the hinterland from Winnipeg to Quebec in the most direct way. The leader of the opposition proposes to do this by buying the Canadian Pacific Railway around the north shore of Lake Superior; by purchasing the Canada Atlantic Railway; by building a long link; and by improving the grades by some arrangement between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. The leader of the opposition presents to parliament a patchwork scheme, presents to parliament a patchwork plan, which will not accomplish the end desired, of a straight road with low grades and a direct course between two important points. The leader of the opposition proposes to carry out his plan by an expenditure of tens of millions of dollars; I do not know how many tens of millions. He himself said that he did not object to free expenditure, and I must say that his plans show that he seems to delight in expenditure.

An hon. MEMBER. It would cost hundreds of millions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It may, but I am not able to go into a detailed calculation at the present moment, although we know that the cost would be enormously greater than the cost of the government plan, which the Finance Minister has stated to the House and to the country will only cost us $13,500,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friends opposite laugh.

Mr. HENDERSON. So well we might.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Do they laugh at the figures brought forward by the Finance Minister? Let me tell them that neither in this House nor anywhere else in the country has a single figure ever announced by the Finance Minister been controverted or attempted to be controverted. More than that, in the seven years that my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has held the position of Finance Minister, he has year after year put before this parliament and before the people of Canada financial statements, and they have all been of so conservative a character that in no single instance have hon. gentlemen opposite been able to point to any error or misstatement in his calculations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the reputation of the Finance Minister is so high in Canada that the people of Canada will accept his statements and will feel absolutely sure that the price which the hon. gentleman puts upon this great project is the outside figure it will cost the people of the country. I venture to say that never in the history of Canada has any plan of such transcendent importance been submitted to the people that involves such a mere bagatelle of a burden upon them.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Finance found it hard to get money enough to pay the cost of taking the census.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Minister of Finance has been able, during the last year, to show to the people of the world that the revenue of Canada is so abundant that we have a larger surplus by double than ever was known in history before, and that notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's insisting upon the fact that the census has been expensive.

I do not wish to enter into the general terms of this debate. The question has been dealt with ably by gentlemen on both sides, and I compliment gentlemen opposite that they have put their best foot foremost and given their ablest and severest criticism to the plan of the government. But all they have been able to show is that the plan of the leader of the opposition has not the full concurrence of the gentlemen behind him. These gentlemen opposite have recognized that the hinterland must be developed and that Canada should be widened from north to south so as to get a firmer grip on our area for agricultural operations. The leader of the opposition states that he is willing to build a colonization railway from Quebec to Winnipeg. He is quite willing to do that after having spent millions after millions in acquiring the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of Lake Superior and improving the grades on the Canadian Northern Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway from Lake Superior to Winnipeg. And after all these millions have been spent, he is willing to build a colonization road from east to west.

Mr. CLANCY. When?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In his speech.

Mr. CLANCY. At what time does he propose to do it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Just as soon as the information can be obtained and as the information is now before the House and the country, no doubt the leader of the opposition wants to do it at once.

Mr. CLANCY. When the interests of the country demand it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman from Peel said that plan would not do, and the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier said that it would not do either, and that you did not want a railway from Quebec to Winnipeg, but that you wanted colonization roads to be run

from the old settled parts everywhere to the north. There is not the slightest doubt in the world that such roads would not develop the country as the plan which the government proposes. The plan promulgated by these gentlemen will not afford good and cheap transportation facilities for the products of the western country, but the plan which the government has proposed will without doubt render that blessing. By this plan we propose to give to that part of Quebec and Ontario one of the best railroads on the continent of America, a road which will be on the main line of our communication between the great west and our seaports on the Atlantic; a road which will be able to carry the products of our western country at the cheapest possible cost, and will, therefore, promote the colonization of that country to the best advantage. As I have pointed out, the hon. leader of the opposition proposes to a great extent to follow our lead. But his followers do not believe in his scheme; they want to build the road in a totally different way. Sir, we make a clean-cut proposition embodied in a contract signed and sealed with a reputable corporation of great resources, which is going ahead with the project as rapidly as possible. In opposition to that and in contrast to that, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition proposes a scheme which involves dickering and bargaining with three or four railway corporations, each of them with its hand on the throat of this country, so that if his party were in power they would be committed to this scheme, and would be obliged to yield to their demands. We do not know, we cannot know, what that will cost. We do know, and the country knows, what our scheme will cost, and the cost is so ridiculously small that the difficulty is for the people to believe that so much can be got at so little cost. But, as I said a moment ago, the people of this country have had experience of the work of the Minister of Finance, and when he tells them that this scheme can be put through at a cost of $13,500,000, they will believe him, and will support and vote for the scheme. I for one, shall be glad to go before the people of the country and ask for their endorsation.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, at this late stage of the debate, I would not have ventured to occupy the time of the House were it not that the importance of the subject makes it the duty of each one of us to pronounce upon it. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), who preceded me, promised that he would give us some new points to excuse this scheme which the government are forcing upon the country; but in the course of the hon. gentleman's argument, I found that he was not dealing with the transportation question at all, but was giving us some very interesting figures about the development of the agricultural products of the west, and the bright prospects of that country for the future. I am sure that we are all very glad that the North-west is going to have the great future which we all predict for it; but that has nothing whatever to do with the transportation question. The hon. minister quoted figures which in themselves, may be all right and proper; but they had nothing to do with the issue before us on the present occasion. They show the real need of deliberation on this question. The hon. gentleman pointed out that in ten or twenty years hence the products coming out of the North-west would be enormous. That is all the more reason, Mr. Speaker, why we should pause now to get the right solution of the question of how to bring these products out by the cheapest outlet. But the hon. Minister of Agriculture is a docile follower of his leader, and therefore he did not wish to trench on the poor excuse which the right hon. leader of the government gave for bringing this project before the House, but contented himself with damning the whole scheme with faint praise. After telling us that the water-ways afforded the cheapest outlet for the transportation of the products of our western country, he went on to excuse the project of a railway to supplement them, without developing any comprehensive scheme by which our water-ways could be improved.

Now, this question of transportation is the most important question that can come before this parliament, in view of the place commercially which Canada is to take in the future amongst nations of the world. We have reached a stage in the history of the development of transportation in all parts of the world, that should cause us to pause and deliberate before we commit this country to a project which will probably keep back the true solution of the transportation question in this country for years to come, and possibly place the country financially in a position that would put her capability of coping with this question and her ability to carry as cheaply as the United States entirely beyond our reach for an indefinite period. The struggle for supremacy in international trade continues at the present time in all its vigour. It is recognized in all commercial countries that that struggle is one of the foremost issues that confront them to-day. Not only is our international trade bound up in this transportation question, but the whole internal development of the country is involved in it. If Canada is going to take commercially her place among the nations of the world, it is absolutely necessary that

the country should have transportation facilities equal if not superior to those of the nation to the south of us. Undoubtedly we are not prepared for the solution of this question at the present time. It is not without grave and thorough deliberation and ample knowledge, gained from all sources, that we can hope to find a solution of this question. This was the position of the government at the opening of the present session, for we find in the speech from the Throne these words :

The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

This shows the position of the government at that time. It shows that they were not prepared to deal with this question without having expert opinions upon it. Five months have since elapsed, and have we got that commission yet ? Mr. Speaker, I believe that not one member of that commission has been appointed, and no report on the subject has been brought in by the government. If further evidence were necessary, we have only to refer to the Order in Council passed on the 19th of May last, and subsequently brought down to this House, which contains some very interesting statements, in view of the project now before the House. This Order in Council has been read by several hon. members, but I think it is a good thing to bring it once more before the promoters of this scheme. The members of the cabinet apparently had a pretty comprehensive idea of what should be done in order to arrive at a true solution of the transportation problem. This Order in Council states :

That the development of North-western Canada has manifested the inability of existing Canadian transportation agencies to take care of Canadian products.

That our agricultural exports can only command the prices over seas to which their natural excellence entitles them when they cease to be confounded and confused with the inferior and often adulterated articles produced elsewhere ; and to preserve their separate identity they must go through Canadian channels.

The minister further states that the questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the conditions to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world.

It appears to me that with a statement of that kind, an acknowledgment by this government that expert opinion should be had in order to thoroughly investigate the different phases of this question, it is premature and ill-considered to bring down a scheme to this parliament three or four months after the opening of the House. The Order in Council goes on :

It is obvious that before any satisfactory conclusion can be reached upon these questions a thorough and comprehensive inquiry should be made regarding :—

The conditions of original shipment and the possibilities of improvement in the conditions surrounding such shipments.

The storage requirements of lake, river and ocean ports.

The harbour facilities of the inland lakes, rivers and Atlantic and Pacific ports.

The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally, any improvement, enlargements, or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.

The minister further states that in making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

The forces operating against the attainment of all-Canadian transport, namely :—

Competition by United States railways;

Competition by United States vessels from Lake Superior ports;

Diversion of Canadian products through eastern outlets to Boston, Portland and other United States ports, should be investigated, and the best and most economical methods used by our competitors should be carefully studied and reported upon.

The minister apprehends that in these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its own products, and it is thought that the most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts who may be appointed and authorized under the provisions of chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Now, it would not be supposed, having this view at the opening of parliament, having enunciated this view and having brought it down to the House on the 19th of May, that this government would plunge into a scheme of this kind without having any thorough or well-considered plans, surveys or information to present to this House.

The hon. the Minister of Agriculture said that this was not introduced hastily, that the country had really been considering it for two years. Well, if the country has been considering it for two years, how is it that the government had not a scheme to present to this House at the opening of parliament ? How is it that they brought in these different resolutions and finally at a very late period of this session brought in the present scheme. The minister quoted the Winnipeg Board of Trade to help out his argument, but what do we find the Winnipeg Board of Trade saying :

That a thoroughly qualified expert in the management of railways be appointed to make a report on existing conditions, and what, in his opinion, would make the Intercolonial a paying concern and of the greatest benefit to the country, and also to study and make recommendations on the following alternative schemes for the consideration of the government and the people.

The hon. minister apparently forgot to

quote that part of the recommendation of the Winnipeg Board of Trade. But we have not only this resolution, we have further the opinions of a man whose life has been devoted to railroad and transportation questions, and who, I believe, was asked to take the chairmanship of this proposed commission, a man who has pronounced against this scheme as a means of solving the transportation question of the west. Sir William Van Horne spoke as follows :

> The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or any other all-Canadian route will never voluntarily carry a carload of wheat by the all-railway route around the great lakes to an eastern Canadian port for shipment abroad, for the simple reason that it will never pay any road to do so. Nor will the transportation problems in the west ever be solved by the construction of an all-Canadian route from coast to coast.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this House and the country well know the reputation of Sir William Van Horne. They know his connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they know very well that if any means could be devised by which the Canadian Pacific Railway could carry their grain to the eastern ports over their own line, they certainly would not use lake transportation.

One might also say that we have the opinion of another man who is considered perhaps an equally good authority on the transportation question in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite, the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. Hays. When this scheme was first brought forward the Grand Trunk Railway had no idea of building a transcontinental railway through from coast to coast via Quebec and Moncton. Their idea was to go in by Gravenhurst or North Bay in order to tap the wheat fields and to establish their line in the North-west Territories. Why the government departed from this and adopted this last scheme, by what means they were pushed into this, is beyond my comprehension, unless it was to satisfy the call of their political grafters. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), who, among the members of the government, had the widest experience in connection with railway matters, and to whom one would naturally suppose his colleagues would look for information and guidance on this question—why was he not taken into their confidence at an early date, and why were his opinions not listened to ? We find that this minister, whom we naturally should have looked to, leaves the government because he does not agree with this scheme as a solution of the transportation problems of the west, and in a masterful and well-considered speech which up to the present time has not been answered by the government or its supporters, absolutely condemned this proposed scheme. But it seems to me that we do not even have to point to such high authorities as I have mentioned for the condemnation of this scheme in the light of the experience of one hundred years of the transportation problem in the United States. The scheme is condemnatory in itself. There is indeed not one point of merit in the whole scheme to recommend it. It is true that the right hon. the Prime Minister announced that it was designed for two purposes. First, to transport grain from the west to the seaboard ; and, second, to protect Canada in case the bonding privilege should be taken from us by the United States. In all fairness, except from this announcement it must be said that one would not judge that it was designed for any such purpose, but rather that some ulterior object was to be served in running a line into the country where for years to come there will be absolutely no traffic to warrant such an expenditure. Surely we have never had a scheme proposed in the history of legislation in Canada which was supported by such weak and flimsy arguments as those which were advanced by the hon. the leader of the government. The bonding privilege ! The hon. the leader of the House grew eloquent over the fact that the bonding privilege was going to be taken from us ; the commercial advancement of Canada was to be stopped if we did not devise some means of freeing ourselves from dependence on the bonding privilege. Let us look for a moment at the annual report of the Inter-State Commerce Commission of 1892, about the time that the fears of the hon. the leader of the government were awakened in this regard. The report says :

> The 'foreign transit trade' has also been a great mutual benefit to the two countries. The statistics indicate that the 'foreign transit trade' of Canada through the United States is very much greater than that of the United States through Canada, but that the reverse is the case as to the 'domestic transit trade' of the two countries. In both the 'foreign' and 'domestic transit trade' the merchandise of each country is permitted to pass through the territory of the other without payment of duty, and the continuance of this commerce and the conditions on which it is to be conducted are dependent on mutual concessions, good will, and fair dealing.

Now, there is just as much fear of war with the United States as there is of the bonding privilege being taken from us. No man can suggest any reason for the bonding privilege being taken away, except the event of war with the United States—and we all know that that is a very distant prospect. Moreover, I firmly believe, that, even if the bonding privilege were taken from us, the only effect would be to throw us on our own resources. In one or two years, if we used the means at our disposal to improve our lines of transportation, this loss of the bonding privilege would be found to be more of a bugaboo even than it is now. But this is not the only occasion when this bonding scare has been brought in to excuse schemes of the government. A few years ago it was

brought forward to frighten parliament and the country into the acceptance of that Yukon steal. On several other occasions, the leader of the House and his colleagues have grown eloquent over the bonding privilege. This excuse for unwise actions on the part of the government should be worn pretty thin by this time.

Now, generally, what are the pressing needs with regard to transportation that call for the construction of the eastern division of this proposed line ? Surely, there is none in New Brunswick. None have been pressed upon us during the last three or four years since I first became associated with the work of this House. I am pretty well acquainted with the maritime provinces, and I can fairly say that I have never heard any distinct demand from the people down there for a new railway in New Brunswick. And, surely, if there is any possible need for opening up more territory in New Brunswick and spending millions of dollars there, we could afford to follow the course of the government at the opening of this House in recommending that proper surveys be made and expert opinion had that a comprehensive scheme would be laid before us. As to the line from Winnipeg to Quebec, there is absolutely no excuse for it at present. It is advocated as a colonization road, but it seems absurd to decide to build a colonization road for 1,300 miles before a survey is made, especially in view of the fact that we have millions of acres of land available in the western part of this country known to be superior to any in this section and awaiting only proper settlement to turn it into profitable wheat fields. In the North-west Territories alone we have 150,000,000 acres of land fit for the cultivation of wheat. Will anybody argue that the less fertile lands between Winnipeg and Quebec can be properly settled while these western lands are opening, with railways already built and others rapidly extending ? And on the other hand, I feel sure that even in the old-settled portions of Ontario and Quebec, we can find thousands of farmers who are upwards of forty miles away from any railroad centre. The construction of this road from Winnipeg to Quebec involves a useless expenditure of public funds and anticipates any possible need for the opening up of that country by fifty, sixty or even seventy years. The idea of a new colonization road in a large, sparsely settled country like Canada, with railways built into territory not yet settled or even a vestige of habitation, is certainly opposed to all ideas of economical and fruitful development of the country. The few scattered settlements which will grow up along this line of 1,300 miles will do much to retard the progress of Canada, to increase the cost of the government of Canada, and to interfere with the settlement of the transportation question by pandering to colonization railroads when our plans should be to serve the country by a great trunk system across the continent. What do we find in the United States ? Do we find them, in the history of their development, rushing railways into every unsettled portion of the country ? It is only a few years ago that Oklahoma was settled, and even then the government did not aid railways with large bonuses. The settlement of the country had gone forward until Oklahoma could be opened up. People were awaiting for the opportunity to go there. We find there now a most prosperous state of affairs, the territory having a population of 500,000 souls. Only when the question of diminishing returns from the fertile plains of the west arises or population so increased that the good lands are taken up, will there be any necessity for opening up this large territory from Winnipeg to Quebec.

Now, with regard to the west, some hon. members on the other side apparently forget that we have a transcontinental line building through there. If what the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) tells us is correct, that the government have known about this need for two years, how is it that for two years Mackenzie & Mann have not been aided to push the Canadian Northern through the Saskatchewan country through to Edmonton and so on to the coast ? If they have known it for two years, how is it that this road was neglected and not pushed forward for two years ? And how is it, let me here remark, that the running rights reserved by the government over railways aided by the government as the Canadian Northern has just been aided to the amount of ten million of dollars, are not utilized to tide over the crisis which the leader of the government appears to think is upon the country at the present time ? Now, this Canadian Northern is opening up a large belt of fertile country that it will be impossible to settle in less than ten years from now. The reason for pushing new lines through that country is beyond my comprehension.

The leader of the government has told us that this is a time for action and not for deliberation. But during the seven years he has been in power and while the west has been growing, how is it that the needs of the country with regard to transportation have not impressed themselves upon the government, and why has not a comprehensive scheme been formulated and brought before this House ere now ? Hon. members on the other side have been getting up year after year and talking about the transportation question. This government has not made any substantial efforts—except such as have been made by some individuals who are out of the government now—to bring before this country a comprehensive scheme to settle this question. And yet they have the audacity to bring before this parliament and to herald in this country a

scheme that on the face of it and in the light of all statistics on transportation that we can get, is an ill-considered and ill-advised measure. As to the eastern section, regarding it in the most favourable light, if it were needed, for colonization purposes, it could be constructed by easy stages through the most inviting portion of the country. That is the usual method of colonization—not to rush through 1,300 miles of territory, but to construct by degrees along the easiest routes and through the most inviting portions of the country. As to the west, its needs are not so much more railways, but more facilities, more rolling stock on existing railways in order to get the products out of the country. The west wants cheaper transportation and control of rates. That is the cry of the west.

I had the pleasure of going through the west last year with the hon. the leader of the opposition, and I did not find any great cry of more railways. The cry was for cheaper transportation, control of rates, more facilities, more rolling stock, for getting the grain to the great lakes. The west wants cheaper transportation and control of rates. This scheme will certainly not fulfil the needs of the west for grain shipments to ocean ports, as it does not touch the present wheat centres, and relief can only come to them from the free use and increased equipment of existing outlets. Perfection of our lake service, the building and enlarging of our canals, the establishing of elevators at both ends of the lakes, the improving of the St. Lawrence route and ocean carriage, is what is wanted at the present time.

Every country rightly regards transportation outlay as expenses to be reduced in every possible way. The wisdom of getting surplus products to outside markets in the cheapest possible way is so obvious that no other country has ever questioned it, and to subordinate this proposition to the bugbear of the bonding privileges, is certainly unworthy of statesmanship and of the leader of the government of this country. The Americans, wedded to every form of protecting their own internal interests, are prepared to cross Canadian territory to the north or Mexican territory to the south, or adopt any other method so long as they can lessen the cost of reaching markets. All Canadians are certainly desirous of shipping through Canadian territory and using Canadian resources. But why get away from the inevitable factor of cheaper water transportation ? You cannot force transportation out of the course of least resistance, that is, the cheapest route. It is contrary to every principle of economy or reason, and by adopting a scheme such as this, to meet the transportation of the west and allay a vague suspicion in relation to bonding privileges, is to sacrifice a certain part of the return of every farmer's crop. No individual would do this, but apparently this government, to satisfy the calls of political grafters for subsidies, are willing to sacrifice the farmers and shippers of this country, and in fact to threaten the commercial development of all Canada. We want a true solution of the transportation question. We want an all Canadian route if possible, and it is possible if we only use the means at our disposal and not minimize the greatest inland waterways in the world. The only way to have the cheapest and best transportation system and to hold it as an all-Canadian route to cement together the interests of the east and west is by utilizing our great waterways and canals.

There is surely no problem of more importance than that of transportation to the west. The west must have cheap transportation, but this transportation question is one in which the future of the east is also at stake. Mistakes made now by too much haste may retard the problem as to the west, but it will eventually reach its true base. You cannot throttle traffic out of its true, its cheapest, course. You may as well try to turn back the tide; you may retard but you cannot keep it back. The east, therefore, in the event of mistakes of this kind, will eventually be the main sufferer. A worse plan for carrying the manufactures of the east to the west than the Grand Trunk Pacific, could hardly be devised. The line which the government proposes to build touches not a single manufacturing centre in Ontario and none in Quebec until it reaches the city of Quebec. It goes clean over the heads of the industrial districts of both provinces, and can reach them only by branches. It is 200 miles north of Montreal; 300 miles north of Toronto, and still farther from Hamilton, Brantford, Galt and other manufacturing centres. There is already one all-rail route much nearer to these manufacturing centres than the new one, and it is not overburdened with traffic, either eastbound or westbound. It may be found necessary some day to build another but at present the case is not urgent.

There are two important points to bear in mind, the necessity of obtaining the cheapest possible effective outlet for western produce and the necessity of obtaining the cheapest possible inlet for its supplies, with regard to the development of the east. As to the first, as I shall later point out, this scheme does not meet the necessities of the case, as you are trying to force traffic from its points of least resistance—water transportation—and you are surely, as to the second, getting farther away from the source of our western supplies, the manufacturing centres of the east. Now, the only reasonable way to hold the western markets is to deliver at reasonable rates to compete with United States goods, and this they cannot do by any scheme of political coercion. Protection by means of giving our products cheap transportation is just as important to

the development of this country as protection by a customs tariff. This proposed scheme is too far north to fulfil this requirement. It cannot provide an economic transfer to the west from the leading manufacturing centres of Quebec and Ontario.

Knowing these conditions is it not idle to think that we can serve these provinces by any consideration of merely local traffic and a colonization road. The local traffic of New Ontario and New Quebec has little in common with the through-traffic of the east and west. There is no satisfactory reason for sacrificing the all important purposes of a trunk line to what is at best, only the secondary interests of the local and colonization traffic. It cannot be but a great mistake to spend millions of the public money on a road which does not directly connect the west with the water highways of the great lakes, or with Montreal, the geographical as well as the commercial distributing point of the east, or which does not make as close connection as possible with the great industrial centres of Ontario. The Canadian Pacific Railway is far superior in this regard to the present scheme, for it is much nearer the manufacturing centres of Ontario and Quebec, and touches many of them.

Again, seeing that the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific already have their connections from Montreal with Quebec to the lower provinces and the seaboard generally, while the Canadian Northern is establishing similar connections, it is an unaccountable waste of public money to add a totally new line, whose proposed directness will be more than likely offset by other physical defects owing to the nature of the country through which it will pass, it will certainly have as many windings and other physical difficulties as the Canadian Pacific Railway; while, to be of any degree of success it should be more economic in its operation than existing lines. The Canadian Pacific Railway admirably located for serving the needs of an all-rail route is far from being taxed to its capacity, as the operation is too expensive to compete with the water route. The average traffic over the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Winnipeg is not more than a train and a half per day, and as the hon. leader of the opposition pointed out, if we spent a small portion of the money that this government proposes to expend on this new scheme to perfect the Canadian Pacific Railway, we could equip it so that its capacity would be equal to ten or fifteen times the present capacity of the road. The road would then be an economic saving to this country because there is no economy in building the line through a territory in which you have existing lines serving the same purpose. With the government in possession of such a trunk line, with the other leading railways granted running powers over it, as proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, there would then be every possibility for real improvement in service and rates between the east and west. The western farmers and producers and the eastern manufacturers and importers, would then have an opportunity of getting in and out of the west at all seasons of the year. Under the present scheme the country is to make its heaviest expenditure on the part of the plan that is the least necessary, while the expenditure of even a small part of the hundred million or more that will be put into this eastern section, would go a long way to establishing an economic settlement of the transportation problem between the east and the west.

Now, it was not my intention or purpose to take up the different clauses of this agreement as to their uselessness, in detail, as they have been pointed out ably by capable men on this side of the House. It is an unworkable proposition, and its proposal of running rights to other railways over a line controlled by another private corporation is beyond the reach of a practical, working, business reality, as was pointed out by the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). The clauses as to unrouted traffic in the plain view of business and common sense are absurd and contrary to all commercial principles of control of traffic, unless the scheme presents in itself the cheapest method of transportation, which it assuredly does not. I shall rather confine myself to the broader ground than even supposing the Bill in all its details workable. The scheme in its entirety does not meet the question of a true solution of the transportation problem.

But let us look for a short time at the history of the western transportation problem of the United States, and see what lessons we have to gain from that source. What do we find from this? That the experience of a hundred years has fully, amply and undeniably established the advantages of the lake and canal service to cheap transportation, that the growth of the traffic along this line has more than kept pace with the required improvement, and that the people of the United States, alive to these economic savings in transportation, are planning to send hundreds of millions in the perfection of them. On inland schemes of water economy over $300,000,000 is in course of spending and recommended as meritorious and necessary. Besides the Erie canal, on which $100,000,000 is proposed to be spent to meet the call for grain and other shipments of the great lakes, there is the great work nearing completion under the state of Illinois, connecting Lake Michigan and the Illinois river, and having in view the ultimate creation of a 14-foot channel to the Gulf of Mexico. The connection of the vast deposits of coal in western Pennsylvania and Virginia with the iron ores of the Lake Superior region by means of a ship canal across the portage separat-

ing Lake Erie from the Ohio river, is under consideration. These and many others are in view. These schemes have been kept back by railways, but the facts and experience of a century have demonstrated the inability of the railways to compete with water transportation. The reason I say that water-ways in the United States have been kept back is that the legislation controlled by great railway corporations has throttled the development of the country along those lines. I could point out to the House, if necessary and if opportunity favoured, instances in different states in which the canal systems are sought to be throttled and kept back by the powerful influence of the railways, as an instance of which a state passed a law that only canals of three miles in length are allowed to be built, and that canals should not pass through any borough, town or village. In the United States they are realizing now the improvements that are necessary to develop the canal system of that country to its full capacity.

No nation is enriched by hoarding its surpluses in warehouses or vaults or in permitting prohibitive tariff or physical obstacles to obstruct its tariff. Nor do we on this side of the House object to money properly spent in forwarding the present and future interests of this country. Our trade must spring from the productive capacity and labour of an industrious and intelligent people, aided by the greatest possible facility of distribution as determined by the cost. And so, we must treat this transportation question. Statistics go to show that the cost of transportation by canals is about the third of rail, while by open water it is still lower, and a nation that ignores an economy of 66 per cent in transportation is wasting its resources and imposing onerous burdens on the people. The possibilities of this country on water transportation are enormous, and we have yet time to pause and think before committing this inevitable blunder. We must not lose sight of the farmer and producer. The market range of any commodity is mainly determined by the cost of overcoming the resistance to its movement, and as these resistances are less by water than by any other medium, the water route possesses the physical advantages that cannot be ignored without loss.

In the report by L. M. Haupt, published in Bulletin 21, United States Department of Agriculture, we find the following :

> The value of a farm or mine depends not only upon its productivity but also upon the cost of transportation to market ; for if this latter item exceed the margin of profit there will be no return for the labour. Hence the character of the way becomes an important factor in fixing the value of property. Thus, on a common earth road the average cost of hauling a ton one mile, as determined by the Agricultural Department of the government, is 25 cents ; the average of the railroads of the United States is but 0·72 cents, or 7·2 mills per ton-mile ; while the rate by canal of limited draught is but 2·4 mills ; and by the lakes a small fraction of a mill only.
>
> On this basis the market range of the different groups of commodities over the several systems of ways may be most successively presented in tabular form, assuming that one-half its value is available for transportation charges. This is more than it should be, but the results are merely illustrative of the relative importance of the resistances.
>
> Limits of market range, by wagon, rail or water.

Commodity.	Margin.	Earth-road. miles.	Rail-road. miles.	Canal.
Forest produce	$ 5 50	22	764	2,293
Agricultural product..	19 00	76	2,640	7,920
Manufactures..	18 50	74	2,570	7,710
Merchandise	153 00	612	21,250	63,750

These figures show at a glance the enormous advantages of the water route over rail route, and they also show the almost prohibitive cost of freighting on the common road which is 33 times more expensive than by rail and about 100 times more expensive than by water. The Minister of Agriculture said that wheat was only a small portion in the products to be taken out of the west, but we all know that at the present time the transportation of wheat is the important factor that we have to consider and the government themselves admit that what they are after is to provide facilities for transporting wheat. If we can take our wheat from the west to the east the other products can wait until some comprehensive scheme is presented to this House. The hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) said in his speech :

> Would there be any objection to having transcontinental freight go over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and at the same time making it a colonization road.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) tried to make out that the Independent-Liberal organ, the Charlottetown 'Guardian' did not comprehend the situation, but the only thing he succeeded in proving was that he himself has not the faintest idea of what this government project is, or for what purpose it is intended, because he confounds a colonization road with a system of transportation which is intended to convey to the seaboard the products of the west in the cheapest possible manner. Taking the comparative rate on wheat in cents per bushel Mr. Haupt gives the following figures :

	Cents.
1868—	
Lake and canal..	16·23
Lake and rail..	20·76
All rail..	30·49
1897—	
Lake and canal..	4·35
Lake and rail..	7·37
All rail..	12·32

Therefore, in 1868, the rates by all water were nearly half of those by all rail, and in 1897, notwithstanding the great economies introduced on railways, the ratio was still

further reduced to about one-third in favour of the all water route. The benefit of our water system in giving us cheap transportation affects all industries and classes, and is clearly manifested in the case of the prime necessities of life. It is well set forth by Mr. Haupt whose opinion and accompanying statistics will be interesting for gentlemen on the other side of the House. Mr. Haupt says :

Thus low rates create traffic ; and whatever tends to this results, provided there be a profit, is beneficial to the railroads as well as to other interests. Deep-water competition is an important element in securing this end. Its influence on the general prosperity of the country is amply shown by the following extract from the Senate report of the Committee on Commerce, made by Senator William P. Frye, in 1892, when, in speaking of the commerce of the great lakes, he said :

No other distinctive type of commerce has contributed more to our industrial development. It has created a means of transportation costing to-day only one-ninth the cost of the same service by rail. . . . . The ton-mileage of the lake marine for 1890 was 18,849,681,384 ton-miles, or about 27·5 per cent of all the railroads of the United States.

The Minister of Agriculture quoted figures to show the comparative amount of tonnage carried over the railways as compared with lake and rail transportation. But we find here that 27·5 per cent of all the ton mileage of the United States railroads was carried over the lake and canal system :

At the average rail rate, say, of nine mills it would have cost $169,647,132 ; but at the lake rate of 1·2 mills it was approximately $22,619,617 or a saving of $147,027,514. . . . . The total expenditure for water improvements of the lakes has amounted to about $30,000,000, or approximately one-fifth of the annual saving effected in transportation. . . . Our waterways have acted as the most powerful regulators of rates. . . . When it is considered that a diminution of the freight charges of one mill per ton on the railroads of the country effects a saving of nearly $100,000,000 to the shippers in transportation, the value of this restrictive power cannot be overestimated.

By such statements of fact the general benefit of the waterway is established.

The only idea the hon. gentlemen opposite can have in forcing this scheme upon the people without giving them an opportunity to speak their wishes, is to glorify themselves in their dying moments by building monuments to themselves in order to try and hide their shame and their conduct for many years in decrying the Canadian Pacific Railway which was built by a Liberal-Conservative government. Now they are trying to immortalize themselves by building a tombstone, but they fail altogether to take into consideration the benefits which our waterways system would confer on the people of the west in the matter of cheap transportation rates. In order to show the range of prices and the influences on the prices of prime necessities. I quote the following from Mr. Haupt's article :

For example, in 1901 Kansas had 5,355,638 acres of wheat and produced 99,079,304 bushels, while Nebraska, its neighbour, planted 2,456,543 acres, yielding 42,006,885 bushels. The yield per acre in Kansas being 1·4 bushels greater than in Nebraska, the price in the former state under the law of supply and demand, should be lower ; on the contrary it is five cents higher. The principal shipping point in Nebraska is Omaha, on the Missouri river, 492 miles, by rail, from Chicago, and 412 from St. Louis, on the Mississippi, whence the rate on wheat in bulk by water to New Orleans is but one mill per ton-mile. The principal port of Kansas city, also on the Missouri, but about 230 miles lower down. From this point to Chicago by rail the distance is 458 miles, and to St. Louis 285 miles. Kansas city therefore has a shorter rail haul to Chicago by 34 miles, and to St. Louis by 129 miles, and it is 230 miles nearer the low water rate to the gulf. As the yield per acre was 18·5 bushels, this grain of five cents would represent a revenue of 92·5 cents over the price in Nebraska ; and had the entire state been sown in wheat this profit, due to proximity to water routes, would have aggregated nearly $50,000,000.

On the actual wheat crop it was $4,953,965. Kansas only has the advantage of nine cents per bushel on her corn crop of 61,506,034 bushels, giving a gain over her neighbour, on the yield of $5,535,543. For her oat crop she received, in 1901, six cents more per bushel than Nebraska, so that her increased revenue from this source was $1,039,944. On these three products of the soil, therefore, had they all been shipped abroad, Kansas would have saved on her freight bills $11,530,000 in the last year. Conversely, at the same differences per bushel on the farm, Nebraska would have lost on the value of her crops about $14,267,000, because of her geographical position. This, if capitalized at three per cent would, it is believed, exceed the total expenditures on our rivers and harbours. Yet the Missouri river commission was abolished because the results secured did not appear to justify the appropriations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take up the subject of the Erie canal for a few moments. This waterway, extending from Buffalo to Albany, a distance of 352 miles, was opened in 1826, with a capacity of 5,000,000 tons. The products were first carried in 76-ton boats ; but the canal has been improved from time to time to meet the growing trade. Its present capacity is not at all sufficient to cope with the demands of trade, and it is proposed now to spend $100,000,000 on this canal—to construct practically a new canal, as large an enterprise for this day as the old ditch was at the time it was built in 1826. But its worth has been demonstrated, and the political parties are a unit in its favour, and have pledged themselves to enlarge the canal to accommodate the largest sized boats. The fact that the political leaders would not divide their parties on the question is evidence of the popularity of the enterprise. And so there would have been unanimity in this country and in this House if the government had carried out their first proposition, and had appointed a commission to look into the transportation question and present to this House a reasonable and

practicable scheme, instead of rushing headlong to meet the political wishes of their friends. The history of the Erie canal, from a statistical standpoint, is given in an article by Mr. Wilner in the 'American Monthly Review of Reviews' for July, 1903:

Canal versus Railroad as a Freighter.—The most attractive arguments, however, are not historical, but statistical. The estimates of engineers put the cost of carrying a ton of freight from Buffalo to New York in barges of 1,000 tons capacity at 26 cents. Compare that with the $100 a ton from Buffalo to Albany previous to 1825, and with the $10 per ton that was paid originally for canal transportation. This rate of 26 cents a ton is equal to ·8 of a cent for a bushel of wheat, or ·52 of a mill per ton per mile. On the present Erie canal the cost of transportation averages 87 cents a ton, or 2·62 cents for a bushel of wheat, or 1·9 mills per ton per mile. The cost of railroad transportation from Buffalo to New York for the last few years has averaged about 6 mills per ton per mile. The cost of carrying wheat, which is the principal article is competition between the railroads and the canal, has been considerably lower, but it has still kept in the neighbourhood of 3½ cents a bushel, or $1.17 per ton, or 2⅓ mills per ton per mile. Arithmetic is dry reading, but no one who appreciates the importance of commerce in developing the prosperity of a commonwealth can fail to be interested in these figures. The contention is incontrovertible that, with such a reduction in freight rates between New York and Buffalo as this canal would cause, New York would again become master of the trade of the west as absolutely as when the cost of carriage from Buffalo to Albany was cut from $100 to $10 a ton. The difference between ·52 of a mill and 2⅓ mills per ton per mile is as great for this age as was the difference between $100 and $10 per ton for 1825.

The traffic that awaits the development of the Erie canal and that awaits the development of our canals and transportation system is immense. You will also find in this article statistics showing the immense tonnage that comes down through the great lakes:

The traffic which passed through the canals at Sault Ste. Marie in 1901 amounted to 28,403,065 tons, of which 23,087,742 tons came east.

This would seem to conflict somewhat with the statements of the hon. Minister of Agriculture:

The Suez canal, in 1901, passed 10,823,840 tons. And the trade that comes down from Lake Superior is only a part of the grand total which concentrates in Lake Erie. Almost as great a quantity originates in Lake Michigan ports. Of grain alone, flour reckoned as wheat, the port of Buffalo received, in 1902, 119,534,437 bushels, and the figures have reached as high, in 1898, as 262,912,849 bushels. That represents only a little of the great price for which the people of New York are reaching in building this canal.

While we, in adopting a scheme such as the one the government have brought before us, are putting back for an indefinite period any possibility of Canada participating in this great traffic that is coming down through the Sault canal, and that is rapidly growing every year:

In 1901, the rail rates were so high that Pittsburg tried successfully the experiment of shipping its steel to Conneaut, on Lake Erie, transhipping it by lake to Buffalo, and then by canal to New York. Cleveland also has tried the experiment of shipping steel in canal boats to Buffalo, and thence to New York. It is obvious that, if a water route is of such vast importance to iron manufacturers, a locality which can combine the advantages of all-water transportation both for the raw materials and the finished products, affords exceptional attractions.

The same writer says:

The price of wheat is now made in Liverpool. The New York price is, roughly speaking, the Liverpool price, less the cost of transport across the ocean, and the Chicago price which controls the west is the New York, price less the cost of transport from Chicago to New York. Wheat is now brought from Chicago to Buffalo by lake often for as low a rate as 1·2 cents a bushel. The average for 1902 was 1·5 cents. It costs about 3½ cents a bushel to send the grain on from Buffalo to New York. The new canal is calculated to take 2½ cents off this charge. Whether this means a higher price to western farmers or a lower price to eastern consumers is a matter for argument. But if it causes a higher price, New York farmers will benefit by it too, and if the consumers get the saving, New York has more of them than any other state.

I have pointed out these figures to show you how the people of the United States have, with an experience of over a hundred years, viewed the question of transportation, with reference to utilizing their waterways in every possible way; and they have now come to the conclusion that water transportation is so vastly superior to transportation by rail, and that it leaves such a large proportion of the profit in the hands of the farmers and producers, that they are willing to spend upwards of $300,000,000 on these inland projects alone.

Now, let us look at the situation from the standpoint of present rates in order that we may understand the position of this new project as a competitor for carrying grain from the west, using the rate from Fort William to Winnipeg as a basis, we would have the rate on wheat over the new route as follows:

	Per Bushel. Cents.
Wheat, Winnipeg to Quebec..	19·98
Wheat, Winnipeg to St. John..	26·97
Wheat, Winnipeg to Halifax..	28

It is true the Canadian Pacific Railway carried grain from Fort William to Montreal and St. John for twelve cents which would mean eighteen cents from Winnipeg, but this was under exceptional circumstances and really was compulsory in order to supply their vessels with ballast and as Sir Wm. Van Horne pointed out could not and would not be done again under any other circumstances. Now, what have we on other rates? Wolvin

& Company have been carrying wheat from Duluth to Quebec by water for from 3 to 3½ cents per bushel, and wheat is now being carried from Fort William to Montreal via Depot Harbour for 3¾ cents, which would mean from Winnipeg 9¾ cents. From Fort William via Port Colborne, to Montreal, it has been carried for 3 cents, which would mean from Winnipeg, 9 cents; so that our cheapest rail transportation by the new route would be Winnipeg to Quebec, 19·98 cents, or Fort William, 13·98 cents. By water and rail to Montreal, 9¾ cents via Depot Harbour, or from Fort William 3¾ cents. Against these rates along Canadian routes we have a rate through the United States by the Grand Trunk Railway, Chicago to New York of 10·9 cents per bushel, under the most fierce competition; by rail from Chicago to Buffalo the rate is 7⅕ cents, and by water from Chicago to Buffalo it is 1½ cents, or a saving by water of 57-10 cents over the prairie route; from Chicago to New York by water and rail it is 5·89 cents, and from Chicago to New York by water and canal, 5·26 cents, or a saving by the latter of 63 cents.

In the report of the United States Industrial Commission, the all-rail route from Chicago to New York is given as 12 cents in 1898, and the lake and canal rate with charges at Buffalo, 4·45 cents. Taking it at 5 cents the average price of 1902, with proposed changes by enlargement of the Erie canal, it will be reduced to 2½ cents. The lake and rail over the same route would be 5·54 and the all-rail 9·88 cents.

These figures serve to show the absolute worthlessness of the new route as a means of solving this problem with regard to our present use of the lake and rail or canal service, and the necessity of using every means in our power to perfect the transportation along these latter lines if we are at all to cope with the rates over the United States service and preserve not only our own tonnage from the west, in grain and other products, but also share the large increase of tonnage that will come from Lake Superior and Chicago ports. Haw can we hope to get our fair proportion of this great traffic if we do not use the opportunities at hand to develop our resources, and if we are to use up our credit and resources on an ill-advised, ill-thought-out and unworkable scheme. I have been pointing out the experiences of the United States with the transportation question, and the conclusions they have come to, and the immense traffic that awaits the country that provides the cheapest transportation, in the hope that mayhap in conjunction with the light that has been thrown upon it by others, it may be possible to induce the government yet to pause in their mad course. There is a feeling throughout this whole country that this may yet be done and that the government may deliberate on the best and most feasible methods of solving the transportation question. There is yet time for the course to be changed and I cannot understand that the government will continue on in this course and place this country in a situation from which it will take years and years to recover. The hon. leader of the government seems to think there is a crisis at hand but on the other hand he does not seem to realize that he is adopting a method that will take from five to eight years to overcome the difficulties and that will be useless in the end. Well, we have only to call his attention to the most excellent scheme outlined by the hon. leader of the opposition, which will meet any possible glut in the transportation of the west and will afford a fair solution of the transportation question. It will meet all the present exigencies besides giving the western people cheaper transportation and control of rates owing to the existence of a government line to Depot Harbour and Scotia Junction and thence by North Bay to Winnipeg, the proposed scheme of the government, while not affording relief to the western people absolutely takes out of our hands any possibility of giving voice to the growing popular idea of government control for at least fifty years or more by handing over this line to the complete control of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. We do not even know whether it is being handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific people or not for we have received from the government no distinct statement as to whether the control of this great project is going to lie with the Grand Trunk Pacific or with the Grand Trunk Railway.

This sentiment that the government should hold some control of the transportation of this country has been growing for years and has been more acute in the west where the people have been complaining of unjust and unreasonable rates. The feeling is now strong throughout Canada for government ownership and operation of the transcontinental line in order that the control of rates may be in the hands of the government, and now is the opportunity for the government to act in the matter. We have been granting subsidies and have practically built the whole railway system of the Dominion of Canada, and handed it over to private corporations. We have surely reached the time now when, if railways are to be built and public moneys expended, the country should hold control of the situation. Competition in railway rates will not bring the desired relief to the west. The controlling factor of water and a government owned and operated line is necessary. The remedy of building one railway and handing it over to a corporation and then trying to remedy the evils of the situation by building another and giving it to another corporation is absurd. Nor is this duplication of railways desirable or economic. It is a mere waste of public resources and the public pays the cost.

As to the successful operation of state owned lines ample proof by statistics and otherwise are available ; it is no new theory. Prussia, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Austria-Hungary, and the Australasian colonies, are operating state owned roads with marked success. With reference to the Intercolonial Railway its earnings have been steadily increasing. In 1896-7 they amounted to $2,866,028, while in 1902, they had increased to $5,671,381, and substantial surpluses have been claimed for the last few years.

Besides, if we make a fair comparison of rates on the other railway systems of Canada with those on the Intercolonial Railway, we shall find that they show strongly in favour of the government owned line. The charges for freight per train mile on the Intercolonial Railway is only 98 cents compared with the $1.51 on the Grand Trunk, while the operating expenses are a great deal less on the Intercolonial Railway than on the Grand Trunk. This comparison of operating expenses on government-owned lines and privately owned lines holds good not merely for Canada but for European countries as well. And the freight rates over the state-owned lines on the continent of Europe are very much lower than are those on the English railways which are owned by private corporations. The Intercolonial Railway, mile for mile, is equipped equally well with the Grand Trunk, though it has only half as much traffic, and its operating expenses, including the maintenance of the line, buildings, &c., would not be greatly increased by an increase in the traffic. At very little additional expense that road could handle double the traffic that it has at the present time. The possibilities of this road under proper management, if it were placed in the hands of a commission independent of politics would be greatly improved. During the past seven years we have spent upwards of $15,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway, all with a view of extending it westward in order to reach the wheat fields of the west. But now it is proposed to spend $100,000,000 to undo the work of the past seven years, and prevent the realization of the objects which the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) with the approval of his colleauges has been striving to attain since he first had the honour of holding the portfolio of Railways and Canals.

Now, as to the cost of this project, it is variously estimated at from $120,000,000 to $150,000,000. And I believe that one gentleman, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) who has had a great deal of experience in railway matters, says that the cost will be upwards of $280,000,000. That is, he points out that during the first twenty-five years' operation of a railway, the improvements that are necessary double the original cost. Suppose that this railway cost originally $120,000,000, it will double in the first twenty-five years of operation to $240,000,000, and, at the end of fifty years we shall find the cost nearer $500,000,000. To put a moderate estimate on the present cost of the road, the figures will come out in this way. Estimating the eastern section from Winnipeg to Edmonton at 1,800 miles, and $40,000 a mile, we have $72,000,000 for that section. Interest for ten years at 3½ per cent would be $25,200,000, and the difference between 3 per cent and 3½ per cent for forty ears, $12,640,000. For the mountain section, interest on bonds for ten years $7,200,000. This makes a total of $117,040,000. This does not take account of interest that should be legitimately charged to capital account for the time the road is building—or probably $4,000,000 or $5,000,000 more. Then there is the guarantee on the bonds which will easily put an incumbrance on the credit of Canada of $30,000,000. or $40,000,000. Besides which we have the Quebec bridge which will probably cost the country some $5,000,000. So that the estimate with which the right hon. First Minister tried to mislead the House and the country, that the cost of the road would probably be only $13,000,000, is absurd. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is the only member on the other side who had the temerity to say that this estimate of $13,000,000 was a ridiculously low one. But as I said before, the Minister of Agriculture is a docile follower of his leader.

Now, I do not want to trespass on the time of the House, nor do I want to trench on any provincialism in connection with so vast a problem as this. But, since the leader of the House has brought down a project that has no inherent good qualities as a transportation system to recommend it to the country as a whole, as this is evidently a project to serve the political purpose of hon. members on the other side and their friends, and is giving additional rail facilities to every province at confederation except Prince Edward Island, I think I may fairly ask why Prince Edward Island has been left out of any consideration, and would say just a few words for railway needs in Prince Edward Island and in support of the proposition brought down by the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett) some time ago, and voted down, that we should at least receive some consideration in the way of transportation facillities in Prince Edward Island. On this point I am quite ready to agree with the right hon. leader of the House and say that this is a time for action and not for deliberation. There has been long, long deliberation in the case of improving transportation facilities in Prince Edward Island, and now we want action. As this House knows, we have been labouring under a great disability in regard to transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I do not want to enter again into a history of the terms of

confederation, but it is well known that the Dominion government bound itself to provide continuous steam transportation between the island and the mainland, winter and summer, thus putting the island in direct communication with the railway system of Canada. Now, that the transportation question is the uppermost in all our thoughts, and now that the government is trying to satisfy all the other provinces, it seems to me that something should be done to satisfy the legitimate requirements of Prince Edward Island. I have already pointed out the deplorable condition of affairs last winter by which a large number of our shippers lost heavily and which loss I trust this government has seen the justice of redressing. I do not wish to present a large array of figures on this question, but it would be easy to show the great disparity between the treatment meted out to Prince Edward Island and that meted out to other provinces with regard to the expenditure on transportation facilities since confederation. Take this scheme that is now before us. Prince Edward Island will be obliged to contribute one-fiftieth part of the expense. That will amount to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $2,000,000. The railway in Prince Edward Island was built entirely at the expense of the province, being charged to us at confederation at a valuation of $3,144,214, or an average of $32.50 per head of the population. Since that time there has been spent in public improvement on the island $1,485,090. But only one small branch to Cape Traverse has been built until the last year or two, when the branch was built to Murray Harbour. Now, Mr. Speaker, we in Prince Edward Island have not been getting our fair proportion of railway improvements. This was recognized by the late Conservative government, but unfortunately too late to remedy, and this government, although urged repeatedly to build branches to meet the requirements have turned a deaf ear and now suggest an immense scheme, touching all the provinces of confederation, but absolutely ignoring the most pressing needs of transportation with Prince Edward Island and mainland and the railway branches in several parts of the island much more thickly populated and whose needs are more pressing in order to open up unknown territories with unknown resources.

I have on several occasions brought forward the necessity of a branch from North-Wiltshire to Crapaud and there are lines of equally pressing necessity in western parts of the island—namely at or near O'Leary station to west shore of the island.

All we want is fair reasonable treatment, and while not objecting to any reasonable scheme and expenditure for our great and rapidly growing west we want to keep in mind our older provinces.

A comparison of railway mileage according to population will show that Prince Edward Island has much coming to her aside from the facts of her actual wants. The following figures speak for themselves: Take railway mileage according to population.

	Population. per cent.	Ry. Miles. per cent.
Ontario..	40·16	37·84
Quebec..	30·60	18·26
Nova Scotia..	8·44	5·57
New Brunswick....	6·09	7·65
Prince Edward Island	1·88	1·11
Manitoba..	5·01	11·28
North-west Territories.. ..	4·29	11·02
British Columbia..	3·53	7·27

When you take into consideration the fact that out of $4,629,304 spent in Prince Edward Island, $3,144,214 was paid for by Prince Edward Island, or charged against her at confederation the comparison is odious, so small has been our portion. The Cape Traverse branch was built with a view to offering some relief by maintaining transportation across the strait in winter as well as in summer.

But the government has seen fit to abandon us, and we are very much in the situation that we were when we entered confederation in this regard. Now that they have at their disposal means and opportunities of relieving the situation, they ought to put us in direct communication with the railway system of the Dominion of Canada, and for this purpose they could well acquire the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway, leading from Sackville down to Cape Tormentine. They would then have only seven or eight miles to cross by steamer, and, as I have pointed out several times in this House, it is the natural and shortest route between the island and the mainland as an alternative route when the ports of Summerside and Charlottetown are not available. If they would put on a proper steamer at these points, if they would give us more facilities, facilities for which the people have been petitioning year after year by making a pier and affording landing facilities on the island side, they would do a great deal to relieve the transportation problem in Prince Edward Island.

But transportation is not our only grievance. There is the matter of telegraphs, about which we have been petitioning this House, and in respect of which the government is under obligation to provide us a reasonable service. We have down there a company that has been claiming to possess a monopoly of the situation, and has been charging us exorbitant rates, while only giving us a twelve-hour service. This question came up the other day in a committee of the Senate, and it was clearly pointed out that no monopoly existed, and the Senate, in reply to an amendment brought forward by the attorney of the Anglo-American Company, asking that right to establish a cable be not granted the Dominion Telephone and Telegraph Company's Bill, threw out the amendment and virtually

declared that no monopoly existed. It remains now for this government to act and provide us an up to date service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out what I consider the means at the disposal of this parliament for solving the transportation question of this country. As I said at the beginning, it is an all important question which will put Canada in the foreground as a commercial nation. We should utilize our great water-ways, and we should supplement those water-ways with the most easy and natural means to reach our ocean ports. The scheme outlined by the leader of the opposition presents, as I said, a comprehensive and easy method, and I trust that the government will yet pause in its mad career and consider this question anew.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lefurgey) who has just taken his seat that it would be almost impossible to offer anything new on this subject, and in view of the great accumulation of information that we have before us, it would be perhaps in vain to attempt to add anything to it. As you and I, Sir, generally sway the opinions of others in the House, and as you, I believe, are going to form your own judgment in regard to this question, permit me to remind you that we have been exhorted by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) to approach this subject in a judicial manner. In order to do that, I would suggest that we should, first of all, determine for ourselves what has been proved and admitted on this question. In the first place, it is proved that it is the duty of the country, as represented by the government, to assist the North-west. What was the condition of Manitoba? We have been told that there was an accumulation of produce, notably of grain, and that the people of that province had no facilities for obtaining the full value of their products by taking them to market at a reasonable cost. Who advocated the railways? Who represented that condition of the country? The gentlemen who represent public opinion in the North-west. The press complained of the accumulation of produce, the members from Manitoba in this House represented truthfully that the inhabitants of that territory were sadly injured by the lack of proper facilities, and the House believed the testimony that was given on their behalf. Now, Sir, the government—assuming this to be correct, and there has been no one to gainsay it, no one to refute it—agreed that to provide for the present and future there should be some facility for relieving that accumulation of produce and benefiting the people who inhabit that territory. They agreed that that facility should be the shortest, the best and most economical means of transportation between the west and the east, in the form of a transcontinental railway. In the second place, as the cost of furnishing this facility is great, and as the whole country has to contribute to the payment, it is admitted to be right and proper that all the provinces of the Dominion who contribute to the accomplishment of that desired end should participate in the advantages accruing from the transport of the produce of the North-west and should share in the benefits of the productions of that land. In addition to that, it is provided that the carriage of these commodities should end at our own ports. Therefore, in view of these considerations, we have the government proposing to build a railway from Moncton to Winnipeg and to aid in the construction of a railway from Winnipeg to the coast. Let us see whether this proposal accomplishes the ends we have in view, and whether the cost will be too great in proportion to our resources.

I have taken the liberty of suggesting that that facility should be a railway, and I do it with great deference to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island who has just addressed us ,and for the following reasons: First of all, that a canal is a very expensive work. Secondly, it is unfortunate that we have no rivers flowing from that country, and that the construction of a very expensive work like a canal, where there is no water in the country, does not afford much facility for the carriage of produce. Against this proposal what does the opposition contend? Among other things, they contend, firstly, that the government cannot economically build the road. I might ascribe the assertion of that proposition to my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). Secondly, that the government will not build the road. I think, on the other hand, we may safely attribute the defence of that proposition to my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Thirdly, that the government will build the road at an enormous cost. Without any hesitation whatever, I think the House will attribute the sponsorship of that proposition to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Fourthly, that the Grand Trunk Pacific will not operate the road, that traffic will not go over it (a) from natural causes; (b) by some great treachery on the part of the government; (c) by some hocus pocus on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; and, fifthly, we have the proposition of the hon. and learned leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax).

The first hon. gentleman who attracted my attention on coming into the House was my hon. friend for Hamilton, whom we on this side regard as a mild and modest gentleman who comes into the House at times from a sense of duty only, and presents us with some calculation or argument which has been omitted, or suggests that there is some view of the question which has been overlooked or some item in the calculation which has been eliminated. But, on this occasion he passed beyond his usual attitude in the House, and the usual language

that he adopts. He exhibited himself to our admiring gaze as a verbal artist of no mean pretensions. I think no hon. member of this House could excel in the description of the locomotive rushing over the muskegs and through the desolations of that country to the north of Lake Superior and in the northern part of Ontario and belching forth fire and smoke from the consumption of the jack pine. Indeed it was a most graphic picture—and no cattle-guards. The next picture was that of an heroic billing clerk. There he sat in his office in Manitoba with his panama hat on, with perhaps a cigar in his mouth and the flies buzzing about his head calmly and heroically discharging his duty by billing the traffic in the direction that he thought would best suit the interests of the company he served. When Nelson was at Copenhagen it was reported to him by his signal man that the commander in chief, Sir Hyde Parker, had sent a signal for him to retire. Nelson took the spy glass out of the hands of the sailor and putting it to his blind eye, said : I do not see the signal, keep my signal for close action flying still. The heroic billing clerk keeps on at work taking no notice of the fact that he is not carrying out the instructions and that the traffic is not being billed over the line which has been prescribed. Mr. Wainwright rushes into the office, Mr. Hays rushes into the office, Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson rushes into the office, and say this to the clerk : You are violating the solemn contract which has been entered into with the government of Canada and you are creating a great risk. It will be very detrimental to our interests. Upon which he will say : It is very true that there is a contract that :

> At all times during the terms of the said lease, the company shall continuously and efficiently operate both divisions of the said railway, giving due and sufficient service for the accommodation of all traffic to the satisfaction of the government.

It is quite true that in clause 42 :

> It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway, or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

I admit what you say to be true but to me the interests of the company are paramount and notwithstanding that I shall continue to route these goods wherever I think it is best because I have the obligation upon me of doing what I think best in the interests of the company. I am afraid the heroic clerk would soon take up his residence in a foreign clime.

The hon. member for Hamilton declared that it would be impossible to operate the railway up in that locality because there was no coal. I say that one of the great causes of the operation of the railway, that one of the great resources that the railway will have, and one of the great sources of revenue will be that the railway will be able to carry coal not only for the consumption of the locomotives but for the use of the inhabitants in those localities from places in the lower provinces where coal is abundant, that the carriage of that coal will afford a revenue to the railway from the fact that it does not exist in the neighbourhood and that the railway will be employed in carrying it in the cars that otherwise would be empty and that are to be returned from the places at which they originally started. Not only will the railway carry back coal but heavy commodities of all kinds and we are also in hopes that it will carry back the products of the lower provinces to the west, and that it will be able to carry them at extremely low rates in consideration of the large trade that will ensue to it as a result which the provinces will be benefited by the construction of this road. But, Sir, if it should be discovered that the directors and managers of this road were either openly or covertly allowing the diversion of the trade which ought to pass over this road through our country to the maritime ports, we could invoke a source of interference by which the House might bring to bear upon them a pressure which would compel them to observe the terms of the contract. We have abundant resources in the pecuniary penalty which they have incurred from the fact that the original loans made by the government and the provinces have multiplied by interest and compound interest until they now amount to the very respectable proportionate sum of $58,000,000.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). Would the hon. gentleman tell us what amount of trade he expects to pass over the eastern division of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway ?

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Yes. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will start from a maritime port. Are we to have no connection whatever with the west and will the west receive none of our products, and are we to be content for ever that the trade shall all be downwards and none of it upwards ? And do you think that the resources and requirements of that country, when developed, will not require commodities from Europe, and will they not come through maritime ports ? Do we not import a large quantity of British and other European goods, and is it not preferable to

bring these goods through maritime province ports than through Boston, and Portland, and New York, whence they are coming now. Are we to take all from the west and imagine that the west will take nothing from us? When they have products that we require and we have products that they require, will not mutual interchange result in benefit to both ends of the country? Are we to look for nothing in the future or are the hopes and expectations of the people in both ends of Canada to be realized that there would be an exchange of products, that commerce will increase, that traffic will be multiplied and that the people will be bound together not only by sentiment and not only by two steel rails, but by the exchange of values and by participations in the benefits which will be mutually derived from each other.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Ask another question now.

Mr. THOMSON (Grey). He did not answer my question.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). He answered it too well.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). We had a speach in this debate by the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), and another by the ex-ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart). As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, I entertain the highest respect, and I may say almost admiration for the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). His conduct in this House; his mastery of the details of business; the successful manner in which he has piloted railway legislation through the House command our admiration and respect. I have no desire, even if I had the ability, to belittle in the slightest manner or to the slightest extent the reputation of the hon. gentleman. I only regret that he has left the government at this time when his experience and services would be most valuable to the country in assisting in the passage of this most valuable measure. But although the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) was a most valuable administrator of railways, I possess no knowledge of his ever having constructed a mile of railway, and although his opinion as an operator of railways would be perhaps as valuable as almost any administrator, still on a question of the location, or the construction, or the practicability of a railway, I would prefer to take the evidence of an engineer, or of one who had to do with the practical construction of a railway. Now, Sir, we are not at a loss for the opinion of a railway engineer of eminence, Sir Sandford Fleming, the most celebrated engineer in Canada, or perhaps in America, who has just completed the great project of a Pacific telegraph cable from Canada to Australia, and who has an intimate knowledge of the whole of the country to be traversed by the trans-Canada, was interviewed by a reporter when it was announced that the Grand Trunk Railway contemplated building a transcontinental road. His opinion, which follows, is a remarkable confirmation, by the greatest known authority, of the wisdom of the selection of the route provided for in the Trans-Canada charter:

I am inclined to think Mr. Blair is on the right track in proposing to extend the Intercolnial Railway to the Pacific. It seems to me, however, that it would be a mistake to try to form a new transcontinental line in a haphazard way by connecting various fragments of railway which have been located without any general plan. The effect would be to lengthen the whole line and unduly lower its engineering character, and almost certainly give it features which would be for ever regarded as blemishing to a great transcontinental line. To realize Mr. Blair's conception of a new national railway, it should, in my judgment, begin at the Quebec bridge, now building, where it would form a direct connection with the Intercolonial, and it should extend from Quebec by the most direct route to Port Simpson on the Pacific. From what I know of the general character of the greater part of the intervening distance I believe a line with splendid engineering features could, with ordinary care, be secured. It would pass away to the north of the rugged shore of Lakes Huron, Superior, Nepigon, and Winnipeg, through a vast region reported generally of alluvial soil, with abundance of wood and water.

First—The Quebec bridge is in progress, that structure I have always favoured, but it would have been a bold man to have proposed such a work a quarter of a century ago. The Quebec bridge will give the needed connection with the Intercolonial as well as the Grand Trunk Railway, and along with a junction with these railways access and egress to and from Atlantic points at all seasons

Second—The greater part of the vast region through which the new line might pass between Quebec and Port Simpson is woodland, and we have to-day a new value given to the timber, which was undreamed of twenty-five years ago. The territory to be traversed is the natural home of pulp wood, and in this vegetable substance the unoccupied regions of Quebec and Ontario have an inexhaustible crop ready for harvesting. A crop of a perennial character, which, in extent, I venture to say, is unsurpassed in the North American continent—perhaps in the whole world.

I have already expressed my doubts as to the wisdom or expediency of proceeding in a haphazard way to establish a new transcontinental railway. I regard the shortest line obtainable between the tide-waters of the two oceans as quite long enough. For that and other cogent reasons I would advocate the most favourable route which can be had between the port of Quebec and Port Simpson for a new Dominion Grand Trunk line, and at the same time to have in view the establishment of railway service with all desirable points by branches judiciously laid out. By having regard to these leading principles, great advantages would, in my judgment, result. It seems to me there is ample room for the new railway. It would in no way interfere with any other line, and it may be regarded as a natural development of the railway system of Canada. I am satisfied that it is possible to establish a splendid national railway on the route proposed with the best ocean ports at its terminal. With a Rocky Mountain passage very much lower than that of any

railway yet constructed across the North American continent, and with general engineering features even more favourable than those obtained on the Intercolonial Railway, such a line would give breadth to Canada and admit of settlements and profitable industries where such are not now possible. In the far Northwest it would open up for ranching the rich plains of the Peace river and Northern British Columbia, and render the more distant gold fields more easily accessible at all seasons.

When the day arrives to open the railway as a through route it will be found to possess advantages, in respect to distances, as compared with the route via San Francisco and New York. From Yokohama to Liverpool the passage across the Pacific ocean would be 605 and across the Atlantic 195 nautical miles less. While the land distance would be 502 statute miles less, making a total saving on the whole distance of about 1,423 statute miles.

Regarded simply from a Canadian standpoint, I cannot conceive any public undertaking which would better meet the wants of the New Dominion, throughout its whole extent. I rejoice to know that it has so soon in Canadian history been brought up for serious consideration.

That is the opinion of Sir Sandford Fleming, and my friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Lefurgey) is to the contrary.

The next gentleman who attracted our attention in this debate was the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart). Although my hon. friend was supposed to have had great experience in the construction of canals, his experience in the construction of railways was quite as limited as the experience in that respect of the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair); and although I cannot compliment him in the same terms as I can the ex-Minister, on the economical and satisfactory administration of his department, I must admit that his experience in the operation of a railway is far greater than his experience in the construction. But I have often admired my hon. friend. He comes into this House charged with the subject upon which he is going to speak, and he employs all his vehemence and positiveness of manner. When he is right, he is irresistible; he bears down on his opponents like a frigate with all sails set, and guns out on both sides. I am free to admit that when he is wrong—and he is wrong very often he is equally positive, and if possible more vehement; he will not listen to any reasons to the contrary; and, by vociferation, assertion and obstinate adhesion to himself, though he is in the wrong, he bears down all opposition, and comes out triumphant in the end. My learned friend, the regulator of the opposition, sent to my hon. friend and called him to come to this House to curse Quebec and defy Nova Scotia, and he carried out that request with the utmost circumspection. He took up his parable like the prophet of old; and, when he began to curse Quebec and to defy Nova Scotia, he turned his face to the wilderness, and what did he say? He said that a railway through that country was positively impracticable; that it was a region utterly unfitted for a railway to pass through; that it was rough; that it was full of jungles, abounding in muskegs, and traversed by granite ridges throughout its length. Well, a gentleman who has passed through that region declares that this is one of the reasons why people in a certain state of mind are subject to hallucinations. This is what is said by Mr. O'Sullivan, who was employed by the transcontinental railway people and the government of Quebec to survey that region during the winter of 1897-98:

> During the winter of 1897-98, I left a party at Rupert House who surveyed the shore line and the estuaries of the rivers in that locality, and in March and April traversed in a direct line across country from Rupert House to Lake Abitibi, and thence homeward via Lake Temiscaming. A proof of the favourableness of that country for railway construction, no obstruction of any kind was encountered on this traverse, but an optical illusion was often experienced, for in the morning when they would strike an open plain, they would perceive ahead of them what appeared like mountain ranges in the distance at right angles to their course, but continuing their march day after day without changing course they never came to them—it is all a gently rolling plain.

If the government should send out their surveying parties—and they will send them out—and if they should find geysers, uphill torrents, glaciers, crevasses, serbonian bogs

> Like that 'twixt Ida and Mount Cassius old
> Engulfed whole armies,——

—places where the earth's crust gets so thin that you can smell fire and brimstone, or mountains of granite rock; why, they can stop. They can come back and go some other way; they need not build a railway through it. When Bill Nye, the traditional governor of Nevada, sent out a surveying party, he made them go east. They surveyed through the various states and territories until they came to the Atlantic, where they stopped and sent back a message to Bill Nye asking him what they should do; and he replied telling them to go on, though it was through the Atlantic. But we can stop. My hon. friend from Lanark has no surveys; he had no location of the line; he had no estimates; he had no means of forming a conclusion; nobody could tell him within ten millions or more what this line of railway would cost. But there was a plain man like ourselves, without any reference to experts, without any incumbrance of engineers, who gave the exact cost, providing for every bolt, every bridge, every culvert, every mile of rails, all excavation of rock and earth, and whatever it might be, without any consultation with anybody, at $125,000,000, not a dollar less nor a dollar more; and that was my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). But, Sir, upon what do we rely? We rely upon the reports of disinterested men who have been sent into that country, without any political bias, without any reference to the proposal which is now before the coun-

try, without any disposition to assist one view of the case or another, who have given their disinterested declarations as to the entire feasibility of constructing a road through that country, and the entire desirability of that region for cultivation and settlement. And what are the proofs upon which we rely ? We have the results of the geographical survey which has been made by Prof. Bell and others. We have the testimony which was given by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). He gave the testimony of engineers and the declaration of the clergy of two of the most prominent denominations, the Oblate Fathers and the bishops of the Established Church. He gave in extenso their declarations that they had passed through these territories and that they had found them admirably adapted for cultivation and in every respect fit to be the homes of a large population. Then there were the authorities cited by the hon. Minister of Finance, by the hon. Minister of the Interior and by others who spoke upon this question. I have some of these here, and may read one or two of them. One, which is a letter from Prof. Bell, contains one or two paragraphs which bear upon this question. I shall read it and shall be glad to submit the others to any gentleman who wishes to traverse what I have said. The letter from Prof. Bell is as follows :

Head of the Geological Survey Department,
Ottawa, March 7, 1887.

J. G. Scott, Esq., Quebec.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of the 4th reached me this morning, and I beg to answer your questions seriatim as follows

1. A considerable portion of the territory southward of James bay is fit for settlement.

2. My own explorations have not extended eastward of the basin of Moose river. In that basin a great deal of good land is found between the water shed of the great lakes and the commencement of the low level country to the south westward of James bay. This would comprise about one-third the region between Lake Superior and James bay. The soil is mostly brownish gravelly loam and light coloured clay, with sand in some parts. In the coniferous forests, when the ground is level, the surface is apt to be coverd with deep moss, but when this timber has been burned off and replaced by deciduous trees, the ground is dry.

3. The summer and winter temperature resemble those of the county of Rimouski. The summers not so hot nor the winters so cold as at Winnipeg.

4. The average snow-fall is about three feet or a little more, still not quite so great as about the city of Quebec.

5. Potatoes and all other kinds of root crops have been found to do remarkably well. Hay also grows luxuriantly. Barley would, I think, be a sure crop every year, and rye could also be grown with advantage. Barley is sown every year at Moose Factory and Rupert's House, and it has ripened well every year that I have visited these parts. Still it is said to fail some years. However, these places are much further north than the region I have indicated, and what is worse for them, they are near the sea, which is said to have an unfavourable influence in the autumn. Mr. John McIntyre (now at Fort William) says he has ripened wheat at Missinaibi and New Brunswick House, within the above area. I have had experiments made at New Brunswick House and at Norfolk, on the Abitibi river, with a great variety of field and garden seeds, and the results proved that this region is capable of growing anything which can be raised, say in the county of Rimouski. I regard the region as well suited for stock raising and dairy farming, and it is not unlikely to prove fit for grain also.

And so on. I have other testimonials to the same effect, but I shall not read them. We may be disposed to slight in some degree the testimony of professional men because they may be influenced by the undertakings which pay them. They may be thought to colour their reports and to make them more favourable than that the ordinary witness would make them. But we have also the testimony of plain men, not professionnal men, not geologist, not surveyors, but men who are well acquainted with these regions, who have passed through them in pursuit of their employment, and who tell a plain unvarnished tale of these regions and of their capabilities for cultivation and for lumbering. I happened to be in the city of Quebec recently and met on the platform a man who is operating in this country, an extensive lumberman. This question had just been raised in the House, and I asked his opinion upon the project. I do not know if he is a Conservative or a Liberal, but he told me he had passed through that region and that there were in it none of those obstacles of which the ex-Minister of Railways spoke; that it was perfectly open and fit for the construction of a line of railway; that it was fit for cultivation ; that there was an abundance of timber and that in every respect it was a most valuable country, which should be exploited and settled. Then we have the testimony of gentlemen in this House, of lumbermen, of hon. members who have passed their time in their youth in going over this country and who know its capabilities ; they have declared unhesitatingly that the unfavourable accounts which have been given are unjust and that they slander the country. They say that the country is well adapted for cultivation ; that it is fit for the building of a railway ; that it is in every respect a valuable addition to the Dominion.

I spoke the other day, in the hotel, to a man who was born in the immediate vicinity of this territory, who had gone over all that region, and he corroborated in every detail the particulars I have just given. He informed me that it was a most valuable country which invited the settlers and those who could use the timber and other valuable resources for the benefit of the Dominion. Thus we have on the one hand the deprecatory remarks of my hon. friend from Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), and my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and on the other hand we have the weight of this testimony from men who have actually visited the localities ; who have inspected

them; who are familiar with them and who declare unhesitatingly that a line of railway can be successfully carried through that district. They say that it is most valuable for purposes of cultivation and that it possesses resources of the most valuable and rich description.

The next hon. member who addressed the House in my hearing was the hon. and learned leader of the opposition, and I sympathized with him in this struggle between his party and the constituency which he represents. That difficulty was apparent throughout the course of his speech because after he had criticised the proposition of the government, after he had denounced it, after he had found fault with it, he took it up piece by piece and in detail and he told us that he approved of most of the parts of it, that is that he was ready to give his support to any proposal which would give a better fighting chance to the lower provinces; that he would help by his vote to assist in the consummation of the desired results, but he would not support this proposition. He was ready to build a railway from Winnipeg to the coast, if necessary, but not in connection with this project. He was ready to build the road from Winnipeg to Quebec, but not in connection with this. And, in excess of all that, he was willing, as a last resort, to favour the construction of a railway from Quebec to Moncton, if he could see satisfactory evidence that it was for the benefit of the lower provinces. My hon. friend in the course of his remarks asked: What will the government do with its 1,600 miles of Intercolonial Railway; and how much of it will be used? He was speaking in answer to the argument of my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell) who had addressed the House on the subject of government ownership of railways, and he said: If you do away with the governmental ownership of railways, what will you do with the Intercolonial Railway; will you sell it, or how will you dispose of it? My hon. friend is sufficiently acquainted with the use of language, and when he talks about disposing of the ownership of railways and asks whether the government will sell this railway, he knows how to draw the exact distinction; he knows that this is mere popular conversation and is not an accurate expression of the question that is before us. How much of the Intercolonial will be used? The Intercolonial would be used from Halifax to Moncton; it will be used from Moncton to St. John; it will be used from Halifax to Pictou and Sydney; it will be used from Lévis to Montreal; it will be used from Moncton to Lévis and back for freight and passengers. And its use will be most beneficial in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific. For, as the grades on the Grand Trunk Pacific will be more favourable for traffic passing from Quebec to Moncton and the lower provinces, while the Intercolonial Railway will afford better grades for the westward haul, it will be more profitable to use the Intercolonial Railway in carrying cars back, either empty or loaded with the productions of the lower provinces. The hon. leader of the opposition intimated that he was prepared to discuss with the Minister of the Interior whether we should hand over the Intercolonial to the Grand Trunk Pacific. No doubt, if a discussion of this kind should take place the leader of the opposition would be a most formidable champion. But, unfortunately for him, in entering into that conflict he would have to bear the weight of Saul's armour in the shape of his past utterances, particularly speeches by himself and Mr. Kenny, in St. Patrick's Hall, in Halifax; previous to the campaign of 1900, as reported in the Morning 'Herald.' Now, Mr. Kenny needs no introduction in this House. He is one of the most highly esteemed citizens of Halifax; he has been a representative here of the county of Halifax, and is known to many of the older members of this House. The Morning 'Herald' is also well known. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has his office in the 'Herald' building, and some say that the 'Herald' has its office in his. But along the hall near my hon. friends office, there is a passage. In printing offices, sometimes there are very dark and narrow passages. But this is a very broad passage. I am sure that when my hon. friend passes a certain door in that passage he always turns back to it. Why? Because in the room you enter through that door is the Tory Machine. There, this very day the committee sat who are deciding who shall be personated in the next election—which they think will come off on the 14th of October—and who shall be satisfied, and the names will be placed on the list. Those who are dead will be taken up and voted in the approaching contest. And to-morrow morning, from the room downstairs, there will come out a most moral and most affecting article describing the improper and mischievous doings of the Grit machine up in the wicked city of Toronto. Well, the question that is discussed in these speeches recorded in the 'Herald' is one which touches very closely upon the question before the House, and that was the ownership of the Intercolonial Railway, 'the people's railway,' which is now so precious in the eyes of my hon. colleague the leader of the opposition, but which at that time was not considered such a very valuable asset, for it was proposed by his colleague and himself to hand over what they now call the people's railway to the management and control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The proposal was that the Canadian Pacific Railway should get running powers from St. John to Moncton in return for similar privileges for the Intercolonial for trains between Quebec and Montreal. On October 13th the Morning 'Herald' authoritatively announced as a declaration before the electors by these

gentlemen the granting to the Canadian Pacific Railway of similar running powers from St. John to Halifax. We know that the term 'handing over the management' of a railway means no more than the granting of running powers, for it participates in the use of the track for traffic purposes. But before the populace and when it may excite some prejudice against an opponent, this is spoken of as handing over the railway to the control of another corporation. In St. Patrick's Hall, on October 26th, 1900, Mr. Kenny, the colleague of my hon. friend and my hon. friend himself appeared before the electors, and this is a report of what was said :

Mr. Kenny—The Canadian Pacific Railway, if it had been offered just arrangements, would have commenced at Halifax and would go right through Canada to British Columbia. Now, Sir, if the Canadian Pacific Railway had a fair business arangement, if it had such running arrangement such as exists between railways in the United States, or even between some railways in Canada, if we had such arrangement, between St. John and Halifax, an immense business would accrue to the port of Halifax. Today, the Minister of Railways says it must stop at St. John ; I won't carry the freight unless it is done in the way I wish it. The Intercolonial Railway is stopped at Montreal ; the grain is gathered west of Montreal.

Mr. Borden expressed satisfaction at what had been so far begun. The tide was certainly with us, but we must beware of the Grit machine.

This is the proposition which the Canadian Pacific Railway made to the Intercolonial Railway. What did the ex-Minister of Railways say ? Let me read :

Carleton, N.B., October 27, 1900.

Mr. Blair declared the fight was the outcome of politics on the one hand and inordinate greed on the other, and that now an election was pending pressure would be used to get friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway something to which they were not entitled as a matter of right.

After explaining the Canadian Pacific Railway's contention that they should be allowed to solicit business in Intercolonial Railway territory and have it delivered to them in St. John, Mr. Blair pointed out that if conceded this would result in the Canadian Pacific Railway year by year taking away from the Intercolonial a large part of business to which it was entitled and on which it depended for success, making the line from Moncton to Montreal little more than a branch. No surrender to Canadian Pacific Railway. The question to him was whether he ought, as Minister of Railways, to surrender business advantages and interests that belong to the Intercolonial Railway in order that greater advantages and benefits would accrue to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that he had not been able to say that it was his duty to act in manner detrimental to the best interests of the people's railway.

Upon what reasonable ground, he asked, could the Canadian Pacific ask us to haul our cars back to Montreal empty in order that more of their cars may go back full ? After referring to the Intercolonial Railway's largely increasing business since its entry into Montreal, Mr. Blair declared that he never would have extended the line had he thought of acceding to the Canadian Pacific Railway's demand.

My hon. friend, figuratively speaking, rolled up his sleeves and put on his most severe forensic look, and defied the hon. member for Hants to go home and declare to his people whether he was prepared to hand over the Intercolonial to the Grand Trunk Railway or to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, we will have to contest this election. We have been defied, and this scrap must come off in Dartmouth, Queensbury rules, and may the best man win. 'Go tell the people of Nova Scotia,' he said, 'if you propose to give the Intercolonial to the Canadian Pacific Railway or to the Grand Trunk Pacific.' Now, the ex-Minister of Railways was pronounced by hon. gentlemen opposite to be incompetent, and to have done the things which he ought not to have done ; but now they pronounce him to be the ablest administrator. In the discussion which took place in Dartmouth, when Mr. Kenny and the leader of the opposition appeared before the electors, the leader of the opposition poured out upon the head of the ex-Minister of Railways one of the most withering invectives which was every pronounced upon a criminal in a court of justice, and he treated him as such. Now they are taking sweet counsel together, and I think I can hear my hon. friend say, 'It is true I called you a boodler, it is true also that I said that you took part in the Drummond County deal ; but, my dear sir, I assure you it was all political, I assure you that I personally entertain for you the highest respect, and that I have no animosity against you.'

Well. Mr. Kenny opened the ball, and he announced that the Intercolonial stopped in Montreal, that it was unable to obtain traffic from the west, and that an effort should be made to bring the traffic over a railway which would go right up to the farmers' homes in the west, and would carry the produce of the west uninterruptedly down to the ports of the maritime provinces. He announced to the electors that they had been defrauded of their just rights in participating in the labour which that railway would afford, owing to the obstinate conduct of Mr. Blair in trying to prevent the Canadian Pacific Railway from having running powers over the Intercolonial. He said that the labourers and the merchants of Dartmouth, and the inhabitants of the county, were deprived of their just rights by the conduct of this individual in hanging on to the Intercolonial. My hon. friend sat and heard that all announced, and he offered not one word of dissent. He did not then speak of the people's railway, he did not then speak of the evil of handing it over to the Grand Trunk, or to the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to any other railway. This was the language of Mr. Kenny:

It is our interest, irrespective of party, to do what we can to get the Candian Pacific Railway

into Halifax, and I fear we can never do it so long as Mr. Blair is Minister of Railways.

That was on October 30th. The leader of the opposition said :

It was desirable that the port of Halifax should be connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Whence this new-born zeal for the Intercolonial ? Why this assertion of its being the people's railway ? Why is it that everything is to be sacrificed to the Intercolonial? As the Prime Minister observed, the Intercolonial was for the people and not the people for the Intercolonial. Then my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said that we ought to wait, that this railway should not be immediately constructed, that the benefits should not be obtained for the people of the North-west. He wanted the opinions of the experts of the Intercolonial before deciding whether the railway should be built or the location chosen. I want to ask, except the Deputy Minister of Railways, what official of the Intercolonial could give the desired opinion as to the territory over which the railway should pass, or of the mode in which it should be constructed, or could give a decision to the government and parliament which would warrant them in taking immediate steps for its construction ? Then he went on to speak of a crisis. 'What crisis took place between the 19th of March and the 30th of July, in those ninety-two days ?' As if a crisis could not take place in a shorter period that months and years. Why, Sir, the greatest events have taken place in the shortest time, have come without any announcement, like thunderbolts out of a clear sky. Think of the great events that took place in the hundred days between the landing at Grenoble and the overthrow at Waterloo. Think of what took place in the thirty days between the first conflict of Strasbourg and the occupation of Paris, not very long ago. Statesmen see clearly and distinctly at once what ought to be done in the premises, and when they see it is desirable to make a bold stroke, to do something that should be formative in the destinies of the people, the government have the courage to act promptly, to avail themselves of the opportunity to perform an act beneficial to the people, and which will make them grateful to such a government for ever.

My hon. friend went on to cast some ridicule upon the selection of the route at no greater distance than two miles from the American border, and he also ridiculed the old bogie of the abolition of the bonding privilege. We know that the bonding privilege enables Canadian railways to run trains through American territory and to American ports, and we know that this railway will not pass through American territory. Is it not sufficient if it passes half a mile from the American border ? A track's breadth away from the American border is sufficient to relieve the railway from passing over American territory. In times of peace that would be satisfactory, but in times of war we cannot say what distance will be satisfactory. The hon. leader of the opposition then went into a most elaborate argument on the subject of water stretches and canals and on this branch of the subject he was preceded by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes), who went into statistics most voluminously and most exhaustively to prove that canal carriage for ocean borne traffic in the United States was cheaper than we could carry goods and produce over a railway in Canada. My hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Lefurgey) this evening gave us a similar argument to prove that canal carriage in the United States was cheaper. Unfortunately for us, we have no canals stretching throughout the entire length of the country between the east and west. A canal is a most valuable work when it connects great waterways, but it is a most expensive work. For a short distance connecting great waterways it affords facilities for cheapening transportation, but it is a most enormous work. Unfortunately our rivers run through the length of the country instead of running south, as the American rivers do. Therefore, in that species of internal transit we never could rival the United States, and we never could participate in the carriage of the products of the west if we relied upon that means of transportation. We would have to abandon all our hopes as to this trade and hand it over to the United States if we had not a facility to rival the facilities of the United States. The only facility which we do possess is our railway, because our rivers are frozen during winter. At the time these products are to be brought out from the west we must employ the only facility at our hand, and it is the long haul upon the railway where there is no interruption of the traffic, where there is no transhipment, where there is no transmission to canal boats or to elevators between the place where the grain is obtained in the fields and the place where it is shipped to its destination in Europe. It is carried in one continuous line, affording cheap and uninterrupted communication and that is the only facility which will rival the canal and river system of the United States. But, here is the dilemma of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He thought to himself : If I should advocate any plan like that, if I should advocate cheap transportation on the canals, what would my constituents say ? They want the spending of the money, they want the transport of goods through our own territory. I have my last year's speeches that I must atone for. I must meet the government on this proposition and I must go one better. I believe the hon. gentleman deliberated for some time because the plan that he proposed to the House showed marks of alterations. But a happy thought was suggested to him, I think it

must have been in passing through a museum where he saw the skeleton of ichthyosaurus and he saw the great bones of the skeleton representing his schemes. The long tail with its joints represented the joints of his proposition. One of the flappers on one side and one on the other represented the colonization roads and as the one on the lower side might suggest the diversion of the traffic to the United States, he seemed to argue that it would be better to cut off the lower flapper and put it on the upper side so that he should have two colonization roads. Suppose my hon. friend is in the city of Montreal and that he has received that mandate which he says is coming from the people to carry out his proposition and to reject and relegate to the realms of darkness that which is proposed by the government. Whom will he take with him to carry out his proposition ? He cannot take the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, because that would offend the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), and he cannot take the hon. member for Lanark, because that would offend the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Therefore, he would have to take his faithful purse-bearer, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He would start from the city of Montreal and he would find that he could obtain no traffic. The people who have brought down the goods from the west will not give any of it to him to carry over his railway. They want it for themselves and they want to take it to American ports. So, he says : I must obtain traffic and to do that I must carry my railway further west in order that I may command it. He builds a road from Jacques Cartier Junction to Ste. Rosalie, thirty-seven miles long, at a cost of $2,000,000. Then, he says : I must go farther, I must command the traffic, and he says to his purse-bearer : Can we afford it ? I will buy the railway extending to Depot Harbour, 342 miles long, and I will pay $20,000,000 for it. His purse-bearer groans but he goes on and when he arrives at Depot Harbour he cannot obtain any grain there. It is being carried past him. Those who have brought it from the west carry it by so as to compete with him. He sees in the distance a dark object, as the bold Sir Bedivere saw the enchanted boat. And as it drew nearer he sees it is a long dark steamboat vomiting clouds of black smoke. When she draws into the pier, in place of the dusky queens robed in stoles of darkest samite there comes ashore a crowd of summer girls in white jackets and red roses in their hats and after them a crowd of men in overalls and plug hats who vent forth strong expressions that are not contained in any book of poetry I wot of. When he got on board the boat he exclaimed : Quid times ? Cæsarem vehis. When he arrived in Port Arthur with his $2,000,000 boats, he found that there was no grain there for him. He found the grain was being carried from Duluth down to Portland, and down to Buffalo and that he could obtain no grain there unless he went further west. He found he would have to go further, and so he buys the road to Depot Harbour 342 miles long which cost $12,000,000, and from Depot Harbour to Sudbury he buys or constructs a line of 120 miles, at a cost of $30,000 a mile which amounts to $3,500,000. And when he arrives there he finds that he is no nearer to controlling the traffic, and so he goes to the Canadian Pacific Railway and says : I want to participate in the trade of the west; I want you to give me running powers over your railway. But the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway say : No, Sir, we constructed that line for our own advantage; we are not here for our health; if you want that road you will have to pay us for it. Perhaps the leader of the opposition has his blood up by this time, and he says : I will have the road in spite of all consequences. Perhaps he expropriates that road, and he expropriates 80 miles of road from North Bay to Sudbury, and he expropriates from Sudbury to Fort William 450 miles more, and we are told that that railroad cost the Canadian Pacific Railway $80,000 a mile, and they will take good care to make the government pay for it, and so we have a further expenditure of $45,000,000. And when he gets to Fort William with that railway he finds that the traffic is not there, and he buys from Fort William to Winnipeg a distance of 426 miles at $50,000 a mile, and there is $21,000,000 more. And thus for his 1,500 miles of railway the leader of the opposition has laid out a sum of $96,000,000. I dare say that at this point his purse bearer from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) would leave him and go home. And when the leader of the opposition gets there and is now able to control the traffic he looks around and then he says : I must go further ; I have not consulted the people of British Columbia; I have not consulted the popular voice there, I must go further. And then he builds a road from Winnipeg to Edmonton 900 miles at $13,000 a mile, which means $12,000,000 more. And then he must build from Edmonton to the coast 400 miles at $18,000 a miles which means $7,000,000. And then there is the mountain section 480 miles at $40,000 a mile which means $19,000,000, and then he finds that he has 3,340 miles of railway for $115,000,000. And now the leader of the opposition is monarch of all he surveys, but he is not satisfied with his transcontinental road. He now begins to see that there is something in the Northwest and he wants two colonization roads. He begins to see that that valuable territory would be a great adjunct to the Dominion and he builds two colonization roads 500 miles each at $18,000 per mile which means $20,000,000. And now that this government has proposed to build from Quebec to Winnipeg the leader of the opposition thinks that he would also like to build from

Quebec to Wininpeg and there he would have 1,475 miles more at $28,000 a mile which would mean $42,000,000 additional. Then the leader of the opposition would build his elevators as he has promised in all parts of the country, and we might put that down with the other incidentals he has promised at $20,000,000 more as a moderate estimate. Then there are improvements to the harbours in Montreal, Halifax, and St. John, and terminals in all these places and free ports and the enlargement of the canals, and the improvement of waterways, and all other facilities which we might put down at the moderate estimate of $50,000,000 more. Thus we have a total of 5,815 miles of railway for $247,000,000, or $542.83 and 22-455 of a cent per family for every family in Ontario. That is what the scheme of the leader of the opposition amounts to. But the defect in that scheme is that at every link in it the trafic could be diverted to United States ports. The defect of that scheme is that it adds no new railway to the existing facilities for getting our grain and produce from the North-west Territories. The government railway is to be utilized for all the railways to have running powers over it, but the railway of the leader of the opposition gives no more power to transit than we have to-day, even if it has been procured at an enormous expense. It is a railway deficient in grades and modern character; it is a most expensive road to work; and it gives no further accommodation to the business of the country. On the other hand you will remark, Mr. Speaker, that the government railway first takes up the produce of Manitoba and the North-west and carries it continuously over territory which is new, territory which is being exploited by it, and it carries it from the farms in the North-west right to the seaboard in a direct line. It is not a diagonal course; it is not a traffic which can be diverted, but every mile of that railway carries the western produce uninterruptedly to its destination and lands it on shipboard. I would ask my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) if he wishes his amendment to be attached to the proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition ? Does he consider that proposal an embodiment of his resolution ? Does he consider that his proposition of government ownership of railways is carried out and given effect and shape in the proposal of the leader of the opposition, involving an expenditure of $247,000,000 ?

Now, Sir who approves of the government scheme ? Is it acceptable in the country ? British Columbia approves of it. The members representing that province have spoken in its favour. Manitoba approves of it; all the members from that portion of the country have recommended the railway and supported it. Ontario approves of it; the members from that province regard it as an enterprise which will produce great results for that province in developing the north country, which has been explored and found to be most valuable. Quebec approves of it; the eloquent members from Gaspé, Bonaventure, and Bellechasse have spoken on its behalf; they know that it will be of great advantage to the labourers and the inhabitants of the country, that it will create a demand for materials required in its construction; that its cities, its merchants, its partisans will be benefited. New Brunswick approves of it; its members have spoken on behalf of the enterprise. The route through the northern portion of New Brunswick has been declared to be most favourable, although at the outset of this debate it was thought that the country and the grades would be difficult. St. John will be benefited. It will be brought nearer to the west. It is already the terminus of one transcontinental railway, and it will be brought within easy communication of another. The province of Prince Edward Island will be benefited from this enterprise; some members have told us that that province gives its adhesion to this scheme. Nova Scotia will be benefited. Although not one mile of the railway is to be built in that province, still we hope that the traffic brought over the line and sent to the city of Halifax will result in benefit to the labourer and the merchant, and to the city at large, which has been long suffering from neglect and from the want of facilities for communication with the west, and for the passage of the products of the west through its portals. I say that the province of Nova Scotia will be benefited. We trust that its iron for bridges, car-wheels and structures, and its lumber for the construction of cars, houses, and other purposes, will be required. The manufacturers will be benefited; the car builders will be benefited; the agricultural interests of the province will be benefited; all classes of people will be interested in the consummation of this most valuable scheme. I would like to know why the hon. leader of the opposition applied such a buffet to my hon. friend from East Grey. The hon. member for East Grey was on the economical tack, and described the dire effects of a great expenditure on this railway. Yet the hon. leader of the opposition submitted a mixed programme which calls for an expenditure of about $250,000,000. My hon. friend from East Grey announced that he would go through the province of Ontario, and inform the farmers that the consummation of this government project would involve a mortgage on their farms and would mean so much taken from their earnings. On the other side of the line, in the states of Vermont and New Hampshire, and other states on the border, the people are proud of describing the sacrifices which their fathers made in the war of the revolution, when their sons and their brothers left the bloody prints in the snow at Valley Forge, when they carried on the war midst the horrors

of that campaign. They describe with satisfaction the contributions of the villages, and the homesteads, and the efforts made by the women to keep their fathers and brothers in the field. They pride themselves on the toils and sacrifices of the past, and they have their great land before them as the result of those toils and sacrifices. But my hon. friend from East Grey will tell the farmers: 'Oh, your hoards lying in the banks will be diminished by twenty cents a year of interest, it may be, as a consequence of this great loan that will be fastened upon you. The money will be spent in the country. It will not be spent for munitions of war; it will be spent among the people for commercial purposes; it will not be wasted; it will be for the development of the country for a hundred years to come.' I would urge the government to press on. There are those who call upon the government to stop, to pause. I would say, press on; heed not those siren voices which call opon you to pause. Listen to the nations that are coming into that country—the Swedes and the Norwegians, the fair-haired races of Europe, who will see that land like their own, and will be ready to go in and possess it. The inhabitants of the overcrowded regions of Europe will come to it. Let the government lead the van, and carry into that country civilization and empire——

> To the regions of the home-wind,
> Of the North-west wind Keewaydin,
> To the islands of the blessed,
> To the land of the hereafter!

Mr. T. I. THOMSON (North Grey). Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of being one of the latest arrivals in this House, coming fresh from the moulds of the people; and from the fact of a large subsidy to a transcontinental railway line having been discussed from every platform during that election, I think that I would not be doing my duty to my constituents if I failed to give expression to the mandate I received from the people of North Grey seven months ago.

I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks which have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche). He reminds me very much of Falstaff, his imaginings are so vivid and his juggling with figures so remarkable. He stated that Canada could not compete in the matter of transportation with the United States. I regretted to hear any hon. gentleman, no matter on which side of the House he may be placed, make such a statement as that. Canada occupies a position which gives us by the lakes and the River St. Lawrence the greatest highway to the markets of the world for the grain of the wheat fields of the west. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, speaking of the transportation proposition as outlined by the leader of the opposition, said that he never heard of American grain coming to Depot Harbour, and that there would be no freight there. for the Intercolonial Railway, if extended to this point. The hon. gentleman is not very well posted, concerning the routes by which the grain of the west seeks the seaports, because millions of bushels both last year and this year have come to Midland, Depot Harbour, Owen Sound and Meaford, and from there been transported to Montreal and the seaboard. I may tell him that more grain has passed through the canals of Canada this year than in any previous year up to this time, not less than from eight to ten million bushels have already passed through our canals. When these waterways are perfected, I have not the least doubt but that this will be the great highway by which the grain of the western states and of our North-west will find its way to the seaboard.

Gulliver's Travels is not to be compared with the hon. gentleman's speech, when he talks about that country lying between Quebec and Winnipeg, away to the north of us, the country that this road is likely to traverse. The hon. gentleman described this is a splendid agricultural country, abounding in splendid timber, minerals, fertile land and everything in fact to make a peo- prosperous and happy. Now, Sir, I am surprised at this statement, two ex-ministers of the Crown—one a gentleman who had been Minister of Railways in the late government for a great many years, and also the gentleman who has withdrawn from the present administration, are men who have given it a great deal of consideration, who have conversed with parties passing through this country and who have given a great deal of time to the study of these questions, who have given opinions as regards the character of the country through which this road will pass from Winnipeg to Quebec; and yet, both of these differ materially from the opinion of my hon. friend from Halifax, and the difference is so great that one cannot understand from what source or sources my hon. friend from Halifax gets his information. Both of these gentlemen described this country as being composed of granite rocks, muskegs and lakes, and my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways in the late government, the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), stated that there was a large tract of country lying north towards James bay that was fertile to a certain extent, particularly for vegetables, barley and rye. He was not, however, prepared to say that wheat could be grown there. He also stated that this line did not go within fifty miles of this region fit for cultivation, so I gathered from this that it is not a country fit for settlement. From the class of timber that they say grows in abundance it is evident that the soil is not fertile, and that it is not a country fit for settlement in the ordinary sense of the term. I asked the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) what they intend to carry on this road between Winnipeg and Quebec or Halifax. He replied that the

merchandise imported from Great Britain and elsewhere would be landed at Halifax and shipped to the west over this road. Why, Sir, we have already a line from St. John, a short line going to the west, and I do not know that this road is overburdened with what it has to carry to the west. But, Sir, the government has stated that this road is being constructed to relieve the congestion of the west. Why did my hon. friend not state that? The figures presented to this House by the different speakers all go to prove that the Grand Trunk Pacific if constructed from Winnipeg to Moncton could never carry grain at a profit in competition with the rail-water haul. I believe that is clear to every member of this House; I believe it is clear to the country, and when I ask the hon. gentleman what he expected to carry over that road, he did not tell me that it was the grain of the west or anything going from the west, but, speaking from a provincial standpoint, in order to make himself right with the people of Halifax, he told us it was being built because the ocean steamers would come to Halifax to unload the merchandise for the west, and that this merchandise would be carried to the west on this Grand Trunk Pacific. Now, Sir, if they cannot present a better argument for the construction of this road, I do not think the people of Canada will endorse the construction of that line.

I was very much struck with some remarks which fell from the Minister of Agriculture with reference to carrying freight from Chicago partly by rail and partly by water. He wanted to prove that there was a far larger amount of freight sent from Chicago to the east by rail than by water. He did not tell us to what points in the east it is shipped. When asked the question, he said he could not say that much of it was freighted to New York. That is quite evident, because he must be well aware that very little of the freight sent by rail from Chicago east goes to New York. If the hon. gentleman will look on the map he will find that Chicago is situated at the foot of Lake Michigan, about 225 miles south of the most northerly part of Michigan, and a vessel leaving Chicago must pass away around the state of Michigan and go down the lake to the St. Clair river, 450 or 500 miles out of the way. Hence, if grain is not shipped by water, it leaves Chicago and gets to the water at Buffalo, or Toledo, or Detroit. But Port Arthur, the Canadian port, lies at the head of navigation, hence grain coming from Winnipeg to this point and passing from there by water to the market is being sent by the shortest possible way by which it can go to the seaboard. Now, Sir, I am going to give the Minister of Agriculture a conundrum. If it requires two pages of the pamphlet issued by his department to explain to the farmers how to wring the neck of a chicken, I would ask him how many pages would be required to convince the farmers that it costs more to haul grain by water than by rail, and also to satisfy the farmers that the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway will only cost the farmers of this country $13,000,000? That is a conundrum for the Minister of Agriculture to solve. But I would not ask him to deal with it until he has finished his one-million-five-hundred-thousand-dollar census. After he has done with that, he may explain to the farmers these little points to which I have referred.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada have made great sacrifices in order that the provinces may be bound together and a great Canadian nationality built upon this north American continent. When it was agreed that Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should confederate with upper and lower Canada, a part of that agreement was that the Intercolonial should be constructed at the expense of the new Dominion. And the Dominion of Canada made great sacrifices to construct that road. At a later period, the province of British Columbia came into the confederation, one of the terms of the arrangement being that the Canadian people should construct a line of railway across the continent in ten years. At this time it became known to the best informed of our people that we had a splendid heritage in the North-west. Many of our farmers were flocking to the prairie lands of the western states in order that they might find cheaper lands for their children. The fact presented itself to the minds of the Canadian people that it was necessary to open our western country so that the people of the older provinces, instead of going to a foreign land, would be able to find cheaper homes for their children under the flag beneath whose folds they were born. And, with this consideration in view, the government of Canada went to work to construct a line across the continent. In 1880, or 1881, the government entered into a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct this line in ten years, for which the company were to receive 25,000,000 acres of land, $25,000,000 in cash, and that portion of the road which was constructed or under construction, which cost the people of Canada $34,000,000. In all, the Canadian Pacific Railway cost the people of Canada $84,000,000. And the people at that time felt that they had made a great bargain. It was a great undertaking for the company to build that line across the continent. The hon. gentlemen opposite had magnified the financial burdens to be borne in constructing this road. They said it would cost $300,000,000, and the picture they gave of British Columbia and the north-western country, of which they now speak so highly was enough to dampen the ardour of the people of Canada. It is no wonder, therefore, that

when the government found a company ready to construct a road on these terms, the people felt that a great burden had been taken off their shoulders. We all felt that the government had made a great bargain. And I think that that is borne out by the fact that the first $25,000,000 of Canadian Pacific Railway stock that was placed on the market only brought twenty-five cents on the dollar, while the whole $85,000,000 of stock realized only $50,000,000. The people who invest their money in these stocks are the best judges of the merits of an enterprise of this kind. There were a few people at the head of affairs who had confidence in Canada, who had confidence that the road would ultimately pay. The result was that the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed not in ten years, but in six years. In 1886 the first train passed over the road to Vancouver. And, Sir, after seventeen years of operation of that road what is the result ? The gross earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway last year were no less than $43,000,000, a larger sum than the money received for customs throughout the whole of Canada. The $85,000,000 of Canadian Pacific stock which had been sold for $50,000,000 in the market of the world, was worth, a few months ago, no less than $125,000,000, or $75,000,000 more than was paid for it in the first instance. This company for years has paid on its common stock no less than 5 per cent, and this year it is declaring a dividend of 6 per cent. I say that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was one of the greatest financial achievements in our history, in fact it was the greatest financial success ever achieved in this country. I say that if the people of Canada supported the construction of a road under these conditions, I ask why should the people of Canada to-day, with the different conditions, with trade waiting for the railway, a trade which must make the road profitable from its inception, be called upon to saddle themselves with an expenditure of from $150,000,000 to $250,000,000 in order that we may have a fresh batch of multimillionaries at the expense of the people ? I would present this as the strongest fact, the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been a great financial success, and that the conditions for railway construction and operation are much more favourable than they were. The company constructing a road across the continent to-day will find it a profitable undertaking if they never receive a dollar from the people of Canada. The fact that the people of Canada assisted in building a railway for the purpose of cementing the provinces and uniting the Canadian people, as well as to develop sections of the country at that time unopened, is no reason why we should be called upon at this late day to add this immense sum to our national debt in order to construct a railway to which these reasons cannot apply.

Now, I should like to say a few words with regard to this eastern division. I know that a great many figures have been placed before the House, but I have my own ideas, and my own opinions, which I desire to state. In my opinion, whatever justification there may be for constructing the road from Winnipeg westward, there is positively no justification for constructing the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. I believe it is a waste of the people's money. And we have the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) to the effect that the road from Winnipeg to Moncton will cost from $70,000,000 to $75,000,000. In making up his estimate of the amount, that hon. gentleman did not take into consideration the interest on the money during construction. Then we are to pay interest on this indebtedness for ten years after the road is finished. Then we hand it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and they pay us 3 per cent for the balance of the period of fifty years. There is something about this agreement still more unsatisfactory. When I first heard of the contract, I was under the impression that the earnings of the whole line would be placed under contribution to pay the interest of 3 per cent on this section, which is the lean and unprofitable portion of the road. But I find that this agreement does not carry that out, that only the earnings of the eastern section, the unprofitable section, are taken into consideration when they pay this 3 per cent. That is, we have the unprofitable end, we have constructed the eastern division; and there is no railway expert in Canada will tell you that the eastern division in 25 years will earn its working expenses. Yet this is the portion of the road that we expect to receive 3 per cent upon after it has earned its working expenses.

There is another feature in connection with this matter more disagreeable still. After having built this road and handed it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for 50 years, according to this agreement we have to pay everything for the betterment of that road, and we do not know where this expenditure is going to end. Everything for the betterment of that road must be paid for 50 years by the people of Canada. I ask you to go back and look at the Intercolonial, a railway which originally cost this country $21,000,000. Inside of 15 years, the betterments of that road, everything in the way of permanent improvements, had cost more than the original construction; and railway men everywhere say that in ten or twelve years after the construction of a road the betterments, or the permanent improvements put on it, will cost quite as much as the original construction. Now, this line of railway from Winnipeg to Moncton is to cost this country $75,000,000 at first; then, according to the precedent of the Intercolonial, it will cost us $150,000,000, and we are handing this road over to the company to operate it

without the least prospect of ever receiving a dollar in return. I ask you. What is there to warrant such an expenditure as this? We are sending out settlers to a country which can never become a desirable country to live in. A few may exist there, but it must for ever remain an unattractive country for settlers so long as we have these fertile lands in the North-west; and I ask you why should we send our people up among the jack pines, the spruce and the birch in northern Quebec or in northern Ontario, while there are millions of acres of fertile prairie lands in the west open for settlement?

Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words as regards the probability of this road ever being able to relieve the congestion in the west. If there is anything in connection with the construction of this line that must affect every ratepayer in Canada, it is that this eastern section never can by any means carry the cereals of the west to the seaboard. The distance from Winnipeg to Port Arthur is 425 miles. We have two lines of railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, both stretching from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. Both have low gradients and small curvatures, both are in a position to carry an immense number of cars loaded with grain, at the least possible cost. This is proved by the action of the government of Manitoba, who, on gaining control of the Canadian Northern, immediately fixed the rate of grain from Winnipeg to Port Arthur and from the west to Winnipeg, at the lowest possible cost to the farmer, so that in the shipment of his grain he would receive as much as possible after deducting the cost of carriage. I think this is the best evidence that the amount that is charged for carrying grain from Winnipeg to Port Arthur is the least rate at which it it is possible that the grain can be carried. Now, Sir, to-day they are charging twelve cents per 100 pounds, and I understand that on the 1st of September they are going to try to carry that grain for ten cents per 100 pounds, equal to about six cents per bushel from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. If it costs ten cents per 100 pounds to carry grain from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, a distance of 425 miles, and I have shown that is the least rate at which it can be carried over that distance, I ask you what will it cost to carry 100 pounds of grain from Winnipeg to Quebec, a distance of 1,600 miles? It is true that by a straight line it is 1,400 miles, but if you add ten or fifteen per cent for curves, you get 1,600 miles as the shortest distance that it will work out. Well, now, if it costs ten cents per 100 pounds from Winipeg to Port Arthur, at the same rate over the 1,600 miles, it will cost just thirty-six cents per 100 pounds, or twenty-three cents per bushel. Now, the cost of carrying a bushel of grain from Winnipeg to Montreal by rail and water haul is only about eleven cents per bushel—eleven cents against twenty-three, or a difference of twlve cents. If the farmers of the west were to ship 100,000,000 bushels of grain over this road which the government propose to build, it would cost them $12,000,000 more than by rail and water. Do you think a farmer is going to pay twelve cents more to ship his grain over this road than he could ship it by rail and water route? Not by any means. He will hold his grain till navigation opens. We are told this road is only to carry grain when navigation is closed. But do you mean to tell me that after navigation is closed the farmer of the west will sell his grain for twelve cents less in order that he may ship over this special line to be constructed by the government? No, he will borrow the money on his grain, and he will hold it until spring in order to save twelve cents a bushel. I think that is clear as noonday. I do not hink that grain ever can be shipped over this road, and if this road is being built in order to afford the farmers relief, it will prove to be a perfect failure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in support of the splendid policy which has been enunciated to this House by the leader of the opposition. It is quite evident that the leader of the opposition has given a great deal of study to this problem; I have no doubt that he has also had the assistance of experts in the preparation of this scheme. Let us look at this problem for a moment. He tells us that we can acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway. Remember that the Canada Atlantic Railway to-day is a paying institution. If we purchase the Canada Atlantic Railway we have got an asset that is worth the money that we pay for it. Now, if it is paying to haul grain from Depot Harbour to Coteau, I ask you: Would it not be equally profitable to carry grain from Depot Harbour to Montreal by all-rail? I see no reason why we could not acquire running powers over the Grand Trunk railway from Coteau to Montreal, and then we would have a railway from Montreal to Depot Harbour, which will prove the very best security and a paying road. In addition, this proposition extends the Intercolonial from Halifax to the foot of the great lakes, which will make the Intercolonial Railway a much more valuable property than it is to-day, while it would not cost the people of Canada one copper. I say that this is a masterly, a splendid proposition, and I ask you to compare it with the scheme of running a road up through northern Quebec and northern Ontario, a distance of 1,600 miles, in order to carrry out the grain of the west.

My hon. friend stated that if the policy of the hon. leader of the opposition were adopted: the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the foot of the great lakes, what freight would it haul? He did not know that there were over 29,000,000 bushels of grain shipped from the lower ports

of the Georgian bay last year and that this year the quantity will be still greater. If we acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sudbury to Port Arthur what position are we in? That has been an expensive road and we will require to spend more money to put it in proper shape, but when we have purchased that road we will give running powers to the Grand Trunk Railway, to the Canadian Northern to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to the Intercolonial Railway and the receipts or rentals from these companies having running powers over the line (because it would be taxed to its fullest capacity where it has now but one-tenth of the business it could do) will pay the interest charges, and the road is ours. The House will remember that the proposition of the hon leader of the opposition was that these roads should acquire running rights over the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific to Winnipeg and they will have to pay for them. What is the use of hon. gentlemen opposite dealing out figures as to the cost of the scheme which has been proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition? The only cost that would be the cost of acquiring these roads and when we have acquired them they are ours and they become a paying property the moment we have acquired them. This proposition if carried into effect would tremendously enhance the value of the railway property of the people of Canada. It would give the Grand Trunk Railway Company immediate access to the wheat fields of the west. The Grand Trunk Railway has a magnificent network of railways, a splendid railway property in Ontario and Quebec. There is not a city, town or village of any importance in the province of Ontario that it does not touch and hon. gentlemen can imagine the importance it is to this line to have immediate access to the wheat fields and carrying trade of the west. If the policy propounded by the hon. leader of the opposition were to go into effect to-morrow the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway would advance fifty per cent in thirty days. This is the scheme worthy of the traditions of the Conservative party and we are proud of the traditions of the Conservative party, which, as the hon. leader of the opposition has said, is the party that had the heart to construct the Intercolonial Railway and to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway which have done so much for the development and consolidation of Canada and it is the party that is prepared to solve this difficult problem that is before us to-day. I ask the right hon. leader of the government to appeal to the people on this question. Let the people have an opportunity of expressing their views and I believe if such an opportunity is given them it will be the best thing that could be done in the interest of Canada to-day. If the right hon. gentleman does not appeal to the people he should at least abandon the scheme and thereby save the honour and national credit of Canada.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Ross (Victoria, N.S.) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. W. S. Fielding), House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, August 25, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for copies of cablegrams between the hon. the Secretary of State for the colonies and His Excellency relative to the publication of the proceedings of the colonial conference.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, with reference to the transportation commission which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) called my attention yesterday, I have to inform my hon. friend and the House that after the intimation by Sir Wm. Van Horne of his inability to accept the position of chairman of the commission, we applied to another gentleman to take the place. I have reason to believe that we shall have his official acceptance, and that the commission will be issued to-morrow.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. WM. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister to an order moved for by me and passed on the 1st day of June, which has not yet been fulfilled. It was for a return with reference to the appointment of members of parliament to positions of emolument under the Crown.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I beg also to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that a return with regard to Intercolonial Railway passes, moved for by me in March, 1902, has not been brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will make a note of these returns.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House

to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, and the motion of Mr. Puttee in amendment thereto.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Mr. Speaker, I am at considerable disadvantage in addressing the House, as I have not that command of the English language which I would desire to have to express my ideas on the varied and important questions involved in the project placed before us by the government. I was brought up in a Gaelic community and have been accustomed to speak that language to the people from one week's end to the other. Therefore, I have not the command of English which would make my speeches interesting. Before going further, I wish to say to the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that if I said anything unkind with reference to him on the occasion when I last addressed the House, I deeply regret it, because I do not wish to have anything but kindly feelings between myself and him. I know that he likes to sit on this side of the House, and I will say to him:

> While the lamp holds in to burn,
> The greatest sinner may return.

We would be quite willing to extend to the hon. gentleman the right hand of fellowship and of friendship, and to welcome him again into our ranks, but I am afraid that he is too far gone, that the germ of Tory hypocrisy has entered into his whole system and that he is past recovery. However, he differed from the government on the question of the fiscal policy, and his action in that matter may be some excuse for him. He made his views, his heretical views, known to the country, and, in doing so, he risked his seat in the government. This he did rather than deny the fiscal policy which seemed to him the right one. I have full sympathy with my hon. friend, and wish him to understand me when I say that, as it has been stated that I read him out of the party, I would be very glad to lead him into the party again if he would have sense enough to come back into the fold.

Now, coming to, perhaps, a more important personage, the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), that hon. gentleman delivered in this House a very bitter, acrimonious speech, one that, I think, did no credit to himself and was most unkind to the government of which he was a supporter. The Prime Minister took that hon. gentleman out of partial obscurity, from being the leader of what I was going to call a mongrel government, more properly composite government, in the province of New Brunswick, half Tory and half Liberal, placed him at the head of one of the most important departments in the government, and gave him a free hand so far as expenses were concerned, in conducting the affairs of the Intercolonial. Under these circumstances, I think he should have acted very differently from the way he has acted.

Life is composed of compromises. We must yield to one another in order to carry on the business of life amicably.

Even in our households we must not act the part of tyrants if we do not get our way. Now the late Minister of Railways and Canals put one in mind of a certain character in Milton's Paradise Lost who would rather fill a certain place in a certain region than to occupy a subordinate place in the region above. Those of us who have read Dante's Inferno will remember that he apportions different punishments to different sins, and he places the sin of ingratitude below almost every other sin in the decalogue. So I think the late Minister of Railways and Canals has been guilty of the sin of ingratitude in the way that he has treated his friend and patron, the Premier of the Dominion of Canada. I wonder, if he had been asked to be the leader of this great commission that is to conduct this railway policy, what his conduct would be, and where we would find him now. Almost in a night the scene has changed, and he has become the fast friend of the gentlemen who sit on the opposite side of the House; they are ready to embrace him now as one of their friends and their hope of assistance in the future. Well, let me say to them that an ex-Minister of Railways and Canals does not count much in this country now, and when a man loses his seat in the government he loses his power and his influence. The late Minister of Railways and Canals, I must confess, has done much to build up the Intercolonial and to raise the standard by laying heavier rails, procuring heavier engines, and placing the road in a much better condition than it had been from the first. The Intercolonial Railway has been a political hack from the very outset; it was never located or built where it should have been, or where it would have been if Sir Sandford Fleming had had his own way. But there was influences brought to bear here and there to shift it from one place to another. I remember that the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) insisted that the Intercolonial was located in the best place, and that the line could not be shortened. I have the authority of Sir Sandford Fleming in stating that from Moncton to Amherst the line might be shortened twelve miles, and with a better grade, and that it would be to the advantage of the people of Nova Scotia if this change were made. When you consider that twelve miles could have been saved in a distance of about seventy, you can fancy what reduction could have been made between Montreal and Halifax.

Now, I am going to quote something from Sir Sandford Fleming himself, who is perhaps the highest authority on this subject. And here I may say for the information of hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, that the first piece of railway in British North America was built in Nova

Scotia, and that the engineer who ran the first engine the 'Sampson,' went to Chicago with his engine and showed it at the exhibition. So I think that in the matter of railways the province of Nova Scotia has been in advance of all the other provinces in Canada, as she has been in a great many other things besides railways. My great friend the late Hon. Joseph Howe, returned from England in 1851 with the assurance of a government guarantee of £800,000 for the Nova Scotia portion of the line. He says :

> The imperial government with a magnanimity which does honour to the British people, sustained by that uanimity of sentiment among the great leaders of public opinion at home that promises for a long continuance of the honourable relations existing between us, has offered to the three British American provinces seven millions of pounds sterling, at the lowest interest at which money can be obtained in the world. This money is offered for the purpose of enabling them to complete, in an incredibly short space of time, and with security and ease, great internal improvements. . . . . Halifax has been formed by nature, and selected by the dictates of sound policy, as a common terminus for these great intercolonial railways.' . . . But when Montreal is reached, shall we stop there ? Who can believe it ? Who can think so lightly of the enterprise of western Canada as to apprehend that she will not continue this iron road, link by link, till it skirts the shores of Ontario and Erie, and draws its tributary streams of traffic from the prolific regions of Simcoe, Superior and Huron ?

Then he goes on to say :

> Throwing aside the more bleak and inhospitable regions, we have a magnificent country between Canada and the Pacific, out of which five or six noble provinces may be formed, larger than any we have and presenting to the hand of industry, and to the eye of speculation, every variety of soil, climate and resource. With such a territory as this to overrun, organize and improve, think you that we shall stop even at the western bounds of Canada ? Or even on the shores of the Pacific ? Vancouver Island, with its vast coal measures, lies beyond. The beautiful islands of the Pacific and the growing commerce of the ocean, are beyond ; populous China and the rich east are beyond.

Then just one sentence more :

> I believe that many in this room will live to hear the whistle of the steam engine in the passes of the Rocky mountains, and to make the journey from Halifax to the Pacific in five or six days.

Who could believe that fifty-one years ago any one would have such a prophetic insight into the future as to utter these sentences ? Still, with all his efforts the Intercolonial Railway was battered about from pillar to post and it took twenty-five years before it was built. Now, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) stated very emphatically, and when he does speak he speaks in the most emphatic language possible, that no change or improvement could be made in the Intercolonial Railway. He is contradicted by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) who speaks like this :

> He could have taken a portion of that money to the harbours of Halifax and St. John and could have equipped those harbours so that they could have handled the traffic coming through for ocean shipment. He would have done some good with the money in that way. He will do no good with it now except the temporary good that may be done while the money is in the course of expenditure.

He has said that in another part of his speech that the money might be spent in removing heavy gradients that are so objectionable to the successful running of the Intercolonial Railway. The Intercolonial Railway, as I stated before, can be shortened from the shores of New Brunswick to Halifax at least fifty miles and there is no necessity for those heavy gradients to be there at all. The road was originally forced up to Springhill because some interested party had influence enough to bring it near the mine so that it would be convenient for the shipment of coal. I know something of the Intercolonial Railway, and it was moved about and it is a matter of surprise that Sir Sandford Fleming had the patience with the influences which he had to contend against before he succeeded in building this road. Sir Sandford Fleming in his history of the Intercolonial Railway says that :

> The survey was made in 1844. The reports set forth that in traversing the highlands, the most difficult grades would not exceed 1 in 15.

The following statement is made upon the authority of Sir Sandford Fleming, the most eminent engineer in British America, perhaps on the continent of America :

> The distance between Montreal and Halifax might thus have been lessened nearly 200 miles. St. Andrews would have taken the place of Portland as the winter terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway, and would have commanded, together with St. John, a traffic now cut off from both places, and centered at a foreign port.
>
> The direct route would have brought the Springhill coal fields of Nova Scotia some 200 miles nearer to Montreal than by the present line of the Intercolonial, and would have rendered it possible to transport coal by rail at a comparatively moderate cost.
>
> If, under such circumstances, an intercolonial line to connect the cities of the maritime provinces with those of the St. Lawrence had been constructed, the building of 250 miles of railway representing an expenditure of $10,000,000 would have been unnecessary. Great as this saving would have been, the economy in working it and in maintenance would have been more important. The direct line would also have attracted certain branches of traffic, which by the longer route must either be carried at a loss or be repelled.

The engineer insisted that the bridges should be built of iron but the stupid commissioners backed by a government that knew no better decided that they should be built of wood. Just fancy the condition that the Intercolonial Railway would be in today if the bridges were built of wood in-

stead of iron. They would have to be renewed and renewed in a great many instances.

The position was one of difficulty. The chief engineer was desirous of avoiding all cause of difference with the commissioners; but his deliberate opinion was on record. The ground assumed by him had not been lightly taken, and the more the subject was considered by him, the more convinced he felt of the correctness of the principles of construction which he had advocated. No argument, however, which he could advance, appeared to have the least weight with the commissioners. They had determined to make certain changes; that the recommendations of the chief engineer should be set aside; and that iron should not be used, but that timber should take its place.

In January, 1869, the chief engineer made his first appeal in the matter, to the premier, Sir John A. Macdonald, and he submitted at length the arguments why iron and not wood should be used. This letter was referred to the commissioners in the usual course. It has never been replied to; and the arguments advanced in that communication remain to this day without refutation.

He was not then treated with the ordinary courtesy that was due him of having his letters answered, because, notwithstanding that his communications were of such great importance and that they were from so important a man, it was not deemed worth while to reply to them.

But the decision of the commissioners was sustained. Five of the bridges were, however, exempted from the principle originally laid down by the commissioners; otherwise, the order was given that all the bridges should be built of wood.

In May, 1870, the chief engineer recurred to the question, in a statement prepared for submission to parliament. A complete list of the bridges was given, and it was there set forth that the cost of constructing them of iron would be but slightly in excess of building them of wood, and accordingly he recommended that iron should be used.

The railway commissioners still adhered to the view they had previously expressed, for, in a majority report, signed by Messrs. Brydges, Chandler and McLelan, they repeated the recommendation that, with the exception of five bridges named, wood should be used throughout the line. This report is dated July 3. Mr. Walsh, however, the remaining commissioner, and the chairman of the board, on July 5, gave his opinion in favour of iron. The matter was thus again brought before the government, and on July 7, an Order in Council was passed, affirming the decision of the majority that wood should be used. The chief engineer took another opportunity of appealing to the authorities on the subject. On July 25, he wrote to the premier, Sir John A. Macdonald, and on August 22, to the commissioners. In the latter communication he asked a delay of ten days for some work in progress, so that the matter could be reconsidered by the government.

In September, Mr. C. J. Brydges, one of the commissioners, addressed, on his own account, a communication to the Privy Council on this subject. He argued that the fear of wooden bridges catching fire was groundless; that, in his experience of eighteen years as a railway manager, he had known no instance of a wooden bridge having been injuriously affected through the cause assigned. He contended that the chief engineer's calculations of quantities and cost were erroneous; that iron bridges would cost at least $300,000 more than the sum named, and their introduction would probably add $500,000 to the cost of the line and would cause delay and confusion.

Mr. Fleming replied to the communication. He cited two instances of bridges on the Grand Trunk Railway, under the management of Mr. Brydges, having been destroyed by fire, but a few weeks before the date of Mr. Brydges' statement. Mr. Fleming contended that his estimates were correct, and challenged examination into their accuracy: and he further made a final appeal in favour of iron bridges.

After an examination which established that the estimates of the chief engineer were correct, the commissioners eventually withdrew their objections and recommended that all bridges over 60 feet span should be built of iron. But, the chief engineer persisted in his efforts to have every bridge, down to the smallest span—24 feet—made of iron, and at last, by an Order in Council, dated May 12, 1871, authority was given to have them so constructed.

With the exception of three structures built of wood by direction of the commissioners, against the protest of the chief engineer, all the bridge spans, of whatever width, throughout the line, have the superstructure of iron.

You will therefore see the big fight that the engineer had with the commissioners in order to get iron bridges on the Intercolonial Railway instead of wooden ones, but at last he succeeded and he was in the right.

The statement that the new line of railway is to parallel the Intercolonial Railway is just a kind of by-play, because when the facts are inquired into you find that in most instances the two railways are a long distance apart. Mr. W. E. Thompson, a competent engineer, states that for from 20 to 100 miles they are 35 miles apart, and in some cases they are 60 miles apart, and so on. The new line of railway runs through a well-wooded and well-watered country, and it will open up a territory for settlement through New Brunswick and Quebec that will be occupied by the people of both provinces. The French people of the province of Quebec are attached to their homes and are not fond of emigrating, and when they find in their neighbourhood opportunities to earn a livelihood they will readily avail of these opportunities. The French Canadians are the only people on the continent of America who have fulfilled the command of the Lord: to multiply and replenish the earth. They have done that to a larger degree than any other people in British North America, and when they find that this railway will open up a well-wooded and well-watered country they will settle along its line. This new road will pass through seven thickly settled counties in the province of Quebec, and as it is separated by long distances from other railways, there will always be a considerable amount of local traffic that will go to the advantage of that road. I shall not enter into the details

of this great scheme that has been promulgated by this government, further than to say that it has my entire approval. At the outset I was foolishly carried away with the idea of government ownership and government management, but I have found that I was mistaken. I read the history of the Australian government railways, and I found that they had to send to Montreal for a Mr. Tait to go to Australia to manage their railroads and to try if he could stop the loss of $5,000 a day which they were incurring by the operation of government railways in that country.

The history of the Intercolonial Railway in the past shows us that that railway was not run on business principles, but, on the contrary, that it was run according to the interests of the different political parties, and was to a considerable extent used as a political hack. To the credit of the late Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) be it said that he has done more to take that road out of politics than any other minister who ever had control of it. The management of the Intercolonial Railway in former days was not creditable to any government or to any party. If a railway conductor or any other employee was suspected of having Liberal leanings, he would be sent out of the district on polling day so that he could not cast his vote, but I know that there was no interference of that kind by the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), or by those under him, during the last two elections. I have nothing to say against the gentlemen who manage the Intercolonial Railway, and I can say that for my own part I have received from them every fair consideration. I am in the unfortunate position of representing a county 120 miles long, bounded by the ocean on one side and the Bras d'Or lakes on another, and that whole county has only eight miles of railway. My friends from Prince Edward Island are like the horse leach, and it is: Give, give, with them all the time; and when they ask for more railways, and more steamboat communication, and more wharfs it is time for me to speak up for my own county and to look forward to the time when the government will interest themselves in building a railway from the rich, fertile parts of Inverness county, through Margaree and through the fertile valley of Middle river and Baddeck. I look forward with interest to the time when something of this kind will be done, but meantime the government have quite enough in hand to see this new road opened up and in working order. No person can foretell or foresee what the future of this great railway is going to be. The opposition to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway came largely from the people of Ontario, and the opposition to the present project comes from the same source. The hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) suggested that some of the people of Ontario should go down to Truro to have their minds enlarged and to be instructed in the duties of citizenship, in dealing with public questions. I think it would be well that they should take broader views on questions of this kind. I believe it will be found that little objection will be raised by the people of Nova Scotia, to the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; the representatives from Nova Scotia as a rule are broad-minded and they are always willing to support what they consider to be great improvements in the country. The attempt is made to frighten us with the bugbear of debt, debt, debt. I heard that cry for eight years in the province of Nova Scotia; the debt was increasing, we were going to be taxed and going to be ruined. Now is there any person in this House, any person with intelligence, who will say that a man, woman or child in the Dominion of Canada will ever be called upon to pay a cent for the support of this great railway? The government of Canada is quite capable of building this railway and it will be built in a way that will be satisfactory to the people of Canada, without a claim being made upon a single individual, and the persons who will go about the country preaching that this is going to be a cause of debt and that people are going to be called upon for taxes for this railway, have too low an instinct to be public men, and they should be hooted out of society, because they know that, when they are preaching such politics as that, they are not telling the truth.

The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) asked why a railway was not built along the Ottawa river. If he would go up the Gatineau he would find a railway there built quite close to the Gatineau river, bringing down the products of the farm and the forest in that country into the city of Ottawa and when this railway is built through a rich and fertile country it will be found that villages, towns and cities will spring up in what is now a wilderness.

I should like to read to the House what Mr. Hawkes, of Carnduff, Assa., a leading Conservative, says:

> The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will, in my humble opinion, be a boon to Canada at large, and to no part of Canada more than to the Territories. As an old resident of the Territories, I welcome it as the best and most encouraging event that has ever crossed the horizon of the prairie country, and if I might venture a word of advice to my fellow residents in the Territories, it is to study the matter on its merits and refuse to allow any more questions of party to influence them when the development, and to a large extent the whole future of the Territories are in the balance, for if we do not get this road, what else is there in sight that will do one tithe as much for us as we may reasonably expect from this trunk road.

Mr. W. A. Wier, a member of the legislative assembly of Quebec, addressing the members of the Manufacturers' Association of Montreal on the resources of northern

Quebec, took occasion to quote, with respect to the wood and clay belt north of the height of land, the very reports now being quoted in defence of the Quebec-Winnipeg project. Mr. Weir made this remarkable citation from the meteorological records :

The average temperature from May to October, inclusive, is one degree warmer at Moose Factory on James bay, than at Dalhousie, in New Brunswick, and twenty-one degrees warmer than at Rimouski, on the lower St. Lawrence. Abitibi, the centre of the clay belt, is seven degrees warmer still. In the matter of snowfall Abitibi has 105·5 inches in the year, Montreal 139:2 inches.

Mr. Weir quoted from the reports of Mr. O'Sullivan, the Quebec explorer, this description of the Hudson's Bay factor's garden at Wasanipi in the clay belt :

I never saw better cabbage, carrots and turnips, and he gave me samples of wheat which compare favourably with wheat grown in any other part of the province. The surrounding country is all level, rich clay land. At Moose river, Mr. O'Sullivan found in Bishop Newnham's garden, ' splendid celery, tomatoes, vegetable-marrow weighing 15 to 40 pounds each, kohi-rabi, carrots, parsnips, turnips beets, pease, beans, cabbage, cauliflower, rhubarb, red and black currants, lettuce, radishes, herbs, all a good size, some not to be beaten anywhere.

Mr. Weir also quoted the following information furnished by the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) as to the extent of this country.

Proceeding westward from Quebec, one comes across, according to reports made to the Geological Survey, 3,000,000 acres of agricultural land fit for settlement in the St. Maurice river section. In the Upper Gatineau district the country is generally level, with occasional rocky hills, sandy loam soil, timber abundant. The whole country is a flat undulating plain, with good flats of farming land. And again, further west, back of the rocky land through which the Lake Superior division of the Canadian Pacific now runs, there is a belt of fine agricultural land, clay and sandy loam, which forms part of the great clay basin of Moose river, and its numerous tributaries, which take their rise near the Canadian Pacific line, north of Lakes Huron and Superior. The headwaters of the rivers are well timbered, and the country is described as an undulating plain, gently sloping towards James bay. Soil is good for farming throughout the greater portion of the country.

I think enough has been said to prove that this railroad is going to pass, not through a scrubby, bare country, full of muskegs, morasses and swamps, but through a rich, cultivable tract. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), in describing the condition of the country, reminded me of the spies sent out to spy out the land. They came back with an evil report; but when the honest, truthful spies were sent out they found very different conditions; they came with a branch of the grapes of Eschol, so large that they had to be carried on a pole, on the shoulders of two other men, which showed the character of the country they were to occupy.

This reminds me of the speech of my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie), who went to that country, and saw for himself the forests of great pine trees there. Admiring these splendid trees, he would naturally say : I would like to have a railroad into this region. I might make selection of a limit here and make another fortune to add to what I have already made in the timber business. Why it is the timber business that has built the city of Ottawa and has made its millionaires. And a new generation of millionaires will be made out of the vast country through which this road is going to pass. Let us not be discouraged as to the result of this great undertaking. I was amused at the remarks of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Thomson). That hon. gentleman said that the result of building this road would be to make multimillionaires in the future. Well, the result of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been the making of titled lords on the other side of the Atlantic. And if this road is going to be so successful that fortunes of this kind are to be made out of it, the fact that these results are looked for is a very good omen for the future of the undertaking. Then, hon. gentlemen on the other side enter upon the most elaborate calculations as to the cost of this road. They throw millions of dollars here and there as though they were matters of no concern. Sometimes they tell us this road is going to cost the government $150,000,000, at other times it is to be $250,000,000, and so it has gone on until one hon. gentleman has reached the sum of $500,000,000. These calculations are utterly without basis, for not one of these hon. gentlemen has gone into that district to learn what the nature of the country is or what the road is likely to cost. The only man who has given the calculation correctly is the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), whose figures can be always accepted as correct. That hon. gentleman secures expert information before he attempts any calculations of cost. I do not think it is necessary to say much about this road, more than has already been said. We had first the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with his magnificent speech, which I am happy to say is being freely distributed throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. And I am proud to say that I have sent a copy of it to every elector in the county of Victoria, whether he be Tory or Liberal. Then we had the speech of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who went thoroughly into the details of the calculations with respect to this road. Then we heard the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), who made one of the ablest speeches, perhaps the ablest speech, delivered on this subject. His knowledge of the country gave him that advantage of information which many others did not possess. Then we had the speech of my hon. friend the Minister

of Finance, who always speaks well and with full consideration. Everything he says can be relied upon as gospel truth. He exaggerates nothing. What he says is within the bounds of truth in every instance.

But hon. members of the opposition were perplexed. The scheme was so complete, the contract drawn up so carefully, that they could not raise any reasonable objection to it. They did not know what to do. They were like the two boys who were upset in the river. As they clung to their boat, one said to the other : ' Can you pray ?' ' No,' was the answer, ' I can't pray.' ' Well,' said the first, ' something must be done, and that —— soon.' The opposition were in such a plight that they did not know what to do. The result was that they promulgated a scheme that nobody else understands and that they do not understand themselves. The hon. leader of the opposition had a hard part to play. But it is a pleasure to compliment that hon. gentleman on the courtesy which he always displays when he addresses this House. He is too much of a gentleman to say anything unworthy of a gentleman. I wish I could say as much for the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair), when he accused his former friend the Prime Minister, of being influenced by Senator Cox. Is there any man in this House having any claim to gentlemanly feeling or aspiration who would think for a moment that the Prime Minister of Canada could be influenced by any Senator in his conduct in regard to this undertaking ? Why, the man is too high above anything of that kind for it not to be even thought of, and the man who says such a thing descends to personalities that are unworthy of a member of this House.

The hon. member for Peel was surprised at the stand taken by us on this side of the House with respect to the late Minister of Railways, when that hon. gentleman threw in his influence with hon. gentlemen opposite. If the hon. member for Peel were to leave his party and come over to this side of the House, what would his friends think of him ? What would they say of him ? They would say of him everything that was bad, and very properly so. The late Minister of Railways and Canals professed to be a Liberal, and I sometimes think that if he were asked to be the head of this proposed commission, we should find him still supporting the government, instead of conducting himself as he has done. He gave us one speech and then he ran away as if he were afraid to face the members of this House again. No doubt he had in mind the old saying :

> He who fights and runs away
> May live to fight another day ;
> But he who fights until he's slain
> Will never live to fight again.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) No, it is not carried. But this railway scheme is going to be carried, carried by a large majority, and carried by the unanimous vote of the supporters of the government. Let the members of the opposition lay that unction to their restless souls. We are going to carry this measure and this road is going to be built, and I hope myself to have a pleasant ride over it from Moncton to the Pacific coast. We do not know the possibilities which are in store for us in this country. We do not know what the requirements of our great railway will be ten years hence ; and it is in order to meet some of those requirements, it is in order to provide requisite facilities for carrying our surplus agricultural products to our seaports, that this road is to be built. People indulge in all sorts of pessimistic theories. They say that no wheat can be carried over this line, that it will never pay, but let the road be built with easy grades and let the rates of freight be as low to Moncton as they are to Portland, and you will see a large portion of the products of the North-west going over this road to St. John and Halifax. Once you build the road to Moncton, then you have to reduce the length of the Intercolonial Railway, as I have said, you have to level the grades so that heavy loads may be carried with ease and passenger trains run with greater speed, and then you will find trade going to the proper channel. Take the case of a hundred cars of cattle. At present these cattle go to Moncton, but by going to St. John they would save about four hours time, and by going to Halifax they would save on the distance to Liverpool or London some 250 miles. And once they got on board a steamer at Halifax, whether in the middle of the night or day, that steamer could sail at once without any reference to the tide. I am not going to say a word against the port of St. John. Perhaps I did so before, and I wish to take it back, for the people of St. John deserve a great deal of credit for their enterprise in improving their harbour. It has been considerably improved since I was there. I remember when I had a barque loading there for Melbourne, and at that time St. John was not the best harbour in the world, but great improvements have been made since, and greater will follow, and I am sure that there is not a man in this House from Nova Scotia who would oppose any grant or any subsidy for the improvement of that harbour.

The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals spoke about the destruction of the machine shops at Moncton. They were going to be dismantled and sold as scrap iron. Why, that is just like the old story we used to hear about the tall chimnies which were going to be smokeless when the present government introduced its tariff. But Moncton, Sir, will in ten years double its population; and instead of its machine shops being dismantled, they will be enlarged to meet the requirements of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. I am not afraid that this new rail-

way is going to injure the Intercolonial Railway, because in the winter the produce of Ontario goes largely over the Intercolonial Railway to Halifax to be shipped thence to the west and east and elsewhere. A wrong impression, I am afraid, prevails among Ontario members that the Intercolonial Railway was built for the benefit of the people of Nova Scotia. In my opinion, it has been of more advantage to the people of Ontario because Ontario sends all her manufactured goods in the winter down to the maritime provinces over the Intercolonial Railway, and when Ontario wants to send exports to Trinidad and Jamaica and other British West India ports, she sends them to Halifax. Our steamers there are loaded with flour and other products of Ontario for export, so that the Intercolonial Railway has been built for the benefit of the Ontario people just as much as for the benefit of the people of Nova Scotia. Of course we benefit by the local traffic largely, but we do not benefit by the traffic going west, because the people of Ontario and Quebec do not buy anything from us. The fact is that the people of Nova Scotia have to export their products to the West Indies in order to procure the money with which to buy the goods that they require from Ontario and Quebec. Some people are carried away with the idea that the rates are too low. Is there any man in this House who would want the rates on the Intercolonial Railway to be raised? If they were raised, that would be to the injury of the western provinces, because they are the ones who benefit by the low rates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the hon. gentleman say that the people of Ontario and Quebec do not buy anything from Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I am not aware that they buy anything.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why, hundreds of thousands of dollars are paid for iron and coal brought to Ontario and Quebec from Nova Scotia. I am a large purchaser of iron from Nova Scotia every year.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) That is quite a different thing. There is no coal coming to Ontario, I am sorry to say, from Nova Scotia.

Mr. TAYLOR. We buy lots of steel and iron and coal too.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) It is news to me that coal from Nova Scotia is sent to Ontario I am very glad that that is the case.

Mr. TAYLOR. What about your steel, where does that go?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N. S.) There is one thing I would like to impress on the government and that is the necessity of reducing the traffic and passenger rates. The moment you reduce the passenger rates you increase the traffic and benefits the railway. This is a report of Sir A. Nicolson, British Consul for Austria Hungary.

The year 1899 will be noteworthy in the history of Hungarian railways, as it witnessed the introduction of the zone tariff on all Hungarian state railways. I have on former occasions reported on this subject, so that it is needless to go into details, beyond mentioning that since the introduction of the new cheap traffic on the 1st of August, 1889, to the 31st of December, 1889, the passenger traffic increased by over 3,000,000 persons and the gross receipts by over £50,000.

Another authority says on this matter:

Wherever reasonable passenger rates have been tried the result has been not only accommodation to the public, but increased profits to the railway.

So, if we succeeded in getting a reasonable passenger rate we may expect an increased number of passengers and increased profits. Passengers from Australia will come to the new port in British Columbia, and passengers from China and Japan will come there, because it is two miles shorter than to go to Vancouver. The mails from Australia and New Zealand will come there, and people from the east who are travelling for pleasure will come by this route to Halifax, and then take the fast line of steamers across the Atlantic. I happened to be a delegate from the Halifax board of trade to the great Congress of Chambers of Commerce held in Montreal last week, and I wish to impress upon the government, and upon the Premier particularly, that they insisted that if we are going to have a fast line, it should be the very fastest that is going, and unless we have that, by all means let us not disgrace ourselves by having anything inferior to the lines now running between New York and Great Britain. If this is done, you will then have a service from Halifax of three days and a half or four days to the other side of the Atlantic, and you will have a flow of passengers going by these fast steamers that will amaze people. One of the finest results from the construction of this road when it begins to be successfully operated, will be the fast line service in connection with it. Great things may be expected from this new road; and the time will come when the next generation will look with amazement and regret at the stand taken by the opposition in this House against this road; their children will be filled with sorrow that their fathers should have been so stupid as to make any objection to the construction of this road. However, it is the province of an opposition to object to what the government does, and these gentlemen have done so in this instance. Their leader has presented a scheme of his own which not one of them so far has been able to explain or to justify. I may say, for the credit of the leader of the opposition, that I think probably this scheme was prepared and placed in his hands by some expert railway men who had different views from his

own. He would have to obtain the ownership of these roads, he would have to purchase them at probably double their cost, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would not allow him to use their track without paying a heavy price for it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have said enough on this matter. I have wearied the House with my tedious and disconnected remarks; and I will conclude by quoting one sentence which I recommend the Prime Minister to study when he comes to read the Book of Psalms, and to apply it to the conduct of the late Minister of Railways. This is what David says:

> For it was not an enemy that reproached me, then I could have borne it; nor was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me, then I would have hid myself from him, but it was thou, a man, mine equal, my guide and mine acquaintance; we took sweet council together.

Yes, they 'took sweet counsel together.' But remember that the late Minister of Railways and Canals was guilty of the sin of ingratitude in his conduct towards his late colleagues in the government. I think perhaps that they are well rid of him, and that another sentence might be quoted in regard to him: 'The toun is well rid o' this deil o' Dundee.' I think the government is well rid of the late Minister of Railways and Canals, and they can breathe more freely, and can act with more harmony. We will have a successor before long who will perhaps be just as acceptable to the whole people of the Dominion, to the people of New Brunswick and of Nova Scotia particularly, than the late Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. E. GUSS. PORTER (West Hastings). I regret exceedingly that, either through my lack of hearing, or of the lack of continuity in the arguments of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Hon. Mr. Ross), I have been unable to follow clearly the speech just made by him, or to understand the reasons which he was urging upon this House to decide it to support the measure which has been introduced by the government. I failed to discover in his speech any reason or any point that would determine me to support that measure. I could only discover in the speech made by the hon. member for Victoria that he is now, as he has always shown himself to be in this House, willing blindly to follow the dictates of the government, no matter what the merits or demerits of the scheme might be, or whether it was for the advantage of this country or not. I had the pleasure yesterday of listening to the very able remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture, and I was somewhat impressed with the careful manner in which he had apparently studied out this whole question, and with the figures that he offered to commend this scheme to the House and the country.

But, Sir, I have taken occasion since these remarks were made to investigate to some extent in the short time at my disposal the statements made by the hon. minister and I am forced to say that a further investigation of the remarks of the hon. minister has convinced me in an opposite direction, and it has convinced me that the scheme is not for the benefit or advantage of the people of this country. The hon. minister at considerable length endeavoured to point out what I think is acknowledged by every hon. member in this House, and I think every hon. member in this House is glad to acknowledge it, that the future of the great west of this country is one in regard to which the very greatest expectations may be entertained. That that country is going ahead and is going to prosper and develop we all believe and we are glad of the fact. The hon. minister took occasion from the development that has taken place during the last few years to make an estimate of what that development would be during the next decade, and after making his comparisons he drew the conclusion in the winding up of his speech that with the natural increase in the productions of the west it would take fifteen trains of thirty cars each to handle the products of the west in 1911. That was the principal feature of the argument addressed to this House by the hon. minister as I understood it. Now, I want to call his attention and the attention of the House to the fact that there exists already in that country two railways—the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, and I would ask the hon. minister to pursue his investigation a little bit further. He quit just at the point, where, if he had proceeded, he would have been able to have convinced himself that another transcontinental railway was not needed in this country. We have those two railways now and as he tells us as a result of his investigation it will require fifteen trains of thirty cars in 1911 to move the products of the west to the seaboard. Now, does that hon. gentleman think, or does any hon. member in this House think, that either one of these railways which now exist, the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern, could not run upon their railway fifteen trains a day? The hon. minister says that it would take fifteen trains a day of thirty cars each every day of the year. Could not the Canadian Pacific Railway run over their lines fifteen trains a day every day in the year? They could do it, and so could the Canadian Northern had they the equipment, the cars and the engines. That brings me to the argument that has been offered by every hon. member on this side of the House who has spoken that it is not a question of another transcontinental line but simply a question of equipping the railways that are already existing in the country and furnishing them with additional facilities. Let us pursue the proposition that is offered by the hon. minister just a few steps further.

If it will require fifteen trains per day of thirty cars each in 1911 to move the products of the west to the sea, I think it can be fairly argued that either one of these railways could run that number of trains if they had the equipment. They could run fifteen trains a day, yes, they could run twenty-five trains upon their railways every day. We have now two existing railways and each one of these railways if equipped could run at least fifteen trains per day over their lines, and so we would find by investigation that the railways already existing in that country, if properly equipped would be able to move the quantity, to put it in the mildest possible form, that the hon. minister argues that will be required to be moved at a time as far as postponed from to-day as the year 1911. He was pleased to refer to the cost of the alternate scheme proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), and it was argued by hon. members on the government side of the House that this scheme would in all probability cost far more than the scheme which is advocated by the government. I would point out to hon. gentlemen which is an important feature that for every dollar which it is proposed to be expended on this scheme offered by the hon. leader of the opposition and which is supported by hon. members on this side of the House we will have one dollar of assets and that there is a broad distinction between that and the scheme which is proposed by the government. The scheme as proposed by the government is one on which it has been estimated that $150,000,000 will be expended by the country and after that expenditure is made the road will be handed over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for a period of at least fifty years. I was somewhat amused a day or two ago in listening to the speech of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), when, in concluding his remarks upon this question, he was pleased to use the following language as reported in the city press:

> He concluded by saying that the Liberal party would go to the country with the words, 'Laurier, prosperity and victory,' emblazoned on its banner.

It occurred to my mind when I read the report of the speech of the hon. gentleman that his position was similar to the position of the Irishman who was watching a procession passing down the street with the words emblazoned upon its banner 'God bless Ireland.' I think the remark made by the Irishman at that time is very apropos when applied to the statement made by the hon. member for Cumberland. In referring to the words upon the banner as I have to the words to be emblazoned upon the banner of the Liberal party, the Irishman made the remark that the banner was not complete, but that there should have been added the words 'God save Canada from the likes of us.' There is an old fable in which it is related of an individual who was the possessor of one of those long eared quadrupeds of the horse family that he had occasion to make a lengthy journey through the country and in making that journey was obliged to pass over a bridge of considerable length. The bridge was very unsafe but the possessor of the animal had no knowledge whatever of its insecurity. It is also related of that individual that he possessed a very vacillating mind and with his animal and his vacillating mind he started upon his journey. And it is related that he got fairly well across the bridge before he discovered his weakness and the peril in which he and his animal stood; and his vacillating mind did not come readily to his rescue, and he sought the advice and the assistance of his friends. Those before him urged him to come on, those behind him urged him to turn back, and in his endeavour to compromise between the conflicting advice that was given by his friends on the one side and on the other, it is related that the old man in trying to please everybody pleased nobody and lost his ass into the bargain.

Now, Sir, the old fable fairly illustrates the position that the government of the day will occupy after they have passed this measure. With the Trans-Canada on one hand, with the interests of the supporters of the government from the maritime provinces on the other, and with the Grand Trunk Railway in the middle, pulling in all directions, I venture to believe that the government will repeat the experience of the old man to whom I have just referred. I used the expression 'after the government had passed this measure,' for, Sir, I entertain no reasonable doubt but that the government will, notwithstanding the want of merit of this measure, and notwithstanding any opposition that may be offered from this side of the House; they will pass that measure by the force of their majority, and that, irrespective of merit or any consideration of the advantage or disadvantage it may be to the country. In the discussion of this question it has pleased the government supporters to urge upon the House and especially upon the opposition, that this Bill should be considered apart entirely from every political consideration and upon broad national grounds.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PORTER. An hon. member says 'hear, hear.' Does he realize the position in which the government has placed him? Does he know that the government has had this contract signed, sealed, and delivered, and that after all this is done, they ask their supporters to confirm the act which they have already done?

An hon. MEMBER. Order them to support it.

Mr. PORTER. Yes, as my hon. friend suggests, the government order their followers to support this measure. The government has tied the hands of every supporter of theirs in the consideration of this measure, and the only thing left for them is to try and justify as best they can the course adopted by the government. They have only the alternative to discredit this goverment for the act they have perpetrated, or stand up when this vote comes on and deliver the goods. But, Sir, one member of the Liberal party in this House has had the courage to stand up for his rights; one member of the government has refused to be gagged and refused to allow the cabinet to do his thinking for him. He has refused to allow them to deprive him of his manliness, and he has shown his willingness to sacrifice his own personal advancement in order that he may advocate in the parliament of this country, at least, what he believes to be right. And, Sir, I take this first opportunity of tendering, humble though it be, my heartiest congratulations to the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) for expressing the courage of his convictions upon this momentous question. Let me say that it would be very much to the advantage of this country, and it would be very much to the honour of the members on the government side of the House, were they to follow the wholesome example that has been set them by the ex-Minister of Railways in this matter. The speech of the hon. Mr. Blair was delivered in this House on the 11th of August last, and since that time, although I have followed the debates in this House as carefully as it has been possible for me to do, I have not heard any single one of the reasons urged by him against this measure, answered by any member of the government. His objections were stated so precisely and so clearly that one might reasonably expect that members of the government would at least make an attempt to answer the arguments of that hon. gentleman. But, Sir, their silence leads one to the logical conclusion that the arguments advanced by the ex-Minister are unanswerable, that the government feel they are unanswerable, and so they are driven to the contemptible alternative of heaping abuse and calumny on the head of the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair). That is the kind of answer the cabinet and their supporters have resorted to, and that is a case of history repeating itself, for I have yet to see a criminal condemned and convicted who has not abused his judge and his accusers.

And, Sir, the arraignment of the government by the ex-minister, and the uncontradicted evidence tendered by him in support of that condemnation and the argument used by him must convince the public that he is right. The louder gentlemen on the government side of the House denounce the ex-minister, the more convinced will the public be of the justice of the conviction of the government, and the more confidence they will have that the ex-Minister of Railways has spoken and acted in the best interest of this country. It is a sorry spectacle to have presented to this House—an hon. gentleman who so recently occupied one of the most important positions in the councils of the nation; a man who was trusted and who was applauded and who was honoured by his colleagues in the cabinet and by his followers alike; in the twinkling of an eye, without any reason having been advanced by members of the government for doing so, we see that hon. gentleman derided, decried, ridiculed and accused of improper motives by the very friends whom he has served so faithfully, so long, and so well. And why do these gentlemen now condemn the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals? Simply because he has had the courage of his convictions and has stood up for what he, at least, believed to be right and in the interests of the country. While that is the position of hon. members on the government side of this House, hon. members on the opposition benches are in an entirely different position. They are not bound by any fetters; they are not subject to the dictates of any minister or of any combination of ministers, they are untrammelled by the exigencies of the occasion they are not afraid to speak and act as seems best to each and every one of them, and I have no doubt that every member on this side of the House has approached this question and has considered it with an eye single to the advancement of this great country, single to the development of those great resources, those unlimited resources which nature has so lavishly bestowed upon the Dominion of Canada.

But, Sir, I regret, as other hon. members on this side of the House have had occasion to regret, the lack of that scientific knowledge upon this all important question which would enable members on both sides of the House to pass the very best judgment upon it. It is remarkable that while opposition members feel themselves circumscribed in their action for want of such scientific knowledge as would enable them to fully investigate the whole situation in regard to this transcontinental railway and the whole question of transportation, hon. members on the government side of the House, notwithstanding the fact that they are not possessed of any greater knowledge, although they are in practically the same position as members of the opposition, still, without any excuse, or without any reason so far advanced, are willing to rush into this matter and to push through, if possible, this transcontinental scheme. It would have been, in my opinion, very much better for the government, very much better for the country, very much better for the opposition members, had the government fulfilled the promise made by the hon. the First

Minister at the opening of this session ; he was pleased then to announce to this House and to the country that the government had been considering this great transportation question, and that they thought it advisable to appoint a commission to investigate the whole matter and to report to the House during the present session. Now, without that knowledge which they then declared they should possess before undertaking to solve this transportation problem, suddenly, blind-folded so far as surveys are concerned, blind-folded so far as the advantages or disadvantages, the cost, the difficulties or the possibilities of this railway are concerned, blind-folded in regard to all these matters, we find this government willing and ready to rush in and construct a transcontinental railway, involving, as it does, the expenditure of millions of dollars, pledging as it does the credit of this country by the guaranteeing of the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for millions of dollars more, involving the possible destruction or the crippling of the Intercolonial Railway, involving as it does the possibility of our not being able to profitably work the great canal system of this country, involving the credit of Canada and the commercial life of this country—I say that they have shown a disposition to rush into this project without a full and fair consideration of it. Let me ask, in the words of my honoured leader, who addressed the House upon this question a few days ago, why has this sudden transformation taken place ? What magic wand has been wafted over these gentlemen to inspire them to go on and construct this railway without the knowledge which they themselves declared they ought to possess before undertaking it ? This question has been asked many days ago and it was asked in all earnestness by the leader of the opposition, yet no answer has been forthcoming from the government from that day to this. They have not answered the leader of the opposition nor have they shown to this House or to the country why they have changed their minds so suddenly. Sir, there must be some reason either good or bad. I would not undertake to accuse hon. members of having been influenced in this matter by improper motives, but I shall await with anxiety, as the country is waiting with anxiety, for this government to disclose a good reason influencing them to take this action. The hon. the First Minister has declared that it is a bold and fearless policy ; it is a bold and reckless venture, I would say, which is leading this country to—I can scarcely say destruction—but in a direction that will not be to its advantage, and it is time now, before it has gone too far, for this parliament to stop and consider well this proposition before endorsing it or saddling this great responsibility upon the country.

During the course of this debate hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House have taken occasion to quote the resolutions of the boards of trade throughout Canada expressing their opinions upon this question. They have also quoted from the newspapers published in the interests of both political parties and from independent newspapers. To my mind the want of scientific knowledge, the want of that knowledge which the government of the day promised this country and this parliament we should have before we would be called upon to decide upon this matter, is the very thing that has caused such a wide divergence of opinion among the boards of trade and in the newspapers, and in the public mind of this country ; it is the very strongest possible proof that can be offered in that regard. Let me refer to an editorial in the Toronto 'Evening News,' a newspaper which cannot be said to be favourable to the opposition in this parliament, one which is well known to be, in fact, favourable to the government of the day. In its issue of August 22nd, on Saturday last, speaking in connection with this subject, it uses the following language :

> The whole question demands very thorough discussion. There are undoubtedly great public advantages to be derived from the extension of the Intercolonial to the lakes and the nationalization of the Canadian Pacific North Shore road, if that line can be brought up to standard at any reasonable expenditure. We want much fuller information than we have yet obtained as to the efficiency of the projected road between Quebec and Winnipeg for grain carrying purposes, and particularly as to the feasibility of the route from Quebec to Moncton. The government's plan for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific across the prairie and through to the Pacific is an improvement upon Mr. Borden's proposition, but it is by no means so clear that the proposals to extend the Intercolonial, to nationalize the Canadian Pacific from North Bay to Port Arthur, and to improve the existing lines to Winnipeg do not offer a better solution of the transportation problem than the government's proposition for an air line from Winnipeg to Moncton, and it must be remembered that great as might be the cost the country would have substantial assets for almost every dollar that would be invested.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. PORTER. When the House rose, Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to point out the disparity between hon. gentlemen supporting the government and those in opposition on the question before us. I was endeavouring to show how the members supporting the government were handicapped, bound down, and fettered by the action of the cabinet, whereas, on the other hand, the members of the opposition are free to give expression to whatever opinion their conscience may dictate. I was endeavouring also to show that the want of scientific knowledge on the part of this House was such as to render it unable to pass the very best possible judgment on the question. I would like to ask whence

comes the cry for this great transcontinental undertaking? Does it come from the Dominion as a whole or is it only sectional? So far as I have been able to discover from my reading of the public press and listening to the debates, I am certainly convinced that the cry is purely sectional. It is only an appeal from the west for more transportation facilities, to enable them to get their products to the markets of the world in the shortest time and at the lowest possible cost and thus promote settlement by furnishing settlers with every possible advantage. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is a cry affecting the whole Dominion and that it is incumbent upon the government to give relief. But, Sir, even admitting that argument, it seems to me that it is where the pain exists, the remedy should be applied, and not elsewhere. I venture the assertion that if any hon. gentleman occupying the government benches were to experience a pain in his back, he would hesitate long before applying a blister from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet. Is it just to punish the whole of this Dominion in order to relieve one section of it? It has been well pointed out by the speakers who have preceded me on this side that the cry coming from Manitoba and the great North-west is a sectional one, raised, not for the purpose of securing the building of a transcontinental railway, but for greater accommodation from the railways that already exist in that country; and I would like to ask why the government have shown such haste to answer this cry, when they have, for more than two years, turned a deaf ear to a cry for relief that has been going up, not from any sectional part of this country, but from the whole Dominion? I refer to the cry of the Manufacturers' Association and those engaged in industrial pursuits. For two years that cry has been going up from one end of the Dominion to the other, urging this government to give them such assistance as will enable them to meet foreign competition. This cry from the industrial interests of Canada is one which does not affect one province alone, but the Dominion as a whole.

It is undoubtedly the fact that stagnation has existed in the industries of this country, and that those gentlemen who have been coming to the parliament of Canada for the past two or three years representing the manufacturing industries of this Dominion have been crying out for relief; and justifiably, because they were not able to compete with their rivals under the conditions imposed upon them. I ask, in the name of everything that is reasonable and in the name of common sense, why has not this business government, as it has been called, evolved some mighty scheme out of the great brain it is supposed to possess, that would relieve the manufacturing industries of Canada and secure to them the conditions to which they are justly and honestly entitled? But it has been suggested that Senator Cox, who is said to be at the head of this Grand Trunk scheme, is not engaged in industrial pursuits, and that is one reason why the government have not been so anxious to come to the rescue of those who are engaged in those pursuits in this country. It has been further suggested that in the readjustment of the tariff and the establishing of an adequate system of protection there would be no rake-off, and it does not require the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of public money. And, Sir, it has been suggested that there is an election close at hand. Can it be possible that any of these considerations have actuated the government to take the step it has taken in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme now before the country? Let the government answer why this cry from the manufacturers and those engaged in industrial pursuits has been lost in the lesser cry of the people of Manitoba and the North-west. Both are cries that affect the commerce of this country, but one is sectional, while the other is of national importance. Do not the industrial enterprises of this country demand as much attention at the hands of this government as agriculture? Both are magnificent in their proportions, and it is a disgrace to this government to neglect the one and favour the other. I do not advance this argument because I think the agriculturists should be neglected and the manufacturing interests promoted, but I advance it to show that the government should not be neglectful of one while it is especially careful in its attention to the other. Both these industries are great and both should receive at the hands of this government the relief they need. Why has the government neglected one and shown such pretended haste to answer the calls of the other? With a boasted surplus of $13,000,000, as announced by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech, and an expressed desire to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada as stated in the preamble to the Bill before the House, one would have expected that a mighty effort would be put forth by the government of the day to relieve not only the one but the other. The very fact that the government has neglected the strongest and most important cry that has been uttered in this country for years, and that it has shown such great haste to relieve the other, is a matter that, I think, the people of the country will say should speak loudly in condemnation of this government. I have already said that, in the revision of the tariff so as to protect the interest of the manufacturers there is no rake-off, there is no opportunity for the expenditure of millions of dollars, as there will be in the carrying out of the scheme which is now engaging the attention of the House. But

it has also been suggested, and I am not disposed to quarrel with the suggestion, that railway contracts are a most prolific source for replenishing a depleted election fund treasury. Happily, it does not rest entirely with this parliament to determine this question. The leader of the government must appeal to the country and ask it to endorse the course which they have pursued in this important matter. And I venture the opinion, and entertain the hope, that the country, when it is appealed to and this question is brought forcibly and formidably before it, will answer with no uncertain sound and say to this government that they have betrayed the interest of the country, they have played to the gallery, so to speak, they have favoured one individual interest as against the interest of the whole country, they have forfeited the confidence of the people, and for that reason they stand condemned.

Now, this agitation, which has been going on in the west, is not a new thing. It has been going on for the past two or three years. And during the course of that agitation, and notwithstanding all that has been said pro and con in regard to the matter I have not yet heard it mooted, nor have I seen it discussed in the newspapers of this country, that there was any difficulty in the way of carrying the products of that great western country to market, once they had reached the head of Lake Superior. The difficulty, so far as I have been able to discover, has been in getting the products of that great western country down to the head of Lake Superior to be carried by the various means of transportation already existing from that point eastward to the sea. I have heard no complaint that the railway and canal system of Ontario and Quebec are not sufficient or not sufficiently equipped to handle all that product once it is at the head of the lake. Nor is such the case. And let me, for a moment, direct the attention of the House to the position we in the older provinces occupy in relation to that matter. Some hon. members have made comparison between the government's policy and the results of railway operation in some of the states of the great union adjoining us. Such comparisons, I submit, are not fair, because on the one hand it is sectional while on the other hand it is national. On the one hand is taken a state with a dense population, with all its resources developed to the greatest possible extent, while on the other hand is taken the entire country, the whole Dominon of Canada, developed but a little beyond the state of nature. By such comparisons hon. members on the government side of the House have endeavoured to belittle and disparage this great Dominion. They have endeavoured to show that Canada has not taken a position in railway development that she should and could have taken, and that she is fully justified in undertaking to build this great transcontinental railway on the basis of the proposition laid down by the government. If a comparison is to be made at all between the two countries, it should be made between one nation as against the other, and permit me briefly to do so. Canada is larger than the whole of the United States, excluding Alaska. The population of the United States is said to be 78,000,000 of souls, the population of Canada is only 5,500,000 of people; in other words, the population of the United States is fourteen times greater than that of the Dominion of Canada. The per capita wealth of the United States upon the same basis is fourteen times greater than the per capita wealth of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, if Canada is justified in building this transcontinental railway line, the United States, with fourteen times the number of our people and fourteen times our wealth, should have fourteen transcontinental railways, or fourteen times as many as Canada. So the absurdity of the argument adduced by hon. members on the government side of the House by a comparison of the States of the Union as against the whole Dominion of Canada, becomes apparent. It is useless to argue from such a hypothesis with a hope of drawing any just or proper conclusion.

Now if hon. gentlemen opposite would, in making their comparisons, take into consideration the province of Ontario as against any state in the union, I venture to say that their investigation would turn out to be largely in favour of Ontario. Let us look at the financial aspect of such a comparison as hon. members opposite have drawn between states of the union and the Dominion of Canada. Such a comparison in respect to the burden of debt that is being imposed upon this country by the government proposition, is really appalling. If Canada builds this proposed line it will mean an expenditure for construction—and I add the cost of equipment, because the hon. gentlemen who preceded me in this debate have confined their remarks almost entirely to the cost of construction. But we have to take into consideration, besides the cost of construction, the cost of equipment of this railway, and I think I am placing it well within the mark when I say that the construction of this railway will cost at least $150,000,000. I am told that the average cost per mile of the eastern section for construction alone cannot be less than $40,000 a mile, and I am told that by gentlemen who have had large experience in railway construction, not only in Canada but in the United States. Now if we would be justified is assuming such a debt as $150,000,000, the United States, to be put on an equal basis, would have to assume an additional debt for railway purposes alone fourteen times as great, which would reach the enormous sum of $2,210,000,000, a sum almost equal to the greatest amount the war debt of the United States

has ever assumed. Such a proposition would stagger even so generous a people as those who inhabit the United States of America; and while it would stagger them, it is enough to bury the smaller number of people that we have in Canada.

Let me pursue this inquiry a step further. The proportion of railways in Canada to-day is greater that the proportion of railways in the United States per capita, without taking into consideration this proposed new line. With a population of 78,000,000 the United States has 202,000 miles of railway; with a population of 5,500,000 the Dominion of Canada has 19,000 miles. Canada to equal the United States' per capita would require to have only 14,000 miles of railway; in other words, the Dominon of Canada to-day has 5,000 miles of railway in excess of the mileage of the United States per capita, with all its boasted progress and advancement. But if Canada does not suffer by a comparison with the United States in her railway development, no more does she suffer by a comparison in other respects. According to the area of cultivated lands that we have in the Dominion of Canada, we produce more than the United States can produce, and in industrial pursuits likewise we produce a greater percentage than do the people of the United States. Our revenues are greater in proportion than the revenues that are derived by the United States of America. So, Sir, I refuse to allow any man to point me to the United States as an example to Canada. On the other hand, I am bold to point out to Canada as a proud example not only for the United Sates but for the whole continent of America.

Now, Sir, one has only to look at the map of the older provinces of Canada, or to refer to statistical reports, to become convinced that these provinces are already a perfect network of railways as far east as the port of Quebec. Consider also the waterways and the canal systems already in existence, while there are now under construction other canals in the province of Ontario, and still others that are contemplated by the government. I refer particularly to the construction of the Trent valley canal, upon which large sums of money have already been expended with a view of bringing the products of the great western country down to the St. Lawrence water-way. I also refer to the project which has been spoken of in this House by the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte); that is to construct a great water-way by way of the French river, Lake Nipissing and the Ottawa river, thereby increasing the water transportation facilities of this country. Let me for a moment refer to the development that has taken place in railways and canals in these older provinces. I do so because it assists us in arriving at a proper conclusion as to the solution of this great question. Take the railways of the older provinces of this Dominion and we find from the statistical reports that Ontario has now 7,139 miles of railway, Quebec has 3,445 miles, New Brunswick has 1,444 miles, and Nova Scotia 1,051 miles, making a grand total in the older provinces of 13,079 miles. These railways are so situated that they reach out in every direction in these various provinces and most of these railways have direct connection with the water-ways of this country. Let me refer for one moment to the great canal system of the Dominion, and I only refer in this connection to the system known as the St. Lawrence canal system. I find upon reference to the statistical Yearbook that we have the Lachine canal which has a mileage of 8½ miles; Soulanges canal, 14 miles; Cornwall canal, 11 miles; Farran's Point canal, 1 mile; Rapide Plat, 3⅔ miles; Galops, 7⅓ miles; the Welland canal, 26¾ miles, and the Sault Ste. Marie canal, 1⅓ miles, or a grand total of over 52 miles of canals. Let me ask the attention of this House for a few moments to the further consideration of this railway and canal system. Towards aiding the construction of these railways this Dominion has contributed in subsidies alone since the subsidy system was inaugurated in 1883, no less a sum than $52,831,830, and upon the construction of canals the government of the Dominion has already expended $83,000,000, making a total expenditure for the construction of railways and canals in the older provinces of $135,831,830. This sum does not include the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, or of its connections. This is a most enormous expenditure. These distances that I have stated that are covered by the railways and canals of this country might be described as magnificent distances, but to all that expenditure must be added many millions of dollars of the capital that has been invested by private individuals in the construction of the railway system of the various provinces, and the expenditure of the provincial governments as well. One can scarcely grasp the magnitude of these expenditures. Let me ask in connection with this: Why has all this expenditure been made? Has this expenditure been made for the accommodation of local conditions only? Do local conditions in the province of Ontario, or the province of Quebec or in the maritime provinces, require such an expenditure of money as that which I have already pointed out? No, Sir, but that expenditure has been made by the government of the country, and by the capitalists not only of this country, but of foreign countries, because they saw that great development was going to take place in the North-western portion of the Dominion, and that there would be need of the lines of railways and canals that were being constructed in the older provinces, and they saw that these lines of railway and these canals that have been constructed

would be a proper means of relieving any congestion that might exist as it is said to exist in Manitoba and the North-west Territories for want of proper communication. The predictions of the government, the predictions of the capitalists who have invested their millions of dollars in these various enterprises have come true, and to-day we realize the fact, that they were far-seeing at the time when they made up their minds to expend these enormous sums of money in properly establishing and equipping the railways and canals of these older provinces to which I have referred. But, no sooner are the hopes of the capitalists and the government realized than we see the government of to-day entering into a contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, and if the expectations which have been expressed in the speeches that hon. gentlemen opposite have delivered during this debate are to be realized we will see all the efforts of the capitalists and of former governments which have been striving for years to provide proper transportation facilities, brushed aside at one stroke. Hon. gentlemen opposite hope to establish a new system by which the legitimate trade, that, under the circumstances as they now exist would be filtered down through these older provinces to the advantage of the older provinces, will be diverted from its natural and legitimate channel and carried, as they tell us, through the wilderness, through the northern part of Ontario and Quebec, with the result that the millions of money which have already been expended in the development of the railway and canal systems of the older provinces will be allowed to take care of themselves, and the people who have invested this money must do the best they can. This government—this business government, as they have been pleased to call themselves—are about to expend no less than $150,000,000 to wipe out and destroy all that capitalists and governments have been striving to do for years. Let me point for one moment to a matter that I think ought to weigh heavily with the government in the determination of this question which is now agitating this House. It is only a few short weeks ago since the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) came down with his budget speech. In his budget speech he was glad to announce to the House and to the country with a great flourish of trumpets, what the government was doing for the advancement of the interests of this great Dominion of Canada. One thing which he specially advocated was to make the whole canal system of the Dominion of Canada free to any one who might see fit to use it. On the 16th of April, in this House ('Hansard,' page 1421) the Minister of Finance used this language in his budget speech :

> The Dominion has spent a vast sum of money in the construction of canals and in the improvement of our waterways from the great lakes to the ocean, by way of the St. Lawrence river. Some years ago, these canals had but little depth of water. It was deemed wise to enlarge and deepen them, at a very heavy cost to the Canadian treasury. The canal system is now about complete, and we are looking to it, as well as to our railways, to carry the great volume of traffic which must pass between the western and eastern portions of Canada. Those who are most closely associated with the operation of the waterways are naturally anxious that every possible obstacle may be removed and every reasonable encouragement given for the transportation of our products through these channels to Montreal and other ocean ports. A large deputation of gentlemen interested in the traffic recenty waited upon the government and urged that, with a view to giving greater encouragement to the business, canal tolls should be abolished, and the inland waters made as free to ships as the ocean is. The government have given the subject very careful consideration. There is room for some doubt whether the tolls that are charged are large enough to be a serious obtsacle to the traffic. . . . . This, as I have said, we will try as an experiment. We hope it may be justified, and we reserve our right as to what may be done at the end of the two years. We think that a trial of that kind will be all that those more particularly interested in this matter can ask us to do, and we do it with the desire that our great waterways shall carry the traffic which nature has destined they should carry.

After making such a statement to the House on the 16th of April last, with regard to our canal system, what apology has the Minister of Finance to offer for being one of those who originated and adopted a project that must be the means if the hopes of the government are realized, of diverting the trade which he says legitimately and properly belongs to the railways and canals of the older provinces ; diverting it to the wilderness of northern Ontario and Quebec, and thus by one scheme destroying the other.

The Canadian Pacific Railway has been alive to the great needs of our west and North-west; the Canadian Northern Railway has also been alive to the situation, and both of these extensive railway systems have been, to the very best of their ability, improving their equipment and extending their lines to meet the wants of that western country. Not only have these two railway companies been interested in the matter, but the Trans-Canada Railway came forward with a project which to a large extent, if not altogether, met with the support of the people of this country. The Canada Atlantic Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada have also been alive to the necessities of the situation. But not until the Trans-Canada and the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and all these interests combined, pressed this matter upon the attention of the government did the government feel that it ought to act and become interested. The proposition as at first advanced by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is one which I think would meet with the approval of the electorate of this whole Dominion. The Grand Trunk Pacific

Railway seeing the great needs of the west and the North-west of Canada, did not enter into this enterprise without having carefully examined the situation. I have no doubt that with the able experts which they have at their command, and with all the resources they could employ in an investigation of this question, the Grand Trunk Railway Company before coming to parliament carefully investigated the whole matter, and using the best skill they could and with unlimited means at their disposal with which to construct a line of railway that would not only relieve the west and the North-west but would also be advantageous to them from a financial standpoint, they came before the government with their proposition. That first proposal of theirs was not a proposition to build a great transcontinental line from ocean to ocean. After having satisfied themselves not only of the requirements of our western country, but of the possibility of constructing a line that would not only relieve the west but that would be remunerative to them, they came before this government, and proposed to build a railway from the Pacific ocean, extending east only as far as North Bay. I have no doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway saw that by the construction of their main line through Manitoba and the Territories they would secure traffic that would feed their lines of railway now in existence in Ontario and Quebec, and at the same time using as an auxiliary our splendid canal system. I have no doubt that they saw that by the construction of the line as far east as North Bay, they would be able to offer the very fiercest competition to the existing transportation companies. Had the first proposition of the Grand Trunk Railway been given effect to, this enormous traffic would continue to filter down through the settled portions of Ontario and Quebec, and as the Minister of Finance truly said in his budget speech, it would give to these old provinces the trade that justly and properly belongs to them. The completion of this project as first advanced by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway would have been of inestimable value to the people of the west and the North-west, not only from the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific in constructing their line in that way would be able to offer keen competition to existing railways which must affect the rates charged, but it also would be of great advantage to the people of the western provinces because of the rapidity with which their products could be handled in the immediate future.

The government had perhaps the best opportunity in that proposition that will ever be offered in this country of applying the remedy to the spot that had the pain. Granting that what was originally asked by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway was not sufficient to relieve entirely the difficulties experienced by the people of the North-west, the government was not driven to the alternative of building a transcontinental railway. They could have, and they should have, aided the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to get into that western country upon very favourable terms. They could have, and they should have, encouraged the Grand Trunk Pacific in building this main line through those western provinces and in extending its lines north and south for the purpose of relieving the people who were going into that country and colonizing it. If that was not sufficient to relieve the needs of the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, there was still another alternative left to the government which would not have involved the expending of millions of dollars and the saddling on this country of a debt which it must feel for many and many a long year. There are now completed two lines of railway from Winnipeg to Port Arthur and Fort William, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway. The government could have gone to these two railway companies and made this proposition to them : we will assist you in double-tracking the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, or if need be in converting these lines into four-tracked roads from Winnipeg to Port Arthur and Fort William and securing running rights for any other railway over them. Mr. Speaker, that is the only point in the whole system of railways at which congestion has been felt, and the government could have relieved the North-west by adopting that plan. This would have many advantages, to my mind ; it would have afforded material relief, and almost immediate relief, to the western people, and that is what they want. They do not want a scheme by which relief would come to the people of the great western country five or seven years from to-day ; they want a scheme evolved by this government and assisted by this government that will bring relief at once.

Let me for a moment consider the proposition made by the government in regard to the relief that they are proposing to the western country. If the only relief that is to be given is such as will come from a scheme of the kind advocated by the government, that will require at least five or seven years to carry out, what are the settlers of that great portion of the Dominion to do in the meantime ? The congestion that existed in that country and of which so much complaint was made in 1902, will no doubt be greatly augmented in 1903, and, with the immense immigration that has been going into the country this year and which we expect to see continue year after year, the congestion that will exist from 1903 to 1908, a period of five years, will be very serious, and I ask the government what is to become of the people who will suffer from that congestion ? There is only one result, one conclusion, to be drawn from such a state of af-

fairs, either the people who are going into that country must cease producing crops as they have been producing them during the past two years or they must sacrifice their production for the want of assistance in transportation, from this business-like government. It has been repeatedly stated during the course of this debate, the words of the First Minister have been repeated over and over again, that we cannot wait, we must act now. At the same time, Sir, the First Minister and his colleagues have evolved a scheme and their supporters are endorsing a scheme which will take at least five years, and which it has been estimated—and I think conservatively estimated—will take seven years, to complete before any relief will be afforded to that country. That is the great advantage of the plan that is advocated by the hon. leader of the opposition, as it appeals to my mind, over the project evolved by the government. The plan of the hon. leader of the opposition would give to that western country immediate relief and would avoid the expenditure of the millions of dollars that must be expended in the construction of the government's proposed transcontinental railway, and besides, it would preserve our provincial railway interests, and would also preserve the national canal system. The policy of the government, which they have seen fit to characterize as a policy of haste, is a policy of delay, and the only result that can flow from it will be deserted homesteads in the North-west and disappointed settlers as monuments to the inability of this government.

While I am upon that subject let me refer to an article appearing in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' of Saturday, August 22nd. It is an interview with a gentleman who is known to possess strong Liberal proclivities and who is one of the largest wholesale merchants in the city of Winnipeg, Mr. Alexander Macdonald. Speaking in regard to this question, Mr. Macdonald is reported in the interview as follows :-

There can be no two opinions, on the Grand Trunk Pacific deal. It's the worst yet, and none know it better than the promoters and their creatures in and outside of parliament who are pushing the deal through. All will welcome the Grand Trunk Pacific or any other road that will tap our fertile plains and relieve the present disgraceful congested condition of freight and passenger traffic. If we had half a dozen railways we would have better accommodation, but rates would remain the same and they are now sufficiently high to pay six per cent on three times the cost of our railways. That the handing over of the Canadian Pacific Railway to a company was a mistake as clearly shown by members of the present government at the time, goes without saying. Still, there was some excuse for the Canadian Pacific Railway blunder, but there can be none for the Crow's Nest railway, Yukon deal, the Canadian Northern Railway. 'Enabling Act,' and still less for the Grand Trunk Pacific swindle. In this deal the principle of government ownership is admitted, but the road, or rather the people who are to build the road, are to be handed over to the tender mercies of a company for fifty years. But the government say they have running powers and the control of rates over the Grand Trunk Pacific. That story is old. We had it first when the Canadian Northern Railway deal was put through.

Still we are paying higher rates than ever to Kootenay points. The Americans would have all the Yukon trade if this railway deal did not go through, but it did not, and still our trade in that quarter is increasing. They told us they had the control of rates and running powers over the Canadian Northern Railway when they were giving away millions of acres of our land, millions of our money. If they had, it would not be necessary to bring on this Grand Trunk Pacific deal, so big and yet so weak that it was thought necessary to get Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself behind it with outstretched arms exclaiming 'Pray heaven that we be not now too late.' What a farce !

'You do not then approve of the scheme as a whole ?'

'No. On the contrary, it is so thororoughly bad that I do not think the road will ever be built. If it is, it will be of little or no benefit to the west, because it will not reach Winnipeg for years. It is to be located somewhere north of the trade centres of Ontario and Quebec and away from the natural outlet of this vast territory—our great lakes. What it will cost no one knows or seems to care. The people have to pay, and the promoters and their friends get the benefit.'

'You refer to the eastern section ?'

'Yes. When they get to Winnipeg, where there is more traffic than three roads can handle and where the local rates are excessive, all is handed over to the promoters, and the government guarantees their bonds for the cost of the road at least, and allows the company to bond and stock it for twice its cost. Here's where the grafters and their political allies make the big haul, and here is where the settler has to pay. The poor bondholder must get his interest, and the poor settler must pay, even if he has to deny himself and his family the necessaries of life, for it would never do to expose the promoters and their pals, because those men are looking for honours.'

'What would you suggest as a solution of the transportation question ?'

'If the government have control of rates and running powers over the Canadian Northern Railway let them use it, and as the Grand Trunk Railway is now tapping our great lakes at several points and have their steamboat connections, they can get to Winnipeg and west this fall and bring us immediate relief. But then we are wasting time talking. It's not the interests of the country that are being looked after by the government, it's their own and the promoters.' There is only one solution to this burning transportation question, and that is a road built, owned and operated by the people and for the people, and our government knows it. The contract should be submitted to the country for ratification, and if it is, I venture to say that the government will have fewer supporters from Manitoba than they had at the last election, and that was only one, who obtained his seat by the customary vote of the returning officer.

While the government had such a favourable opportunity as was presented by the original scheme of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, they in their wisdom saw fit to

tack on the eastern section, under the specious plea that they were going to build an all-Canadian road; and they advanced as a reason for building this transcontinental railway through the northern portions of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec that it would open up a large portion of those provinces which are fit for settlement. I do not think that any sufficient justification for placing such a great burden on the people. I look upon the development of Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces as being very largely a matter of provincial concern. Each one of these provinces owns its Crown lands, and these lands are always available for the aiding of railway construction or any other improvements, necessary to develop these provinces so that I think such matters might be very well left to the provinces themselves. Of course, I do not say that we should apply that principle to the North-west Territories. It is only applicable to those portions of the Dominion which enjoy provincial autonomy, and it ought not to be too rigorously enforced with regard to them. The application of that principle would not prevent the Dominion government from giving assistance where it was justly and properly due, nor would it prevent the Dominion government from giving assistance in matters which concerned Dominion development. I venture the assertion, in answer to the proposition stated by the government, that the building of this railway through the northern portion of Ontario and Quebec will have the effect of colonizing and opening up those portions of these provinces, that if the same amount of money were expended in providing quick and close communication by rail and water between the settled and unsettled portions of those provinces, their development and settlement would be very much more rapid and satisfactory than by the scheme we are discussing. As to the eastern section or this scheme, I do not know that I can add anything particular to what has already been so ably said by the leader of the opposition. I can only say that I most heartily concur in the opinion he has given, that if there is to be a paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway through the province of New Brunswick or from Lévis to Moncton, that paralleling should be done by the Intercolonial Railway. It should be a part of the Intercolonial Railway system. Let it be a portion of the railway built by the people owned by the people, and, as my leader has said, operated for the benefit of the people.

I have refrained from discussing at all the terms or the particular paragraphs and conditions of this contract, because, having at least satisfied myself that the scheme as a whole is a bad one and not for the advantage of this country, it seems to me to be wasted time to discuss the particular features. I may, however, be pardoned for using just one illustration of the manner in which this contract was prepared as between the government and this great railway corporation. I am not passing by the consideration of the terms of the contract, because I have not considered them. I have considered them very carefully and to the best of my ability. The feature of the contract that I wish to refer to is the fact that it is made up of so many 'ifs' and 'buts,' and provisos, that almost any result may reasonably be expected to be worked out from it. Going over the Bill as a whole, I find that the road is to be built in five years—if possible. I note that the interest of three per cent upon the construction of the eastern division is to be paid after seven years—if it is earned. I find that the traffic is to be carried through Canadian ports—if the shippers do not say otherwise. I find that supplies for the construction and operation of this railway are to be purchased in Canada—if produced; they are to be purchased in Canada—if produced in sufficient quantities; they are to be purchased in Canada—if produced of the proper quality; if they are to be purchased in Canada—if they can be purchased at as good a price as anywhere else; they are to be purchased in Canada—if they can be purchased on as good terms as anywhere else. In short, this is a very 'if'-ty agreement.

The alternative policy which has been offered by the leader of the opposition, and which I most heartily support, is a policy that is broad, a policy that is specific, a policy that is convincing and a policy that, above all, is patriotic. And although the announcement of that policy was made in this House by my honoured leader several days ago, we have scarcely had a reference to that announcement from the government side of the House since the day it was delivered. They seem, Sir, to have been paralyzed by the force of national sentiment for development and advance contained in that admirable address. Sir, I do not wonder that hon. members on the government side of the House have not had the courage to attack the policy that has been advocated by the leader of the opposition. But I am surprised that, with the exception of one who spoke in advance, there is not a single member of the government or a single member of this House supporting the government who has had the courage, in view of the arguments that have been advanced in support of that policy, to shake off, as it were the fetters that have been placed upon him by his party, and assert his manhood by supporting the alternative policy of the leader of the opposition on this question. The policy that has been offered by the opposition is one that secures for the people the key to the whole transportation problem and the consequent control of rates for the benefit and advantage of the whole people. And, Sir, that policy affords means for immediate and permanent relief to the con-

gested trade conditions existing in our western country, whereas the government policy postpones for fifty years even an attempt to control the situation. The scheme of the government has a detrimental effect on the existing railway systems of the older provinces, and a most detrimental effect upon the waterways upon which, as I have already pointed out, so many millions of dollars have been expended, by diverting into another channel the trade which legitimately belongs to them and which, if undisturbed, would naturally benefit the provinces through which these railways and these canals run. And, Sir, the policy of the government refuses immediate relief to the west and postpones the possibility of the west receiving any relief for at least a period of five, and possibly seven years. And, with regard to the policy that has been announced by the hon. leader of the opposition, I would trouble the House by referring to a few comments by leading newspapers with regard to them. Let me first refer to the St. John 'Globe,' which is a Liberal newspaper. It says:

The speech of the leader of the opposition is one with which the government party can find little fault.

The Montreal 'Witness,' a paper most friendly to the First Minister, spoke of the policy of the leader of the opposition in this way:

Mr. Borden, the leader of the Conservative party, has performed the feat of his life in his great speech against the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, and in offering in exchange therefor the policy we have so much urged of developing to the utmost the connections between the lakes and tidewater and between the harvest fields and the lakes. He has been specific and urges the Blair policy of extending the Intercolonial to the lakes, and also the acquisition and improvement of the unprofitable section of the Canadian Pacific from North Bay to Fort William, using that line, which is capable of carrying ten times the business it now does, as a common highway for the all-rail traffic of all the railways to the prairies and the coast.

Let me refer also to the Montreal 'Herald.' In discussing the policy announced by the leader of the opposition, it said:

Mr. Borden does, at all events, discharge the prime duty of an opposition leader in circumstances like the present by submitting an alternative proposition, and one which, it were useless to deny, has some features of merit.

The foregoing is from the paper of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher). Now let me refer to the Ottawa 'Evening Journal,' which claims to be an independent paper, but which is well known to favour the party in power. It speaks of the policy of the leader of the opposition in this way:

He is for immediate control by the people of Canada of the transportation outlet from the west, where the Liberal government is merely for control fifty years hence.

Mr. Borden says, in effect Let us have at once—and it can be had at once—a government road from Halifax to Port Arthur, the head of the great lakes; let us arrange—and it can be done—for immediate control of running rights from Port Arthur to Winnipeg; and at Winnipeg let us offer transportation facilities east to all western roads, ready and able advantageously at any moment if desirable to carry a government road clear across the continent.

Winding up the article, the 'Journal' says:

Practically, it seems to us, Mr. Borden is for immediate government ownership of a nature which would give to the people of this country a splendid check at once and for all time upon all transportation business and rates in Canada. Practically, it seems to us, the Liberal government is for a railway scheme which may gain nothing for the people for fifty years save some local convenience along a route a great part of which is barren; and moreover a scheme which meantime will inevitably hinder early redress of transportation grievances by any other plan of government action.

Now, Sir, I do not consider that I should be confined in my quotations to newspapers that are friends of the government. It is well recognized that the public press of the country, be it Liberal or Conservative, represents the opinions of the people, while it is also a moulder of public opinion, in this Dominion as in any other country. Let me for a moment refer to the comments made by the 'Mail and Empire,' a Conservative paper, upon the policy announced by the leader of the opposition. The 'Mail and Empire' closed its article in reference to the alternative proposition offered by the leader of the opposition, as follows:

Mr. Borden has propounded a really national policy on this great subject. He will bring the Grand Trunk into the west, and open up new territory there. He will give us three transcontinental lines instead of two. He will make us independent of the bonding arrangement. He will conserve the Intercolonial, and he will bring Canadian trade through Canadian channels to Canadian ports. The whole will be accomplished without mortgaging the country forever. This solution is the wisest that could be propounded. It looks to development, to cheaper rates, to increasing business for the merchants and the manufacturers of Canada, to trade for Canadian ports, and to prosperity for all lines of Canadian effort. It opposes waste and national loss, and is in harmony with the great policy of 'build up Canada.'

Let me go a step further towards the west and quote the opinion of the Hamilton 'Herald':

Mr. Borden has taken a bolder step than has been taken by any other party leader in Canada with reference to the question of transportation. He has committed himself, and as leader of the Conservative party he has committed that party, to the principle of government ownership and control of a transcontinental railway system. His speech has raised and strongly defined a great dividing issue between the two political parties. It was, therefore, one of the most momentous speches ever delivered in parliament.

Let me go still further west and read from another Winnipeg paper. I have al-

ready read from the Winnipeg 'Telegram' the opinion of one of the leading Liberals in that city; now let me read from the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' itself, a Conservative paper.

Mr. Borden's great spech in parliament last night reveals to the Canadian people for the first time the full statute of his statesmanship. With the occasion has come the man. Those who know Mr. Borden personally know that he is a worthy successor to the great leaders of the Conservative party. All Canadians know it now. Need it be said that the Conservatives of the west will be delighted with the sound, competent, courageous and genuinely patriotic policy he has announced and not only Conservatives, but the whole west, with the exception of those who have the misfortune to be entangled inextricably in Liberal party organization.

Canada from sea to sea will, we are sure, applaud the great unifying, upbuilding national railway policy announced by the Conservative leader.

Now, let me refer to an interview that was held between a newspaper reporter and the Premier of Manitoba, Mr. Roblin, who has lately come back from the country endorsed by a very large majority of the electorate of that province, who have not only sanctioned the general policy of his government but has approved of his railway policy, that he advocated throughout that province. The interview took place on the 19th of August:

Premier Roblin, asked as to the feeling in Ontario about the Grand Trunk Pacific project said:

Sentiment in Ontario, so far as I was able to judge it, is against the government building the road and then giving it away without securing any practical or material advantage for the people. In fact the people in the east appear to think there is no guarantee that the so-called Grand Trunk will operate the road from Winnipeg to Moncton unless it absolutely appears in their own interest to do so.

The fact that they are proposing to build a road from Moncton to Winnipeg, north of the height of land through the country of which Laurier and every other member of the government who has spoken has admitted that they have made no railway survey, seems to have created doubt as to the reality and genuineness of the whole scheme, particularly when it is remembered that one provision of the Bill gives the Governor in Council power to stop all construction until the meeting of parliament.

Not to belittle that great friend of the government, Senator McMullen, let me quote from some remarks made by him in the Senate upon this question:

He thought the increase of population in the North-west and the desire to keep the trade arising from that would justify the construction of the line. At the same time he believed the bulk of the grain would be brought out by the canals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that my remarks have not been intended nor have I any desire to belittle the scheme advanced by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company when it first came before the government with a proposition to afford relief to the west, and to the north-west portion of this province, as well as to benefit itself. I am not opposed and have never been opposed to reasonable assistance being given by this government for the construction of such a line of railway as they then proposed. In fact I think it was the duty of this government to give such assistance, and I think the opportunity then offered was one which they should have embraced, and that they will regret having tacked on to that proposition such conditions as will render the operation of that railroad neither profitable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company nor advantageous to the people of this country. I am not opposed to the Grand Trunk Pacific, but I am opposed to the scheme that is offered by this government, particularly to that portion of it respecting the eastern division, which will be of no possible advantage to the country, but which must be on the contrary a great detriment to it. I oppose it because it will cripple the railways that are already established in the older provinces; because it will destroy, or at least cripple, the great canal interests of this country; because it will injure if not destroy the government system of railways in connection with the Intercolonial; because it postpones for a period of at least five years the granting of relief to that great western country; because it postpones even an attempt to place the key of the situation of this great transportation question in the hands of the people for at least a period of fifty years; and because it imposes a burden of obligation upon this country which is wholly unnecessary, and which is contrary to the interests of the Dominion. Sir, I support the policy which has been advocated by the leader of the opposition because it obviates those difficulties and disadvantages that I have pointed out in connection with the government policy. I support the policy of the hon. leader of the opposition, because, Sir, while the Conservative party of the Dominion of Canada inaugurated a national fiscal policy for this Dominion, the honoured leader of the opposition to-day has inaugurated a national railway system for the Dominion of Canada and I support that policy because it is a policy of preservation and development as against a policy of waste and national loss.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate it would be a mere waste of time on my part to enter into anything like an elaborate discussion of the financial or commercial details of this matter more especially because both these aspects of the question have been already handled and admirably well handled by my hon. friend the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) as well as by many other hon. gentle-

men on this side who have addressed the House on this subject. What I more particularly desire to do on the present occasion is to address a few words to the House and to the country as to the general policy pursued by the Liberal party in times past on this great question and also as to the merits of the general policy which the leaders of the Liberal party have now the honour to propound for the consideration of this House and of the people of this country. It is just two and thirty years almost to a day since this question of a continental railway was first propounded in this chamber for the consideration of the people. Probably of those who then took part in the discussion, there are remaining at this moment scarcely as many as I could count on the fingers of one hand in both chambers of parliament, and bearing in mind that we had not then provided ourselves with the same facilities for recording the opinions of both parties that we now have, it is not unreasonable or unnatural that considerable ignorance should prevail, I may say, on both sides of the House as to the true position which the Liberal party adopted on that occasion and as to the policy which, when they succeeded in displacing the government of Sir John A. Macdonald, they were prepared to recommend. Now, Sir, I have noticed in some sections of the press, and I have noticed among some weak-kneed brethren even in the Liberal party, a disposition of which I do not at all approve to intimate that the Liberal party were to be blamed for the criticisms that they bestowed on the government policy as regards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Sir, for myself, I desire to say that I have no apology to offer and no retraction to make as to anything I may have said in condemnation of the course of the Conservative government on that occasion. My opinion is that the Liberal party were right then and that the Liberal party are right now. I am prepared on the floor of parliament or on the hustings before any Canadian audience from Vancouver to Halifax, to maintain that the events of the last seven years, that the events of the last five and twenty years, not to say of the last two and thirty years, have most amply justified in every respect and justified to the hilt all the objections that the Liberal party brought forward against the policy of their opponents at that time and most amply justified the policy which they were prepared themselves to recommend. It is not very long ago since, I believe, with the approbation of both sides of the House, we raised a statue to my honoured friend the late hon. Alexander Mackenzie on the grounds of this paliament, and I am not prepared here and I do not think the Liberal party are prepared, having done that, to underrate his ability or to depreciate the policy which was pursued by him. More than that, I want to say, as I have the right to say, and I know whereof I affirm that I have the right to say, that while Mr. Mackenzie disapproved and disapproved very strongly, as I disapproved very strongly, of the terms and conditions under which the Canadian Pacific Railway was originally constructed, when he became a minister of state and Premier of this Dominion no man could have applied himself more diligently, more zealously, more earnestly or with better results to the task before him of preparing the way by the making of proper surveys and by the construction of the essential link required to bring the two sections of the country together than Mr. Mackenzie during his term of office, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway was constructed within a reasonable space of time after his leaving office those who were concerned in it would I think endorse in full what I am stating here that it was very largely due to his energy and enterprise that they were able to bring that work to a successful termination at the time they did. I distinguish, and I think the House and the country should distinguish, between the men who conducted the Canadian Pacific Railway to a successful termination and the politicians who originally made the bargain under which the road was constructed. Scarcely too much can be said in praise of the energy and enterprise displayed by the one and scarcely too much can be said in condemnation of the short sighted policy which marked the proceedings of the other. These gentlemen have said that the Canadian Pacific Railway was a colossal undertaking and having reference to the resources of Canada at that time I am inclined to agree with them. It was a colossal undertaking but the blunders which marked it on the part of those who carried it on were colossal too. However good the record of the Canadian Pacific Railway may be looked at as a commercial undertaking, I think the future historian of Canada would bear me out when I say that no possible combination of blunders could be conceived or could have been more injurious to Canada than those which marked the initiation of that enterprise. I say in the first place that the bargain which they made in 1871 with the people of British Columbia by which, without the smallest knowledge of the actual circumstances or of the facts that they ought to have known, they bound themselves within ten years by a treaty with that state, unasked for by them, to construct that railway, was a fatal mistake, a mistake which resulted in a very great injury and very great loss to the people of Canada and which in its direct result seriously affected the permanent usefulness of the road. I say further, and I say it with full knowledge that their conduct in entering into that undertaking, and in proposing the construction of that railway without any consultation with the English government of the day, also showed great recklessness

and great folly and great short sightedness on their part in not availing themselves of the advantage of the position they possessed. Some years after it fell to my lot to endeavour to retrieve that blunder and I very well recollect that after bringing the matter before Lord Carnarvon and the late Lord Salisbury, who was then Indian Secretary, I was referred to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Northcote, to whom I made the request that the British authorities would at least come to our assistance to the extent of guaranteeing the sums which were necessary for us to raise for the purpose of building that road. I very well recollect that when I came to lay my proposition before Sir Stafford Northcote, while he admitted the substantial truth of my suggestion that the road was of imperial concern, that its construction would be a great benefit to the whole British empire; he told me nevertheless in so many words: that although he believed that my request would have been acceded to at once at the time that the union of British Columbia was affected, yet, that as we had chosen to bind ourselves by treaty to the people of British Columbia to build that road within a certain period of time, it was out of his power under the circumstances to propose to the British parliament to grant us any assistance.

Over and above all that, I say that the whole future of the North-west was for a great many years most seriously hampered and impeded by the atrocious land policy—I can use no milder term—which the Conservative government put in force, not merely by the granting of huge quantities of land for the purpose of constructing the railways, which might have been excused, but by the extraordinary folly which induced them, in a country in which it was of the greatest importance to prevent settlement from becoming straggling and scattered, and where it was eminently desirable that we should concentrate settlement, their policy brought about such a state of things that for a long period of time a great portion of the whole North-west was practically held in mortmain, and no settler, unless he was a man of means and able to purchase a large tract of property in the immediate vicinity of his farm, could be nearer than, from a mile to a mile and a half to his next neighbour.

There is not the slightest doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a great enterprise. There is not the slightest doubt that the managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway showed great ability. On the whole, the work that they performed reflected very great credit on their enterprise and on their energy, and to my certain knowledge they did not spare, many of them, to risk their whole fortunes in the prosecution of that enterprise. But, Sir, while I grant that to the full ; still I say that as regarded the chief object and end of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway looked on as a colonizing enterprise, was for a period of 18 years at least, a most lamentable failure. If ever there was a case of the end being sacrificed to the means, it was in the policy which was pursued by the late Conservative government with respect to that same Canadian Pacific Railway. The object that the people of Canada had in view ; the object which alone, in my judgment, justified the huge sacrifices that they were called upon to make, was a two-fold object, namely, the filling up of the North-west, and the stopping of the exodus which we had so much reason to deplore, and which went on in Canada, as everybody knows, for a period of nearly 20 years.

How stand the facts ?—and I am willing to be judged by the facts. In the 18 years to which I refer ; if you include the value of the railway that we gave the Canadian Pacific Railway ; if you include the money we spent ; if you take the value of the land we gave ; we expended in money or money's worth, about $100,000,000 for the avowed purpose of colonizing the North-west. And what did this government find when they took office, in 1896 ? I have the facts here from the Department of the Interior. They are noteworthy facts, they are facts which I trust every man who wants to know how the policy of the present Liberal government and of the Mackenzie government, and how the policy of our Conservative predecessors in office contrasted, will do well to bear in mind. What did we find in 1896 ? We found that all over Canada immigration had come to a dead standstill ; we found all over Canada that the settlement of the North-west had likewise come to a complete full stop. In 1896, the last year, bear in mind, of our predecessors' regime, the total number of homesteads taken up in the North-west had sunk to the pitiful figure of 1,340. I have to-day received from the Department of the Interior their list of homestead entries for the year ending the 30th of June, 1903, and they amount to 31,383, as against 1,340 in 1896, just seven years ago. Some of our friends opposite are fond of comparative statements and I suggest for their consideration that that is a fair comparative statement as between Liberal performance and Conservative promise—as 1,340 is to 31,383, so stands the policy of the two governments, in respect to each other.

And what has been the contrast with regard to our trade and commerce In these 18 years to which I have referred, our trade and commerce had come to almost a standstill. From the year 1878 to the year 1896 the volume of our trade and commerce increased in the ratio of two per cent per annum—36 per cent in all for the 18 years. That is very considerably less than the growth and increase which has taken place during one single year of the present Liberal government. And, Sir, what to my mind

is worse still, during that same period of 18 years our population, if the truth had been known, was barely increasing at the rate of one half of one per cent per annum. I doubt very much if the natural increment to the population of Canada from 1878 to 1896 exceeded 30,000 a year, which would be about one-fourth of what ought to have been the natural increase of a population like ours in a country like Canada. And if you refer to the records of my own department it is not too much to say that during these 18 years, Canada was nowhere, while to-day Canada is first in the march of progress among the nations of the world. I do not intend to inflict any great number of statistics on my friends here, but I had lately placed in my hands a short summary of the progress of Canada from the year 1896 to the year 1903. It varies slightly from the one I gave before, but it is worth repeating as a sort of illustration of the progress made during 18 years of Conservative rule and of the progress made during seven years of Liberal rule. It also confirms the ground upon which my hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has deemed it right to assure the people of Canada that they may, without undue pressure on their resources, hope to construct this railway on the terms that he has laid before them.

In 1896 (the year concluding on the 30th of June), the gross trade of Canada, coin and bullion excepted, amounted to $211,000,000; in this present year of grace, the trade of Canada amounted to $439,000,000, being an increase in these seven years of 107 per cent. Next to us comes the little kingdom of Japan, with an increase of 97 per cent, but if you turn to the great republic of the United States, you will find that their total increase during these seven years instead of being 107 per cent, was a bare 47 per cent. Canada had grown more than twice as fast as the United States in the volume of trade and commerce. If you compare with England or France or Germany you will find that in the case of England the total increase of trade in these years amounted to just 26 per cent, while in the case of France it amounted to 21 per cent, and in the case of Germany to 38 per cent:

STATEMENT showing the Trade of the following Countries (Merchandise only) during the years 1895 and 1902, together with the Increase and Percentage of Increase.

—	1895.	1902. (unrevised).	Increase, year 1902 over 1895.	Percentage of Increase, 1902 over 1895.
	$	$	$	Per cent.
Canada (*a*)	211,739,913	439,212,202	227,472,289	107·43
Japan	133,084,033	262,443,241	129,359,208	97·20
Cape Colony	146,281,249	233,312,649	87,031,400	59·50
United States (*a*) (*b*)	1,642,925,161	2,417,983,175	775,058,014	47·18
Italy	429,424,191	626,893,133	197,468,942	45·99
Germany	1,770,379,422	2,453,491,000	683,111,578	38·59
Belgium	591,708,471	797,746,000	206,037,529	34·84
Argentine Republic	207,633,480	272,637,574	65,004,094	31·31
Switzerland	304,788,030	386,543,454	81,755,424	26·82
Great Britain (*b*)	3,128,380,466	3,950,834,168	822,453,702	26·29
France	1,369,084,100	1,669,960,000	300,875,900	21·98

NOTE.—Years ended December 31, 1895 and 1902 unless stated otherwise; Imports for Consumption and Exports of Domestic Merchandise, unless stated otherwise.

(*a.*) Years ended June 30, 1896 and 1903.

(*b.*) Includes Total Imports, not Imports for Consumption.

Sir, I said just now, during eighteen years Canada was stagnant and still; had practically made no increase at all for the increase of two per cent per annum during these years can hardly be considered as anything worth taking seriously into account, and that both as respects the present growth of the population and as respects the growth and volume of our trade, it is absolutely and literally true that we are advancing now almost as fast in one year as we were doing before in ten years.

What was the policy that my friend Mr. Mackenzie desired to inaugurate? I have alluded to it before and may repeat it now. Mr. Mackenzie pushed forward with all his power the construction of the essential link between the waters of the great lakes and Winnipeg; he pushed forward, with all his energy, the surveys which it was absolutely necessary to make if the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be constructed at all, but, above all and before all, Mr. Mackenzie had placed before him the necessity of establishing, in the case of Manitoba,

a strong central province from which the Canadian Pacific Railway would radiate east and west as occasion demanded, and I say here now, having fully considered the whole situation, I say here now, with the additional experience of the last five and twenty years, that I fully believe that had Mr. Mackenzie's policy been carried out, had he remained in office, that Manitoba and the North-west Territories at least would have been as far advanced in 1885 as it is to-day in 1903. What we are doing now is practically, and literally almost, to repair the shortcomings which were committed during these eighteen years, and it is not an insignificant thing, it is not a slight thing, that the very track of these railways that we are now considering goes as nearly as possible over the line which had been selected five and twenty years ago by Mr. Mackenzie, and which I well believe the gentlemen of the Canadian Pacific Railway regret exceedingly that they had not been required to adopt themselves.

Now, Sir, we have had placed before us two schemes; there is the scheme of my right hon. friend the First Minister, and there is the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition. With respect to that, I might say with some degree of truth that whereas the hands are hands of Esau, the voice is the voice of Jacob. My hon. friend, peradventure, had been instructed—I will not say dry-nursed, as he objects to that phrase—he had been instructed apparently by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in propounding that scheme to the House. There are two or three things that strike one forcibly on looking at that scheme. I had not the advantage of hearing my hon. friend, but I read what I believe is a correct report of his speech. One suggestion that occurred to me was this, that as Canada east of Montreal had practically ignored my hon. friend and his followers, he thought it would be a good piece of policy to ignore Canada east of Montreal. That was not natural, but I do not know that it was good policy. Looking at the whole scheme, according to such lights as I possess, it struck me forcibly that the leader of the opposition, whatever else he might or might not have done, had certainly supplied my right hon. friend beside me with a very excellent argument in favour of his scheme. So far as I could see, the hon. gentleman proposed to spend a great deal more than would be necessary for us to spend, on any fair construction of the contract we are making with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. He proposed to spend a great deal more than my right hon. friend beside me proposes to spend, and he likewise proposes to get a great deal less for our money. If I followed him correctly, he wants to buy a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, which he would not get for nothing ; he also proposes to double-track it—a somewhat expensive operation—he is willing to purchase the Canada Atlantic Railway, and I suppose double-track and improve that, also an expensive operation. He has views at some convenient time, not stated, but which he might find would come upon him soon, of building a railway along the height of land, too. I am told he is willing to expend a very large sum of money for the purpose of constructing and owning and operating also—an expensive amusement, I may venture to state—the section of road from Port Simpson or some other point on the coast to the edge of the Rocky mountains, and he will likewise, I believe, be prepared to provide for the railways that would be required for the development of the prairie section. Take it all in all, I am inclined to think that for one penny my right hon. friend's scheme would cost, the plan of the leader of the opposition would cost us ten. However, that is a matter which we can discuss or which has been discussed already, and will be further discussed, on another occasion.

Now, Sir, with respect to our policy, I would like to point out to the hon. gentlemen opposite that there is more than one object to be aimed at in this project which is now before the House. Our objects are threefold : we desire in the first place—and that, of course, lies at the base of the scheme we are proposing to the House—to develop, and develop early, the whole of the North-west. We desire, in the second place, to knit together, as far as in us lies, the several sections of this Dominion ; and in the third place, to prevent the diverting of traffic, which unless some such project as this can be carried into effect, is almost certain to occur, I believe to the very considerable detriment of the people of Canada.

Now, under these circumstances and granting that these are worthy ends, worthy of a great party, and a policy to be desired in itself, there are two questions to be asked of us : first of all, can we afford it under the circumstances, and, in the second place, is this the best method. Here, Sir, I will pause for one instant to review an argument preferred by an hon. gentleman on the other side. Now, I hate discussing these questions from a sectional standpoint. I think that in a federated commonwealth like ours, that is the very worst policy ; we must view these questions as a whole, as they will affect all Canada, not as they will affect one or two sections, however important. But if it is necessary to have regard to sectional arguments, and if my hon. friends opposite ask what Ontario is to gain under this project, I must for once answer them according to their own line of argument. I say Ontario has a great deal to gain under this project. I say, Sir, speaking as an Ontarian, that, in the first place, about 1,000 miles of this projected

railway are to be constructed through the northern portion of Ontario, no insignificant advantage, on the whole, to that province. I say, in the second place, that the construction of that road on the terms on which we propose to construct it will bring almost every town and village of the smallest importance in Ontario into direct communication with the whole of the North-west Territories. I say, Sir, in the third place, if there should be any foundation at all for the statement made, apparently on good authority, by the government of Ontario, that the construction of this railway will open, to the advantage of the province and of the Dominion a very large and important section of territory in Ontario, which otherwise might remain for a whole generation locked-up and useless. Sir, if I correctly followed the hon. gentleman who spoke last, I would judge that he approves of about 75 per cent of our scheme. If I followed him correctly, he would find no fault, I think he said he would find no fault, with the construction of this road from North Bay to the coast of the Pacific. It is not very often that a great project can be brought forward by one party and exposed to the criticisms of the other and get as many as 75 per cent good marks. It is some time since I stood my examination in the hall of any college, but if I recollect aright, in my days a gentleman with 75 per cent on his papers generally got first-class honours.

The true objection, although the hon. gentlemen opposite do not dwell very much upon that phase of it, the true objection as far as I could judge and I do not pretend to be a thought reader, that they had to this bargain of ours was that it was too good a one. They would have preferred we should have brought down a vey much worse one. Some of them hinted broadly—and I think inconsiderately—that the bargain is so good, they do not believe that the Grand Trunk Railway will ever live up to it. Well, I am not one of those who believe it to be necessary, in order that a bargain be a good one, that the other party to it should be defrauded or injured in any shape or way. I believe that a really good bargain may be one which is to the advantage of both parties. I think that this is notably an instance of the sort. The Grand Trunk Railway could not finance conveniently a transcontinental railway on its own resources. Strong as may be the hold, it undoubtedly has on a large section of the English public, I think that is rather beyond its power, and the government guarantee is worth many millions to it, if not absolutely indispensable. On the other hand, I equally strongly believe that the government, by the terms it has made, by the mode in which it proposes to deal with this great question, is likely to escape from a sea of difficulties. Sir, were the government to own and operate, as has been suggested, this transcontinental railway, and in particular to own and operate a section so remote as that west of Winnipeg, there would be no end to the demands that would almost of necessity be made upon it for the construction of branches here, there and everywhere, for the lowering of rates, and for concessions in every possible shape and form. I have seen enough in my time of government management of railways, and I do not hesitate to say that, in the present condition of Canada at any rate, under the form of government which subsists in Canada at any rate, it would be highly impolitic and prejudical to the best interests of the country for the government to own and operate a great system of railways. So far our experiments have been costly and not altogether satisfactory; and although I could understand that, under certain and totally different conditions, the policy of government ownership might be a fair subject for discussion. I beg leave to say that, as a rule, if the government is to own and operate railways, it must own and operate them all. I beg leave further to say that our present system of government is one which imposes no end of difficulties in the way of the successful operation of railways.

Not to take the proposition exactly of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, but to take the proposition advanced by several of his followers, what would we have if we had stopped at North Bay? Given the desirability of having an all-Canadian route, it is plain that we have taken the only possible way in which that can be attained. In this business, I hold that it is idle, and worse than idle, to discuss the commercial side alone. While I grant that that is a very important side of it, still after all it is but one side of a great national question like this. That is the greatest difficulty which besets us in the task of opening up and settling and consolidating the various sections of this Dominion. Every man who has traversed that country, or who has examined the map, will agree that the greatest practical and pressing difficulty in the matter of consolidating the interests of the various portions of Canada, lies in the huge gap we have to bridge which extends from the borders of Manitoba nearly to the province of Quebec. At this moment that bridge, as it was described lately by Sir William Van Horne, can only be traversed by one single track railway. The difficulty is accentuated by the fact that there is a large influx of immigrants coming in from the United States. In many respects those are the choicest we can get, the very best settlers that can come in. They are men of experience and capital, who will not be daunted by a single frost or disaster. They are, in every respect perhaps but one, the very best immigrants that can be had. One thing too may be said of them, that a very large number are men or descendants of men who, in former years, left Canada, and whom we

will be all delighted to welcome back to our territories. But while that is perfectly true, we must also remember that these men, from the necessity of the case, unless they are provided speedily with rapid means of communication, will tend to throw their traffic and commerce southward instead of eastward. That everybody will admit, and the circumstances are such that it is comparatively easy for them to do it. That, in my opinion, is the justification for the government of Canada incurring very considerable expense and taking very considerable risk for the purpose of securing as soon as we can, and on the best terms we can, another line of railway communication from older Canada to the new settlements. If we can create settlement along that new line, as there is reasonable hope we may do, no doubt we can go a very long way towards overcoming these difficulties. But my right hon. friend was perfectly right when he said time presses. At the best it will be some years before we can put this railway of ours into operation. In the meantime, population is pouring into the west, I am happy to say, at the rate of from 100,000 to 150,000 per year, and there is every reasonable probability that they will continue to do so (if they find railway facilities are being provided for them) during the next four or five years. At this moment, although a very large number of the immigrants who have come in have hardly had time to break the sod, the resources of the two systems, which are now operating in the North-west, are taxed, as everybody knows, to the utmost to meet the demands of the settlers. What will they be five years hence when five hundred thousand or six hundred thousand of additional settlers will have found their way to the prairies of the Saskatchewan or the Peace river valley? It is impossible for us to entirely prevent the tendency of trade to go south, and it would be absurd for us to attempt to prohibit it, but we have it in our power to provide other channels, and for this purpose, the aid of the Grand Trunk Railway is likely to be invaluable. For this purpose, we require, as in former days, the Canadian Pacific Railway required, to establish a system bringing our new line into communication with the majority of the people of Canada. Any man who knows anything of the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway knows that it was in the greatest difficulties until it had supplied itself with a system, such as the Grand Trunk Railway now has ready made; and my right hon. friend never showed his statesmanship better than when he seized the opportunity which the Grand Trunk Railway placed in his hand—the opportunity of securing the aid of a going concern with ramifications extending throughout the Dominion. Why, at the very outset a great volume of trade will be supplied to this new line of railway, which could be obtained by no other means whatever.

And, there is another consideration which it may be as well for the House to bear in mind. The Grand Trunk Railway has numerous connections. It is already extended to Chicago; and if we were to refuse to cooperate with it, if we were to refuse to accept the hand which is stretched out to us, the Grand Trunk Railway, beyond all question, would find its way into Manitoba and the North-west, but not through Canadian territory.

I do not know whether my friends opposite, I do not know whether my friends beside me, have appreciated the full significance of this fact, that, as the crow flies, the distance from Winnipeg to Chicago is just 700 miles, if the Grand Trunk so desired, it would be quite possible for it to obtain a very easy and effective entrance into the North-west through American territory. It is quite true—and there is the advantage we possess—that in any such attempt as that it would be impossible to get aid from us for the construction of a transcontinental railway. But, I repeat that if we do not choose to accept the offer they make, we should only have ourselves to blame, and we could not reasonably pass censure upon them if they avail themselves of their present connections and run their line to the North-west in that way.

Let me review the objections which my hon. friends opposite have brought forward. Those objections, as I took them down are in brief as follows: They demand that we shall have surveys and that we shall take more time. They allege though, I think, inconsiderately and without fairly estimating the value of the concessions which have been made to us by the Grand Trunk, that the price is much too high. They allege that we ignore great centres of commerce. Some allege that this road should be owned all through by the government, some that it should be owned and operated all through by the government. Now, Sir, as I have said, I was one of those who, two and thirty years ago, took part in the debates on the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Unfortunately, there are few left to bear witness to what took place then, but I assure the House that we know at the very least, a thousand times more of the route we are proposing to traverse than did the gentlemen who agreed, in 1871, to build the Canadian Pacific Railway within a period of ten years. Why, Sir, it took ten years before they could find a practicable route through British Columbia; and it is my profound belief that, as the late lamented Sir John A. Macdonald did not know, when he made the treaty of Washington, whether he had the right to navigate the Yukon or not, so neither he nor his colleagues, when they made that bargain with British Columbia, knew whether they would have to cross one ridge of mountains or twenty. Certainly, surveys should be made, and they will be made and are being made; and most as-

suredly the government and the Grand Trunk would be guilty of the most consummate folly and imbecility if they did not make sure to have proper surveys made, and make sure that a proper line could be constructed, before they spent a cent of public money on that construction. And, in this bargain that we have made we are taking all reasonable precautions on that score. It is in the highest degree, not merely our interest, but the interest of the Grand Trunk Railway, which stands behind the Grand Trunk Pacific, in the first place, that the road should be well built, and, in the next place, that the road should be as cheaply built as it can be, consistent with durability. They have every interest to have it so built. They have undertaken to operate it, and we have bound them in severe penalties to operate it. They have undertaken to pay interest on the whole amount spent in construction of the road, and in that way the people and the government have good security that reasonable precautions will be taken to build the road well and on reasonable terms.

Now, Sir, I have listened with some interest to the calculations as to the probable cost to the country of this road which we propose to construct. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter), who spoke last, intimated that it would cost about $150,000,000. He did not condescend to details, but those, as he said, were a matter which might be conveniently deferred to another time. I have made some calculations, too. I agree with the hon. gentleman that we assume a large liability ; but after all, the large liability must be measured by the cost to the people of Canada. And I say this, that if the plan we have laid down be carried out, if the Grand Trunk fulfil the stipulations we have made with them, it will be found that the statement made by the Premier is literally correct, and that we shall not require to spend on this road more than an interest payment of about $2,000,000 a year for a period of seven years. It is quite true that for another period of three years on certain portions of the line, the interest may be capitalized. But on that interest so capitalized we shall draw interest. Therefore, the Premier was undoubtedly correct in saying that, if the bargain be implemented—and we have taken all reasonable security that it will be implemented—we shall have this result, we shall have a road, 3,500 miles, available for the people of Canada, and in large part owned by the people, for a total expenditure of about $14,000,000. Sir, I do not wish to make unpleasant comparisons, but this is a contrast with the arrangements that were made by which at least $100,000,000 was given as a free gift, without any ownership by the government of any part of the line, to the gentlemen who constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway.

But, Sir, what are the general results that we may reasonably hope for from the project we are now discussing ? I will take first of all that section as to which there will probably be least dispute, that is to say, the prairie section. Now, in that section for, probably, a distance of 1,000 miles you may depend on taking your road through a reasonably fertile country, the vast proportion of which may probably be used for agricultural purposes. I am under correction, but this is a calculation which has been frequently made by railroad experts, and, I think, is substantially true, that where a railway passes through a fertile country such as the North-west, every mile of railway will practically provide homes for about 100 settlers, and their families, that is to say, for a distance up to fifteen or twenty miles on each side of the road. I do not think anybody will very seriously object to that estimate. As I have said, the settlers pouring into that country are settlers of the very best quality, settlers with capital, with experience, settlers who, given the road, will probably at once make use of it to the best possible advantage. They are at once large producers and large consumers. Here let me call the attention of the House to the well-known fact that, for the first four or five years at any rate, the rapidity or progress in a prairie country is out of all proportion to the rapidity of progress in a wooded country. I do not say that, after a certain lapse of time, the wooded country may not hold its own; but I do say that before this road comes into actual operation, there is every reason to believe that the vast bulk of settlers going in there, especially the settlers from older Canada and the United States will be very large producers indeed. I do not wish to exaggerate or to draw any pictures which we may be accused hereafter of painting in too rosy colours ; nevertheless, I believe that with the advantages which modern agriculturists possess, there is every reasonable ground to hope that the bulk of these settlers, some more and some less, will average a production of something like $1,000 a year. And I invite the House to consider, if that calculation be a fair one—and my hon. friends from the North-west Territories, I think, can bear testimony to the fact that, within five years a great many settlers known to them have succeeded in doing better than I estimate—what would be the worth of 100,000 settlers to the people of Canada ? I have said nothing of what may be called the possibilities, of what may be hoped from the great stretch of country from Quebec to Winnipeg. Nevertheless, if you are to put any dependence upon the surveys made by the Ontario government, which have taken a considerable space of time, and which have been taken without any reference to this projected railway of ours, there is every reason to believe that a very large tract of good agricultural country will be added to the resources of this country. I say nothing of the British Columbia sec-

tion. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the construction of the road through British Columbia means easy access to the territory we possess in the Klondike, to which it is becoming more and more desirable we should have easy access within a reasonable space of time; and quite possibly it may lead to the development of other equally rich Klondikes after that road is built. Now, Sir, what we hope to do, what we propose to do, what I think we can do, is this: By the construction of this railroad we can probably provide homes within a reasonable space of time for something like a million, or it may be two millions of people, in addition to those who will locate themselves along other lines which are now opened or being opened throughout the North-west.

Sir, it is alleged that we are taking risks in this matter. I do not desire to deny it, we are taking risks, no question about it. But I would like to know when any great national project was ever successfully put through unless the government that proposed it and the people that took it up were willing to take certain risks. But what we say is that we have guarded those risks well. We say that as the scheme stands we are providing a traffic that we could provide in no other way, and we are taking all reasonable precautions that this road shall be well built and cheaply built. Here let me say one word as to another objection which I notice has been taken to our project and that is that these lines to a certain extent will parallel other lines within the fertile belt. Now, my opinion is, and I give it for what it is worth, that within due limits, it is a great advantage, in dealing with a country such as we have to deal with there, a country which may be roughly defined as consisting of a fertile belt having an average breadth of 200 miles and an average length of 1,000 miles or thereabouts—I say it is a great advantage that a system of railroads should be put through which are in reasonable proximity to each other. In my judgment, in a country like this, groups of population should not be strung out at great distances from each other. I think it is a great advantage on the other hand that the population should be concentrated that the population should be, I won't say dense, but at any rate sufficiently close together to enable them to enjoy the advantages they have been accustomed to enjoy in older sections.

More than that, in all the journeys I have made through the North-west I have noticed, and the older and more observant settlers have noticed the same thing, that one of the great dangers which we have to guard against in the North-west is the temptation, particularly in a fertile country like that, recklessly to impoverish the land by taking from it a succession of grain crops and attending to nothing else. Now, I think that the multiplication of railways and the consequent concentration of population is one of the best means you can devise for the purpose of averting such a danger. How real the danger is, those who have paid any attention to the progress of agriculture in the United States can testify. It is on record that in many sections of the United States, probably quite as fertile as the North-west, the grain crops have fallen from thirty bushels an acre to twenty bushels, to fifteen bushels, to twelve bushels, to ten bushels, to eight bushels. That is the record of American agriculture, and that is a danger we desire to avert in the North-west. That is one of the questions that, if he continues in his present position, it is the intention of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture to devote his special attention to, and it is one in respect to which, if we are wise, we will profit by the errors and the mistakes of our neighbours.

Sir it appears to me, there are three things absolutely essential to the progress of the North-west. One of those, as I have said, is to supply a sufficient number of railroads to meet the needs of transport, and thoroughly to develop the country. Another thing, I think and in saying this I may differ in opinion from some hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially from the hon. gentleman who spoke last—another thing is a just system of taxation under which the people should receive a fair reward for their labours. A third thing, I believe, is the establishment of sound principles of farming which I trust we will see to it shall prevail in the North-west. Now I do not very often read newspaper quotations——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is rather rough on some of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues who read newspaper extracts.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have not noticed that my hon. friends read newspaper extracts. But, I have here an opinion from a Conservative journalist and a gentleman who, I believe, gave a considerable amount of trouble to some of my friends at the recent election. I will read what a Conservative journalist and a Conservative speaker of considerable merit, I believe, had to say in respect to my right hon. friend's scheme. That gentleman writes:

> The inhabitants of the territories would be justified in welcoming the Grand Trunk if for one reason only. That reason, which stands out, to my mind, in bold and convincing relief is that not one of the burdens or abuses which the territories have complained of in the Canadian Pacific Railway charter are to be found in the Grand Trunk proposal.
>
> If the territories were asked to contribute of their remaining wild lands to the Grand Trunk, then might we well pause, and ask ourselves whether we were not paying too great a price for the road. But the territories do not give an acre. There is no cash bonus; and the territories do not give a dollar. We shall have the Grand Trunk with spur lines and branch

lines opening up the country north and south of it ; we shall have the evil spell of monopoly and one-road ascendancy broken absolutely without any first cost to ourselves. With another outlet to the two oceans, and the control of the rates in the hands of the government, should we not be even as the ass that brayeth, if we troubled ourselves very much about the Intercolonial, or hybridization, or any such secondary matters ? Truly we should.

If there were any exemption from taxes we might have cause to kick vigorously. But there is no tax exemption. The Grand Trunk will come in as a great taxpayer. It will contribute its share to the expense of schools and roads and bridges. Instead of being a legalized pirate, preying on the labour of the people, it will be a help to school districts, local improvement districts, and to towns and villages. This seems to me an important consideration ; and who in the territories would like to assume the responsibility of keeping out this company which will help develop the country as a taxpayer as well as a common carrier.

If the Grand Trunk were receiving a cash bonus, then we in the territories might complain, and say we had given enough of our lands to the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railroads, without paying a toll of cash to the Grand Trunk. But as before said, the territories pay not one dollar.

If the Grand Trunk were coming into the territories with power to impose whatever rates it chose on the people of the territories, then I would indeed be the first to call a halt, till the people had protection. But the Grand Trunk will not be like the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will not have a free hand and a cloudy charter under which it can demand whatever tale of brick it chooses to levy. There will be government control of rates.

If the Grand Trunk were coming in with a monopoly of any kind we might well consider whether we had not just cause to look with suspicion on its advent. But it has no monopoly. No disallowance agitation will ever be necessary.

The Grand Trunk Pacific will, in my humble opinion, be a boon to Canada at large, and to no part of Canada more than to the territories. As an old resident of the territories I welocme it as the best and most encouraging event that has ever crossed the horizon of the prairie country ; and if I might venture one word of advice to my fellow residents in the territories it is that they study the matter on its merits, and refuse to allow any mere question of party to influence them when the development, and to a large extent the whole future, of the territories are in the balance.

For if we do not get this road, what is there in sight that will do one tithe as much for us as we may reasonably expect from this new trunk road?

I think, Sir, that testimony, from a consistent opponent of the government, both with his pen and with his voice, is not to be entirely disregarded.

Mr. HEYD. Who was it ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. A gentleman by the name of Hawkes, the editor of a Conservative paper somewhere up in the Territories.

Mr. DAVIS. At Carnduff ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I dare say my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) knows something of him. I think he has heard from Mr. Hawkes of the delinquencies of the present government on more than one occasion, as I have knowledge. Now, Sir, as I have said, given these conditions, it appears to me that the future of the North-west is reasonably assured. It appears to me that every cent we may expend we are justified in believing we will have returned to the public treasury tenfold by the policy we have entered into. If the scheme is carried out on the lines we have laid down, then, Sir, I venture to say that before five years have expired, by the end of which time we expect a large proportion of this road will be in active operation, the trade and commerce of this country will have increased, thanks to the production which we may reasonably expect to follow, to such a degree that the duties we will receive on our additional imports will probably in one single year more than implement the entire sum we will require to lay out on this road. And, Sir, in conclusion let me say, that if in 1871, when the revenue of Canada amounted to barely $20,000,000, when the trade and commerce of Canada collectively amounted to barely $17,000,000, we might have had cause to hesitate before we committed ourselves to a project involving a gift of $100,000,000 for the construction of a little over 2,000 miles of road, it does not follow, that in 1903 when the trade and commerce of Canada amounted to $440,000,000 in place of $17,000,000 and the revenue to $66,000,000, in place of $20,000,000 we cannot afford to donate $14,000,000 for the construction of a road 3,500 miles in length.

Hon. J. I. TARTE (Montreal, St. Mary's). Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with the hope of saying anything new in this debate, because the question under discussion has been dealt with from all standpoints. But the position I have occupied and the attention that I have endeavoured to give to the transportation question make it a duty for me to ask the indulgence of the House on this occasion. One thing is cheering. We have not heard anybody during this long and interesting debate talking blue ruin or talking about the absence of the credit of this country. On both sides hon. members of the House have expressed the fullest confidence in the future of Canada and in its ability to grapple with the biggest problems. Mr. Speaker, we possess in the North-west Territories a vast and fertile domain. Last year 100,000,000 bushels of grain of all kinds were grown in those territories, 53,000,000 bushels of wheat in Manitoba, and 14,000,000 bushels of wheat in the territories. During the last couple of years we have heard a good deal about the condition of trade in the west. Complaints have been made to this parliament over and over again. It was said that there were not enough elevators, not enough granaries either in the Territories or at the ter-

minals. The railways had not foreseen the great development that was coming on. They had not supplied themselves with the equipment which they could have, perhaps, provided. Undoubtedly, there was, as I have said, not enough elevators, not enough granaries, and undoubtedly there was not enough rolling stock at the disposal of the railway companies. The congestion existed from the wheat fields to the outlets. There was no congestion from the outlets to the seaboard. About the same congestion took place in the American territories, not quite to the same extent, but a good deal of congestion took place there. The evils of others do not cure our own. I fully recognize, and all men who have given some attention to the condition of affairs in this country have recognized that something ought to be done. I do not share the views of some of our colleagues in this parliament when they say that there has been no question of another transcontinental railway. The question was discussed in the press. It was discussed, specially, perhaps, in the province of Quebec, where the Trans-Canada Railway Company was organized four or five years ago, with the object of constructing a transcontinental railway. However, I do not mean to discuss that side of the question now. Let me call to the attention of parliament the geographical position of Canada. Our North-west Territories are tributary to Lake Superior, differing in that respect from the American states or from a good many of them at any rate. Some of the American states are tributary to Lake Superior, some others are tributary to Lake Michigan, and some others are tributary to the Gulf of Mexico. Our territories are tributary exclusively from the water-way standpoint to Lake Superior. We have no share in the ownership of Lake Michigan. During the last ten or twelve years the tendency of the grain and flour traffic has been towards Lake Superior. The construction of the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie Railway which was completed in 1888, contributed greatly to make Duluth and West Superior more and more the head centres of the grain trade. Let me quote from the 'Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance' of the United States:

> Spring wheat markets, reporting for eleven months, including Minneapolis, Milwaukee, Duluth, and Chicago, have thus far this year received 162,675,462 bushels, against 172,717,364 bushels in 1902 and 146,508,740 bushels in 1901. A marked feature in the wheat trade of the North-west is the concentration of the crop at Minneapolis and Duluth, at the former point for milling and at the latter for lake shipment eastward. More than half of the total receipts have gone to Minneapolis, and there is a steadily increasing volume drawn to that centre of consumption. Duluth likewise has gained in wheat receipts from 18,002,583 bushels in 1901 to 41,465,290 bushels in 1902 and 34,008,376 bushels in 1903. On the contrary, Chicago has been handling a steadily diminishing volume of wheat. From 43,391,337 bushels in 1901 to 38,007,346 bushels in 1902 and 34,761,870 bushels in 1903 is evidence of the change that is gradually taking place in the course of the country's grain trade.

Chicago will, of course, be always one of the most important trade centres for wheat, corn and flour, because it is at the outlet of the corn and soft wheat belt. Our Canadian railways are drawing a good deal of the trade from Chicago, and let us hope that when we have carried out contemplated improvements we will draw to Canada more and more of that western trade. But, again, Lake Superior, is the natural outlet of our Canadian North-west, and the great trade from the American states is being diverted gradually towards Lake Superior. That is the clearest evidence of the strategic importance of Duluth in a commercial sense. Lake Superior is the key of the St. Lawrence route. It is the first link in the great water-way through Canadian channels from the west to the east. From the very beginning of civilization on this continent, the waters between Montreal and the upper lakes were recognized as the natural trade route. In 1798 the North-west Company built the first lock at Sault Ste. Marie to be used by the fur traders in French bateaux and in English boats. That first lock was 38 feet long by eight feet wide, and Mr. Clergue has renovated that interesting relic as a curiosity for those who visit Sault Ste. Marie. I feel that it is unnecessary to say much in support of the superiority of waterways as a means of transportation. That is self-evident, but the two transportation systems, the railways and the waterways are not enemies; they are allies. They must be made to work in harmony. There has been a very severe struggle between the railways and the waterways in the United States. In 1861 the lakes were carrying the greatest quantity of grain and flour, but in 1865 the railways began to encroach on the lake vessels for the carriage of these products, and especially flour. In 1881 the railways were carrying 96 per cent of all the flour transported, and had practically the whole trade in their hands. From that date, however, the lake vessels increased their flour shipments year after year, and to-day they are carrying 40 per cent of the flour from Chicago, as well as a large quantity of corn and a larger quantity of wheat. A great deal of that trade is carried to Buffalo. Chicago has lost ground. I was not in the House when the Minister of Agriculture made his excellent speech, but I notice that he gave figures to show that a large quantity of grain, and flour especially, as well as other products, were being carried from Chicago. Chicago will always be a large centre of trade, as I have said, and the many railways that are centreing there will always bring to it a trade in grain and flour. But it is undoubtedly a fact that Chicago is losing its grain

trade year after year, and for the excellent reason that the wheat fields of some years ago are being displaced, and that the northern states are to-day the wheat-growing states par excellence. Chicago is exceptionally well located as far as railways are concerned. The distances are favourable to Chicago. The distance from Chicago to Buffalo by rail is a little over 500 miles, and the distance by lake is 889 miles. In spite of that, the lake vessels are carry ing from Chicago to-day about 40 per cent of the flour and 70 per cent of the wheat, not quite 70 per cent but over 60 per cent of the wheat. The same thing may be said of Milwaukee. In 1900 only 12 per cent of the flour from Milwaukee was shipped by rail; 39 per cent was shipped by the transit lines and 50 per cent all lake. Let us not lose sight of the fact that a large quantity of the traffic which is represented as being carried all rail is destined for local points for local consumption. Nearly all of the grain, especially of the wheat and corn, which is destined for export is carried by lake. The railways must necessarily carry grain to ports that are not reached by the lakes, and that is the reason that such a large quantity of rail traffic still appears to the credit of Chicago. I have insisted on these points to establish, to the best of my ability, the superiority of water transportation.

Let me quote on that point from the report of the proceedings of a conference that has been held in the month of June of this year. I will quote the words of Mr. Alfred Noble, who is president of the American Society of Civil Engineers :

> The average haul during the season of 1902 on the lakes has been 827·4 miles. The freight was 0·89 mills per ton mile.
>
> If the freight had been carried by rail the average could hardly have been less than three mills per ton-mile.
>
> On this basis, the saving in transportation by the water route during one year was nearly $63,000,000. This amount of saving on Lake Superior commerce alone, during a single year, is within $5,000,000 of the entire amount appropriated by the United States for all harbours and waterways on the lakes above Niagara Falls from the formation of the government; if the commerce between Lake Michigan and Lake Erie be included, the annual saving greatly exceeds the amount thus appropriated. Indeed, the savings during one year on a single article, iron ore, would repay all the money expended up to this time on the waterways and harbours which it traverses on its way from mine to furnace. Viewed in this way, no great investment was ever made by a corporation or government with such a magnificent showing of profit. But a far broader view may be taken justly; this water route has not merely afforded inexpensive transportation, but has been creative of a large part of the wealth of the nation. Without it, the development of our manufactures of iron and steel and other industries dependent on them, related to them, all constituting a great share of the national wealth, would have been retarded or impracticable; without it, the prairies of the North-west would have remained unproductive and unpeopled for a much longer time. With these broad considerations in view, we may place to the credit of lake transportation a sum perhaps hardly definable, but compared to which the largest above mentioned is a mere trifle.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has quoted some rates from Kansas City to Chicago. I did not intend to say anything at all on the question of rates which has been so fully dealt with by many members of this House, but in view of the statements made by the hon. minister, I shall refer briefly to this question. The rates on wheat from Chicago, Duluth, Port Arthur and Fort William to Meaford, Midland, Owen Sound, Goderich and other lake ports this season are between 1⅛ and 1¼ cents and even 1 cent. The highest rate between Chicago and Buffalo in 1902, has been 2½ cents. The lowest rate has been 1⅜ cents, an average for the season of 1·5 cents. Let me compare the rates by rail and canal. The average rate from Chicago to New York by lake and canal in 1900—and the rates were about the same last year—was 4·49 cents; by lake and rail, 5·10 cents; by all-rail, 9·96 cents; The comparison is worth noting.

In 1901 by lake and canal between the same points, that is from Chicago to New York, the rates were as follows: By lake and canal, 5·11 cents; by lake and rail, 5·54 cents; by all-rail, 9·88 cents.

The Duluth rates are the same. I could quote from the reports of the Chicago Board of Trade and of the New York Produce Exchange, but I will not worry the House with quotations of rates which are available to any one who wants to look them up. They all prove in the clearest possible manner that the difference between railway transportation and lake transportation is about 60 per cent in favour of lake transportation, at least 60 per cent.

So far I have quoted the rates of to-day, the rates that have been in force. What are going to be the rates of the future ?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. For about five cents a bushel of corn or wheat is carried from Chicago to New York. We should not forget that Chicago is only 912 miles from New York and about 800 miles from Baltimore and Philadelphia, so that it is in an exceptionally favourable position for railway transportation. What are going to be the rates in the future ? As I have said, grain is carried at the rate of five cents per bushel to-day between Duluth, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and Boston. Our American friends do not mean to stand idle. They do not intend to rest on the laurels they have gained. The legislature of the state of New York has adopted a project

by which $100,000,000 will be spent on the Erie Canal. That canal was started as a ditch. It began with four feet depth, when Governor DeWinton opened it in 1825, and was only able to carry vessels of seventy-five tons capacity. It was subsequently improved and is to-day seven feet deep. A few years ago the state legislature voted a pretty large amount to deepen it to nine feet. The work was stopped because it was found too expensive, but last year the legislature voted $100,000,000 to deepen it to twelve feet. If the electorate of the state of New York ratifies the vote of the legislature, the canal will then be able to accommodate barges of a thousand tons capacity. The average rate on a bushel of wheat in the Erie canal to-day is 2½ cents; and it is estimated that when the improvements to which I have just alluded, are carried out, the cost of carrying a bushel of wheat will be reduced to one-half cent or one cent per bushel. Then where will you be? It costs one and a-half cent from Chicago, from Duluth, from Fort William and the Georgian Bay ports to Buffalo, to carry a bushel of wheat. It has cost so far three cents or three cents and a-half in the summer to carry a bushel of wheat by rail to Buffalo and two and a half cents by the Erie canal. If the rates should be reduced to one-half or one cent between Buffalo and New York, I ask again where you are going to be and what you are going to do? Our American friends have improved their organization on the lakes in a marvellous manner. I had the advantage of making a round trip on the lakes last year. I visited nearly all the American harbours on those inland waters. I was amazed at the energy and activity that the Americans have displayed. Their organization is simply perfect. We must not be surprised at the great volume of lake trade. Lake vessels have been built with great rapidity. In 1881 the number of American vessels on the lakes was 4,000. In 1890 that number had increased to 10,555. In 1899 the number of American vessels in the lakes had risen to 20,255, and at this moment, if I am not mistaken, the number of American vessels on the lakes is 22,000. They have improved the St. Mary river and the Detroit river and deepened it to a depth of nineteen feet. Their vessels carry to-day, thanks to those improvements, as much as 250,000 bushels of grain. The size is increasing year by year. The Americans are contemplating adding an additional foot of depth on the St. Mary and Detroit rivers. Instead of nineteen feet, they will have twenty feet, which means an addition of ten per cent to the capacity of their large ships. Those waterways, the St. Mary river, the Detroit river, and the lakes, are buoyed and lighted up as the streets of Montreal and Toronto. Ships of the largest tonnage can navigate those channels just as safely at night as in the day time. The result of their improvement has been simply marvellous. I have just given the number of ships that are navigating those waters. They number 22,000 now and the rates have been decreased from year to year as fast as the improvements have taken place. When there were only fifteen feet of water from Lake Superior to Lake Erie, the freight rates, for instance, on iron were $2 per ton. As soon as there were nineteen feet depth, the rate fell to $1 per ton. In every port of any importance, there are elevators of the most modern kind. Duluth and Lake Superior ports are gaining rapidly on Chicago, as wheat and flour centres. Duluth and West Superior have twenty-two elevators, with a capacity of 34,000,375 bushels. Buffalo has twenty-eight elevators, with a capacity of 21,390,000 bushels. St. Paul and Minneapolis have forty-two elevators, of a capacity of 34,475,000. In connection with those elevators, there are flour mills in Duluth, West Superior, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, Buffalo—in fact in all the harbours worthy of mention. Those elevators are not all of the elevating kind, but there are storage elevators, which are used in connection with elevating machinery. I think that the best elevators in the United States are at Duluth. How are those storage elevators used? All the grain from the west cannot possibly be shipped in two or three months. Shipments of grain begin in September and terminate in December at the outside. The reason why the Americans have equipped Duluth, Chicago, West Superior, St. Paul with these elevators of more than a million of bushels capacity each, is because they have realized that they cannot possibly ship all their grain in two or three months. They ship all the grain they can in the season of navigation, then they store in their elevators all the grain that the different railways carry from their wheat fields. A good deal of that grain is used for milling purposes. A certain quantity is shipped to the seaboard, but very little. Let me remind all those who take some interest in the transportation question, that very little grain is handled in the winter months. Let my hon. friends look at the reports of the Chicago and Duluth boards of trade and the New York Exchange, and they will find that the largest quantity of grain is handled in the summer months, especially September and October. The grain that is shipped in the summer season is shipped to the different ports. We speak often of New York, Boston and Portland. But let us not forget that Philadelphia, Baltimore and Newport News are also very important reshipping points indeed. In the winter months, as soon as the season of navigation is opened, the railways raise their rates. I said a moment ago that the rates between Buffalo and New York were between three cents and three and one-half cents during

the season of navigation. But the very day the season of navigation closes the rates go up to five cents.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Will my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tarte) permit me to ask him a question ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Certainly.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Does that refer to wheat or to corn ? Corn shipped from American ports is generally grown south, and shipped earlier than wheat, which grows further north.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Chicago is the most important centre, of course, and rates are about the same for corn as for wheat, and they are about what I have quoted. There may be a fraction of difference at times, but the rates are just about as I have given them.

Well, Sir, bearing these facts and figures in mind, bearing in mind the plain and undeniable fact that grain is carried by our American competitors for the rates I have quoted, what is our position and what are we going to do ? My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has built up an argument by quoting the rates between Kansas city and Chicago. He told us that wheat had been carried for five cents per bushel between these two points.

Mr. BROCK. Five cents per hundred pounds ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) has made a mistake, unwillingly no doubt. The regular rates between Kansas city and Chicago are nineteen cents per 100 pounds. Let me say immediately that the rates from points on the western Canadian side and the American side are about the same. A good deal has been said in this parliament as to the hign rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern. Without quoting the figures, let me say, in a general way, that the rates are practically the same for the same distance. Or rather, I should say that the American railways, the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern, for instance, have a shorter haulage than the Canadian Pacific Railway has. Yet, their rates for that shorter haulage are about the same as the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway for about double the haul.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) will permit me, may I ask if he is speaking of the through rates from the west or the local rates ?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I speak of the rates from the wheat fields of the American west and of the Canadian west to the outlet on the lakes. The rates are about the same. Well, I ask again, what are we going to do ? Are we able to compete with our American friends ? In my humble opinion we can, by taking the proper means. If we want to compete with them, I think we must take our lessons from them and from our own experience. Some of our hon. friends on the other side of the House have often told us and some have repeated the statement during this debate, that the present cabinet never did much for transportation. Well, I am, to a certain extent responsible for what has been done and what has not been done. All that I wanted done has not been done. I will refer to that later on. But the question of what we have not done is, after all, of less importance that the question of what we ought to do. In what position are we ? We are joint owners of the great lakes, except Lake Michigan. Now, here are some figures showing relative distances :

	Miles.
Chicago to Depot Harbour, via lakes.. ..	579
Depot Harbour to Port of Montreal, via rail..	379
Total	958
Chicago to Buffalo via lake..	889
Buffalo to New York via New York Central..	440
Total	1,329

Difference in favour of the St. Lawrence route and the port of Montreal, 321 miles.

	Miles.
Duluth to Depot Harbour via lake..	644
Depot Harbour to Montreal via rail.. ..	379
Total	1,023
Duluth to Buffalo via lake..	997
Buffalo to New York via New York Central..	440
Total..	1,437

Difference in favour of Montreal, 414 miles.

	Miles.
Port Arthur to Depot Harbour..	510
Distance to Midland about the same.	
New York to Liverpool..	3,105
Montreal to Liverpool..	2,821
Difference in our favour..	284

Sir, nothing is better fitted to educate us than facts. Let us see what Mr. Booth is doing to-day. Mr. Booth is a simple individual, a gentleman of large means, but he is only one man. He has built a railway. He started it as a colonization railway, and a railway to serve his own lumber business, but to-day he is carrying a vast amount of grain. I shall never forget an occasion when I was making an address at a banquet in the city of Montreal. My neighbour to the left happened to be a railway magnate. I had studied with some care the location of Mr. Booth's road and had given a good deal of attention to our geographical position. In my address I said that in my opinion Mr. Booth's road was destined to a great futrue, that it would before long carry millions and millions of bushels of grain. I was interrupted by my

neighbour in a voice loud enough to be heard 'rot.' I kept cool, but I felt that I would have my revenge by and by. A couple of years after, Mr. Booth published a statement saying that he had handled 20 million bushels of grain by the Canada Atlantic Railway. I took the statement to the railway magnate, one of my best friends, and I said to him 'rot.' He asked me what I meant, and I reminded him of his interruption. Mr. Booth is competing to-day with the great American railways, not only for the grain trade and the flour trade, but for trade of all kinds. He has a fleet on the lakes of six boats; four are under American register, for the good reason that he is handling not only Canadian trade but a larger volume of American trade, and is consequently obliged to use American registered boats. Mr. Booth will carry this year over twenty million bushels of grain from Depot Harbour. He would handle fifty million bushels of corn and wheat if he could get accommodation in Montreal or elsewhere. That simple but eloquent fact is the strongest evidence of what we are capable of doing if we only do the right thing and do it now.

Lake Superior is the headquarters of the trade, but at the same time all the lakes are tributary to the St. Lawrence route. The distance from Milwaukee, from Chicago, from Duluth is shorter to Canadian ports, to the port of Montreal, than to the ports of Buffalo and New York; in other words, a bushel of grain can be carried cheaper from those ports to the Georgian Bay ports than it can be carried to the port of Buffalo—it cannot be carried, at any rate, at the same rate, because the distance is longer than by our route. Depot Harbour is not the only harbour on the Georgian bay, all the harbours on the Georgian bay can be trade centres for grain and traffic. There are to-day, Midland, Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound, and on Lake Huron, Goderich—all these harbours are reservoirs of grain. A large quantity of grain is carried, not only from Canadian points but especially from American points, to these Canadian harbours. Why is it so? Because they are located in such a way that they offer more advantages. If they were equipped as the American harbours are equipped, they would handle a great deal more trade.

To help us to compete with the Americans we have two systems: The all-water system through our lakes and canals, and the lake and rail system. I had the honour of being Minister of Public Works six years and a half. A year ago last January, I presented to the right hon. gentleman, then my leader, and to my colleagues, a memorandum which was the result of my investigations on the transportation question. Before the estimates were discussed I thought it my duty to place before my colleagues a report expressing my views, and giving the result of the attention I had bestowed upon the transportation question. I then advised my colleagues to take up energetically the question of the waterways from the head of Lake Superior down to the sea. Starting by the all-water system I advised the equipment of Fort William and the further equipment of Port Colborne. Fort William and Port Arthur are the natural and necessary outlets of our North-west domain. It would be necessary in my humble opinion to spend a pretty large amount of money to place those two harbours in a proper condition to handle trade.

The Department of Public Works is carrying out a certain amount of work now. The Mission river, which is the outlet of the Kaministiquia river to the lake should immediately be widened and deepened to a depth of 20 feet for the reason that the ice accumulates at the entrance of Port Arthur harbour. By deepening the Mission river we would certainy get two or three weeks' additional navigation in the fall months which would mean a good deal indeed. I suppose a half a million dollars could accomplish that particular work at Fort William. I beg to call the attention of my former colleagues to the statement I am making now. I have studied the question carefully, I have been to the spot on several occasions and let me tell them that I know what I am talking about. Then, following our way down the lakes, I would say that all the waters should be overhauled. We should have on the lakes testing machines, as we have on the St. Lawrence, so as to be sure that we have the depth of water that we say we have in our reports, and so as to be sure that there is no obstacle to navigation. At Port Colborne a couple of million dollars should be spent, and I will tell the House how, in my humble opinion, it should be spent. The Public Works Department is completing the breakwater on the north side of the harbour. That breakwater will not be sufficient. That port cannot be used by ships for loading and unloading unless there is another breakwater on the other side. The waves on Lake Erie are nearly as big as on the Atlantic ocean, and unless you protect the ships you cannot possibly handle the trade there. I was advising my colleagues in the memo. which I hold in my hand, that an elevator and warehouses ought to be built at Port Colborne, and that the port should be equipped as a national harbour. Before I started for the Paris exhibition my colleagues were good enough to permit me to place in the estimates of the Department of Public Works the sum of $250,000 for an elevator at the port of Montreal. I had advised, and my advice had been accepted by my former colleagues, the building of an elevator at Port Colborne, at the port of Montreal and at Lévis. I will explain later on why I gave that advice then. At Port Colborne we should immediately make the necessary expenditure

to provide a harbour that would allow the large boats in the carrying trade on the lakes to load and unload. On the American side, Buffalo, with its 22 elevators, with its magnificent improvements, with its good and safe harbour; on the Canadian side, nothing. We are in that position. We are public carriers. We have spent $80,000,000 in building our system of canals. It is not surprising that we are not handling more trade in our canals. We have no equipment. It would be necessary to spend a couple of million dollars to make Port Colborne what it should be. There is an obstacle at that point to which I have called the attention of the House. When a ship loaded too heavily to go through the Welland canal arrives at the entrance it is obliged to light its cargo. The Grand Trunk Railway Company has a small elevator at Port Colborne and another one at Port Dalhousie. The Grand Trunk Railway charges 2 cents a bushel to carry grain for 27 miles; in other words, it costs more to carry a bushel of grain between these two points, 27 miles apart, than it costs to take it from Chicago to Buffalo, Port Colbourne or to Depot Harbour. That state of affairs should be put an end to immediately. The government should either acquire that piece of railway or take some means to give relief to the trade. If we want our water-ways to compete with the American water-ways we must take means to bring about that result. The distance between Port Colborne and Montreal is 367 miles, out of which there are 63 miles of canals, and the balance is composed of lake navigation. As I have said, that part of our Canadian system of navigation should be overhauled with the greatest care. The Department of Railways and Canals has had charge in the past of these water-ways. I do not want to make any unfair reproach, but I know that our water-ways have not been overhauled and taken care of as they should have been taken care of. The government should overhaul them without delay. The channels should be made wider, they should be made deeper, and they should be made as safe as American waters are. Now, we have reached the port of Montreal. I advised my former colleagues in the same memo. to make in that important harbour the necessary expenditure to make it free as far as it is possible to do so. Montreal is not a local port. It is the head of navigation. It is the centre where the trade from the lakes accumulates and it is also the centre where ocean navigation comes up. We have, in the port of Montreal, been borrowing money on which the harbour commissioners have paid interest so far. The trade is increasing and there is no doubt whatever that the harbour commissioners will be able to continue to pay their interest. They will honour the obligations that they are incurring. There is no doubt as to that, but that is not the point. If by not making the port of Montreal as free as it can be made, we oblige the trade to pay tolls, that is an impediment in the way of the development of our trade. The debt of the port of Montreal, with the advance that parliament has allowed this year, will reach the very large amount of $10,000,000. Let me ask my former colleagues in the House to weigh my humble words. This is a mistake that parliament is committing. The St. Lawrence route, if we want to compete with the American route, must be made as free and as cheap as it is possible to make it. I do not mean to say that there shall be no charges at all in our national harbours. But we should only exact tolls sufficient to enable us to pay the cost of maintenance and nothing more. Let us make our national ports free as we have made the canals free. It would be necessary to spend in the port of Montreal at least $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 to properly equip that port. The warehouses that must be built, if we want to handle trade, will certainly cost $3,000,000. The wharfs that are being built to-day are not sufficient to give accommodation. The Grand Trunk Railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway will tell you that they cannot direct more trade to the port of Montreal because they have no accommodation there. That fact is indisputable. I had advised my colleagues in that memo. to expend the money necessary to build an elevator, to build new wharfs, to equip the port with cranes and every other modern implement that we find in every well equipped harbour in the world. Since that memo. was handed to the right hon. gentleman, the harbour commissioners of Montreal, under the direction of the Department of Public Works, have started to build an elevator with borrowed money. Sir, the government should lose no time in assuming the debt of the port of Montreal to the extent at any rate of every future expenditure including the advance that has been made this year. I am not speaking from a Montreal standpoint; I am speaking from the standpoint of the St. Lawrence route from beginning to end.

In speaking of the elevators in the west I forgot to mention that it cost four cents a bushel to store grain the whole winter season in Duluth, Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul. I make this statement now because it will be necessary to refer to it later on.

We should not, I say, lose any time in carrying out the necessary policy to make the port of Montreal as free as it can be made. Let us not borrow any money. Let the government assume not only the debt, but the management of the port of Montreal. Montreal is the terminal of our Canadian canal system. Is it reasonable that this country, having spent $80,000,000 on canals, and spending large sums of money to-day to equip our harbours on the lakes and to deepen and widen the St. Lawrence

river; is it reasonable that the terminals should not be in our own hands? Is it a good policy? I have nothing to say against the Montreal harbour commissioners, but I do say that the system is bad. I have been long enough a minister to know that the system is thoroughly inefficient. Twelve or thirteen men meet there a couple of hours a week; business men who have their occupations waiting for them. They discuss matters in a very light way at times. I do not make any personal allusions, for I speak of the past commissioners just as I do of the present ones. The work costs at least 30 per cent more than it should cost, and the work is not attended to as it should be. There is nobody responsible. I am speaking within hearing of friends from Montreal who know that I am speaking the truth, and not all the truth either. The commissioners are men of good-will, but they are not competent for that kind of business. A minister is responsible to this parliament; the government is responsible to this House; you can lay your hand on them when they make a mistake, but the harbour commissioners are irresponsible, and you cannot do anything with them. They do the best they can, but I repeat that they are not competent to handle a large proposition like the most important harbour of this country. Last year the trade of the Montreal harbour reached the wonderful amount of $191,000,000, being nearly half the total trade of this country. Is it reasonable that such a harbour should not be under the control of the nation itself?

I had advised my colleagues to equip the ports of Three Rivers and Quebec; the St. Lawrence route for me is all the one thing. I had advised the building of elevators at Three Rivers and at Lévis. The government has reduced the plans that my department, under my direction, had prepared for the harbour works at Quebec. I believe they made a mistake in reducing these plans, but nevertheless they are doing a useful work. In Quebec they are perhaps a little better off than we are in Montreal; they are, of course, not handling the vast quantity of trade that Montreal handles, but nevertheless the port of Quebec is not eqpipped as it should be.

I had also advised the beginning of what is called the Georgian Bay canal. I do not advise the whole project immediately, but I did advise the immediate improvement of the French river. The distances have not perhaps been given the attention that they should receive, and I propose to state what they are here. From Fort William to Buffalo the distance is 750 miles, and from Fort William to North Bay the distance is 543 miles, difference in favour of North Bay of 207 miles. The distance from Duluth to Buffalo is 857 miles, and from Duluth to North Bay 575 miles, a distance in favour of North Bay of 282 miles. The distance from Milwaukee to Buffalo is 716 miles, and from Milwaukee to North Bay 463 miles, a difference in favour of North Bay of 253 miles. The distance from Chicago to Buffalo is 733 miles, and from Chicago to North Bay 520 miles, a difference of 213 miles in favour of North Bay.

That work from the mouth of the French river to North Bay would cost in the neighbourhood of $5,000,000. It has been represented to me on several occasions that the distance to Midland, another Georgian Bay port, is about the same as to North Bay, and there is something in that point.

Mr. CLARKE. Depot Harbour the same.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, it is. All these harbours on the Georgian bay are within a few miles of the same distance. There is perhaps something in that point, but let us not forget that we must not think only of to-day, and we must not think only of one railway line. The Canadian Pacific Railway have no harbour on the lakes except at Owen Sound, from which trade cannot be profitably carried to the eastern ports. The improvement of the French river would, no doubt, induce the Canadian Pacific Railway to place a fleet on the lakes. But while we were discussing the French river scheme, another discussion took place, and in these negotiations the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and myself took part. It was represented that if the Canadian Pacific Railway could be induced to extend its line from Peterborough to Midland, a distance of 100 miles, both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway could work from that port to the St. Lawrence route. It was in view of the possibility of such an arrangement being made, and after having several interviews with Mr. Hays, that I did not insist more during the last session of parliament that my colleagues should immediately provide money to begin the works on the French river. The two schemes are worthy of consideration. My own opinion is that both could be carried out with advantage, and that there would be trade enough for the two routes. However, if the French river scheme and the Georgian Bay canal cannot be started immediately, let us not lose sight of the Peterborough and Midland project.

In connection with these improvements in the harbours on the great lakes and in the port of Montreal, the improvements of the St. Lawrence itself must be taken into account and brought to a speedy completion. I expect that within the next two seasons the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal will be thoroughly deepened to a depth of 30 feet and widened to 450 feet in the straight parts. There were about 65 miles of dredging to be done, and I suppose that there are now nearly 40 miles completed, as all the dredges are at work. May I call the special attention of my hon.

friend the Prime Minister himself to the immediate necessity of better buoying and better lighthouses and better fog signals on the St. Lawrence from the straits of Belle Isle up. Let me tell him that after the numerous trips I have made on the St. Lawrence route from Belle Isle up, I have come to the conclusion that the St. Lawrence route has not been attended to as it should have been and that it is not to-day receiving the attention it should. The Prime Minister himself should take that matter in hand. The Department of Marine and Fisheries should be strengthened.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Well, I mean strengthened as far as officials are concerned. We had better have strong officials; let us have officials who would listen to instead of resisting arguments. I have nothing to say against the present officials. I know one thing, that when the minister does not travel himself he is making a mistake. Now, we have accidents—we will have accident after accident, unless better attention is given to the St. Lawrence. The pilotage system should be attended to without any delay; it is bad. The St. Lawrence, I say it again, is not attended to as it should be and what is the result? The result is that the insurance rates are higher from the ports of Montreal and Quebec than from American ports. There is no great danger between Quebec and Montreal; if a boat grounds it only scratches its bottom a little, that is all. But if unfortunately a boat is grounded in the gulf, well, the scratch is a little deeper, the ship is lost and then up go the insurance rates.

We should have a system of elevators at Port Colborne, at Montreal and at Lévis. How do the Americans handle their business? First let me remind the House and the Prime Minister, there is not one single American transcontinental line which goes from ocean to ocean. They go to the Pacific ocean but their terminals are at Omaha, St. Paul, Duluth and Chicago. They carry the products of the west, of the wheat belt and the corn belt, to the outlet. They load their elevators with this grain that they have not been able to carry in the summer months, during the seasons of navigation. In winter the manufactures mill it and flour and grain are carried to the seaports: New York, Boston, Portland, Newport News, Philadelphia and Baltimore, and a certain quantity of grain to fill the boats. My hon. friends from the maritime provinces will perhaps be kind enough to give some attention to what I am now saying. When I was Minister of Public Works I always endeavoured to study their case and their position to the best of my ability.

Now, what are the Americans doing? They carry grain to Buffalo, to Duluth, to Chicago and in winter months they ship it to their winter ports. Between Buffalo and New York the distance is 440 miles by the New York Central; between Lévis and St. John it is only 578 miles on the Intercolonial and it will be only 500 miles on the new railway which my hon. friends are asking the House to allow them to build. We will be able to compete with our American friends if we carry the wheat by our waterways as the Americans are doing. What I suggested nearly two years ago not only stands good to-day, but stands better than it did then. Our policy must be a policy of cheap rates, otherwise we will not be able to compete. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was reminding us the other day that a few steps from the Canadian frontier the American system of railways is working. My hon. friend is perfectly right and the distance between Winnipeg and American ports is not very great. From Winnipeg to St. Paul is only 500 miles; from Winnipeg to Duluth is only 450 miles; from Winnipeg to Port Arthur is 440 miles by the Canadian Northern Railway and 425 miles by the Canadian Pacific Railway. From Chicago to New York is only 912 miles. Now we have to be careful. For if we do not provide cheap means to carry our traffic the Americans will get it in the future as they have done in the past. St. John and Halifax, our Canadian winter ports, will get more grain and flour traffic by the waterways than they ever will by any all-rail project. What the Americans have accomplished is clear evidence of what we could do. Let us not lose sight of one thing. We have to compete, not only as regards distances, but we have to compete against strongly entrenched rivals. Those ports of New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore are great centres of trade. The railways are always sure to get there return cargoes, but the ports of St. John and Halifax have not so far been profitable centres in that respect. The Canadian Pacific Railway have taken a good quantity of traffic but the east-bound traffic has been always about ten times larger than the west bound traffic. Of course, conditions will improve and they will improve more if we take the means to give to our harbours and winter ports better equipment. Let us equip the St. Lawrence route in the way I am now suggesting. Let us accumulate a grain trade in the St. Lawrence in the fall months, and Halifax and St. John will have more trade to handle. There will always be a certain quantity of through trade handled in the winter months. Cattle will be handled by rail, and the winter months are fairly good for that trade. These are in resumé my views on the question of waterways and transportation. I think that there is urgent necessity for us to apply our energy and our financial means to improving our waterways immediately, otherwise we will lose trade. Holding these views, I awaited with a great deal of interest and anxiety the ministerial explanation on the project before us. I

stand in this happy position that I have no party purposes to serve. I am speaking for myself and without any bias or prejudice.

What is the project we have to discuss to-day ? The Grand Trunk Railway applied during this session for a charter from Quebec to the Pacific ocean. When the Bill was discussed before the Railway Committee, Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and Mr. Hays positively declined to agree to build the eastern section at the same time as the portion in the North-west Territories. Their views was to build a railway from Gravenhurst or North Bay to the Territories. We had a vote on those points. The Grand Trunk Railway positively declined to agree to build the eastern portion of this project simultaneously. I quite understand that position in which the government was placed. I am not going to impute to them any improper motives. That is not my way of discussing questions of broad policy. I quite understand their position. When the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway declined to build the eastern portion, the government were urged by their followers to build the eastern portion from Quebec to the west ? Then our friends from the maritime provinces appeared on the scene and insisted on having the line extended to their territory. The government could not induce the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to take up the scheme. The Minister of Trade and Commerce told us to-day very frankly that the Grand Trunk Railway credit could not build the whole enterprise, and in that my right hon. friend was right. No private company could safely build that part of the project. Then the government made up their minds to build it themselves. Let me say here that I do not share the views of those who believe that there are not good agricultural lands in the territories through which this road will go. I cannot possibly agree in the views expressed on that point. I happen to know some parts of that country well. I lived eighteen years in the city of Quebec and took special interest in the Lake St. John district. That was a great colonization district, and at its inception I took a great interest in connection with my newspaper in that part of the province. I can assure the House that from Roberval towards the west there is a magnificent fertile district, splendid lands, lands just as good as any in this country. I see some of my hon. friends nodding no, but let me tell them that I am speaking of what I know. I had properties there, not very extensive, and I have been out there fifty times at least so that I know the country pretty well.

I know that part of the country well, and it was because I know it well that I urged, with the help of my right hon. friend—that we urged upon our colleagues in 1900 to give to the Lake St. John Railway Company a subsidy on sixty miles from Roberval towards James Bay. I think the government would have done well to increase the distance covered by that subsidy and also to increase the rate of subsidy itself, for $3,200 per mile cannot possibly build a road there. It is a fine district. The Lake Temiskamangue district is also a very fine country. I was there some years ago, and I was there again last year. It is a fine district, capable of giving to settlers all the advantages that the best lands can give. The region of Lake Nipissing is also a good district. There are fertile belts, there is no doubt about that, and there are also barren lands. Behind Quebec, on the Ste. Anne river there are some lots fit for colonization, but there is no very great extent of good land. In my younger days I have often been on hunting and fishing expeditions over the height of land, across the Laurentian range. I know that part of the country fairly well. The road will pass through a country, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, in which there are large stretches of cultivable land. Below Quebec, I happen to know the country. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) made a statement as to the region below Quebec through which the line will pass. I have had the honour to represent L'Islet in this House, and I know the parishes through which the road will pass. They are very, very fine settlements. The whole of that district is good land. The settlers to-day are at a distance of from thirty to forty miles from the Intercolonial Railway. As to this part of the project, I believe that it is wrong to say that the lands are not good. We have no interest in saying that the lands that we possess are not good when they are good. I will not discuss the project of the government on those lines. Now, having said that much, I will discuss the question from another standpoint.

My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, in introducing this Bill, told us that the project was imperative, that it was necessary not to lose any time. Well, I shall not say that we have no survey, no information at all, but I would ask my right hon. friend whether we could not have had more information than we have now, whether before embarking on this project it would not have been the part of prudence to get more information ? We know that there are good lands through which this road will pass, but no survey has been made for the construction of a railway. We do not know what obstacles are to be met. Nobody knows. Then, nobody knows the financial aspect of the project. It is very well to say that the road will not cost more than $35,000 or $30,000 a mile, but I ask my right hon. friend whether he is sure that it will not cost more ? I am not afraid of spending money. In point of fact I have been accused of being a spender of money. But I find myself a very moderate man indeed in the face of the schemes of the leaders on either side of this House. It is evident that I am not so progressive as these hon. gentle-

men are. Why was this scheme imperative? Was it from a transportation point of view? I do not think it was imperative, and when my right hon. friend thinks it over, I believe he will agree with me. The road will be useful. I am glad, for one, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company gets into the North-west. I should like to see them there for good. I will deal with the position of the Grand Trunk later on. But the government have resolved to build a railway from Winnipeg to Moncton. For local purposes, it will be a useful road. I never knew of a railway that was not useful. It will develop the part of the country through which it passes—there is no doubt about that. The questions are, first, what would be the cost? And, second, could we have done better? As to the project being imperative, I think that the House has made up its mind that it is not so urgent as my right hon. friend said it was. It is not imperative, but the project is an attractive one from certain standpoints. This road will not afford us the means of competing for the trade of the west. It will not cheapen the rates on wheat or any other commodity by a fraction of a cent. Nobody on either side has tried to show that the rates will be made cheaper. It is simply out of the question that the road can have that effect. Let us compare the figures. Mr. Wolvin, to-day is taking grain from Duluth and Chicago to Quebec for less than 3 cents in the summer months. This road will not carry grain at that rate, will it? It is out of the question. The season of navigation lasts for more than seven months. On the American side very little grain is handled in the winter months. Some is brought down during those months, just as some is brought down over the all-rail route of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But nobody pretends that this new road will cheapen the rates by a single fraction of a cent. No business man in this House will contradict me on that point. From that standpoint, then, the scheme is not imperative. Would it have been better for the government not to make an arrangement with the Grand Trunk? What is going to be the result of our policy? The government has made the agreement, and, of course, the House will support the proposal of the government. For that proposal was submitted to a ministerial caucus, and it must be carried now. We may as well discuss things as they are. The scheme is to be carried—it will be carried. There are members of parliament who are not enthusiastic, but, of course, party government is party government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Yes, and when my Conservative friends are on this side of the House the government will be a party government, as it always has been. We are here to talk business, and not to make theories. Well, now, we have no information, the government has no more information than I have to enable them to reach a definite conclusion as to the cost. It may cost $40,000 a mile, it may cost more. The Grand Trunk Pacific is going to pay 3 per cent interest after seven years, and is exempted for three years more in certain contingencies—I think we may safely call it ten years. When the ten years are over, if the road is not paying, then the government will be approached by the Grand Trunk Pacific and will be urged not to exact interest. That is the ordinary course of affairs. It is just as well to look these things in the face. We are undertaking an enterprise that will certainly involve the credit of the country for a large amount of money. It is 1,500 miles from Winnipeg to Quebec, if that costs $40,000 a mile—it may cost more than that—there will be $60,000,000. Add $15,000,000 for the road from Quebec to Moncton, and you have $75,000,000. Well, we must make allowance for contingencies, and I think we may say $20,000,000 without hesitation for interest, &c. We are not very far from $100,000,000. Now, the country is rich and prosperous, and if the money is well invested we can stand it. But is it a good investment? Are we sure? Are my hon. friends on the treasury benches sure that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will pay interest? They are no more sure of it than I am. We are undertaking, as I said, an enterprise that will involve the credit of the country to the extent of nearly $100,000,000. What I fear is that we are embarking in an enterprise that will prevent us from doing something else that is more necessary. If the government are sure, if my hon. friends who support the government do feel confident that the government are making a safe calculation, I think their duty is to join me in using all legitimate constitutional pressure on my right hon. friend and his colleagues to induce them to go on with our waterway development immediately. We cannot cheapen transport by the new project, we cannot cheapen rates for our western territories. With the waterways we can certainly do it, that fact is indisputable. Our friends from the maritime provinces would derive more benefit for their winter ports through a waterway policy than they will from this railway policy. They will not get any trade from this railway, they would get a vast amount of trade through a good waterway policy.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) What about the winter trade?

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I am glad of the interruption. The Canadian winter ports will be served just as the American winter ports are served, through the accumulation of trade at certain points, let us say our Georgian Bay ports, and Montreal, Quebec, Lévis—these will be fed in the same

way as the American ports are fed. The American ports are fed from Buffalo, most of them.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). They are frozen, then.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The land is frozen, but the railways are not frozen. If my hon. friend will give me his attention for a few minutes he will agree with me. During the fall months Americans are carrying grain to Chicago, Buffalo and other points, a vast quantity of grain that cannot be shipped to the seaboard. In the winter months they take that grain and carry it to their winter ports. I suggest the same policy for us. That policy succeeds with our American friends. They could have built through railways from New York to the Pacific Ocean; they have not done so. They carry very little grain in the winter months by railways. In the winter months they feed their ports with the grain accumulated in the fall months. I suggest the same thing. The two projects are not antagonistic. If this project did not cost more than $25,000,000, I would stand it; I would not be afraid of that. But it seems to me the government are making a big mistake, a tremendous mistake, in overlooking our waterways. Of course, the right hon. gentleman may not have said his last word. Indeed, his attention has been called over and over again to this question of transportation.

Now, what would be the result of a waterway transportation policy? On the lakes there are 22,000 American vessels carrying, not only grain, but trade of all kinds, developing the North-west and all that region west of and around the lakes. They have easy and cheap water communication between the different states. I suggest the same policy for ourselves. The same thing is being done to-day. What do we see in the St. Lawrence? Every day in Montreal we see ships bringing coal from the maritime provinces. The railway does not carry much coal, the St. Lawrence route carries it. In the winter the St. Lawrence is frozen up, so is the Erie canal, so is Lake Superior. But there is an accumulation of grain before the freezing takes place. Now, what would happen if the suggestion that I made to my colleagues formerly, and that I make again to-day, were carried out? What would be the result? There would be an accumulation of grain in Montreal, in Three Rivers, in Quebec, in Lévis, in all the ports to which ships come loaded with coal from the maritime provinces. These ships would simply take down the grain to the sea. We would build up a big merchant marine on the St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic Ocean. If we were true to ourselves, if we would only look carefully at the maps, we would realize the great possibilities that are before us. Not only can we command our Canadian trade, but we can command a large volume of American trade. In spite of the very inferior accommodation we have, we are commanding to-day a large American trade. We are attracting to our shores large volumes of trade of all kinds. Perhaps my hon. friends, and even my hon. friends on the treasury benches, have no conception of the volume of trade that Mr. Booth is carrying, not grain only, but trade of all kinds. We could do the same thing. We could establish a trade that would simply create a revolution. I am afraid that my hon. friends are embarking on a project that will prevent them from attending without any delay to the most pressing needs of this country. Are the government sure of the date at which the eastern portion of the project, that is to say, the road from Winnipeg to Quebec, will be completed? There is no date mentioned. I would like to have some information upon that point before I give my vote. The contract says that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will have to approve of the grades, that the plans must be submitted to them and that surveys will have to be made. Of course, surveys will be made. I grant that the government will not embark upon the construction of that road without making surveys. They must do it. When will the road be completed? I would like to have a clear statement on that point? The government are building the road from Winnipeg down to Quebec. Winnipeg is not a wheat centre. It is a big city, a city that is growing bigger every day, but it is not a wheat centre. Will the government have control of the rates that they think they will have? I have never known as yet of a railway company which has been fully controlled by any government as to rates. After a very long experience I have some doubt as to that. Of course, government ownership would have settled the case. I would like also to have some explanation as to the location of the road in the North-west Territories. I hold in my hands a map of the North-west Territories and of Manitoba. There are already two railways in that country without taking into account the Northern Pacific. These two railways have about 4,000 miles all told of rails laid down. The House, no doubt, would like to know before the vote is taken, from the government, if they are in a position to tell us, where the location will be. That is a very important point because we are told that the new enterprise will give additional value to a large quantity of land. There is already a pretty large quantity of land available in the North-west Territories. I think there are about 80,000,000 acres available inside of the two railways. I would like to know what the location of the road will be if the government are in a position to tell us.

I shall be glad to deal shortly with the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg

(Mr. Puttee). The hon. member for Winnipeg is asking the House to state that the time has so come for the government to assume the ownership and management of railways. In Europe nearly all the countries are the owners of their railways and I am surprised—I confess my former ignorance—to find out that the statistics prove that the railways managed by the governments are managed cheaper and better than the railways managed by private corporations. That is the case in Belgium, it is the case in Holland, it is the case in Germany, it is the case in almost every country of Europe. France is, perhaps, the only country where that statement cannot be applied but the case of France is a peculiar one. In France the government owns only 1,600 or 1,700 miles of branch lines. All the other railways are in the hands of private companies but with this condition that all the railways will come back to the state in 1950. The government has given a guarantee to the different railways amounting to four and one half per cent with a sinking fund. In 1915 the sinking fund will have extinguished part of the debt, and under the system in force in France in 1950 the railways will come back to the state. But, France has taken good care to have the system of transportation controlled by the state. There are 12,000 miles of canals, small streams and rivers which are under the direct control of the French government and competing with the railway companies as to rates. In Germany state ownership has simply accomplished wonders. Not only is it a great military organization, but it is a great commercial organization. The railways are managed in a more democratic way because the people are consulted as to their wishes and requirements. When it is found that certain German commodities are undersold in certain markets of the world, the German management of railways comes in immediately and lowers the rates so as to enable that merchandise to compete. That is business. Well now, before embarking on the scheme that we are discussing, would it not have been the part of prudence to have the commission that has been announced to us take charge of that matter and see what we can do ? I know the feeling on both sides of the House. There is no reluctance to vote all the money necessary to be used in developing this country. The feature of this debate which will tell well in the country and outside of it, is the tone of confidence that we have heard from both sides of the House. An admirable confidence has been expressed in the future of the country. But would it not have been the part of prudence to have paused and to have had the whole matter submitted to a commission instructed to see what we can do and what is the best thing to do. The project will be useful. I hope that nobody, even the strongest opponent of the government, will claim that a railway is not a useful thing. It may be expensive but it is a useful thing. Perhaps it would have been better from a colonization standpoint to have done something else. Perhaps it would have been better to have built railways from colonizing centres. Perhaps that would have accomplished much. I express my views just as I feel them. The country has the right to have the views of those who have given some attention to a great question like this. There is a good deal in that, but for all that, the scheme will be carried out. Now, I have only one word more to say as to the Grand Trunk Railway. The position of the Grand Trunk Railway is a peculiar one. It is partly an American railway system and partly a Canadian railway system. Portland is their chief port ; it has been always their winter port and it has often been their summer port. I cannot blame them too much for that, because they could not find accommodation in Montreal or elsewhere in Canada, and they had to ship their goods somewhere. They have not spent much money in Portland itself ; not more than $2,000,000, but they have spent $25,000,000 in their system between Montreal and Portland. They have a railway from Chicago to Buffalo which is a large carrier of freight and especially of cattle, and where is their future trade going to go ? We will not live long ; even those of us who live to a good old age will not live for a great many years. The same thing is true of the representatives of the Grand Trunk Railway who are negotiating with us. They will leave this world, but the geography of the country will remain the same. The Grand Trunk Railway will never be able to carry grain during the winter months in any large quantities over that new road. What is the Grand Trunk Railway going to do in the future ? Under the administration of Mr. Reeve, the Grand Trunk Railway was altogether an American road. I had several more or less friendly quarrels with him. He was a Portland man. Fortunately, Mr. Hays succeeded him, and wide-awake man as he is, he saw that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would require some friendship or attention from this country and he looked to the port of Montreal. It was I who negotiated with him as to the Grand Trunk Railway settling in Montreal. At my request my colleagues upheld me in declining to give to the Wolvin syndicate the site at the Windmill Point and the Grand Trunk Railway to-day have that site and are building warehouses and elevators on it. Last year the Grand Trunk Railway carried about 10,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain, and during the last six months ending the first of June they carried 6,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain to Portland. In point of fact we have fed the port of Portland all through, because only an indifferent quantity, say 1,000,000 bushels of American grain, was shipped from that port. The Grand Trunk Railway did this because

they had no accommodation at Montreal, and moreover they are bound to support that part of their system. It is not a question of love with them, it is a question of business, and as they are business men they must support that part of their line. They go all through Ontario and they take pease and oats, &c., and they take wheat from Midland and they ship it via Portland. The government are going to build a line from Winnipeg. The Grand Trunk Railway will not come straight to Lake Superior but they must find an outlet somewhere. Has the government provided for that point? There will no doubt be a branch line from the government line, but is it sure that the Grand Trunk Railway will ship their trade through Canadian channels—I don't speak of to-day; I speak of things that may happen in five years or in ten years. If we improve our waterways, if we do our part on a sufficient scale, they may come through Canadian channels, but if not they will not do it. If we do not improve the spout they won't use it, they cannot use it. If we do not improve the port of Montreal, and the St. Lawrence route, and give accommodation on the lakes, the Grand Trunk Railway will not come our way, but they will go to the American seaports, as they are going now. Let me call the attention of my right hon. friend to that point, which is an essential point, and to which I am very much afraid the government has not given sufficient consideration.

My hon. friends on the treasury benches have gone fast. I do not like to lose time. I am not slow myself, but I believe they have gone fast. It would have been better for them to wait for another year to give more consideration to this scheme. However, they have not done so, and I therefore call earnestly their attention to these important points. The Grand Trunk Railway will develop the North-west. It is my wish that the North-west should remain Canadian from the transportation standpoint, as well as from the fiscal standpoint. I have always advocated the two policies side by side. Let us do our part from the fiscal standpoint and from the transportation standpoint as well, and then we can rest assured that our country will march rapidly in the path of progress and prosperity.

I have to apologize to the House for having spoken so long, but the question is of great importance. In expressing the hope that before the debate closes the Prime Minister will give us more positive information, especially as to the eastern portion of the project, I am sure that I am expressing the feeling of many members of this parliament. We have not received sufficient assurances to make up our minds. We have no idea as to the location in the North-west, we have no assurances as to the future of the policy of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. And the Grand Trunk Railway being both an American and Canadian concern we have to take more precaution than would perhaps be necessary in another case. I resume my seat, Sir, thanking the House for the indulgence it has extended to me.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I have followed with a great deal of interest the speech of the member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and I must regret from a psychological standpoint, at all events, that the hon. gentleman has failed to tell us whether he was in favour of the policy of the government or not. On that point, however, I do not feel disposed to reproach him very much, because up to the last few days I will candidly admit that I had no very clear mind as to which way I would vote myself. I may say at once to the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that if I have made up my mind to vote for the project of the government it is not because any influence has been brought to bear upon me, as he seems to think is the main reason of all those who support this Bill.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Oh, no, no.

Mr. BOURASSA. I admit that this question is of such magnitude that for any man with a will of his own, any man who has an intellect of his own, it is not an easy thing to decide immediately. At the same time I think that a man of the position of the hon. gentleman, a man who has made this transportation question his own question for five years, should, when he comes before the parliament of Canada and the people of Canada to express his views on it, be able to tell the people whether the scheme is good or not. If he cannot make up his mind as to all the good qualities or all the difficulties of the proposal I submit that he might very frankly tell the House that there are some features of the scheme of which he does not approve and some of which he does approve; but at the same time he should be in a position to tell us whether he is going to vote for the scheme or not. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is hoping that as the leader of the opposition is of somewhat the same turn of mind as he is, no vote will be taken, so that if the scheme turns out all right he will be free to say that he was favourable to it and if it turns out all wrong that he was against it.

I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman in his lengthy review of our waterways system. I admit that the hon. gentleman has in the past given to this question a good deal of attention, that he has proposed to the government and to the country at large a good many improvements to our waterways, but I do not think this is the time to discuss that part of the transportation question. As the hon. gentleman has said we have now to decide whether we are going to approve of the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme or whether we are going to disapprove of it. The questions of elevators at Port Colborne, improving the harbour of

Montreal, deepening the channel of the St. Lawrence, are questions that are not germane to the subject of this debate. Of course when the hon. gentleman discusses the question of the wheat trade I perfectly understand that he may make a comparison between the carrying of wheat by water and by rail ; but I am surprised that a man of the breadth of mind which the hon. gentleman generally displays on political questions, has discussed this question to-night from the narrow point of view of carrying grain. Certainly if the government had come before parliament and asked this House to ratify a proposal by which the credit of this country would be largely involved simply for the sake of carrying wheat I would be inclined to take the position the hon. gentleman has taken, but I would carry it to its logical conclusion and I would say 'I am going to vote against the scheme.' I have been struck during all this discussion with a remark which I may recall to the hon. gentleman, the words once uttered by a man for whom he has a great deal of admiration, whose policy he is now recommending to the people of Canada, a man for whose intellectual capacity I myself have a great deal of admiration, Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain was once explaining to the people of Great Britain his idea as to the change that should take place in the imperial policy of Great Britain and just in the midst of a sentence, interrupting even the grammatical construction of that sentence, he said : 'Oh that the lack of imagination should always be the drawback of Englishmen.' I am surprised that the hon. gentleman, who cannot be accused of any lack in that respect, has not realized that a scheme like this cannot be seen only from one point of view, cannot be studied only from the point of view of the actual requirements of this country. I may say that when the discussion on this resolution commenced fifteen days ago I was myself so convinced that this road could not carry wheat that I hesitated a great deal before I made up my mind to support the project. But the more I looked at the question from a broader point of view, from the point of view of the general trade of Canada, and especially from the national point of view of the general benefit of this country, from the point of view of the development of the northern districts of the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec, and from the broad, general, national point of view that it is better for the government to lend the credit of this country, to expend the money of this country, upon one large national enterprise, than to expend it piecemeal upon small enterprises, the more decided I became—and I am going to express my decision although I still entertain some doubts as to some features of the measure—that I would support the Bill. I might say that the arguments advanced by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) as to the possibilities of general trade being carried by this railway, had some influence upon my mind; but if a deep impression was made on my mind I must say that the touch of light did not come either from the caucus of the Liberal party or from any expression of opinion from the treasury benches, notwithstanding all the respect I have for the ministers of the Crown ; the one speech which induced me most strongly to uphold the government policy was the speech of my good friend the leader of the opposition. After all, on a business matter of this kind, although I find myself as does the hon. member for St. Mary's division, Montreal (Hon. Mr. Tarte) quite often in the deep sea between the two parties, we have to choose between the policy of the government and the policy of the opposition. I do not know if my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is going to offer to this House an amendment in which he will give a material form to his policy, and by which he will tell the people of this country that he has a policy of his own and that he will stand by it. If he does not do so, even if I should come to the conclusion that the government's scheme was not a good one and that I should vote against it, I would have to vote to put the accomplishment of this object into the hands of men who profess to a policy but who will not dare to formulate it, even in the mild form of a motion. If the hon. gentleman was sincere and serious in his speech, as I have no doubt he was, he is bound, before this debate is over, to put his policy in the form of a motion, and to have that motion framed on the lines of his speech of the other day so that the people of Canada can choose between the two policies. Therefore, I assume that in the speech of the other day we find the policy of the opposition on the transcontinental railway question ; and it is by making a comparison between the two schemes that I have come to the conclusion that, not being able to find an ideal scheme, I will certainly support the better of the two and to my mind the government's policy is by far the better.

As to the amendment offered by the member for Winnipeg, it is most probably going to be snowed under. At the same time there is no doubt that the hon. gentleman is putting before the House and the country a question which is going to grow in importance from day to day. I can well remember the days when my good friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) was speaking in the desert, when he was laughed at by nearly all the speakers on both sides because he was advocating the principle of government ownership. Now, however, that principle is making its way. I may say at once that I am in favour of it. First, because all the large avenues of trade belong by right to the people just as much as the King's road and the water-ways. We have no right to alienate them for ever.

Secondly, because when the trade and population of the country will have increased to a large figure, our railways might become one of our greatest sources of revenue. My third reason is because the ownership of railways by the government is the best means of regulating rates. No law we can try to put in force against a company having sovereign right over its property, will be as effective as a right which a government will have that owns the road against a company that merely operates it. In the case of Canada there is special reason why we should stand by the principle of government owership. The geographical conditions of our country are such that it is only by the building of railways we can make one country of it. Without these connecting links, the different parts of our country would be utterly divided from each other; and it stands to reason that we should protect our integrity as a nation by assuming the ownership of what might be at certain times used as the greatest disruption of the unity of this confederation.

But to adopt the principle proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) would be going too far, and for a number of years government ownership should be limited to the right of ownership and not be extended to construction and operation. The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) made a comparison with different European countries. Comparisons are always more or less deceitful, but we must admit that continental European countries have given the railway problem much more attention than we have. They have tried different systems and if the hon. member for St. Mary's had gone to the root of the question, he would have found out that government operation of railways has been successful only in cases where you have two things. The first condition is that there should be such an immense amount of traffic that the railways are paying by themselves, without government support, that the local traffic is such that there is almost no war of rates between the government and other railway companies. The second condition is that you must have a civil service entirely free from any political influence. In Germany the railway service is conducted just as the army is: political influence has nothing to do with it; but it will be a long time, whatever party be in power, before we can adopt such a policy. My hon. friend to my left reminds me that in those cases I have given, the country owns practically all the railways, which is different altogether between the government owning some of the railways and competing with private companies. Besides, in a new country like this, I would not be in favour of closing up immediately the avenues of railway enterprise for the investment of private capital. We should, on the contrary, invite private capital to come and aid in the operation of railways.

Coming to the present scheme, I would prefer that the government should keep the right of ownership from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that they should give a contract for the construction and a lease for the operation of the line to one private company, under one system of administration from east to west, instead of the dual system which has been adopted. To my mind the lease should have been longer, and a smaller, rather than a larger rate of interest should have been levied from the company as a rental; or, as an alternative, the company should have been required to invest a portion of its capital, and the state reserve its right to redeem it within a number of years. Anyhow, whatever, might have been the details, what I would have preferred above all would have been unity of system. The reason given against that unity of system is this, that the state cannot go into the building of hotels and branch lines, and equipping ports and fitting up steamers. But that reason applies just as much to the eastern section as to the western section. If the government are sincere in making the eastern section a colonization railway, they will have either to do these things themselves or have the Grand Trunk Railway do them. I know something about colonization. I represent a constituency where colonization has been carried on for twenty years, I have myself opened up lands for settlers, and sold them lands, and I know what arguments attract the settlers. The settler has to be directed, he has to be guided. If you leave him to himself, if you simply open a large tract of land and build a railway, and tell that settler to go there he will choose every time the worst land. He will choose that which is easiest to clear. But the good lands in Quebec and Ontario are thickly covered with wood and these do not attract settlers. You will have to build houses for the settlers, and have government agents to take them to the good land. You will have to build branch lines down the valleys you cross, otherwise you will repeat the mistake made in some districts of the province of Quebec. By settling the country across the valleys and not along the valleys, you will then have the settlement along the line poor and deprived of good land, while the settlers, who went into the valleys along the waterways, will have no railway facilities. To be complete as a colonization scheme, it will have to include the building, not of expensive hotels, but houses of refuge, such as were established by the federal government in several districts of Quebec several years ago. And you will have also to build steamship lines to give communication to the settlers along the water-ways which this road is going to cross.

It has been stated that the line from Winnipeg to Quebec should be built as a national

railway because it would be used as a great highway and a regulator of rates for the carrying of trade from western Canada to the east. But the same reasons that were given as far as the principle is concerned, for state ownership of the eastern will apply as well to the western section.

It seems to me that we very often ignore the real facts of the geography of our country. We think of this line as being a great national highway, and as destined to act as a regulator of rates between the west and the east. But, as proposed, it will simply affect that part of Canada from the centre to the east. Why should not the same principle apply to the carrying of freight from the centre to the west? I have great hopes of the future of British Columbia. I think British Columbia is one of the finest provinces of the Dominion. Certainly, the day is not far distant when there will be as much trade between the prairie country, the wheat-growing region, and British Columbia, as there is to-day between the wheat-growing region and the east. The Prime Minister has said that we are not legislating for a few years, but for a long time to come. Therefore, I regret that the principle having been adopted of having a national highway and regulator of rates between the centre and eastern parts of Canada, we do not also have a great national highway and regulator of rates between the centre and the west, and that the whole line should not be undertaken and built as a great national highway and regulator of rates for all time to come from the Atlantic to the Pacific. This is enough to show that there are things in this project which I do not like. On the other hand, there are features that I like. I take the same position as my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver)—not being able to get all that I want, I take what is given to me. I accept this as a great improvement upon the railway policies of all past governments. I take it as a great improvement upon the time when we were giving lavishly the money of the people and the lands of the people also to assist railway companies that were not only free to do as they liked in the opening up of a country and in the carrying of trade, but that were free at any time to connect their railways with American railways and sell the future of this country from a commercial as well as a political point of view. And, when I see that the only alternative presented to the House is the scheme of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), I am bound to say that it takes a great deal from the remorse I should have had, perhaps, in voting for this project.

I have no doubt that, during my absence from the House—I have been absent for some days—a good deal of attention has been given to the project of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden). I have not followed the discussion. But, in order to make my views quite plain, so far as the financial phase of the question is concerned, I have had some work done for me by a very competent engineer who was, I may say, one of the resident engineers of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the building of that part of their line north of Lake Superior, which is the very part which the hon. leader of the opposition proposes that the country should take over. I suppose the figures have been given to this House, but if I take the liberty of wearying the House once more with a list of figures it is because this estimate that I shall read has been very carefully prepared by this engineer, who overlooked the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway line north of Lake Superior, who knows thoroughly the Canada Atlantic system and the Canadian Northern system, and who has himself made two explorations in the district in which the road here proposed is to traverse. Therefore, I think he is the one engineer in Canada who is most competent to speak both on the project of the government and on the project of the opposition.

Mr. CLANCY. To whom does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) refer?

Mr. BOURASSA. I refer to a gentleman who is now the manager, I believe, of the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and who was resident engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the section north of Lake Superior, Mr. Doucet. I have asked that gentleman to make an estimate of the proposed scheme of my hon. friend, and here are his figures. The first proposition of my hon. friend is to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway and connect at Montreal. His estimate is, first, to construct a railway from Jacques Cartier Junction to Coteau, 37 miles, at $35,000 per mile, $1,295,000. To purchase the Canada Atlantic system, which cost about $17,000,000, would undoubtedly require $19,000,000. I think this is $1,000,000 less than an estimate that has been placed before this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) know how much it has been offered for within two years?

Mr. BOURASSA. No.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding). Does my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) know how much they are asking for it now?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not know that any price had been set.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand the price has advanced lately.

Mr. GERMAN. Seventeen million.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the growing time, you know.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have no intention of giving extraordinary figures. I do not think my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will contradict me on this estimate, when I say that it would not be safe to approach Mr. Booth with a much lower figure now. The hon. gentleman suggested the building of a branch to connect the Canada Atlantic with the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Sudbury. This line would be about 120 miles in length. Estimating it at $30,000 a mile, we find that the cost of this would be $3,600,000. So, this would bring that part of the scheme up to $23,895,000. I may say that Mr. Doucet has forgotten to make an estimate of the building of the line that would certainly be required from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal to make a complete system to connect with the Intercolonial. Now, the hon. gentleman has suggested, in order to make the connecting link between this proposed new system of government railway and the railways in the North-west, and realize the idea of giving through transportation, to acquire or lease from the Canadian Pacific Railway the line from North Bay to Fort William. That is the very part of the line which this engineer was supervising during the time of the building of it. And, as will be noticed, he gave much more moderate figures for the cost of this line than we find given in some newspapers and also given by some hon. members in this House.

Mr. BARKER. Can the hon. gentleman tell us precisely the position occupied by Mr. Doucet when he was on the line on the north shore of Lake Superior?

Mr. BOURASSA. I could not state exactly. He was one of the superintending engineers.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) knows how many grades of engineers there are?

Mr. BOURASSA. I know that there are many. But Mr. Doucet is considered one of the best railway engineers not only in Quebec——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). His experience on the line north of Lake Superior was many years ago.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes, about eighteen years ago, I believe. He gives the figures here of actual cost, this is not a question of estimate. This is the cost of the line that the hon. gentleman suggested that we should buy.

North Bay to Sudbury, 79 miles at $30,000 per mile, $2,370,000; Sudbury to White River, 304 miles, at $35,000 per mile, $10,640,000; White River to Peninsula, 64 miles at $40,000 per mile, $2,560,000; Peninsula to Nepigon, 118 miles at $60,000 per mile, $7,080,000; Nepigon to Port Arthur, 64 miles at $30,000 per mile, $1,920,000; making a total from North Bay to Fort William of $24,570,000.

This added to the estimated cost of the Canada Atlantic, as purchased and connected at Sudbury with this part of the line, would be $48,465,000. I am simply giving the cost price. I do not want to give too high figures, because, even by giving the lowest figures, my conscience feels safe when I say that the scheme of the opposition is still worse than that of the government. Now, the hon. gentleman says—I am quoting from 'Hansard':

> The third point which I would submit to the consideration of the House, as a sound policy is to assist in improving the grades of one or both lines from Winnipeg to Fort William, upon condition that complete control of rates is obtained, and that the Grand Trunk Railway, as well as the Intercolonial Railway shall have running powers from Fort William into Winnipeg.

Well, this engineer estimates that to reduce the grades on the Canadian Pacific Railway between Fort William and Rat Portage would cost $3,000,000; and to reduce the grades on the Canadian Northern from Fort William northward would cost $1,500,000. Now the leader of the opposition has also suggested that in case the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific could not agree, the government should build the mountain section. Here is his estimate, and I think it is a very conservative estimate. It is divided into two sections: From Edmonton to Dunvegan, 250 miles, at $28,000, $7,000,000; from Dunvegan to Port Simpson, 550 miles at $48,000, $26,640,000; terminals at Port Simpson, $1,500,000. Total $35,140,000.

Mr. CLANCY. That is pretty hard on the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the mountain section my limit was the $30,000 that is provided in the contract. Therefore my hon. friend from Labelle does not differ from the Minister of Finance.

Mr. BOURASSA. Now, there are certain other improvements that would have to be made. It is admitted on all hands that between Depot Harbour and Madawaska, in order to make it a wheat carrying road as the hon. gentleman is anxious to do, there should be a reduction of grades estimated at $10,000 a mile. That would mean an expenditure of $1,330,000. Now I have not read the whole speech of my hon. friend, and therefore I do not know but that he has suggested what I am going to say. But there is no doubt that if his scheme was adopted, if there were any carrying trade of a general character on that line, in conjunction with the carrying of the freight on the Canadian Pacific Railway over their own system, in conjunction with the carrying of freight over the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific to the east, before long a double track would have to be laid on that

part of the Canadian Pacific Railway which my hon. friend has suggested to the government to take up. Therefore, according to a low estimate, one-third of the cost of the original cost of the line would have to be added. Taking the estimates I have already given for that part, it would mean an addition of $8,190,000. My hon. friend therefore cannot deny that the Canada Atlantic Railway carrying its present trade together with the trade which is developed along its line by the settlement of the lands, and taking all the western trade that would come over that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway which my hon. friend suggests we should buy, and also all the freight that would come through the big lakes, with all the trade which is already now carried by Mr. Booth's line—all this trade would certainly necessitate a double track.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not be prepared to admit that at all. I would ask my hon. friend if he has made inquiries, as his researches seem to have been somewhat extended, as to what the Great Northern Railway of the United States carries over a single track now.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I have not, but I have been told that if the plan suggested by my hon. friend was carried out, the Canada Atlantic Railway could not do justice to the amount of traffic that would have to be carried over that line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In that connection would my hon. friend inform me if he had considered the proposal of the government to provide for double tracking from Winnipeg to Quebec ?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, but I will come to that later on. I am simply taking the scheme of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose you will admit that it would be as necessary in the one case as in the other.

Mr. BOURASSA. I do not, for this reason, that if the scheme of my hon. friend was carried out, the line of railway north of Lake Superior would be the one connecting link between all western railways and all eastern railways, and all the freight carried by the Canadian Northern, by the Grand Trunk Railway and by the big lakes, would have to go over the Canada Atlantic Railway ; while with the government's proposal, there will be two main lines north of Lake Superior to connect the east with the west. But leaving aside the question of double tracks or the question of improvements, his scheme includes the purchase of the Canada Atlantic Railway, the building of the line to Sudbury, the purchase of the lease of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, and the building of the line through the mountains, which would bring the government expenditure up to the figure of $83,605,000. Now, if you add the improvements that would certainly be necessary, that will be imperative, it would increase the figures by $17,580,000 bringing up the grand total to $101,185,000. That is leaving aside entirely the question of a line between Quebec and Moncton. My hon. friend concedes that we may have to build a line in the northern part of Quebec and of Ontario before many years have passed. Therefore, from a financial point of view, I think the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition is far from being as acceptable as the scheme of the government.

Now, I was dumfounded when I read, coming back from New Brunswick, the report in a newspaper of my hon. friend's speech suggesting the acquisition of the Canadian Pacific trunk line between North Bay and Fort William. The strongest argument against the government's project, so far as the transportation of wheat is concerned, was made by the ex-Minister of Railways, whom the leader of the opposition and his followers applauded so highly, namely, that the proposed line would probably not carry freight because the grades in the eastern section would not justify the company in doing so. If it is possible that the proposed railway of the government will not be in a position to carry grain. And to remedy this my hon. friend comes in and gives us an alternative in respect to a part of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway which is known throughout America as being the most impossible line as far as the carrying of grain is concerned that there is in existence. My hon. friend comes here and says, that because we may not be able to carry grain over the line from Winnipeg to Moncton, we should not build it, but rather acquire a right of way over a piece of railway which is the greatest drawback to the carrying of freight between central and eastern Canada that is in existence. If I wanted to use the line of argument that has been used by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals and by some of the followers of my hon. friends opposite, and if I had not for my hon. friend a deep personal respect and a thorough conviction that he is perfectly honest and sincere in everything that he proposes, I would say that this looks very much like a bait offered to the Canadian Pacific Railway to enable them to get rid of the most costly and least profitable part of their line. As far as the carrying of freight is concerned, the scheme of my hon. friend opposite is far from being as acceptable as the scheme of the government is. But, from the freight point of view, as I have said, I have followed with deep attention the argument of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and to my mind he has entirely forgotten that in a country like this where we contemplate the building of a railway such as that which is proposed, we not only have

to take into consideration all the conditions as they exist to-day but all the conditions as they will exist ten years hence. This railway cannot be built in one, two, three or four years. It will take some years to build it; and though the needs of the trade to-day may not be such as to make the building of this road immediately imperative, it would be improvident on our part to delay the construction of the road, if it were possible that the needs of the country would not be satisfied in a few years hence and possibly before the completion of the railway. With the development of the North-west going on, with the changing conditions in the system of farming in that country, I think it is very imprudent to say that because grain cannot be carried by the all-rail route we should not build this railway. There is one part of the speech of the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) which I will say very truly and very sincerely struck me much more than that part in which he spoke of the possibility of the United States repealing the bonding privilege. I am not very much afraid as to that; but one argument which my right hon. friend gave, and to which I attached more importance was embodied in his reference to the change that is taking place in the growth and cultivation of wheat. There is not the slightest doubt that before ten years are over, people in Manitoba and the North-west Territories will have adopted a different system of farming. There will be dairy industries and there will be much more mixed farming carried on than there is now. There will be an immense increase in the raising of cattle. The hon. member for Montreal, St. Mary's, was obliged to admit that cattle could not be properly transported by the water route, and therefore are we confined to the carrying of wheat? I say no, because, before this railway is completed it will be found that the road is a necessity and under these circumstances I say that we should undertake the work at once.

I regret that some changes have not been made in the scheme. If I may make a personal reflection, I might remind the House that at the opening of the session last year I asked the government to consider at once the question of railway transportation both from the commercial point of view and from the political point of view. I insisted upon the necessity of changing our railway policy and I may say very humbly that if at that time consideration had been given at once perhaps the scheme that is now before us would have had some of its features changed. I think the minister of the Crown who then stood up and asked the House to put my motion aside was the then Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who now comes forward and says we acted too quickly and that the government should have studied the subject further. As far as colonization is concerned, I have nothing more to add to what I have already said. I will not say from a political point of view whether the scheme of the government or the opposition should be carried by this House. As far as I am concerned, and as far as three-quarters of the members from the province of Quebec are concerned, it would not affect a vote. The election is not going to be contested only on that ground. The people of the province of Quebec will study the different political questions, but I may say this to my hon. friend, that leaving aside the small point of view that some of his followers have taken, and leaving aside the still smaller point of view that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has taken, I may say that all the provinces, Quebec and Ontario as well, have a right to say that in an enterprise of this kind, due consideration should be given to all sections of this country. The province of Quebec is the oldest province in the Dominion of Canada. It is the part of the country that was settled first. We have made heavy sacrifices not only for the development of Quebec but for the development of Canada at large. At the time of Union we took from our riches to pay the debt of Upper Canada and we have paid debts that were incurred by Upper Canada to improve their ways of transportation. We have paid taxes for works that have been done for the particular benefit of Upper Canada. We have never complained very much about that, and now, when we have a railway enterprise like this, which is a national project, we ask that due consideration should be given to our interests, and the people of Ontario ask the same thing. I think we have a right to ask this without being under any necessity of giving way to sectional prejudices. We do not do it because it goes through Ontario or Quebec, but we say that when we are going to give more transportation facilities to the people of western Canada, we can at the same time give help to the provincial governments of Ontario and Quebec in settling and developing their unoccupied lands.

Now, I must say that there is one part of the government's scheme that I cannot accept. That is the line from Quebec to Moncton. It may be said that the same principle that I have just enunciated applies to the Quebec-Moncton line—the need of settlement; but I will remind my hon. friends that there is this difference: We do not ask the government to build colonization railways in Quebec and in Ontario, but we say that when a transcontinental railway is being built it should be located in such a way that the province shall derive the utmost benefit from it. If the government had already a line which was fit for through transportation, we would not ask the government to duplicate it, and therefore, under the circumstances, as far as that part of the scheme is concerned, I cannot agree to

support the line from Quebec to Moncton, inasmuch as the traffic can be carried over the Intercolonial Railway. If a colonization railway is needed let the government aid the construction of a line of railway in the province of New Brunswick for the purpose of promoting settlement. Therefore, when the Bill goes to the committee, if a motion is made to amend the contract as far as that part of it is concerned, I will vote for it. On the general question, while I have more or less diffidence in accepting some parts of the scheme and though I do not hail it with as much enthusiasm as that displayed by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), at the same time there are several features of the Bill which certainly induced me to vote for it, and which certainly permit me to endorse it with very great pleasure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he has any engineer's estimates of any part of the route ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Of the Quebec-Moncton line ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg—I mean estimates as to the grades which he says are necessary ?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, certainly not, but as I say, I consider the railway necessary there. I consider that we should not simply build a railway in the west without extending it to the east. I consider that the fact that the government own this railway is the beginning of a new policy involving the principle of government ownership, and therefore I am in favour of that part of the line. Let me say to the leader of the opposition, that he himself has made his suggestion without having much information with regard to it. As far as one portion of his scheme is concerned, and that part of it about which we have the most information, namely the purchase of a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway line, the information which we have in regard to it is sufficient to prove that it is absolutely unacceptable to the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely the hon. gentleman knows that I stated expressly that my scheme would be subject to the best expert advice as to carrying it out.

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that all the information we can gather enables us to say that the building of the railway between Quebec and Winnipeg is certainly more feasible than the Conservative government could have declared the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the time they undertook it. It is only a question in this case of whether you choose the St. Maurice Valley or whether you come to the head waters of the Ottawa river to cross the height of land. I may say, Sir, that I had no intention to speak on the subject to-night and the debate has been so protracted that I have left aside many other considerations that I intended submitting to the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend told us in the early part of his speech that he came to the conclusion that the scheme I proposed was much more expensive than the government scheme. How can he arrive at that conclusion, as he tells us he has no estimates as to the cost of obtaining these grades which he says are necessary from Quebec to Winnipeg ? How does he make any comparison when he has no estimate ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I admit that the comparison cannot be final.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I see. I may hope to convince my hon. friend yet.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have given the lowest figure I could get. I asked the engineer to give the lowest figure possible. As far as the proposed government road is concerned we could give very high figures and very low figures, but take the figures that were given by the member for St. Mary's for instance, namely 1,500 miles at $40,000 a mile, and that would make it only $60,000,000 after all, and I believe we would have a better line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has made a very carefully prepared speech and I want to be perfectly clear about it. He has placed an estimate on the lines comprised in my proposal upon the basis of certain grades which he says are necessary for the economic hauling of freight. Can he tell me from any data which he has in his possession, within $10,000,000 of the cost of the government proposal based upon grades of that kind ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think not.

Mr. BOURASSA. I admit the estimate is not complete, but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) wants to leave the financial point of view, I may say that even if it were proven to me that his scheme would cost $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 less than the government scheme, I could not support it because—and that is a point which I had forgotten—the great objection made by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to the government scheme was an objection that I had myself in mind, namely, the dual system of the project of the government. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) asks parliament to adopt a railway system upon which we have government ownership on one part, joint ownership or lease of the Canadian Pacific Railway on another part, then running over the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern Railway; and again government ownership at the other

end. Under his scheme you would have government control on part of the line, Grand Trunk Railway control on another part of the line, Canada Pacific Railway control on another part of the line, and this, after fifteen days of protracted debate on the part of the opposition to prove that the government project lacks unity. Well, Sir, it certainly lacks unity in my opinion, but if there is no unity in the government project what does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) think of the unity of his project ?

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). I am sure that the Prime Minster who has been a very constant attendant at this debate is not in a mood to listen to a two hours or three hours speech to-night, and I shall ask the right hon. gentleman to consent to my motion that the debate be adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not like to refuse the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) but if we are to have prorogation before the snow flies we must make some progress with this debate. I understood that it is agreed that the debate would come to an end on Tuesday next. If that is so, then I will agree to the motion of my hon. friend, but it must be understood by both sides that the debate will be concluded on Tuesday next.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, August 26, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. How many Civil Service employees are there, and into how many classes are they divided ?
2. What is the annual salary in each class ?
3. How many employees are there having an annual salary of not less than $1,500 ?
4. What are the hours of work for these last-mentioned employees ?
5. Is there one or several permanent federal employees who work fifteen hours per day, viz.: from nine o'clock in the morning till midnight ?
6. If so, what are their names ?
7. How many requests for increases of employees' salaries have the different Ministers received since July 1, 1902 ?
8. Who are the employees whose salaries have been increased since July 1, 1902 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I am afraid that I shall be unable to give the hon. gentleman the information which he desires in detail, as his question is a very comprehensive one. Perhaps it would be sufficient if I indicated in general terms where the information may be found, because that which is available is already in possession of the House. The number of the civil service, the officials in each department, their classification, their salaries and their names are all set forth in detail in the civil service list. The hours of duty are from half-past nine to four o'clock, but, of course, it is expected that, when necessary, officials will work later, and many of them do. I am not aware whether there are some who work the long hours mentioned by the hon. gentleman, fifteen hours ; it is quite possible ; but I should say that if that takes place it is exceptional and in emergencies. I thought the privilege of these long hours was only restricted to cabinet ministers.

Mr. INGRAM. Or to members of parliament.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Or to some members of parliament, that is, those who attend. In the outside service there are officials who have longer hours, but I do not attach much importance to the question of official hours, because I think it is the duty of a civil servant to do the work that is required, irrespective of official hours. That is certainly done in my department, and I know that many civil service officials do work much longer than the ordinary official hours, and do it very cheerfully. With regard to increases of salaries since 1902, I think I am safe in saying that all the civil service officials have received what is called the statutory increase. I am not aware at the moment of any exception ; if there has been, it has been for some good reason. But speaking generally of the civil service, they receive the statutory increases. As to applications for an increase, I cannot recollect any special application, but a formal application was made on behalf of the civil service generally, by a deputation, for an increase of pay.

HAULAGE OF OFFICIAL CARS.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Ingram—asked :

1. What sum was paid each year, since June 30, 1889, up to June 30, 1903, for the haulage of government, official, and private cars, over railways in Canada and the United States ?
2. How many government, official, and private cars were owned by the government on the 30th day of June, 1896 and 1903, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) :

1. The government have made no payment for haulage of government, official or private cars over railways in Canada and the

United States since June 30th, 1889, up to June 30th, 1903.

2. The number of official cars on the Intercolonial Railway on June 30th, 1896, was four; the number on June 30th, 1903, was six.

One of the additional cars was required for the use of the official occupying the office of general traffic manager, which office was created to meet the changed conditions on the Intercolonial Railway by reason of the largely increased volume of traffic.

The other car was ordered in connection with the visit of the Duke and Duchess of York, and was used on the royal train during Their Highnesses' trip throughout Canada.

BAND OF THE COLDSTREAM GUARDS.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria) asked:

1. Has the government been officially advised that the band of the famous Coldstream Guards is about to visit Canada, to play at the Toronto Exhibition?

2. If so, has it been arranged that other metropolitan centres in Canada shall have the opportunity of hearing this world-renowned musical organization?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government has not been officially advised that the band of the Coldstream Guards is to visit Canada.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, and the motion of Mr. Puttee in amendment thereto.

Mr. JAMES CLANCY (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will consider it presumption on my part to attempt at this stage of the debate to offer anything particularly new. The discussion has been a long one, and I am not at all certain that it has been barren of what may turn out to be good results, or that it has been unprofitable to the country. One thing has been made clearly apparent during this debate, and that is that the government who have launched the scheme and those who are supporting it have no fixed ideas, absolutely no uniform notion, of the utility of the road, or of anything beyond the fact that the scheme has been placed before the House, and that they have been asked to support it. We find both the press supporting the Liberal party and Liberal members in this House, declaring, from the Prime Minister downward, that we are mostly to lose sight of every commercial consideration in connection with this enterprise, and that we are to follow what the Bill itself discloses. One main idea of it is to appeal to every sectional jealousy, to satisfy every sectional ambition, to appeal to each locality at the expense of the scheme itself. Now, Sir, the Prime Minister tells us that we are not at all to consider this as a commercial line; we have the Minister of Trade and Commerce telling us that it is idle to discuss this question in its financial aspect; and we have the Minister of Finance declaring that the short line feature of it is not of much importance, but that we must consider other interests, namely, such interests as we find in the maritime provinces. I may perhaps be permitted to say, speaking entirely for myself, that if we are to have a national scheme, if we are to have a road that may be called a national transportation road, then the country will conclude that the government ought to be strong enough to have fixed by themselves a route that would have made it purely national. The hon. gentleman dare not do that, because it will destroy every vestige of local reasons for supporting the Bill. The Prime Minister made, at least by inference, a very strong appeal on behalf of the city of Quebec and of that locality. The Minister of Justice could not refrain from strongly dwelling upon the fact that the city of Quebec and that portion of the province of Quebec had been neglected in the past, and it was time now that something should be done for them. Now, Sir, it seems to me that in undertaking a railway that is worthy to be dignified by the name of a national transcontinental railway, it should be built on some better grounds than an appeal to local and sectional interests.

Now what is this after all? The right hon. gentleman—and I do not desire to speak in severe terms of the right hon. gentleman—knows himself that this scheme is surrounded with very grave party difficulties. The right hon. gentleman had behind him a strong section of the province of Quebec, mainly from the locality where his constituency is, from which a very large delegation came to this House; and he was confronted with a very grave difficulty because on the one hand he had applications from those who were promoting a transcontinental line, and on the other from those who wanted to build it. These gentlemen have been in the field for some time. They no doubt had their applications before the government, they had no doubt had these applications heard, and they had no doubt had promises made, not only directly, but by inference, of grants of money and of land. The right hon. gentleman saw in the earlier part of the session that there was one way to deal with this business. He adopted the plan which was put in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General, who, in the speech from the Throne, said that there was only one way to deal with it, and that was to submit this important matter to a commission of experts and let them

lay down a plan. I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government why he abandoned that course? I know that the right hon. gentleman will not be disposed to answer that question. He would not care for this country to know the reasons why he abandoned that plan, but the country knows perfectly well what his surroundings were and that he was forced as a matter of fact by party exigencies to take a different course rather than to launch a scheme which is now merely one on paper. What did the right hon. gentleman do when he found himself in this difficulty? He could not give what the Trans-Canada people asked, because very naturally, they were asking for large subsidies. Mackenzie & Mann came at the same time seeking aid of some kind either by way of endorsing their paper, giving guarantees or otherwise. We found the Grand Trunk Railway people coming at the same time asking for assistance. The right hon. gentleman saw the impossibility of dealing with each and every one of these schemes upon its merits. He must refuse some of them. He could not afford to yield to all the demands that were made by these other corporations, each of which was no doubt very powerful in a party sense. What did the right hon. gentleman do? He abandoned his original idea, one that the country applauded at the time, and would still applaud if carried out, he abandoned the only sane and sound idea which should guide any public man leading a great political party to which the interests of this country have been entrusted for the purpose of getting out of what was purely a party difficulty. The right hon. gentleman changed the plan in a few hours, as was told us by one of his own colleagues. I may say that the hon. gentleman who made the statement was not one who was compelled to guess, as many of us guess and guess pretty acurately at what was going on; he knew what was going on, he was the colleague of the right hon. gentleman, he was perfectly well able to speak as to what was in the mind of the right hon. gentleman, as every other colleague of the right hon. gentleman knows what is in his mind, and he told us how it came about that he abandoned the whole thing. What was done? A pencil was drawn across the map of Canada. There were no surveys, there was not a particle of information, there was not a single attempt made to get any information from the moment that the right hon. gentleman was induced to declare, and to declare with good reason, that he must have a commission of experts to inquire into the conditions and necessities of the country, but a mere pencil mark was drawn across the map, and it was brought down here as a great transcontinental railway scheme. What is the right hon. gentleman's position? It is a matter of notoriety, although it is not a strange thing nor am I going to say that it is a matter that does not happen in all parties, because it is a daily occurrence under our system, that the right hon. gentleman found his friends rebelling against it from one end of Canada to the other. As to that we have the evidence of a number of gentlemen. We have the evidence, for instance, of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who declares that he himself was opposed to it, who declares that in the caucus there were party difficulties, and who declares that he afterwards gave up his own opinion, and so on. We have innumerable declarations in this House and notably one made last night that the rank and file of the Liberal party rebelled, and if it had been possible on the part of the Liberal followers of the government in this House to have dissuaded the right hon. gentleman from the course he has taken we would have had a different state of things. But, the right hon. gentleman had to get out of his party difficulties.

It has been said by the Prime Minister, and by nearly every other hon. gentleman in this House that this will be a colonization road, that it will serve this district and serve that district. I do not lay any the less stress upon the importance of a colonization road or its utility in this country, because it is the duty of the government to assist in every possible way the building of colonization railways, but I deny that you can sacrifice a single feature of the great transcontinental line for the purpose of colonization. We must meet the necessities of colonization in some other way. Would any hon. gentleman launch a transcontinental railway scheme involving an expenditure of from $110,000,000 or $120,000,000 with colonization features that would result in the impairment of the main scheme? Had he considered for one moment the impairment of a strong feature of that scheme for the purpose of promoting colonization? Such a consideration absolutely undermines every particle of the transcontinental railway scheme. What must a transcontinental railway mean in Canada? It must mean that Canada is setting out now for the first time to solve a great problem, and the solution of that great problem not only requires that we shall have the best road that Canada can produce, but that we must have a national competing scheme that will compete with the railways that Canada comes into competition with to-day. Can we afford to consider the locality we are giving a colonization road to? Can we consider whether this or that small part of the country will be served or not? Can we consider whether this particular locality or that particular locality will gain by this railway or whether the railway should be designed for the purpose of serving the greater interests of Canada as a whole? The right hon. gentleman has sacrificed the

strong feature of a transcontinental railway by giving consideration to interests of that kind.

Having said so much, I desire now to deal shortly—and I hope I shall be able to redeem the pledge to be brief which I gave—not with the contract which has already been dealt with in very great detail, but with the two schemes which are now proposed, one by way of Bill and the other as enunciated by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I think the country will have no better means of judging than by putting these two schemes side by side, the one as declared in the Bill, the other as declared from his place in this House by the hon. leader of the opposition. Let me say at the outset that I know of nothing more unprofitable, nothing that would have a greater tendency to becloud and deceive than to make extravagant statements on the one side or the other for the purpose of showing the strength or weakness of one side or the other. Each scheme ought to be dealt with entirely on its merits. We should lay down one given rule which should be applied to both schemes, as that is the only means by which we can arrive at a fair conclusion. Thus it would be well to entirely free the question from the surroundings which hon. gentlemen have dragged into this scheme. The hon. leader of the opposition, in outlining a transcontinental railway scheme for Canada, has incidentally mentioned some matters that are only remotely connected with it. In order to make an intelligent comparison we must place these two schemes side by side at the points at which they meet and at which they may diverge and where each of them may end. I think that is the only way to give the public an intelligent idea as to the merits of the two schemes. We are told that the hon. leader of the opposition has committed himself to the building of a road from Moncton to Quebec city, and also from Quebec city to Winnipeg. Now, I am sure that hon. gentlemen who desire to discuss these two schemes upon their merits will not drag into what is after all, a clear enuciation of what the general policy will be, irrelevant considerations. In order to make it clear, I will read what the leader of the opposition said in referring to the line between Quebec and Moncton. He said :

> If within a certain number of years a practical route be found, then extend that road to the Pacific coast. Build it as a government road from Quebec to the coast. Be not afraid to undertake that project, but do not undertake it until you have the information, the data which will enable you to deal with it. I am not saying this for the purpose of delay. I believe in going ahead with the work once you get the information and the data which are necessary.

That means nothing more nor less than that when such information is obtained and when the necessity arises, the work would be undertaken, and then it would be extended as a part of the Intercolonial Railway and be a scheme under the direction of the government of the day in some way. I make that statement in order to divorce the proposal from what is after all the live question, namely, a transcontinental railway from ocean to ocean. The hon. leader of the opposition similarly dealt with the road from Quebec to Winnipeg, and he said :

> So far as the line from Quebec to Winnipeg is concerned, I am not disposed to minimize the possibility of that northern country. Looking at the history of the great west, there may be a great flood of settlement into that country north of Lake Superior some day or other, at least up to a certain point west, but I do not think we know enough at present to justify us in saying there will or will not be, because I do not know how far that country is capable of competing in the early future with the magnificent country we have in the North-west. I have some doubts as to whether or not that great northern country may compete as early as we would desire with the great western country. But I am not disposed to minimize its importance in any way, and to my mind the rational way of dealing with that road from Winnipeg to Quebec is this.

Mark the words :

> To thoroughly explore and understand it, and then to build that line from Quebec to Winnipeg, as a colonization road according as the requirements of the people and colonization demand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly clear that that is to be a colonization road and no more, and that colonization road is to be built when we have obtained all necessary information and when the interests and requirements of colonization demand it. Colonization alone is the main feature of that undertaking. I have dealt with these two points in order that we may consider them apart from the live question of the transcontinental road proposed by the government, and as to which the two parties are asunder. I have no doubt that the right hon. gentleman would agree with the view expressed by the leader of the opposition if he looked upon this from the point of view of a colonization road, and I believe that, because he has laid great stress upon the colonization utility of his scheme. If there was no transcontinental line in view, I have not the slightest doubt but that the Prime Minister would agree with the views expressed by the leader of the opposition, both as respects the Moncton section and the Quebec and Winnipeg section. I now propose to make a comparison between the scheme of the leader of the opposition and the scheme of the government with respect to that portion of the line which commences at the end of the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal and that part of what is called the national transcontinental railway, commencing at Moncton both ending at Winnipeg. I think such a comparison is the only

intelligible plan that can be adopted to give to the people of the country a fair conception of the two schemes. I need offer no apology to this House when I say that I would not attempt to give any figures on this point on my own initiative, because the House would properly regard such figures as being of little value. I shall not, therefore, give information that is my own, but I shall give information which has been obtained from the most reliable source possible. When the leader of the opposition laid down this scheme he particularly emphasized the fact that he would proceed with his project only on the strength of the best expert evidence that could be produced in Canada, and consequently it must be remembered that the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition may be deviated from or changed in the light of the best expert evidence obtainable.

The hon. leader of the opposition proposed, in the first place, to extend the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to the city of Winnipeg. We have a 99 years' lease from the Grand Trunk Railway for the use of its line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, so that it will not be necessary for me to refer to that part of the line to any detailed extent. We have expended large sums of money in acquiring terminals at Montreal. It is proposed by the leader of the opposition that a first-class road shall be built from Jacques Cartier junction to Côteau junction on the Canada Atlantic Railway. Mark you, we speak of a first-class road, because if a transcontinental railway is to compete for traffic with existing railways in the United States, and in Canada for that matter, no second or third rate road will do. It is estimated that the thirty miles from Jacques Cartier junction to Côteau would cost $40,000 a mile. That will not shock hon. gentlemen opposite, because the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) stated that he had expert evidence from a gentleman of long experience that it would cost $30,000 a mile. It is then proposed to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway from Côteau junction to Depot Harbour, if it can be acquired upon favourable terms, and if not, that a road should be constructed. Hon. gentlemen may say that we have to deal with corporations, and that corporations are very exacting in the amount which they require a government to pay for their property.

It would be just as well for this House and this country to understand that the people of Canada are the possessors of the soil of Canada, and that we have the right to use our power to expropriate, dealing justly and prudently, as I am sure any government would do. Canada is not a railway company dealing with another railway company. It is a nation dealing with its own affairs; and the railways of this country, whether they exist now or shall come into existence in the future, must be subject to the will of the people of Canada; so that the question as to whether we would have any trouble or not in dealing with this matter amounts to nothing. But I am now proceeding on the plan which has been clearly enunciated by the hon. leader of the opposition. It might not be thought prudent or advisable for us even to acquire the Canada Atlantic. That is entirely an open question. The estimate is that that road of 342 miles, with its equipment, could be acquired for the sum of $12,000,000. Every hon. member of this House knows that within the last two years, if not within the last year, there has been an option open to the world for that road for $11,000,000. But suppose we did not acquire the Canada Atlantic, we might have to construct a railway from Coteau Junction to Depot Harbour at a cost of $12,000,000, which would be very nearly $40,000 a mile.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? If you do not purchase the Canada Atlantic, how do you propose to get through the Wilno Pass? Hon. members know that there has been a lawsuit between the Canada Atlantic Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to who has the right to go through that pass.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid my hon. friend did not pay attention to what I said a moment ago. I said that this is not a case of one railway company dealing with another. The people of Canada will take over every pass they require in the interest of the country. That does not mean that the Canada Atlantic people will be unfairly dealt with. It means that the people of Canada must preserve and maintain their own rights, and exercise those rights whenever it is in the interest of Canada to do so.

Taking the next section of the proposed line, from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, a distance of 104 miles, our knowledge as to the character of the country or the cost of that road, is no surmise. There are actual plans made from surveys, under which contractors could put in their tenders to-morrow if they chose to do so; and the cost of that section of 104 miles is put down at $40,000 a mile. I wish in this connection to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), on the evidence of an engineer whom he states to be a gentleman of repute, now connected, I believe, with the Trans-Canada scheme, gave as the cost of that section $30,000 a mile; and my figures are considerably in advance of that estimate.

Then, to acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sudbury to Fort William, 555 miles, I put down as costing $25,000,000. Hon. gentlemen have laid a good deal of stress on the difficulty of dealing with that section. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader of the opposition has found a rational and final solution of that question, namely, that this unprofitable piece of

railway be used jointly by all the railways. He pointed out that the two sections of Canada are separated, as it were, by a bridge; that no single railway company could operate this unprofitable section and make it profitable; and, therefore, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would, as business men, without the slightest doubt, be glad to get rid of that section. What is the proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition? We have several great railways running from the west to the east—I say the more the better. At a certain season of the year that section of railway would have to be operated, either by a single company or by all the companies in common. The hon. leader of the opposition proposes to nationalize that unprofitable section of 555 miles, and offer all the railways of Canada inducements to use that bridge, which they could do combined at much less cost than could a single company. Could any proposition be made that would appeal more to the business sense of the people of Canada than that all the railways of Canada, including the people's railway owned by the government, would use that section in common? I am told that it costs the Canadian Pacific Railway, in round numbers, $1,000,000 to operate that piece of road, which is a drag on their earnings all over their system. Let us suppose that we had running over it not only the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial. We would have four railways running over that unprofitable section, reducing the cost to each three-fourths; in other words, each railway bearing one-fourth of the cost. Is that not a scheme which appeals to the good sense and the business experience of the people of this country? The estimate of the cost of that section which I give, $25,000,000, is equivalent, in round numbers, to $45,000 a mile. The estimate given by the hon. member for Labelle, obtained from Mr. Doucet, an engineer, was $40,000 a mile. Therefore, hon. gentlemen opposite will see that in every case the figures I am giving are above the estimate of their own friends, and therefore they are not in a position to quarrel with them.

The hon. leader of the opposition proposes that $3,000,000 be put down for the betterment of the road between Sudbury and Fort William; because it is recognized that if that road were acquired, it would be necessary to spend a considerable sum of money upon it for the purpose of improving the gradients.

The hon. leader of the opposition further proposes that we should acquire or lease or obtain running powers upon, or build, whatever the best railway experts in Canada, would recommend, a line from Fort William to the city of Winnipeg. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader of the opposition wisely and prudently said what must be done, if you build a railway in the interests of Canada, namely, that it might be to the best interests of Canada to get running powers over the railways now going from Winnipeg to Fort William, which is the seaboard of the North-west. No one would attempt to do more than provide for the building or the acquiring, or getting running powers over the road, just as a commission would advise in such a case, and I have taken, therefore, the plan of making a calculation based upon the cost of building a road which may be a possibility in order to compare the scheme from end to end with that suggestion by the government. To acquire or construct a line from Fort William to Winnipeg, 426 miles, would cost $30,000, a mile, or $12,780,000. For the betterment of that road, we would have to spend $2,100,000, in order to make it a first class road. With your permission, Sir, I shall now go over the road from Coteau Junction to Fort William, giving what each section would cost. From Jacques Cartier to Coteau Junction, thirty miles to be constructed at $40,000 per mile would make $1,200,000. From Coteau Junction to Depot Harbour, by the Canada Atlantic Railway, the distance is 342 miles. We would have either to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway or build another line, which would cost $12,000,000. From Scotia Junction, on the Canada Atlantic Railway, to Sudbury, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, 104 miles at $40,000 per mile would cost $4,160,000. To acquire or construct if necessary—but I am going to assume that it will be acquired, because it will be in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway to enter into an agreement of that kind—555 miles of railway between Sudbury and Fort William at $45,000 per mile would cost $25,000,000. For the betterment of that section, to make it a first-class road, it is estimated that $3,000,000 will be necessary. To acquire or construct—because the latter might be a possibility—the railway from Fort William to Winnipeg, 426 miles at $30,000 per mile, would cost $12,780,000. For the betterment of that piece of road, it is estimated that $2,100,000 would be required to make it a first-class road. There would be, if we add the section between Scotia Junction and Sudbury 104 miles, a matter of interest amounting probably in round numbers to $200,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the last item which the hon. gentleman gave, the item of betterment, is that intended to be applied to the road he proposes to build? Twelve million seven hundred and eighty thousand dollars he gave as the cost of building an independent line from Fort William to Winnipeg, and then he spoke of betterments on that line.

Mr. CLANCY. When I say that the construction of the road would cost $30,000 per mile, such a road might not be up to

the standard and would require additional expenditure for betterment. If, on the other hand, you were to acquire one of the roads in existence, you would have to spend that same amount on betterment to make it a first-class road. The sum total which will bring the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal into the city of Winnipeg will be $60,470,000. You remember that we are dealing now entirely with the roadbed, with its terminals, and with the equipment which belongs to a railway outside of its rolling stock. The scheme proposed by the government from the town of Moncton to the city of Winnipeg is precisely that class of work, and I wish to make a comparison upon similar terms. I propose now to deal with the scheme proposed by the right hon. gentleman, alongside the one enunciated by the leader of the opposition. I wish to ask any hon. gentleman in this House if he is prepared to say that you can build a mile of the road from Moncton to Winnipeg any cheaper than you can a mile of the road from Montreal to Winnipeg. Can any hon. gentleman state within ten million dollars what that road will cost? Will any hon. gentleman assume the responsibility, even upon better information that the government have, of saying that mile for mile the road from Moncton to the city of Winnipeg can be built as cheaply as the road proposed by the leader of the opposition, namely, the extension of the Intercolonial from Montreal to Winnipeg? They both pass through a country somewhat similar, and the estimates I have given are based on the experience of a country traversed by railways, where we have reliable information as to the cost of a first-class road. If we wanted to begin work to-morrow, we have all the information necessary to ascertain the approximate cost. But the question of policy, how it shall be done, the most economical and efficient way to do it, is a question to be determined on better information than you can get in this House.

I shall now make a comparison upon the same basis of cost, between the government scheme and the proposition of the leader of the opposition. The cost of the eastern section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is as follows: From Moncton to Winnipeg is 1,875 miles. I am taking the figures given by the Finance Minister, and I am going to take the mileage given all through by hon. gentlemen opposite, so that there will be absolutely no mistake in making a fair comparison. According to the Minister of Finance, the distance between Moncton and Winnipeg is 1,875 miles, and the average cost per mile, as set forth in the extension of the Intercolonial Railway is $41,500, including everything. I, therefore, apply the same rule and calculating 1,875 miles of road from Moncton to Winnipeg, at the same cost per mile as the extension of the Intercolonial, we have a cost of $77,812,000. Then there is the interest during the period of construction, taking the figures given on the cheaper plan outlined by the Minister of Finance, this would come to $3,309,000, and the contribution to the Quebec bridge would be $2,000,000, as estimated by the Minister of Finance. The total capital expenditure in this case would be $83,122,000. I will ask you, Mr. Speaker, to mark the words 'capital expenditure,' because it is an important feature in this scheme.

In the scheme laid down by the hon. the leader of the opposition there is absolutely no interest expenditure involved beyond the paltry some of something like $200,000, but the interest expenditure upon this road as proposed by the government, from Moncton to Winnipeg, a distance of 1,875 miles, would come to $29,238,000. Then there is another sum involved which the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) termed the cost to the country. The Prime Minister estimated this at $13,000,000; the Minister of Finance raised him half a million, and called it $13,500,000; the Minister of Trade and Commerce went still further and told us yesterday that it would be $14,000,000. Now, let me tell the whole truth as to what this is to be. There is an expenditure on capital as I have said of $83,122,000; and the interest on the cost of construction on this eastern section—and I am dealing now with the eastern section alone, leaving out the prairie and mountain sections for the purposes of this comparison—the interest on the cost of construction, in ten yearly payments, which the government in their contract have agreed to pay, and must pay, would be $2,493,665 a year for ten years. Some hon. gentlemen may say: Well, we may have to pay that for only seven years. There is something in an argument of that kind, speaking generally, but the probability is overwhelmingly on the side of having to pay it for ten years; and for this reason, that it is no small matter for the Grand Trunk Railway to have to finance each year so large a sum in interest as $2,493,000. There is another danger; it has not been contended in this House that this will be a paying, competing road. No hon. gentleman has offered the statement so far, or even the suggestion that this will be a competing road through Canada. They have said time and again: Oh, there is a good deal of fine national sentiment in this. It is going to promote colonization. But no man has ventured to deny the one fact that is overwhelmingly more important than this, namely, that this is not to be a national competing road from one end of Canada to the other. There is the other danger that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will not have net earnings sufficient to pay that interest or any portion of it. The doubt is, and this doubt was in the minds of the men who made the bargain—for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway

people are not in any sense infants—that for the first seven years they will not be able to pay anything. They contemplate that for the next three years it may be possible, nay, it is probable, that they cannot pay one cent and they therefore ask you to capitalize that and to charge them the interest on it. The Grand Trunk Railway thus compels the government to finance for it something like two and a half millions of dollars. If the Grand Trunk pays that, it will go into the public treasury of Canada. If the Grand Trunk does not pay it, it is not a debt against the Grand Trunk Railway, it is a sum upon which interest is to be paid, and therefore constitutes a part of the cost of the road without one dollar going into the road in return.

For ten years we must pay in interest out of the treasury of Canada, $2,493,000 a year, an enormous sum. Let it be remembered that each of these payments must be carried, one of them over nine years, one over eight years, one over seven years, one over six years, one over five years, one over four years, one over three years, one over two years. Therefore we must pay out of the treasury of Canada to carry each of these payments during the period of ten years a sum amounting to $3,366,000. There is absolutely no doubt that this will have to be carried. If you had made a payment nine years ago you would have borrowed the money to pay it, and therefore must pay the interest on the money for that nine years, and in this case the interest will constitute part of the cost of this scheme. Then the government have entered into a contract with the Grand Trunk that the rental, if any is paid, is to be paid annually. They have undertaken by their Bill and by the contract that the commissioners appointed to construct and manage this road shall issue the bonds of Canada, payable half yearly. Therefore a sum of money is borrowed that is paid to the government if it is paid at all, yearly, and the government has to pay the interest upon that half yearly. The difference thus arising during that period is nearly one million dollars that the country will lose directly by that transaction, $935,150 is the net sum. The whole sum involved, Mr. Speaker, is $29,238,000 not one cent of which will have gone into that road, every cent of it being a dead loss to the country. There will be nothing to show for it.

I have given you the capital expenditure at $83,000,000 in round numbers. I have pointed out in detail—and I challenge hon. gentlemen to successfully controvert a single statement I have made—that you are paying out nearly $30,000,000 interest on this scheme after it is constructed. The Minister of Finance made an allowance for interest during the period of construction, but I am now dealing with that future interest which amounts in round numbers to $30,000,000 for which you have to carry a dead scheme for ten years. Now if that can be said then this road will have cost $83,000,000 with $29,000,000 added to it, altogether $112,000,000. I wish to say and to emphasize this particularly, that thirty-five per cent of the money will be paid out by Canada, $83,000,000 of it for construction and nearly $30,000,000 paid out for interest for which Canada will have not one copper to show. I know of no more alarming condition of affairs than that Canada should have to enter upon a scheme of this kind.

I know of no more alarming condition of affairs than that Canada should have entered upon a scheme that involves, not the cost alone, for if the cost went into the road you could use it as an asset, but that Canada should be asked to commit herself to a scheme that involves the payment of a subsidy to a railway without any return for ten years, a cost that will amount to two million and a half dollars, in round numbers, in order to get the company to take over the road and run it. Is it any wonder that the Grand Trunk Company refuse to enter into a scheme of that kind, or to finance it? It was stated by way of apology, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the reason for doing that was that the Grand Trunk Pacific, although a great and rich corporation, backed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, was unable to finance so great a scheme. The Minister of Trade and Commerce was cautious, prudent, as he always is, and refrained from entering into details of that kind. The hon. gentleman did not tell us that we could have got over the difficulty without costing us one cent, by way of guarantees, if we considered the security good. But the hon. gentleman skated over the thin ice without falling in. I only regret that the hon. gentleman did not improve the opportunity to give scope to his intellect and experience upon a question of this kind. Had he done so, he would have denounced the scheme as the rottenest scheme that was ever proposed in Canada. He would have told the country that we had entered upon a scheme that would involve an expenditure of $30,000,000, in interest and that for all the good we would get out of it, we might as well throw the money into the Ottawa river.

Now, that is the essential difference between these two schemes? The first one is a scheme that loads Canada with interest for many years to come. The best evidence that it is a scheme that should not be entered upon is the fact that the shrewd railway men of Canada would not touch it. It has been said in this House over and over again that the Grand Trunk Pacific did not want this scheme. It has been said in this House that it was a miserable compromise of local conditions and party conditions, and that what might have made it a scheme of national utility has been sacrificed to the meanest motives. The Grand Trunk Pacific Company know that perfectly

well. They refused it, and they said: If you want a scheme of that kind you must carry it out yourselves. The government said: If we build the road you will operate it? The company said: No, you must give us two million and a half dollars a year, or we will not operate it for ten years. What does that mean? It means that we have to build a road that will be no good as a competing transcontinental line; it means that we have to build a road that cannot earn dividends above the cost of operation; it means that if you want a railway of that kind, it will be so expensive and of such a character that Canada must bear the burden and folly of it, because the Grand Trunk Pacific is not in a position to bear it.

But we have that scheme financed by the Finance Minister. I am sorry he is not in his place, but I am delighted to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce is here. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has been an authority for many years upon questions of finance. I sympathized last night with the hon. gentleman's embarrassment. He is a gentleman of long experience, a gentleman of more caution than the Minister of Finance, and in his utterances he took very good care not to commit the country to the extravagant statements made by the Minister of Finance. Now, Sir, let us see how the Minister of Finance deals with this great question. Before I go further, I want to call the attention, both of the Postmaster General and of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to this fact, that what the Minister of Finance terms the cost of the road to the people, is only a portion of the loss to the people in addition to the cost. It is not the cost at all. The leader of the opposition has never shirked his responsibility. He has never given any uncertain sound on any question which he is discussing. He is prepared to say, as his followers are prepared to say, that every dollar that goes into this work costs the people that much money. If we borrow the money, the credit of Canada is pledged to that extent. The sums paid out in interest are absolutely lost to the people, in addition to the cost of this scheme. Now, I wish to read what the Minister of Finance says:

> If at the close of the year, when we are making up the accounts, we lay aside the surplus which will have accrued as stated in the budget speech, and subject to the improvement which we hope will take place in the final adjustment of the accounts, and if, instead of using that surplus to build railways elsewhere, to reduce our debt, or in the many other ways in which we could use it, we place that $13,000,000 in the hands of financial managers, I hope to show the House that that money would meet every financial responsibility which the government of Canada have assumed under this contract. How is this brought about? We have to consider not the mere multiplication of interest for seven years. What we have to consider is what use we could make of that $13,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he is prepared to commit himself to this government handing over $13,000,000 to be invested by finance managers? Does he propose to hand it over to an insurance company, as has been suggested by the Minister of Finance? Does he propose to take $13,000,000 and invest it in that way? I ask the right hon. gentleman now if he is prepared to sanction any such plan; and without being offensive I ask him to give me an answer now, because it is important. The right hon. gentleman, prudent as he always is, cautious and wise, will never commit himself to a folly of that kind. Yet the Finance Minister, who sits alongside of him, has made that statement in this House, he would commit such a folly. I call it folly, Mr. Speaker, but the word is a mere euphemism for a much stronger term that might be applied to a proposition of that kind. I know of no more palpable fraud upon the people of this country than to propose a matter of that kind. It is something that no government would think of doing. It is something that no government in Canada has any authority to do. But he told us that apart from that he was going to use it. We have had surpluses in past years as follows, according to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite:

1898	$1,722,712
1899	4,837,749
1900	8,054,714
1901	5,648,333
1902	7,291,398

Now, the hon. Minister of Finance proposes to invest, as he says, $13,000,000 of surpluses that he is going to have in cash. I desire now to ask the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) what has become of these past surpluses? Will that hon. gentleman tell us where that money has gone? These surpluses aggregate $27,554,000 during these past years. Will that right hon. gentleman tell us where that money is? Has there been one dollar invested in any way? Has it been placed at the credit of the people of Canada in any of the chartered banks? Has it been invested in securities? Has there been such a thing in existence? The right hon. gentleman will not answer such a question. Nobody knows better than that right hon. gentleman himself that this is a perfect fraud upon the people. No such thing is possible. The money did not exist, it is a mere bookkeeping fiction, and there was no surplus. I shall not ask that right hon. gentleman to account for it, because it did not exist in any sense. I say that when you have to call to the aid of any scheme such frauds as that, such pretensions, it requires no better answer for the people of this country than the complete silence of the right hon. gentleman. If any man in Canada knows, he does. Where has that money

gone ? There is a difference, as the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock) will see, between the cost of the two schemes, including interest and capital expenditure in both cases. The one leaving Moncton and going to the city of Winnipeg, and the other leaving the city of Montreal and reaching Winnipeg, of $51,000,000. Where is that difference thrown away ? I have calculated the cost per mile in each case as being precisely the same, because it is the only way of making the comparison. There has been thrown away at the commencement of the line, in paralleling the Intercolonial Railway, $15,000,000 or $16,000,000. We have evidence beyond doubt of that fact. We have the evidence of the hon. Minister of the Interior and we have the evidence of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that the Intercolonial Railway can compete, and compete successfully, even with a shorter line. In order that there may be no mistake, I will give to the House what was stated in this House as evidence. I will give to the House the views of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, a gentleman of experience greater than any other man in this House, who declared from his place here that the Intercolonial Railway could compete successfully and compete with the shorter line, because it had a better road, and that by attempting to shorten that road 60 or 70 miles, you do not improve it in any way, because you cannot get as good a road, and the difference is so small that it is not recognizable. He says :

It must not be forgotten—and I wish to emphasize this fact—that the Intercolonial Railway has such exceptionally favourable grades, is so well laid, and is such an exceptionally favourable road for traffic, running along the coast line, that it can haul heavier traffic 259 miles further—

In this case it would only be 60 or 70 miles further.

—than the Canadian Pacific Railway in shorter time. You can therefore see how small a figure 77 miles would cut under such circumstances.

But that is not all. I am going to give the evidence of an hon. gentleman in this House who, it has been said, made the speech of the season in regard to this question. I have now reference to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton). He had made a reference to the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway, as hon. gentlemen will see by reference to 'Hansard,' and then he proceeded to say :

The figures that I have given prove that the Intercolonial Railway was able to do a substantial amount of business, and that the Intercolonial was able to do it in competition with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway ; both lines much shorter than the Intercolonial Railway ; both lines—and this is the point I wish to emphasize—both lines shorter than the new Grand Trunk Pacific Railway line will be. Then, Mr. Speaker, if the Intercolonial Railway under its traffic agreement can compete with the short line to Portland and with the short line to St. John, why in the name of common sense cannot it compete with the new line by way of the Chaudière Junction ?

We have the evidence now of the hon. Minister of the Interior that such an expenditure is wholly unwarranted. The only reason given for building a shorter line was to enable the transcontinental line to be a competing line. We are told by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals that the Intercolonial Railway is a competing line, and that it will be a better competing line than the proposed short line, as hon. gentlemen may term it, and we have the further evidence of the hon. Minister of the Interior that the Intercolonial Railway is competing, and can compete, with the existing short line. Then, I say you have thrown away $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 of their $51,000,000 in constructing that alleged shorter line through the province of New Brunswick. But you have done more. You have paralleled the Intercolonial Railway. You put a road alongside the Intercolonial Railway when it is stated by one of the hon. ministers that the Intercolonial Railway will be a better competing line than the proposed short line, and I say it is the rankest folly to build a road alongside the Intercolonial Railway and thus render the Intercolonial Railway less efficient. You will destroy the efficiency of the service for the people living along that line, you build a line to no purpose, and you will enter upon a scheme which is an absolutely unjustifiable one, as a supporter of the government declared from his place in the House last night, and one that he was prepared to vote against.

Where does the balance of the $51,000,000 go ? The other part of it disappears in the payment of interest. The sum payable in interest will be about $30,000,000.

Now, I want to come to another feature upon which much stress has been laid, and that is the colonization feature of this road. I shall not say anything in regard to the province of Quebec, because I confess to a very limited knowledge of the character of the country in that province. I am, therefore, leaving out the question of colonization in New Brunswick and Quebec. I believe that to be a question of general policy, which must be dealt with by itself. But I will take the province of Ontario, and I shall not have one ill word to say of that country.

The hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) delivered an admirable speech last night, in which he said that both parties had faith in the country and I venture to say that for the first time in his whole parliamentary experience, he had seen both sides of the House professing abiding faith in the possibilities of Canada when discussing a controver-

sial policy. It was a feature that he had never witnessed in the course of his whole public life. I believe that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) came to parliament a very young man, and he has grown up in wisdom, and experience brought to him by those two greatest schools in Canada, namely: Membership in the House of Commons and membership in the profession of journalism. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) was pleased to notice that no matter what the scheme before this House may be, the present opposition, the Conservative party of Canada, refuse to decry the country when they are discussing it. The opposition in this House, Sir, will use no unworthy weapons in meeting any scheme promulgated by the opposing political party. In that respect they differ from another parliamentary opposition in Canada in days past. The opposition in this House have chosen to examine the scheme itself and to base their criticisms upon its merits or demerits, and I will not go so far even as to tell what I believe to be the whole truth about the country through which this government railway will run. Let me say in general terms, that I believe that part of Canada is worth something. But, if you put colonization roads there to-morrow, the northern part of the older provinces cannot possibly compete with the great west for many years to come. As an evidence of that let me refer to the reports of the Ontario government surveyors, upon which hon. gentlemen opposite have been compelled to rely entirely for their information. There are about 100,000,000 acres of land in that territory, and if you take what is called the clay belt and every patch of agricultural land that can be collected in it, you have something like 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 acres of agricultural land in northern Ontario, or about one-seventh of the whole. I shall not decry the country; I need not say more than that. I believe that some day, even perhaps in this generation, young men may go into that territory when the lands in more favourably situated parts of the country are exhausted for agriculture. Sir, I shall not follow the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) in his manner of justifying the government scheme. He told us that this country would be settled up immediately, when as a matter of fact every one knows that it cannot compete in agricultural possibilities with the fertile lands of the west, for many years to come. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil) proposed to subject French Canadians to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. He told us that there were people in Quebec who would go into that country and grub up stumps. I shall not allow the remarks of the hon. gentleman to dispel from my mind my long-cherished belief, that the French Canadian people are as intelligent and progressive as any other people in Canada. My experience of them is that they are as much alive to public questions, that they are as keen in business questions as any other class of our people; and to say that French Canadians would go into such a country as that and be too dull to see the advantages of the west, is a statement which I for one do not believe. Are our French Canadians or any other Canadians for that matter, less intelligent than the Europeans who are flocking into our west to reap the many advantages which that country possesses? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcil) driven into a corner for an argument in favour of the government scheme, was forced to say that his fellow French Canadians were duller than other people and could not see the advantages of fertile lands as compared with these regions in the north. It is a slander on the French Canadians, and I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that your own experience has been, that French Canadians will dig up stumps when they can get clear and fertile lands on which to settle.

I have said, Sir, that the question of colonization must be dealt with separately, and I have also said that it would be folly amounting to insanity to subordinate a single feature of a strong national transcontinental competing railway to the idea of colonization. What is going on in the province of Ontario just now? Commencing at Quebec until we reach the line between Manitoba and Ontario going west, what do we find in the matter of railway construction? We have the Lake Temiscamingue and Pettawawa River Railway, under the Canadian Pacific Railway, built some distance into that country. We have the Ontario government constructing a line from North Bay and penetrating that country into the fertile lands of Lake Temiscamingue. We have the James' Bay Railway, now under construction, I understand, that will run from Sudbury to Lake Abitibi also in what is called the fertile belt. This has been given by the Ontario government a cash subsidy of $2,000 a mile and a land grant of 5,000 acres a mile for 175 miles running north. We then have the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway, that runs from Missanabie Station further west, through the valley of the Missanabie and within forty miles of the clay belt. In order that hon. gentlemen may not be sceptical let me read what this report says:

> The southern boundary of this great tract of fertile land is less than 40 miles from the Missanabie Station on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the country north of the height of land being an immense level belt sloping off towards James Bay, the construction of a railway and wagon roads through every part of it would be comparatively an easy matter.

But that is not all the railways that are projected or under construction. There is as I have said, the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway running from Missanabie station to Moose river or James bay, going through the whole length of that coun-

try. It has from the Ontario government a cash subsidy of $2,000 a mile and a land grant of 5,000 acres a mile for 240 miles. Then we have from Peninsular Harbour, a station still further west, the Lake Superior Long Lake and Albany River Railway, running from Peninsular Harbour to Hudson's bay. It has a cash subsidy or ten miles of $3,000 a mile from the Ontario government. Then we have the Nepigon Railway, running from Lake Nepigon to Long lake and James bay, also penetrating that country. It has a cash subsidy of $3,000 a mile for the first fourteen miles, which, I believe, are being constructed. Then, we have the Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Railway, which runs from Port Arthur to St. Joseph's lake, on the Albany river, which, as you know, forms the boundary line between Keewatin and the province of Ontario. The length of this railway is 225 miles. It has received from the Ontario government a cash subsidy of $2,000 a mile for the first ten miles, which, I understand, are in operation, and a land grant of 5,000 acres a mile for the whole length. It is abundantly clear that an effort is being made in the direction of colonizing that country. I have pointed out seven lines of railway which will be feeders to what in the near future I contemplate will be the Intercolonial Railway of Canada. Much has been said as to the value of developing that northern country. That country has both mining and agricultural features; and, although the latter may be and will be delayed in their development for many years, for the reason I have given, some day the country will be developed and colonization roads will be built through it; but they will be built from other parts of Ontario than from the city of Quebec or the city of Winnipeg into Ontario. The natural flow of capital into that country will not come from either of these quarters. The men who put their money into these schemes are men who live in the great cities of the province of Ontario. No man can be considered sectional because he says that the capital for these purposes is more likely to come from the great cities of the province than from either end of it. Some day it may be found necessary to build a colonization road through that country, or the necessity may never arise. It must depend entirely on the information which may be obtained, and the circumstances which it will disclose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just one matter more which I desire to deal with, and that is with regard to the relative cost of the two schemes before us. I am assuming, as I have a right to assume, that this House will not of necessity consent to the scheme placed before the House by the government. I have a right to assume that hon. members on both sides of this House will exercise their prudence and their independence—will recognize their responsibility, not only to their constituents, but to this country. This is not a question that involves merely the responsibility of a member of this House to his own constituents. It is, I am glad to say, a bigger and more important question. I am going to assume, as I have a right to assume, that this is an open question—that this parliament may not adopt the scheme proposed by the government. I go further, and say, after all, before this debate closes, the government, before they ask the House to commit the country to so rash a scheme, will have the grace themselves to withdraw it. I do not despair of either of these events happening. I therefore assume that this is an open question; and I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, as to what would be the proper course to be pursued by every independent member of this House, having both schemes placed before him. One is a scheme that involves the expenditure of some $83,000,000 of capital, and a further expenditure of $30,000,000 of interest, which is absolutely thrown away. One contemplates a paralleling the Intercolonial Railway uselessly, as has been shown by one member of the government, who has set up a defence on behalf of this scheme, and also by an ex-minister who has made no little sacrifice by the course he has taken with regard to it. The other scheme is for the construction of a line from the city of Montreal to the city of Winnipeg, into which not one dollar shall be put that will not the next day earn interest and pay its way. If the scheme proposed by the government is so rational that it can be as fittingly called a national railway as the Intercolonial, we shall have to wait five years before we derive any benefit from it, and during those five years we shall have to pay for it. The one is a scheme that meets the wants of the people to-day. The other is a scheme that involves a delay of from five to seven years before the people can derive any benefit from it. Under these circumstances, is there any difficulty in any person, either inside or outside of this House, concluding which of these schemes he should support? One is for the development of the people's railway. In one case we invest our own money and accomplish more. The proposition of the government is not for a competing national railway. It cannot be a national competing railway. Let me give you the reasons why it cannot be. Whether the trade of the west goes to the city of Quebec or to the city of Montreal is a matter of no importance to the shipper, because ocean freights from the city of Montreal to Liverpool are precisely the same as from the city of Quebec to Liverpool. To show you that it is not a competing line, I want to give you the all-rail distances. The distance from Winnipeg to Montreal, by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is 1,426 miles; the distance from Winnipeg to the city of Quebec by the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific, as given by the Minister of Finance,

is 1,475 miles; and the distance from Winnipeg to Montreal over what will be the Intercolonial Railway is 1,406 miles. I have pointed out that the distance by the Canadian Pacific Railway to tide water is much shorter than by the proposed line. I have pointed out that by the Intercolonial Railway it is 1,406 miles from Winnipeg to Montreal as against 1,475 miles from Winnipeg to the city of Quebec, and it makes no difference to the shipper whether his goods are transhipped for Liverpool at Montreal or Quebec. But there is another point. During the season of navigation the distance by rail and water. From Winnipeg to Fort William is 426 miles, from Fort William to Depot Harbour, 444 miles; and from Depot Harbour to Montreal, 379 miles; or by that route the distance is 1,249 miles to Montreal as against 1,475 miles to Quebec.

But let us compare the rail and water route, which will be used for 90 per cent of the freight, with the proposed competing line. From Winnipeg to the port of Quebec by the rail and water route is 1,411 miles, and by the all-rail route—which is the more expensive route—the distance is 1,475 miles, or 64 miles longer than would be the extension of the Intercolonial Railway, using rail and water, during the season of navigation. That clearly demonstrates, first of all, that we need not make any invidious distinction between the city of Montreal and Quebec. Montreal is the great metropolis of the Dominion, and Quebec is an important city, but the Canadian people are not going to consider the local jealousies of these two places as against the general interests of Canada. They will adopt, therefore, the shortest and cheapest means of getting to Liverpool and other ports, and I have shown you that the rail and water route to Quebec, as proposed by the leader of the opposition, is shorter than the other.

With regard to the mountain section, I have only this to say. The leader of the opposition laid down this as a feature of what he considers a national scheme, that the Grand Trunk Railway will be in no worse position under it than it is in to-day. His proposition involves the giving to the Grand Trunk Railway or any other railway, such assistance, by way of guarantee or otherwise, as will ensure the most speedy construction of a railway in that country. I may, therefore, dismiss for the moment any discussion of that phase of the matter, but there are two important features he did point out. One was that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway should locate that road where it would be in the interests of the territories, namely, that it should go north a reasonable distance in order to ensure some benefit to that section where there is now no railway communication. The other was that any subsidy given to the Grand Trunk Railway, or any other railway, to build through the mountains should be given under such conditions that no company should control that line, but should be obliged to give running powers over it to other companies on such conditions as would be fair all around. Some stress was laid on the fact that the hon. gentleman went further and said that, in the event of the railway companies not agreeing on the terms, the government would construct the road itself. But that is a remote consideration. We would have the power to regulate the rates and other matters, and it would not be in the interest of the railway companies to contend over questions of that kind, so that we may leave that point entirely aside.

I desire to say in conclusion, that we have the two schemes now placed before the country. With the one case we have a live scheme, on which there will not be a dollar expended for which we do not get value. In the other case, we have a scheme of procrastination, and one that will impose a burden upon the people to the extent of $30,000,000, for which there will be nothing to show, and more than that, we will be investing money in the building of railways which will not belong to the people of Canada. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) was forced from a strong sense of duty to go out of the government because he was not prepared to give his sanction to such an insane proposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite frequently make unworthy references to that hon. gentleman for the course he took; but I would ask what had he to gain? Had he anything to gain personally? Did he not know that the moment he failed to agree with his colleagues in the cabinet, the moment he failed to lend his experience and ability in bolstering up the insane scheme they proposed, he would be blackguarded by the supporters of the government from one end of Canada to the other. Is it an argument against the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals for any hon. gentleman to declare—as an hon. gentleman opposite has done—that the reason he resigned was because he wanted the manipulation of the government contracts, and could not get it? We had another hon. gentleman who, I believe, is slated for a judgeship—I should hope that support of the government scheme is not the price of a judgeship in this country—declaring that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was not fit to latchet the shoes of the Prime Minister who put such a scheme on foot. We had another hon. gentleman, the member for Victoria, N.S.—who is reading a newspaper now, and I would ask him to turn his eyes this way—declaring that the chairmanship of the Railway Commission had something to do with the stand taken by the ex-minister. I am surprised that a gentleman of his long parliamentary experience should be obliged to call to the aid of so insane a scheme the attributing of unworthy motives. The ex-minister

is suffering now the penalty of his loyalty to his country. He has to submit to the taunts of hon. gentlemen opposite. He has to endure being hounded all through the country by his former supporters. Let me say that never was a man actuated by more worthy motives. Never was there a man who made greater sacrifices. Never was there a man in the history of this Dominion who had a greater opportunity offered him to serve his country, and to his great credit be it said, that there are few men, who, although the opportunity might fall to their lot, would be strong enough to avail themselves of it as he did. I desire to say—and this is the least that ought to be said by every honest man sitting on that side of the House if he would express his honest views—that there is no man to whom the people of Canada owe a greater debt of gratitude, no matter what may happen to this scheme.

I desire in conclusion to say a word in reference to the hon. gentleman whom, as an humble member of this House I have the honour to follow, the leader of the opposition. The Conservative party to-day are not living upon the achievements of our great leaders in the past; their achievements were great enough, Mr. Speaker, to be recalled and the Conservative party might well fall back upon its record and that of the great leaders who have preceded the hon. gentleman who now with such signal ability leads the opposition in this House. The opposition to-day are not living upon the great deeds of statesmanship of former leaders of the Conservative party, we are living to-day upon live issues, led by a great leader. What are the evidences of that, Mr. Speaker? At a supreme moment in the history of Canada when we had to decide upon an immense expenditure only to be justified because it was a great national undertaking, when we were at a point that if we were to spend a dollar we must spend it wisely and must divorce our decision from every consideration other than the national welfare, we have found a leader strong enough to propose what he believes and what the country, I am sure will believe is a great national scheme for the reasons I have already stated and one that would justify any expenditure of money. There is no small risk in a leader taking that position. But he has not only undertaken to criticise, but I believe has successfully criticised, what he believes to be, what I believe to be, what I believe every hon. gentleman opposite believes to be, a mistaken policy and one which Canada should not adopt. The leader of the opposition has taken upon himself to point out the difficulties of that scheme, difficulties so great that it is evident that if we are to build a railway, that is not the way to build it. He has propounded what we believe to be not only a rational scheme but a national scheme, which he is prepared to defend from end to end of this country, a better scheme than that one proposed by the government and one that would cost less money, a scheme that will give an asset to Canada for every dollar that is spent upon it and that will earn returns from the day of its inauguration, a scheme that belongs to the people, a scheme that challenges admiration, a scheme that will control the railway rates on all the railways of this country. I realize that the Grand Trunk Railway is a great system and that it would be a fatal mistake to cripple that, or the Canadian Pacific or any other of our railways. But the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition is so perfect that it will not cripple a single interest in railway building in Canada. It gives full scope to all of them; it goes so far as to nationalize sections of road in order to make it possible for all those roads to prosper. In a word, Mr. Speaker, it is a scheme that I believe will be approved by the people of this country and that is worthy of the great leader of the Conservative party.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). Mr. Speaker, I apprehend that it is very seldom a matter of greater importance comes before the parliament of Canada for consideration than the one which we are considering at the present time, a question of greater interest to the people of Canada, or of greater importance in the development of our national industries. Though this debate has been somewhat protracted and will likely last for some time longer, I feel impelled to express my views on the subject and not to give merely a silent vote.

Every hon. gentleman who has addressed the House so far, I believe, has had something to say in reference to the late Minister of Railways and Canals, and I do not know I will hold myself up as an exception to that rule. I will say that I regret exceedingly that that hon. gentleman found it incumbent upon himself to retire from the government. He was a gentleman whom I, at any rate, always admired as chief executive of the Department of Railways and Canals. I trust that there were no other reasons than purely patriotic reasons that induced him to retire from the government. But I could not help but think, in listening to his speech, that he did exhibit something of the spirit of a spoilt child, that he had had his own way for so long in his native province of New Brunswick, and had been a dictator, an autocrat, in that province for so long a time, that he could not submit to the suggestions of any one else when he came to Ottawa. Now, Sir, there is this particular coincidence in connection with the resignations from the government. It was only a short time ago that every Conservative speaker and every Conservative newspaper

in this country were claiming that the two hon. gentlemen who have lately left the government were the masters of the administration, that they were the men who controlled the situation. Possibly, Sir, these gentlemen had seen that statement so frequently and so continuously made throughout the country, that they began to think so themselves. But when the time came for decisive action these gentlemen found that there was only one master of the administration, and that was the right hon. Premier of Canada. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite cheered very lustily the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals when he made his statement. I thought that if it had not been for the argumentative powder which he furnished the opposition they would have been absolutely without ammunition to bombard this proposition. They have apparently followed almost entirely in his lead; he was the bell-wether that led the flock on the other side. It is not so very long ago that these gentlemen were not so fond of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. It is only last session of parliament that these gentlemen cheered with great fervor the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) when he made on the floor of the House a most bitter personal attack on the ex-minister, not only impugning his executive ability as a minister of the Crown, but challenging his honesty as a man. That statement was cheered by these hon. gentlemen. They condemned him right and left, but now, forsooth, after he has picked out for them a policy which they think will be of some benefit in the approaching elections, they cheer him lustily.

Now, Sir, I did regret that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals went out of his way to make a personal attack upon his late colleagues, and I feel very confident that had he exhibited less vindictiveness, his remarks would have had greater weight, at any rate with hon. members on this side of the House, than they will have under the circumstances. However, I regret very much that he has seen fit to leave the government. He was an able administrator, and I believe an honest man, notwithstanding the assertion of hon. gentlemen opposite. I would be very glad indeed if I could see him back again at the head of the Department of Railways and Canals of Canada.

Now, Sir, what is the position of this transcontinental railway question? The ex-minister says that we are rushing into this project with undue haste, without sufficient knowledge. The leader of the opposition says that before anything is done in the way of construction of a transcontinental railway we should have a transportation commission appointed, and that view was followed up this morning by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). These gentlemen became exceedingly eloquent on the question of a transportation commission, arguing that we should have had commissioners appointed who would investigate the whole problem and report to this parliament before anything was done. Now, what is the position with regard to the appointment of a transportation commission? Why, Sir, we all know that when the question of transportation first came up in this House two seasons ago, there were very diverse opinions in regard to the matter. But transportation of what kind? Not railway transportation, but water transportation. The then Minister of Public Works was demanding very loudly and eloquently that the French river navigation should be improved, that millions of money should be expended by the government in improving the French river, so as to allow freighters of the largest class on the upper lakes to go through to North Bay. The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) were both contending that the government should build, or aid in constructing, the Georgian Bay canal, besides improving the French river. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) was also in favour of that proposition. Many hon. members were in favour of deepening the Welland canal to twenty-two feet. Large sums of money were being expended at Port Colborne for the betterment of the Welland canal route; the harbours on the upper lakes were being improved, and considerable sums of money were being expended in those places. And, Sir, it was by reason of the divergent views of hon. members of parliament in regard to the best mode of transporting the cereal products of the west to the seaboard, that the question of the formation of a transportation commission was taken up. I venture to say that you cannot find within the pages of 'Hansard' a speech made by any member of this House in which it was at any time suggested that the problem of a transcontinental railway should be at that time taken into consideration by this transportation commission. Why, Sir, the very fact that Sir William Van Horne was suggested as chairman of that commission absolutely disproves the argument that there was any question of a transcontinental line of railway to be inquired into. What would he say? He would simply say to the government: Why, the Canadian Pacific Railway can carry all the products of the west that need to be carried for many years, and the best thing you can do is to give a further bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we will carry the products. That is very likely what he would have said. I say the very fact of his being nominated on that commission disproves the idea that there was a question of a transcontinental railway involved in the appointment of that commission.

Now, Sir, has there been undue haste and want of deliberation in this matter? When this session of parliament opened, a Bill

was presented by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) on behalf of some gentlemen asking incorporation under the name of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. That Bill went before the Railway Committee of this parliament. The proposal was to construct a line of railway from the city of Quebec to Port Simpson on the Pacific coast. When the Bill came before the committee there was not an hon. member of this House, there was not a man in the Dominion of Canada, but was delighted to know that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company proposed to construct a second transcontinental railway. There was not a dissenting voice from any member of this House against the proposition for the construction of a second transcontinental railway. Well, Sir, what occurred then? This Bill came before the committee. Where did the obstruction arise? Not from people in the west, not from people in Ontario, not from members from Ontario but from hon. members from the maritime provinces who suggested that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company should be compelled to continue the line to the city of Quebec, and to the city of Moncton. There is where the opposition came from. The Grand Trunk Pacific did not want to build it, the western members were not asking that it should be built; but the eastern members, and most notably the hon. member for King's county, New Brunswick, (Mr. Fowler), wanted it built. The hon. member for King's county insisted most loudly that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company should be, not only allowed, but compelled to extend their line from Quebec to Moncton, thus paralleling the Intercolonial, concerning which hon. gentlemen opposite are so much concerned at the present time.

There was then no suggestion in the Railway Committee by any hon. gentleman opposite that the Intercolonial was being paralleled. A few hon. members on this side of the House supporting the government, did suggest, I believe, that we were paralleling the Intercolonial. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals condemned the proposition of members from his own province because it would parallel the Intercolonial. He said that he was prepared, if Minister of Railways and Canals at the time this railway was constructed, to give them running rights, to enter into running arrangements with the Grand Trunk Pacific over the Intercolonial. Well, Sir, Mr. Hays agreed to that. But no, that would not satisfy these gentlemen from the lower provinces. They simply insisted that that portion of the line should be built, and that it should not only be built, but should be begun at the same time as the western section. Mr. Hays said, very well, I want to construct this railroad. Here is a great country, we want the advantages of opening up this enormous territory between Quebec and Winnipeg, and we are willing to go a step further and construct the line from Quebec to Moncton. Now, Sir in that situation of affairs we were to have a transcontinental line not only to Quebec but from Quebec to Moncton, paralleling to some extent the Intercolonial. That was the position. That was agreed to by the Railway Committee. And, Sir, what hon. gentlemen in this House stood up and condemned that proposition? I have failed to find anything in 'Hansard' and I certainly did not hear while sitting in parliament any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House stand up in his place and condemn the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway either because it was going through this wilderness which they claim of no value or because it was paralleling the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, we are face to face with this proposition: The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company intended to build. They intended to parallel the Intercolonial Railway. The whole proposition was based on the hypothesis that they were to have government assistance. Mr. Hays most emphatically and very frankly stated before the Railway Committee that if they built this road they must have government assistance. Every argument before the Railway Committee was based on the assumption that parliament would grant assistance and grant very large assistance. Now, what amount of assistance would have been granted? The hon. senior member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) gives a cue as to what assistance would at any rate have been demanded. He said the other night that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company would have in five minutes turned down an offer of $20,000,000 to build this road. I believe they would have. If they had in mind what the government gave to the Canadian Pacific Railway they would have turned it down certainly. If they had in mind what the government of Canada has granted by way of assistance to other railways in this country and what the government of the United States has granted towards railways in that country, they would have turned down a proposition of that kind. I do not know what government assistance would have been granted to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for the construction of the road, but this I do know and it is something that we can take as a settled positive fact that the government would have granted substantial assistance, and that it would have granted substantial assistance with the approval of this parliament, and I believe that assistance would not have been much less than $35,000,000 or $40,000,000. The government was face to face with this proposition: The road was to be built, government assistance was to be asked—was it better for the government to take hold itself of the eastern section of the road and to build it as a government work, or hand over to the Grand

Trunk Pacific Railway Company $35,000,000 or $50,000,000 and let them build the road and own it? That seems to be placing the matter in a fair and reasonable position. The road was to be built either by the government or by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company with government assistance. The government steps in and says: We will build the eastern section of the road if we can enter into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company on such terms as will be satisfactory to the people of this country and on such terms as will safeguard the public interests. The contention that this line is paralleling the Intercolonial Railway is one that is absolutely valueless when we come to consider the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was bound to be paralleled, if not by a road built by the government, then by a road built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The question is: Which is the better business proposition, whether we should give to the company the large assistance which the company would have demanded and which parliament would have approved and allow the company to build and own the road or whether the government should construct the road, and then, having constructed it, own it absolutely and own it for all time to come? Hon. gentlemen say that the Intercolonial Railway is side-tracked and that you are killing the effectiveness of its operation. I take issue most emphatically with any hon. gentleman who makes that suggestion. I think it is just the reverse. Instead of side-tracking the Intercolonial Railway we are extending the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Winnipeg. We are building a government road from Quebec to Winnipeg over which the Intercolonial Railway will have the same running rights as any other railway company in the country. Then why say that we are side-tracking the Intercolonial Railway? Section 24 of this agreement says:

> 24. The said lease shall also contain proper and usual provisions,—
>
> (a) Reserving to the government in respect of its ownership, present and future, of the Intercolonial Railway and any other line or lines of railway, running powers and haulage rights over the said Eastern Division upon equal terms with the lessees.

The fact of the matter is that we will have Intercolonial Railway trains running through to Winnipeg and competing with the Grand Trunk Pacific over this line owned by the government and operated by these different companies. So that the contention that the Intercolonial Railway is being side-tracked is manifestly a fallacious one. It is said that all the expenditure that was made on the Intercolonial Railway between Quebec and Montreal goes for nothing. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) said that we were condemning what he did last year. I say that we are doing nothing of the kind. The Intercolonial Railway has its present arrangement with the old Grand Trunk Railway Company by which that company agrees to deliver to the Intercolonial Railway freight at Montreal. That agreement still stands and the Intercolonial Railway will get an equal amount of haulage from the Grand Trunk Railway at Montreal in future as it has in the past. How in the name of all that is sensible can the Intercolonial Railway be injured by the construction of a second line from Quebec to Winnipeg, whereas, as a matter of fact, the Intercolonial Railway has up to the present moment never got one dollar's worth of haulage from any place west of that section of the country. The Intercolonial Railway has never derived any benefit from any haulage of freight from the North-west. Under the very excellent agreement entered into between this government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company the position of the Intercolonial Railway was improved with respect to haulage, but as a matter of fact the Intercolonial Railway never did get a dollar's worth of haulage from the North-west. But, Sir, the construction of this railway from Quebec to Winnipeg, will place the Intercolonial Railway in a position to compete with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and not only get its proper share of the haulage from Ontario under the existing agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway, but it will compete with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in its grain haulage to the seaboard from the territories.

The ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) desired not only that the government should own the road, but should operate the road, and we have an amendment before us suggesting the idea of government ownership and government operation. For myself, I am free to state now, that I am absolutely and emphatically opposed to any system of government operation of railways in Canada. Our government has enough to do looking after the development of this country without going into the railway business. We have got business men in Canada who are capable of looking after and operating our railways. The conditions existing in certain European countries where they have government operation of railways, do not correspond with the conditions existing in Canada. Our government as at present constituted, and in view of the great work of developing our country before us, cannot spend its time in the operation of railways. That matter should be left, and wil be left to private corporations, not only for the present, but for a long time in the future.

It has been said that there was undue haste on the part of the government in entering into this agreement, and that they should have had further information and further data to proceed upon. To my mind that question simply depends on whether the agreement is a good agreement or a bad agreement. If it is a good agreement

we could not have entered into it too quickly—if it is a bad agreement we should not have entered into it at all. Now, is it good or bad ? We have heard very little criticism of this agreement from the opposition, that it fails to protect the public interests, assuming that this road is to be built. I venture to say that there is no gentleman in this House who can successfully criticise this agreement as an agreement not calculated to protect the public interest. I never saw an agreement more carefully prepared and more thoroughly safe-guarding and protecting the interests of the people of this country. Why, Sir, the agreement is so good that the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) suggested that he did not believe the Grand Trunk Railway would ever carry it out. He thought it was so good an agreement for the country that there must be something underhand, something unseen in it, some private deal in it between the company and the government. The tenor of the discussion on the opposite side of the House has been, that this agreement is too good, and that it cannot be a bona fide agreement or else the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company would have never entered into it. Therefore, Sir, I am safe in saying that no just criticism can be offered to this agreement. The ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) told us that the agreement, although signed by Mr. Hays on behalf of somebody, placed no responsibility and no liability on any person whatever. Well, if the agreement is not carried out by the company it need not be carried out by the government. But remember that the company have to deposit with the government $5,000,000 as security that they will carry out the agreement, and with that $5,000,000 we have money enough to make the explorations which hon. gentlemen opposite are so keenly anxious for. If the company deposit $5,000,000 and do not carry out the agreement, then that handsome sum is appropriated by the Crown. If they do carry out the agreement, well then we have our agreement perfected and the money is returned to the company. But what was the security given by the Canadian Pacific Railway ? It was not $5,000,000, but $1,000,000, and Sir Charles Tupper stated that $1,000,000 was ample security for the due performance of that immense contract by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We therefore have five times the security from this company that the Conservative government demanded from the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, Sir, the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) said we were binding ourselves to construct a railway through a country which was absolutely unknown, and the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) repeated that statement so far as Quebec and New Brunswick were concerned. The ex-Minister of Railways also said that in constructing through New Brunswick, we would be obliged to make a detour into the state of Maine. Well, to start with, the agreement prevents that. This government has not undertaken to do impossible things, and the contract says that the railway shall be constructed wholly upon Canadian territory. If it cannot be constructed upon Canadian territory then it will not be constructed at all. The contract says that the eastern division shall be constructed, by and at the expense of the government, upon such location and according to such plans and specifications as the government shall determine, having due regard to directness, easy gradients, and favourable curves. If we cannot locate the line through this section of the country with easy gradients and favourable curves, then we are not bound to locate it at all. The contract also says :

> The construction of the eastern division shall be commenced so soon as the government has made the surveys and plans and determined upon the location.

The location is to be of easy gradients and of favourable curves. That is all the government is binding itself to do. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk as though the government had entered into a contract whereby they must at once, without surveys, without consideration, without an examination of the country, rush ahead and at any sort of unlimited expense construct a line of railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. That argument is absolutely fallacious and misleading. If hon. gentlemen opposite will read the agreement and interpret it as any reasonable, sensible man would interpret it, they will find that the government, when the agreement is ratified by parliament, will immediately begin to enter on the survey of this territory. The agreement expressly says that the work shall not be begun until they have made surveys and plans, and until they have determined upon the location of the road, having reference to easy gradients and favourable curves. Why, Sir, the people of this country would not stand for this government, or for any government, rushing ahead blindfold into an enterprise without making full and ample inquiry. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are as much interested in securing the best line, with the easiest grades and the most favourable curves as the government is. All the surveys, all the plans, all the specifications, are to be submitted to the engineer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. That company is to have a voice in the construction of this road, and very properly so, because they have to pay 3 per cent interest on the cost of its construction ; and they will certainly see that a modern and up-to-date road is built, and built as cheaply as it can be, consistently with efficiency and proper construction.

Now, Sir, compare for a moment the sections of this agreement which are binding on the government as to construction and the section which is binding on the company as to construction. Section 10 says:

The work of locating and constructing the said western division shall be commenced forthwith after the ratification of this agreement by the parliament of Canada, and shall proceed with the utmost despatch and shall be completed within five years from the 1st day of December, 1903.

So that we have this condition of affairs, that the company must, immediately after this contract is ratified by parliament, begin the construction of the western division of this railway, and must have it completed within five years, whereas the government, in constructing the eastern division, can take as much time as is necessary to have proper surveys made and to construct the railway in a modern up-to-date way. I think the contract submitted to the people of this country will receive the approval of every business man in the Dominion of Canada. I doubt if any man can successfully criticise it.

There has been something said in regard to the cost of constructing this railway. I do not think I need occupy the time of this House at any great length in discussing that question. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) this morning had compiled a peculiar set of figures, which were somewhat incomprehensible to me, and I am very much inclined to think also to himself. He says that the line of railway from Moncton to Winnipeg will cost $41,500 per mile. He makes that assertion, comparing the cost of that line with the cost of procuring a right of way for the Intercolonial Railway between Point Lévis and Montreal, under the agreement which was entered into by the government a year or two ago. That, I understood to be his suggestion, and it is absolutely erroneous. I have had the pleasure of asking railway men what, in their opinion, that portion of the railway would cost. Railway men differ in opinion on these matters; but there appears to be a strange unanimity of opinion on the part of hon. members of this parliament as to the cost of railway construction through this country. My information is that the line of railway from Moncton to Winnipeg, speaking generally, at a fairly conservative estimate, will cost about $30,000 a mile. The hon. member for Bothwell suggested that that line would cost $77,812,000. According to my information, it will cost about $54,000,000, so that the hon. member is out $23,812,000. Probably that is not very much for the hon. member for Bothwell. Probably that is not so much out as he will be after the Redistribution Bill goes into force. He made some other suggestions as to cost which I will refer to in a moment.

Well, Sir, the hon. leader of the opposition has propounded a policy. Some one, whose name I have forgotten just at the moment, has said, 'Oh, that mine enemy would write a book!' It occurred to me that the right hon. Premier felt, 'Oh, that the hon. leader of the opposition would propound an alternative railway policy!' And he has done so, and a more absurd proposition I think was never submitted, not only to parliament, but to any body of sensible men. I think I could hear the inward growls of the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) when that proposition was made by his leader. I would like to know what the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) thinks of it. I would like to know what a good many other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House think of the proposition of their hon. leader. The hon. member for Bothwell made a suggestion as to the cost of carrying out that proposition. I will take the liberty of stating what my information leads me to believe is the fairly correct probable cost of the proposed road of the hon. leader of the opposition.

In the first place, he has to construct a line from Montreal to Coteau. My information is that that will require a line 37 miles in length, which, at $40,000 per mile, the figure given by the hon. member for Bothwell, would cost $1,480,000. The next part of the proposition was to buy the Canada Atlantic line from Coteau Junction to Depot Harbour. The hon. member for Bothwell states that that line has been in the market for the last two or three years. He says there is a standing option on it. We know that Dr. Seward Webb, of New York, who is connected with the wealthiest people in the United States, came here and put up $1,000,000 with Mr. John R. Booth as an option for the purchase of the Canada Atlantic Railway, at the price, if my recollection serves me, of $11,000,000 or $12,000,000. But that option was not carried out—why? Dr. Seward Webb had behind him all the weath of the New York Central Railway Company, all the wealth of the Vanderbilts, with whom he is connected, practically the wealth of the city of New York. Why, then, was that purchase not carried out? Rumour makes the sugestion, whether it is correct or not we do not know, that the suggested earnings of that road were not the same as the actual earnings. For some reason or other Dr. Seward Webb did not carry out the purchase. At any rate, the hon member for Bothwell says that the Canada Atlantic Railway is in the market for sale. I do not know whether the government of Canada need to purchase a railway that is in the market for sale. At any rate, I understand Mr. Booth now wants $17,000,000 for that railroad, and it is very certain that it would cost at least $3,000,000 to put it in a satisfactory shape to be used as a transcontinental line, bringing its cost up to $20,000,000.

The hon. leader of the opposition next proposes that we build a railway from Scotia Junction to Sudbury, the length of which he puts at 120 miles. The hon. member for Bothwell puts it at less than that. My information is that its length is 120 or

122 miles. That road cannot be built for less than $30,000 per mile. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) said it would take $40,000 per mile to build it. There is a sum of $4,200,000 more. The leader of the opposition had another feature in his scheme. He proposes that we should purchase the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William. This is a road which was practically built with the people's money, which was subsidized to an amount that would perhaps have built two such roads, and the hon. gentleman coolly asks that after we have built this road for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company we should buy it back again and make them a present of all this money. He says that eminent railway men are in favour of that proposition. I could imagine that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy would be in favour of it. I have been told—I do not know whether it it true or not —that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) is the father of the proposition submitted by the leader of the opposition, that it was he who suggested the purchase of this line from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. No doubt the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would be willing to sell. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has told us, it is absolutely an unprofitable section of road. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have no use for it in the future at all because they have the Soo line running to Minneapolis from the North-west which they could use. They have a line, which is just as short, by the Soo line running up to Moosejaw and reaching the Pacific coast, with better grades and equipment and better fitted to do a profitable business than the line along the north shore of Lake Superior. Certainly they would like to sell the latter line. They built it with the people's money, and now they would like the people to buy it back, and $50,000 per mile is the lowest price at which it could be purchased. I believe that the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) said it would cost $60,000; but taking it at $50,000, that would make $27,500,000.

Then the hon. gentleman started on another equally extravagant project. His great desire appears to be to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway. He proposes to improve the grades of the Canadian Northern Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William and Port Arthur to Winnipeg. Those are two lines, both of which have been heavily bonused by the government, which have received enormous government subsidies; and now the hon. gentleman says we should devote a large amount of the revenues of this country to improving these lines of railway, provided they will give us the right to control the rates. Well, so far as the Canadian Northern is concerned, we have control of the rates now. But that is another item of expenditure which, I am credibly informed, will amount to $7,500,000.

Then he has a proposition to build a railway from Edmonton to the coast. He is to give aid to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and then suggests that we should build a government road from Edmonton to the coast. That road will be about 700 miles long, and will cost, at any rate, $40,000 per mile, which would make $28,000,000 more. Then he comes on with a colonization scheme. He proposes to spend on this great transcontinental scheme from Montreal to Coteau and thence to Winnipeg, $88,680,000. And although he condemns this government for making a line paralleling the Intercolonial Railway for a few miles through the province of New Brunswick, the hon. gentleman suggests that as soon as he has paid out $88,680,000 to procure this transcontinental line, he will immediately start out building a new line to parallel it from Quebec to Winnipeg and from Winnipeg to the coast, because he says eventually it will be necessary to make a through line from Quebec to the coast. And this colonization road of which he speaks certainly could not be built for less than $42,000,000. So that we have the snug little expenditure of $130,680,000, and a railway several hundred miles longer than the one proposed by the government, a railway which does not open up one acre of new territory, which is running through the older settled portions of Canada and which will not be approved by the people of this country.

Hon. gentlemen opposite seem absolutely to forget or ignore the true principle involved in this proposition. They appear to think that the sole object of the government is to secure a transcontinental line of railway. But that, as I understand it, is not the exclusive object. The object of the government is to have a railway through the new portions of Canada, which will bring to light the hidden wealth that exists there. The proposition of the hon. gentleman will cost over $130,000,000, and you will have really nothing in the way of a transcontinental railway. What would be the use of purchasing this road from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company north of Lake Superior and this line of the Canada Atlantic Railway Company from Coteau? Every pound of freight that would go from the west to the east over these lines of railway go there now. The quantity of freight coming from the North-west to the seaboard would not be increased. The government would not take any more traffic than is being taken by these private corporations. But the hon. gentleman would give running rights over these lines to other companies. Very well, let them run their trains over them. We have got the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway now, and I do

not believe that the haulage from the west to the east would be increased by one thousand pounds by the purchase of these railways. I can easily imagine that eminent railway men anxious to dispose of their property would approve of this proposition. I do not think it should be called a transcontinental proposition. I think a better name would be a scheme for the relief of John R. Booth and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

But on the proposition of the government, there is something more than the transcontinental feature, and something stronger. Hon. gentlemen opposite have argued very strongly that we are going through a territory of unknown quantity and quality, that we are going to construct a railway through a country which is of no importance. I would like to call the attention of the House to this fact, that this is not the first railway enterprise which ever proposed to traverse land of an unknown value. One has but to read the history of the transcontinental roads through the United States, and even of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to know that it has been the experience of them all to traverse lands of which little was known in the first instance, but which in the end turned out to be valuable assets.

Consider, Sir, the tremendous task that lay before the Northern Pacific Railway in traversing what was known as the bad lands of Dakota, and the other arid portions of that North American desert. Before the Northern Pacific entered that section of country that is now the state of Montana, it was supposed to be a howling wilderness, absolutely valueless in every respect, but the entry of the railway into that country opened it up and developed it, developed more particularly the copper industry of that state, and to-day the state of Montana which when that railway was projected was considered to be an absolute wilderness, is one of the richest states in the American republic. The process everywhere has been that the explorer goes into the country; he locates mining claims which he considers to be of some value, but which are absolutely valueless until the railway comes along affording transportation facilities to bring in the fuel for the transfusion of the ore and to convey the product to market. That is what we expect in our own country, particularly in the province of Ontario. The principal ore which has made the wealth of the states lying east of the Rocky mountains has been copper ore, and we know, Sir, from very positive information which we have received that throughout new Ontario, particularly on the line of this proposed Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, we have indications of copper which are exceedingly rich. We have further large areas of iron ore, such iron ore as is found on the south shore of Lake Superior, from which 25,000,000 tons is taken annually to supply the furnaces of Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York. If this iron ore exists in Ontario, as I believe it does exist, it would almost pay us to build this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for the single purpose of opening up those mines. We would in that way do something at any rate to bridge the gap of which the hon. leader of the opposition speaks as now existing between eastern Canada and western Canada. A great iron industry on the north shore of Lake Superior would, I assert, do something to bridge that gap, and would create a greater solidarity, a closer kinship and brotherhood between the Canadians of old Canada and the Canadians of that new Canada lying west of Lake Superior. We have this further fact that we have already established in that northern portion of Canada at Sault Ste. Marie a very considerable iron industry, an industry which at the present moment is practically in its infancy. But, Sir, I would ask what will be its position when this Grand Trunk Railway comes to be constructed? I believe, and I am informed that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will require for its purposes 100,000 tons of steel rails annually for the next five years. Canada's importation of steel rails to-day is about 150,000 tons annually, so that this new customer will add to the wealth of the iron industry 100,000 tons, making a demand for 250,000 tons of steel rails annually. These will be the product of the steel rail mills of Canada if they can be produced here as cheaply, as economically, as they can be produced in other places. The hon. member, the junior member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) the other night suggested a very peculiar proposition. He said that under this agreement the government had absolutely given away all possible chance of protection to the iron industry of this country. He bases this statement on clause 17 of the contract, which provides :

> No addition shall be made to the cost of construction or to the capital of construction account in respect of customs duties in cases where there is direct importation of material or supplies by the government.

I was not at all surprised to hear the hon. Minister of Finance suggest to the hon. member for West Toronto that he certainly could not be serious ; a more absurd proposition I never heard emanate from any man claiming to have the ability that the hon. member for West Toronto claims to have. There was never the slightest intention of allowing steel rails or any other material which shall be consumed in the construction of this railway to come into Canada to the injury of our own producing industries.

Now, Sir, I say that we have that large industry now at the Soo, and the construction of this railway will give an impetus to that enterprise so that, possibly within a short time, the men who so courageously pioneered that industry in Canada will reap some benefit from their investments.

We have also territory further to the north, and I believe that when this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway passes through that country it will serve as a basis of operations and as a basis of exploration in that country around James' bay and Hudson's bay. We know, Sir, that three years ago certain Philadelphia gentlemen sent one of our Canadian geologists, Mr. Low, of Ottawa, up into that country with an exploring party to look for copper. They found not only copper, but they also found several islands in which there was a large quantity of iron ore. These Philadelphia gentlemen are now at work, and either this year or next year at the latest their ships will be carrying iron ore from these islands through Hudson's strait to the markets of United States. Surely what these gentlemen have done as a private enterprise, we Canadians, with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway running through that country as a basis of operations, running through that country, can investigate every nook and cranny of that northern region and ascertain for ourselves whether we cannot devote some portion of its wealth to our own purposes instead of allowing it to be taken off to foreign countries to increase their wealth.

There is one other factor in connection with this proposition that seems to me the strongest, perhaps, of all, and that is the fact that the old Grand Trunk Railway Company is behind it. Had the government adopted the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), and extended the Intercolonial to Winnipeg, we would have had a single pair of rails running from Quebec to Winnipeg without a branch line in the country. It is well known that a through-trunk line cannot possibly be made to pay without branches. What would the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a trunk line, have amounted to without branch lines as feeders, had it not gone into outside enterprises, into the shipping industry, into different industries in order to bring traffic to the main arteries. Sir, every trunk line of railway must have branches, must have feeders stretching out in all directions, to bring into the main artery the products of the surrounding country. The present Grand Trunk Railway possesses unrivalled facilities for collecting merchandise in Ontario and Quebec for despatch to the west, and for distributing the hard wheat of the west among the millers and merchants of Ontario and Quebec. It is, without doubt, of the greatest importance, to Ontario at any rate, that the government has so managed that behind the proposed transcontinental line stands the Grand Trunk Railway Company with its large mileage in Ontario and Quebec, with its splendid equipment in both of these provinces. The government might have constructed branch lines, but will any one say that the government could have constructed a system of branch lines that would have been in any way equal to the system of branch lines owned and operated by the Grand Trunk Railway Company? The Grand Trunk has spent half a century and millions of dollars in perfecting its present system and its present mileage, and that whole, huge organization for the collection and distribution of products becomes, by the government's policy, the auxiliary of our transcontinental road; whereas, had the government extended the Intercolonial, we would have had no benefit, in Ontario at any rate, from the proposition suggested by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals for constructing a single trunk line across that territory between Quebec and Winnipeg. Hon. gentlemen opposite have suggested that that country can be opened up and explored by extending lines to the north. It might be after some years that colonization roads extending north would develop and open up that country. But who will say that by the construction of this transcontinental railway as suggested by the government, that country will not be opened up very much more quickly? The wealth of that country will be developed very much more quickly than it would be by any system of local lines running north and south. The whole system of the Grand Trunk will be brought to bear to make this transcontinental line a success, the whole organization of the Grand Trunk will be brought to bear to transmit and distribute the products of the west among the people of Ontario, and Quebec, and the maritime provinces, who desire them for their own consumption. What this railway will do for Ontario it will do for Quebec, it will do for New Brunswick. I do not know much of New Brunswick, but having made a short visit there, I feel that I know this much at any rate, that the one thing New Brunswick needs is more railway accommodation. I cannot imagine how any hon. member of this House from the province of New Brunswick can stand up and denounce the attitude of the government in constructing this line of railway through that province. Their conduct is to me inexplicable.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). We will see no more of it.

Mr. GERMAN. I venture to think we will see no more of it, because I believe the people down there desire this railway, they are anxious to have this railway, notwithstanding that some hon. gentlemen say it will parallel the Intercolonial. They want more railway facilities there, and I will be surprised indeed if the people down there do not heartily support the government's proposition.

Now, Sir, the whole history of railway development proves conclusively that railways are the magic wand which turns the wilderness into a land of activity and wealth, and this Grand Trunk

Pacific cannot fail to open up the country to the north of the older settled portions, and to direct population into those regions. These people will create industries, and open up what is at present a vast wilderness, and make it a valuable portion of our national domain. The ex-minister says that we should wait, hon. gentlemen opposite say we should wait. For what should we wait? For exploration? We have had explorations, the whole province of Ontario has been explored, the government of the province of Ontario has had exploring parties out for years. The gentlemen who are interested in the iron industries of Sault Ste. Marie have had exploring parties out in the province of Ontario for years. We have the reports of those gentlemen, and we know, in the province of Ontario at any rate, that we have unbounded natural wealth only waiting to be developed by the introduction of a railway such as this. We know that the province of Quebec has been explored as well as the province of Ontario. Then why should we wait? Is it merely to suit the wishes of the hon. gentlemen opposite? Sir, the people of this country will not wait. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals said that Senator Cox would not wait. I do not know whether he will or not, but I do know that the people of Canada demand that we shall have a transcontinental railway. Therefore I do not see any necessity for delay.

If we are ever to have another transcontinental railway constructed, now is the time to begin operations, while we are on the crest of the wave of prosperity, while there is wealth in abundance, while money is plentiful and can be secured at a low rate of interest. Now is the time to take the initiative, now is the time to go ahead with the construction of this road. We are warned by some that hard times will be on us shortly, that there will be depression in the money markets of the world, that there will be depression in our financial institutions. Why, Sir, it appears to me that the construction of this Grand Trunk Pacific, and the millions of dollars that it will be necessary to expend upon it, the money being brought in from a foreign country, will go very far to turn back the tide depression that is said to be approaching, and will prevent for many long years to come financial depression in this country. I say that now is the time for us to advance.

A good deal has been said about the transportation problem. We are told that grain cannot be carried from the west to the east by railway. Well, it seems to me that he must be a bold man who will prophecy anything about the carrying trade of the future. We know not to-day what conditions will exist five years hence when this Grand Trunk Pacific is constructed. We do know this, however, that grain is being carried from the west over the Canadian Pacific Railway to St. John. We know further that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with their usual enterprise has purchased a line of steamships for the Atlantic ocean. They must have wheat as freight, and how will they get that wheat to St. John without carrying it, at any rate for five months in the winter, by rail? They will certainly carry it by rail, and if the Canadian Pacific Railway can carry wheat by rail from Winnipeg to the coast, how much more readily can the Grand Trunk Pacific, with its easier grades and its more modern appliances? The Grand Trunk Pacific, under agreement with the government, is bound to supply shipping accommodation not only on the Pacific, but on the Atlantic ocean, they must take care by their own ships of all the freight that is hauled over their line. So they will get grain from the west, and they will give a greater measure of competition than we have existing at the present time. They will give lower rates of freight by reason of that competition, and that is exactly what the settlers in the North-west require. What they must have is low freight rates in order to compete with the agriculturists in other parts of the world. I believe that large quantities of the wheat of the North-west will be carried by rail. The Minister of Agriculture told us in his speech the other day of the large quantities of wheat that were being carried from Chicago to the Atlantic ports by rail. If wheat can be carried from Chicago to the Atlantic ports by rail, it can be carried in the same way from Winnipeg to the Atlantic ports, and this, I believe, is what this new railway will accomplish.

Now, Sir, what have we in this proposition? We have a line of railway extending from Moncton to the Pacific coast, we have the shortest transportation line from the wheat fields of the west to the markets of Europe. There is no line on the American continent which will afford as short a haul for the wheat which is grown in the north-western part of the north American continent as the Grand Trunk Pacific will afford by the route from Winnipeg to Moncton and St. John and by steamer from there to Liverpool. So that, we have the shortest transcontinental line from the west to the east. We will have a line of railway which will cost this country a trifle compared with the enormous resources of the country and compared with the amount of money which other railways have cost this country and cost other countries. We have a proposition which will be approved of by the people of this country and in contradistinction to the policy stated by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I submit that there can be no reasonable or fair comparison made between them. I will not take up the time of the House any longer. Looking, at this proposition, Sir, from every point of view, I believe it to be sound, businesslike and patriotic, the best thing that

can be done under existing circumstances for the North-west Territories, for Ontario, for Quebec, for the maritime provinces and for Canada at large. I venture to believe, moreover, that when this debate is ended, when the heat of partisanship has passed, at least some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will come over to our opinion in the matter and join with us in assisting the right hon. leader of the government in carrying out his wise and energetic policy to the end. I cannot believe that many intelligent Conservatives either here or elsewhere will remain long if ever attached to that monstrous absurdity the policy of the hon. leader of the opposition which will involve an enormous expenditure, an expenditure far greater than that involved in the policy proposed by the government and give us nothing in return but a system of shreds and patches of remnants and job lots which will be of no avail in opening up our country either east or west. Notwithstanding our political differences we are all Canadians proud of our name and heritage, proud of the mighty future which seems to be ours, if we but be true to ourselves. Let us then get together and when this debate is ended strengthen and uphold the great Canadian at the head of the government while he devotes the next four or five years to consummating indeed work which promises to be a fitting crown to a long, meritorious and useful career.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to follow very closely the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) who has just taken his seat, because a considerable portion of his speech has been based upon assertions and upon idle street rumour the employment of which I thought was rather unworthy of the hon. gentleman and which are deserving of very little consideration at the hands of this parliament. The hon. gentleman has referred to the scheme proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), as being fathered by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). The hon. gentleman knew perfectly well when he stated that, that it was absolutely without foundation and if he did not know it I can assure him now, although I do not know that it will prevent him from repeating that assertion, that the hon. member for West Toronto had just about as much to do with formulating the policy of the hon. leader of the opposition as the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) had himself. However, I will say that if he had been consulted on the question it would have been no discredit to the hon. leader of the opposition, as a gentleman of the business experience in railway and financial matters, the hon. member for West Toronto is quite competent to advise the hon. leader of the opposition and is much more competent to do so than the hon. member for Welland. Now, if I am correctly informed the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, when the 'Globe' newspaper outlined this scheme a few weeks ago, was one of those to take exception to it, but, evidently the party lash has been called into action since then with the result that the hon. gentleman meekly responds to it, gets up and addresses the House and praises the scheme of the government in language so extravagant as to almost make you believe that he was speaking from conscientious conviction. I believe that the hon. gentleman's second christian name is Manly, but I think he was most unmanly in the manner in which he referred to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). He said that the hon. gentleman was as much out in his figures as he would be out of the House when the gerrymander got through with him. I do not think that is anything to the credit of the hon. gentleman or to the credit of the committee which dealt with that subject. However, let us hope that should the hon. gentleman be so unfortunate as to be gerrymandered out of his own constituency he will be back here as a representative of the people from another constituency, but, should it be the misfortune of the country that he should not be returned, I feel confident at any rate that it will not be because he has done anything to cause his disqualification or to prevent him from being able to exercise his franchise during the next seven years. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House has spoken as if this transportation commission had nothing whatever to do with transportation by rail. He said: You can search the pages of 'Hansard' in vain to find there any intention expressed or referring to the transportation commission anything except the question of transportation by water. If the hon. gentleman had been in his place in this House during the last few days he would have heard quoted on more than one occasion the Order in Council passed on the 19th May, 1903, in which the duties of this transportation commission are laid down. I am not going to read it all again but I will just quote sufficient to show that the hon. gentleman has been ignorant of the duties that were to be assigned to the transportation commission. Amongst other things the commission were to inquire into:

> The conditions with regard to the navigation of the St. Lawrence route, and, generally, any improvement, enlargements, or other matters affecting the more economical and satisfactory uses of any Canadian channel of transportation by land or water.

I think that is a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman when he states that the commission had not referred to the question of rail communication. Then the commission proceeds:

> The minister further states that in making such investigation attention should not be confined to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of

transportation by land or water can be opened up.

The hon. gentleman will see that he is entirely in error in assuming that the transportation commissioner's duties would be exclusively devoted to the question of transportation by water. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons assigned for the construction of this line is to relieve the grain congestion in the west and to afford more adequate facilities for carrying the products of our farms in the west to Canadian seaports. As a representative of the west, I desire to engage the attention of the House for a short time and I will do so as concisely and succinctly as possible. I am sure it must be a source of gratification and pride to every true Canadian when he comes to review the history of western Canada in particular during the past quarter of a century and when he comes to compare its condition to-day with what it was at the beginning of that period to see the great strides and the marvellous development that has taken place. A country that had in years gone by been referred to as one too cold for human habitation, whose climate was considered to be antagonistic to the successful production of cereals and too far removed from the markets of the world as to render their profitable rearing impossible, has to-day become the happy home of thousands and hundreds of thousands of contented people, the products of whose labour have justly earned for themselves a world-wide reputation because of their quality and quantity.

The wonderful resources of that country have attracted these immigrants to our shores by the thousands, and they are to-day making their homes in that new and progressive land. Now, Mr. Speaker, this primarily is attributable to the foresight and sagactiy of Conservative statesmen; to men who had every confidence in their country and in its future, and who did not hesitate to grapple with these questions and carry them to a successful issue so as to bring about these wonderful results, the benefits of which we are now reaping. Many years ago a former Governor General of Canada referred to western Canada as being 'the great lone land,' coupling with it the expression, that it was a country of illimitable possibilities. No longer can that term be properly applied to the Canadian west—the Indian and the Buffalo having long since given place to the white man and his accompaniments of civilization. Farming operations have long since passed their experimental stage; the 100,000,000 bushels of grain grown by our farmers last year is a sufficient guarantee that the future prosperity of that country is assured. Possessing a road as we do; a national transcontinental highway that has been the pioneer in bringing about this development, that unites us with eastern Canada, as well as affords us an outlet at the head of lake navigation; we are no longer, as we were in the early history of the country, depending upon American roads for transportation. Therefore, in discussing this question we should not lose sight of the fact that the western Canada of to-day is not the western Canada of twenty-five years ago; and that railway construction to-day is not the hazardous undertaking it was at that time. A great and a growing trade has developed largely through the enterprise of those who had sufficient courage to invest their capital to open up that country, and to bring about that development which now demands more accommodation and greater facilities to meet the requirements of our western people. We should not be slow in expressing our appreciation of those who in that day were optimistic, but who nevertheless builded even better than they knew. To-day we have the Canadian Pacific Railway as a trunk line with its branches extending particularly in Manitoba, as a net work, and which has rendered possible the profitable raising of grain. We have as well, the Canadian Northern Railway system tapping these districts not touched by the Canadian Pacific Railway and affording competition at competitive points. Each of these roads has an outlet at the head of lake navigation. Notwithstanding this, during the past two years those roads have been taxed to their utmost capacity in their efforts to cope with the immense traffic of the country. I am free to admit that that is largely and mainly due to the fact that there was a great scarcity of rolling stock and motive power. The cry was 'more cars' from weeks end to weeks end during the period of congestion. This congestion was in turn brought about because the firms which supplied the rolling stock were so overtaxed—not only by orders from Canadian railways but from American railways, and from railways in every country in the world by reason of the immense prosperity which has visited almost every country in the universe of recent years—that they had been unable to fill their orders for often one or two years after the receipt of the same. Owing to the large influx of population to this western country in recent years (and which we hope will continue) and owing to the constantly increasing acreage brought into cultivation year after year, more facilities will be required in the immediate future in order to cope with the growing trade of that country.

A proposition has been submitted to this House by the Prime Minister ostensibly for the purpose of meeting this condition, as well as—so he states—to make us independent of the American system of transportation from the use of which he says we may be prohibited by the abrogation of the bonding privilege. Dealing first with the former of these reasons, the vital questions that present themselves are: Will this road, even after its construction, afford the necessary

relief; will it reach the congested districts; will it be able to handle any great quantity of grain over its all-rail system during the close of navigation on the great lakes? Will it, because of its location, be able to compete successfully with other lines by rail and lake; will it in short be the best means that can be devised to accomplish the purpose for which it is designed? If, Sir, these questions could be truthfully answered in the affirmative, then notwithstanding the immense outlay that will be caused by the construction and completion of the road; notwithstanding the immense liability incurred; this outlay and this liability will not have been incurred in vain. But, on the other hand, if it can be successfully demonstrated to members of this House that even after its completion this railroad will not fill the bill, will not meet the requirements of the people; if it is found that it is not the best means that can be devised; then, Sir, it will not only be a wilful waste of public money, but if it is persisted in after its defects have been pointed out to its promoters, they will deserve and no doubt will receive, just condemnation at the hands of an indignant electorate. So far as the question of the abrogation of the bonding privilege is concerned, I think it is scarcely deserving of serious consideration from the members of this House. The argument has been so effectively disposed of that scarcely a member on the other side discusses the question now at all. They have dropped it so suddenly, that it is evident they themselves have recognized that it was a mere bogey set up by the Prime Minister to coerce the people of Canada into this large expenditure, when there was absolutely no fear on that score whatever. The Prime Minister was driven to a considerable extremity when he had to go back fifteen years to bolster up his opinion by quoting from a message delivered to congress by the then President of the United States, Grover Cleveland, wherein he suggested the abrogation of the bonding privilege—a suggestion by the way which has never been acted upon up to the present date, and for the good reason that its adoption would react more upon American railways than on Canadian railways. Nor was the Prime Minister more fortunate in his quotation from Mr. Andrew Carnegie, a gentleman who of very recent date has been misrepresenting Canada and everything Canadian. Why, the Prime Minister himself had to take exception to the letter from which he quoted, in which Mr. Carnegie stated that our harbours and our ports were ice-bound during five months in the year. But still the right hon. gentleman used Mr. Carnegie as an authority to bolster up his views on this question of the bonding privilege. What would become of the great traffic that is passing from Chicago and the western cities over the Grand Trunk Railway system through Canadian territory to Portland, Maine, if the bonding privilege were abrogated? What would become of the Canadian division of the Michigan Central owned and operated by Americans—a double track system nearly all the way on which an immense traffic is being carried from the eastern to the western states and vice versa? What would become of other systems of railway traversing our country in which millions of dollars of American capital are invested, should this bonding privilege be abrogated by the American government? Sir, the bonding privilege is in no more danger to-day of being abrogated than it has been at any time during these last fifteen years, or than it will be during the next fifteen years, and for the very good reasons that if it were abrogated the greater injury would be inflicted on the American people themselves. At any rate, suppose that the privilege were abrogated, the Prime Minister would leave the impression upon this House and upon the country that we would be absolutely at the mercy of the American people, when as a matter of fact we would be just as well off now as we will be after the completion of this government transcontinental road.

What do we find to-day? We find that we can get on a train at the Pacific ocean and go through to the Atlantic and vice versa, without traversing one single foot of American territory. It is therefore that I say that this is a mere bogey put up by the Prime Minister in order to vent spurious convictions on his own part, and to inoculate other people with similar convictions, if he were successful in his attempt.

Now, Sir, when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway submitted their first proposition to this parliament, it was not at all the same proposition as that which we are now called upon to ratify. It provided for the extension of the Grand Trunk Railway from its present terminus at North Bay to the Pacific ocean. But there happened to be another charter in existence, that of the Trans-Canada Railway, held by some Quebec capitalists and other gentlemen; and pressure was brought to bear on the government of the day by these gentlemen and in turn by the government on the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, to extend their eastern terminus to the city of Quebec. The Liberal members from the maritime provinces, seeing the success of these gentlemen from Quebec, thought that their political influence might also be catered to by having the eastern terminus extended further, and located in one of the maritime provinces. But here a difficulty arose. The rival claims of St. John and Halifax loomed up on the horizon, as to which should be made the Canadian port. A solemn conclave was held by the Liberal members from the maritime provinces, to which, by the way, their fellow-members in the House of Commons of the Conservative persuasion were not invited, and a compromise was

effected by which neither St. John nor Halifax, but the inland city of Moncton, was selected as the eastern terminus; which makes it absolutely necessary to use the Intercolonial Railway from that point to reach either St. John on the one hand or Halifax on the other. The government are quite well aware of the fact that during the last few years especially there has been growing up in this country a very strong opinion in favour of government ownership of public utilities. But fearing to grapple with this question, not having sufficient statesmanship to construct a line right through to the Pacific coast under government control, they thought they would cater to this element of our population by seeming to adopt in part this principle, by constructing themselves a line 1,800 miles in length from Winnipeg to Moncton, and handing it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company for a period of fifty years, allowing the company to construct the line from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast by the government guaranteeing their bonds and paying a certain amount of interest, which is practically a subsidy on the cost of construction. I venture to say that this scheme, which has been properly called a hybrid scheme, which possesses neither the virtues of government ownership nor those of company ownership, but the evils of both, will satisfy neither those of our people who are in favour of government ownership nor those who believe in leaving such undertakings to private enterprise.

Now, whatever difference of opinion there may exist in our country to-day as to the wisdom or otherwise of a state-owned and controlled railway through Canada from from ocean to ocean, we cannot shut our eyes to this fact, that in this age of rapid progress and advancement, what might to-day receive a half-hearted support at the hands of the people, may in a few years become their unanimous desire. But by this scheme of the government, we put it out of our power to have government ownership in the proper sense of the term in the next fifty years. No matter to what an extent public sentiment may have developed in the meantime, no matter how urgent may be the demand for government control of rates, if we adopt this scheme of the government, we put it absolutely out of our power to obtain relief by government ownership in that long period. We have already a system of government railways extending from the Atlantic coast to the city of Montreal, into which we have put about $70,000,000 of public money. Although that system is not paying its way, notwithstanding the prosperous times, the government now propose to construct another railway to compete with it; and thus, if not to render the expenditure of that amount of capital nugatory, to depreciate it to a considerable extent. A few years ago this parliament was asked to vote several millions of dollars for the purchase of the Drumomnd Counties Railway, in order to make it a portion of the Intercolonial Railway system —for what reason ? In order that the Intercolonial might gain access to the commercial metropolis, the city of Montreal, and get its fair share of traffic—in other words, to make it more than a merely local road. But now it is proposed to destroy it—yes, to condemn it, as is suggested; practically to parallel it and to take away trade from that railway in which we have sunk so much money. So that, in estimating the approximate cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, we must take into consideration the large amount of loss that will be sustained on account of the future operations of the Intercolonial Railway system, an amount which no one but practical railway men can properly estimate, but which will be a large and serious drain on the public resources of this country.

Now, Sir, the government seem to have rushed into this enterprise without any, or with very little, consideration. The project of constructing a line to the Pacific coast was never mooted until a short time before the opening of the present session; and the proposal to construct the eastern section was never mooted until three months of the present session had rolled by. The government have not given the subject any consideration, as has practically been admitted by the right hon. the Prime Minister. They have rushed into it without any surveys, by which they can approximately estimate its cost, and without placing any information before the House in order that the members may be put in a position to approximately estimate its cost. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) state that the government are not bound to go on with this road, but that they are going to have surveys——

An hon. MEMBER. Backing down.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Yes, he is the first hon. gentleman on that side of the House who has spoken in that strain. He states that the government are bound to make the necessary inquiries and to have the country surveyed before they need build a mile of the road. Why did they not do that before signing the contract? They are pursuing practically the same course that they did in connection with the Yukon Railway, when they signed a contract ten days before parliament met, and placed themselves in a position to be mulcted for $400,000 damages. And the hon. gentleman states that the government are not obliged to build a single mile of this railway until they have these surveys. We suggest that they postpone these expenditures until they have the necessary information, instead of taking a plunge in the dark as they are proposing to do. The hon. member for North Norfolk admits that this railway can

never be a grain-carrying road. What, then, becomes of it as a through route to the seaboard? The western section will be constructed, and it will have its connections through American channels to the seaboard. The Grand Trunk Railway Company seem to be providing for this already, because I see by the newspapers that they are purchasing the Wisconsin Central Railway, which is going to be the link to connect with their western division in Canada.

Now, the 1,800 miles of this railway from Moncton to Winnipeg have been estimated to cost about $30,000 a mile. Even at that low estimate, that line will involve a cash outlay of $54,000,000, which must be added to our already large national debt.

I was amused when I heard the right hon. Prime Minister state as one of his reasons why this road should be constructed, that it was necessary to implement a pledge made by a Conservative government twenty years ago. The right hon. gentleman need not have travelled so far afield in quest of pledges that required to be fulfilled. Year after year, session after session, policy after policy, pledge after pledge, principle after principle, have been brought to his attention, made by himself as the head and leader of the government and of the Liberal party, and made by his colleagues in the government, which have absolutely been repudiated or abandoned; and he has to go back to twenty years ago to find one pledge that has not been carried out by a Conservative administration.

On this question of national debt and expenditure, do we not remember when the right hon. gentleman travelled along with the Minister of Trade and Commerce from platform to platform moaning and bewailing the condition of Canada, and lamenting that the people were being ground down and impoverished and were not even able to pay the interest on their national debt. And the expenses of administration were so heavy that if he were in power he would reduce them from $1,000,000 to $4,000,000 per annum. These pledges were not made twenty years ago, but a very few years ago. He need not go back twenty years, he need not go back even six months, to find his broken pledges. If he will take up the speech from the Throne at the beginning of this session, he will find in it the distinct pledge that a commission would be appointed to take into immediate consideration the transportation question. What excuse have hon. gentlemen opposite been able to give why this pledge has not been fulfilled? Not one of them has ventured to explain the reason why. Why go back twenty years to find a broken pledge, when here is one, made solemnly to the representatives of parliament at the opening of this session, and which has had the fate of all the others.

The Minister of Finance, in his speech on the subject before the House, tried a little legerdemain. He called in an actuary, and with the assistance of this actuary he assured the House he was going to pay for this road by simply taking $8,000,000 out of our surplus and putting it to one side. This amount on spot cash, when laid aside for a number of years, would cover the whole cost. If the hon. gentleman would only call in the same actuary and apply the same method in reducing our national debt, he would be doing an important service to the country and carry out one of the pledges of his party. He has here an excellent opportunity of adopting a splendid scheme for rolling off our heavy national debt.

No better evidence could be required than this debate has furnished to show that the right hon. the Prime Minister is much more at home in indulging in word-painting and in giving a display of oratorical fireworks, calculated to stimulate the enthusiasm of his followers and bring them into line, than in discussing coldly and logically a business proposition. Many of his followers are in their hearts opposed to this scheme, and a few weeks ago were very outspoken in expressing their opposition to it; but under the influence of the party lash and their party fealty they are now falling into line and giving this scheme their endorsation, and no better evidence could be required to show that the Prime Minister is more at home when engaged in this, to him, congenial occupation, than in grappling with a business proposition. When the right hon. gentleman declared that these eighteen hundred miles of railway were to be constructed without costing a single dollar to the people, he undoubtedly excited the enthusiasm of his supporters. But where is the money to come from? The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway people do not put it up, and the contractors are not such philanthropists that they are going to build the road out of pure patriotism. On the contrary, they will have no doubt to estimate sufficiently high on their contract to allow them to be milked to supplement the government election fund. When the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) asked why the government were rushing suddenly into this large expenditure without the necessary information, possibly he might have got his answer in the fact that the general elections are looming up in the near future, and the government, having no policy on which to appeal to the electors with confidence, feel compelled to fall back on ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, in which they are past masters.

Clause 24 of the contract provides that the government shall borrow this money, taking power to pay three and one-half per cent, and when the road is constructed, they are to hand it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway to be operated by that company on the payment of three per cent on the cost, or at a loss of one-half per cent. For seven years the company, after the road is constructed and taken over by them, are not called on to pay one

dollar of rent. Estimating the cost at $30,000 per mile for 1,800 miles, the government will have to pay interest on $54,000,000 at three and one-half per cent, which will amount to $13,230,000 for the seven years. In addition they will be called upon undoubtedly to pay interest another three years, should the Grand Trunk Pacific be unable to pay three per cent per annum, which will entail an additional expenditure of $5,610,000. Then the company begins, at the end of the ten years, to pay rental at the rate of three per cent for the balance of the fifty years; and if the government should have to pay three and a half per cent, that would mean a payment by the government of interest amounting to $1,890,000 per year, and a receipt by them of $1,620,000 per year, or a loss of $270,000 per annum, which would make a total loss, on this head alone, of $10,800,000. But that is not all. The government are called on pay interest—and I am taking the expenditure estimated by hon. gentlemen themselves—during the time of construction, and the time of construction will be at least, on this portion of the road, eight years. They allow five years for the western portion, but I think it will be found that in that difficult portion of country, where a great deal of rock blasting, heavy cuttings and bridging will have to be done, 225 miles of construction a year will be a very good average, which will give eight years, and eight years' interest on half the total cost of the 1,800 miles, or on $27,000,000 at three and a half per cent will amount to an expenditure of $7,560,000 during the course of construction. In addition, by clause 16, the government is bound to pay for all betterments and replacements of structure, and so on, for the space of fifty years. This will be added to the cost of construction, but nevertheless it will go to swell our national debt. Then there is the indefinite bargain in connection with the Quebec bridge, which the Finance Minister estimates will cost us $2,000,000. Then the government finds all the terminals which will be necessary in Quebec, Winnipeg and Moncton. How much these will cost we cannot tell, but it will be a very large amount. With regard to that portion of the line west of Winnipeg, the government undertakes to guarantee the bonds to the extent of $13,000 a mile on the prairie section and $30,000 per mile on the mountain section. Estimating the prairie section at 800 miles, this will entail a liability of $10,400,000 on that section for principal, and $312,000 for interest, and estimating the mountain section at 600 miles, it will entail a liability of $18,000,000. This involves payment of interest on the mountain section of $540,000 a year or for seven years, of $3,780,000.

I must say that ordinary members of the House of Commons may be excused if they differ somewhat in the estimate of the mileage and the cost, because you cannot find two cabinet ministers agreeing on either of those two items. I am taking the mileage estimated by the Prime Minister. The Minister of Justice estimates that the mileage on the prairie section will be 1,200, but I am putting it at 800. The Minister of Justice estimates the mountain section at 480 miles, but I am estimating it at 600. So that upon the whole, the Minister of Justice estimates a considerably larger mileage than I do. Six hundred miles at $30,000 per mile would amount to $18,000,000, on which the government will have to pay interest at the rate of $540,000 per year, or in all $3,780,000 for the seven years. This is practically a subsidy. It has been stated that the government is not giving any land grant or cash subsidy. It may be true that, in the wide acceptance of the term, they are not giving a land grant, but they are giving the right of way over all government property for stations and roadbeds, and they are giving as a gift, $3,780,000, which in reality is a subsidy, and for a further term of three years, they also covenant that the government is to pay the interest should the company not be in a position to do so, and I think you will find that the company will have the better of the agreement. This will be an additional $1,620,000 which the government will have to pay, taking the bonds as a security. So that taking the figures of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves, we have this total expenditure:

Cost of line, Moncton to Winnipeg..	$54,000,000
Seven years without rental, government pays interest..	13,230,000
Three years more interest, government pays..	5,670,000
Forty years loss ½ per cent (difference between 3 and 3½)..	10,800,000
Interest during time of construction say eight years..	7,560,000
Total government portion.. ..	$91,260,000
Seven years interest on bonds, mountain section..	3,780,000
	$95,040,000

But mark you, Mr. Speaker, that this does not include the liability on the prairie section or the mountain section, or the interest during the time of its construction. Nor does it include the cost of terminals and of the Quebec bridge. Nor does it include the deficits that will be incurred in the future operation of the Intercolonial. Altogether the cost would amount to considerably more than $100,000,000, which will be left as a legacy for our people to pay many years hence.

In regard to the equipment of the line, I notice that $20,000,000 is set aside for that purpose, but it is a significant fact that of this amount, $15,000,000 goes to the equipment of the western section, and but $5,000,000 goes to equip the eastern section. This rather indicates that the company,

even after the line has been constructed, have no serious idea of extensively operating the eastern section, at least that portion of the line east of the great lakes. The government have not even stipulated that they should have the option of purchasing the line owned by the company west of Winnipeg at the end of the fifty years, so that at the end of that time, if the government are desirous of operating the whole line as a government road from ocean to ocean, either because the company have thrown the line back on their hands, or because it is desired in the interest of the people to operate it as a government road, they would be left with a line whose western terminus would be Winnipeg, and which would have no feeders. We all know that no considerable amount of east-bound traffic originates at Winnipeg. The traffic which goes eastward from Winnipeg originates west of that point, and this line would be left without connections with the west. It is true that the government have the power of expropriation, but, as has been pointed out by the member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), it would have to expropriate at the then value of the road, and after taking into consideration the amount of capitalization and not the amount of cash the company shall have put into the enterprise. Therefore, I say that the government should insert in this agreement a clause to the effect that they shall have the right of taking over the road at any time and operating it as a government road by paying a certain amount for it.

No provision is made for the construction of branch lines to the government portion of the road. It is true that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company take power in this charter to construct a branch line to Port Arthur and one to North Bay and one to Montreal, which they may or may not construct. Of these, the first, at any rate, will be absolutely necessary if this road is going to carry any grain at all. Other branches will be necessary to reach the commercial centres of Ontario and Quebec unless this road, because of the want of suitable eastern connections, is going to be seriously handicapped in handling westbound traffic in competition with the Canadian Pacific and other lines.

So far as running rights are concerned, I think it has been demonstrated by gentlemen much more conversant with railway matters than I am, that the exercise of running rights, in the manner suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite, over all this system of upwards of three thousand miles, will not be practicable. There is no parallel whatever between the running rights provided for in the scheme suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition and the running rights that are provided for in this contract. The hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) practically admitted that this is a worthless concession, except in so far as it might be a lever with which to exercise pressure on the company to secure concessions by way of reduction of rates or otherwise. I do not think the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will at all fear such a lever when they are told in advance that if the government should exercise these rights they would do so at a loss. That has been stated, and I do not think the Grand Trunk Pacific Company will ever be frightened by the threat of exercising these running rights or will throw obstacles in the way when they know in advance that these rights can only be exercised by the Intercolonial Railway at a loss.

A few years ago the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) told the people of the west that this government, and he, particularly—he took credit to himself—were securing running rights over that portion of the Canadian Northern line then being constructed, called the Rainy River branch, between Winnipeg and Port Arthur. He said they were securing running rights and guarding the interests of the people over that line for the very purpose for which they are now asking this parliament to construct a new line, namely, to allow the Grand Trunk Railway access to the province of Manitoba. I have here a report of a speech delivered by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) in December, 1898. He was given a banquet at Boisevain, and his speech at that banquet is reported as follows :

> The first free railways were built by his friend, Mr. Greenway. No one ever heard of the right of giving the railways running powers over other lines till Mr. Greenway inserted it in charters of Manitoba railways. The Dominion government had insisted that the same conditions should apply to the Crow's Nest Railway, and the same condition had been imposed upon the South-eastern (Canadian Northern Railway) Railway. The government were determined to secure this freedom of equal running powers in every railway charter granted at Ottawa.

The same minister, at the time the question was being publicly discussed, announced with emphasis his intention to resign if the same provision as to running powers that the government insisted on in the Crow's Nest Pass bargain was not secured in the Rainy River charter.

We all remember how Mr. Sifton, in replying to a St. Andrew's rapids deputation, in December, 1898 :

> Introduced the question of the South-eastern-Rainy River road to Lake Superior, and declared that the government would take steps to preserve the independence of the road. He added also—and was applauded for the statement—that the government would take the same precaution that it had taken with the Crow's Nest Railway and reserve to itself the right to grant running powers over the road to any railway company that desired it, so that if the Grand Trunk desired access to Manitoba and the North-west it could have the privilege of placing its trains on the Rainy River and running them directly through to the west.

If the hon. minister had been true to the pledge he then made and had secured these running rights, why go to the trouble and the great expense of building another line through that country in order to gain the very power which he then said he had secured in respect to the Canadian Northern ? Why not exercise those running rights ? I understand, however, that the running rights that he secured over the Canadian Northern are over an intermediate portion of that road, affecting neither the Port Arthur end nor the Winnipeg end, so that they are practically valueless.

The Prime Minister gave as one of the chief reasons for constructing this line the immediate and crying necessity of relieving the wheat congestion of the west, and yet this contract does not provide for a single branch line in the heart of the congested district, in the province of Manitoba. We do not, in fact, know where this road is going to run. It is true that the promoter of the charter, in reply to a question, said that it would run north of the Canadian Northern ; if that is the case, it will not touch the heart of the congested districts at all, in fact, it will not go near the congested district. It will open up a new country, but it will not relieve the congestion. If it is built south of the Canadian Northern line, then, while it will afford that amount of relief that any trunk line will afford to a limited area on each side of the trunk line, it will still have no branch line in the heart of the congested district. When we take into consideration the vast amount of money that is to be put into this road and the liabilities it will impose on this country, the least we could have expected would have been that the government would have secured absolute control of rates ; but this they have not done. They should have secured control of rates in reality and not in name alone. The control of rates secured by this scheme is no greater than that which we already enjoy under the Railway Act of Canada, and we all know by our experience in the past how useless that is.

But in addition to this, because of the large capitalization of this road, $45,000,000 on the portion west of Winnipeg, which, together with the bonding powers of $30,000 a mile on the prairie section and $50,000 a mile on the mountain section, will amount to upwards of $90,000,000, the fixed charges that must be met before the government can exercise control over rates will be so great that we can look for no reduction in rates for many years to come. How different has been the action of the government of Manitoba of recent years : Hundreds of miles of the Canadian Northern have been secured by the government of that province by a bond guarantee of $8,000 per mile.

It is true that the government at the last session of the legislature increased this guarantee to $10,000 a mile, but with this stipulation, that $2,000 of that sum must go towards equipping the road, to purchase more rolling stock in order to prevent a recurrence of that blockade which had existed for a year or two. But owing to the fixed charges being so high on this line, the government have absolute control of the rates, and they have exercised that control. Last year they reduced the rate from 14 to 12 cents per 100 pounds. That is quite a control, they have a control in reality. An Order in Council has been passed to secure another reduction on the 1st of September, of another 2 cents per 100 pounds. That will bring the rate down from 14 cents to 10 cents per 100 pounds from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, giving the 10 cent rate that Mr. Greenway, when premier of Manitoba, declared he would willingly give a million dollars of public money in order to secure, and which has been secured without the cost of a single dollar. The government takes by this contract the power to guarantee the bonds to the extent of $13,000 per mile on the line built through the prairie country, no more difficult of construction, and in return they secure not one single concession by way of reduction of rates.

Now, it has been shown that a very small proportion of our grain exported from the west goes over the north shore line, the all-rail line by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in the opinion of competent railway men, of grain men thoroughly conversant with the transportation question, the all-rail route cannot successfully compete with the mixed route. So, after this railway is constructed, we will find that the great bulk of the grain will still go by the lake and rail route in preference to the all-rail system, only a small proportion passing over the all-rail system after the close of lake navigation. Now the average rate on grain from Port Arthur to Montreal by rail on the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been about 12 cents a bushel ; whereas the average rate by lake and rail has been about 7 cents a bushel, showing a difference of 5 cents in favour of the lake and rail route. But with the improvement in their waterways, if there is going to be enough money left to improve them after this road is built, if the company improve their gradients on the railway east of the Georgian bay, and make it easier to carry grain with longer trains, we will have this differential rate against the all-rail route still further intensified. I believe it is the intention of this company to construct the branch line from Port Arthur, 150 miles in extent or thereabouts, and if that is done, that will be the route that grain will take and not the all-rail route, and once that grain is in the elevators at Port Arthur or Fort William, it absolutely passes beyond the control of the Grand Trunk Pacific people. There is no provision in this contract that will compel this company to be responsible for the delivery of that grain at a Canadian seaport once it is

in the elevators at Fort William. Naturally the grain will seek an outlet, possibly by the Grand Trunk at Wiarton, Midland and Sarnia, anl there be transferred to the Grand Trunk Railway system to be conveyed where it will pay them best to convey it, namely, to the city of Portland in the state of Maine, where, according to the Minister of the Interior, they have already expended some 25 or 30 million dollars in building up large terminals. The Minister of the Interior stated that after this road is constructed we will see grain carried from Winnipeg to St. John for 11½ cents a bushel over the all-rail route. If the hon. gentleman is so sure of his ground, let him incorporate a provision in this contract pledging the company not to charge higher rates over the all-rail route than will be charged over the lake and rail route, then he will give some tangible proof that he believes in his own statement, and a considerable portion of the objection from the west at any rate, now urged against the construction of the road will be done away with.

Now, it is not my own opinion alone, or of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that the all-rail route will never be a great carrier of grain. I am going to quote from an organ that the Minister of the Interior and his friends will not take exception to. I am not going to try, as the Minister of the Interior did, to leave a false impression on the members of this House by making them think that the paper I am quoting from is opposing the railway. The hon. gentleman quoted copiously from newspaper extracts, notably from boards of trade, with the one idea of leaving the impression that they favoured this scheme of getting into the west. If he did not mean that, there was no point in his argument. This Winnipeg 'Free Press' is the mouthpiece of the Liberal party, it is considered as an automatic machine to register the decrees of the Minister of the Interior, whatever they may be, and will support any scheme propounded by this government because of its partisan character. It is true that it has moments of frankness, and in one of these moments of frankness it gave utterance to the following opinion :

> That the new road, when in operation, will be able to quote a lower rate for grain from Winnipeg to the seaboard than the present Canadian Pacific Railway all-rail rate, is probable ; but a fall in the lake-and-rail rates may make it relatively as unprofitable ten years hence as it is now to ship by rail to the sea.

That is quite an admission, but it is not an argument against the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. Critics of that scheme should not overlook the fact that a line from Port Arthur is an essential part of the undertaking. When Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson was in Winnipeg he was given a dinner by the board of trade, and in a speech he outlined some of the services to the west that the Grand Trunk Pacific would render. He dwelt upon the excellent lake and rail route for the carrying out of the grain in the fall that the projected route would furnish. He pointed out that the Grand Trunk touches the lake at many points, such as Sarnia, Goderich, Wiarton and Midland, and predicted that the Grand Trunk, once it got a properly equippel road, could itself move the entire wheat harvest of the west across the lakes. Then the article goes on :

> It is therefore more than probable that the great bulk of the wheat grown in the west will continue to go out by way of the lakes, despite the new road from here to the Atlantic ports.

That is the argument used by the Winnipeg 'Free Press.' Apparently, Mr. Speaker, this road is designed for the purpose of carrying constituencies rather than for the purpose of carrying grain from the Northwest. I might also quote Sir William Van Horne, but he has been already quoted, to the effect that the all-rail route will never be able to compete with the mixed route. But hon. gentlemen try to minimize Sir William Van Horne's opinion, saying that he is the ex-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that his interests are bound up in that undertaking entirely, and he would naturally be opposed to a rival enterprise. But Sir William Van Horne was the very gentleman whom the government considered head and shoulders above any other man in Canada as an authority on the transportation question, and had even asked him to be chairman of the transportation commission, in order to give them the benefit of his experience, and they pledged themselves to be guided by the advice of that commission. So it is too late in the day to minimize Sir Wlliam Van Horne's opinion as an authority on the transportation question. But I see another genial gentleman who has come into the House, and whom I am going to quote for the benefit of hon. members on the other side. They cannot take exception to his opinion, because he is a gentleman whose opinion is deserving of the very highest consideration. . Now, I am not going to try to make out that that hon. gentleman either is opposed to this road, or at least that he will show it by his vote, because I believe that he will be found voting with the government. I find in the Montreal 'Star' of July 6th, an interview held with our good friend from St. Lawrence division Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) in which he is reported to have said :

> Mr. Robert Bickerdike, Liberal M.P., for St. Lawrence division of Montreal, said on Saturday that he thought the government would be wise to do one of two things, either to continue the Intercolonial from Montreal to the Pacific coast, or else to let some public corporation do it The government should own the whole of the transcontinental line, or should dispose of that portion of it that they

now operate from the Atlantic ocean to Montreal.

'I see,' said Mr. Bickerdike, 'no object whatever in starting, say, halfway and running from Moncton to Winnipeg, if that is the programme at present. I would prefer to see the Grand Trunk Pacific or some other public corporation own the whole line. In one word, it should either be a government road from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast, or it should be owned and operated by the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Trans-Canada, but in any case what is most required at the present time is sufficient roads to carry the grain from the Manitoba district to Lake Superior, and then sufficient Canadian bottoms to bring the grain from Lake Superior to the seaboard.

I think that is very good advice, and I am sorry he did not get his friends to follow it. I think the hon. gentleman has not changed his mind though possibly by his vote the country may imagine so. The hon. Minister of the Interior also quoted a certain gentleman whose advice, or whose opinion was, he said, of great importance. The gentleman I refer to is Mr. James H. Ashdown, of the city of Winnipeg, whom the hon. minister said was one of the wealthiest and best-known business men in Winnipeg, all of which is very true. Mr. Ashdown was the Liberal candidate in Marquette in the election of 1896. Mr. Ashdown, the hon. minister says, gives an unqualified support to this measure. That is a favourite way the hon. minister has of twisting things to suit his own purposes. The hon. minister is very tricky. He has to be watched. I took the trouble to compare the statement of the hon. minister with the original interview given by Mr. Ashdown, and I find on reading Mr. Ashdown's interview that he does not give an unqualified but a very qualified support to the measure. He distinctly states in the 'Free Press,' and his interview appeared before the hon. the leader of the opposition's scheme had been propounded, his preference for government ownership right through, but if he cannot have that he will hold up his hands for the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. That is not an unqualified approval of the scheme, and I think that when Mr. Ashdown reads and digests the speech made by the hon. the leader of the opposition he will change his opinion and he will be found supporting this scheme, notwithstanding the fact that he is a strong Liberal. The hon. Minister of the Interior quoted from the Winnipeg 'Tribune,' and sought to leave the impression that the paper, which he stated sarcastically was a friend of his, was in favour of the government scheme. The 'Tribune' is not a Conservative paper, but it is one of these old line Liberal papers which have broken away because of the non-fulfilment of the pledges of the Liberal party. I will quote from that journal of the issue of August 7th, as follows:

By the purchase of the Canada Atlantic, the utilization of the lake route and the exercise of the running powers that Mr. Sifton boasts the government possesses over the Rainy River road, the transportation question could be speedily and effectively solved, that is so far as the spout is concerned. The construction of necessary branch lines in the west could follow quickly. But there would be no chance for exploiters in such a scheme, no chance for 'great' spectacular speeches——

Of course we all know what he is driving at there.

——no chance for 'broad' statesmanship, no chance for humbugging the people again. Great is Canadian 'politics.'

It does not look as if the 'Tribune' was an ardent supporter of the scheme. But, I find that the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and several other Liberal journals have been culling what they consider to be gems of the right hon. gentleman's oratory, putting them into conspicuous places, and heading them 'striking sentences.' The Winnipeg 'Tribune' has got together some striking sentences which I shall inflict upon the House:

'Striking Sentences.'

The party press is publishing 'striking sentences' from Sir Wilfrid's 'oration' on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway deal.

Here are a few 'striking sentences' which Sir Wilfrid might have uttered in view of the bargain about to be consummated:

Another transcontinental railway, every inch of it on Canadian soil, is a grand thing. We intend building one-half of it and handing it over to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for fifty years, part of that time for nothing, and for the balance probably at a loss, if money increases in value. For the balance of the road we will guarantee the cost. There is a heap of money in the contracts in sight for the boys. Remember it will be 'all-Canadian, all-Canadian, all-Canadian.' It is a commercial necessity in view of the approaching general elections. It is a corollary of our status as a nation which exists for the enrichment of promoters.

Now is the time for action; the elections are near at hand. The flood tide is upon us that leads on to fortune for the promoters and the politicians who stand in with them. Soak the exporters of the west and the party dupes of the east. If we let it pass it may never recur again. The people are getting on to the game; if we let it pass the voyage of our political life, bright as some say it is, will be arrested in the shallows; and where will it land our dear promoters and their pals? Pray Heaven, or somebody else, that the time is not yet too late.

'We cannot wait, because time does not wait' and the boys are in a hurry.

'The prairies of the North-west, which, for countless ages, have been roamed over by the wild herds of bison, or by the scarcely less wild tribes of red men, are now invaded by the promoters. They will, if we have our way, be in possession for fifty years to come.

'It will not only open territory hitherto idle and unprofitable,' but this gigantic deal will open the treasury, and it will make a big hole in the pocket books of our serfs, the settlers, whom we bind for the next fifty years.

The sum total of the money to be paid by the government for the construction of the entire line from Moncton to the Pacific ocean is some-

thing I don't know anything about. We have had no reports on the cost, but I hope it will be somewhere under $150,000,000. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway boys promise us to make it as little as possible, consistent with the requirements of the great, progressive age in which we live. Thank Heaven we are alive in this age.

It will open territory hitherto idle and unprofitable, and will keep a lot of kicking farmers busy paying tolls, so that we will hear less of their clamour for tariff reductions, senate reform, civil service reform and such nonsensical things.

This deal will make us free from all bondage save railway bondage for fifty years. The air will be as free as ever.

The new railway will be another link in the chain to bind the producer to high freight rates.

Every one who has in his bosom a stout Canadian heart, and is not yet out of his long dresses, may live to see the day when the country will have public ownership of railways.

We look upon this new deal as a clever scheme to fool the people who have been clamouring for cheaper rates. It won't hurt the present railways very much, as we are bonding the line in such fashion that it cannot bring down rates. The joke is that we almost forgot about a water connection at the lakes, but we intend building a branch line to the lakes.

These are some striking sentences. I do not imagine after reading that paper that it would be considered a very ardent supporter of the government scheme. But if I desired to enter into that subject and to weary the House with extracts, as the hon. Minister of the Interior did, filling up page after page, I might quote, not from Conservative journals, but from such journals as the Montreal 'Witness,' an ardent supporter of this government, the Ottawa 'Journal,' an independent paper with strong Liberal leanings, the St. John 'Telegraph,' a Liberal paper as well; Chatham, N.B., 'Advance'; another Liberal paper, the Forest 'Free Press,' edited by Mr. H. J. Pettypiece, the Liberal member for Lambton in the local legislature, and many other papers, all of which papers strongly denounce the government's proposition. I notice that the hon. Minister of the Interior also quoted the Grain Growers' Association of the North-west Territories as being in favour of the scheme, or he sought to leave that impression on the House. But the hon. minister evidently had not been supplied before he left the House with a resolution passed by the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba, at a recent meeting. The Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba met in convention on August 5th and 6th and passed the following resolution, which was moved by Mr. Scallion, of Virden, and seconded by Mr. Robinson, of Elva, neither of whom is a Conservative, but both of whom are members of a non-political association of the farmers of the west. The resolution is as follows:

Moved by Mr. Scallion, of Virden, seconded by Mr. W. A. Robinson, of Elva, that:—

Whereas the parliament of Canada and the several provincial legislatures have granted under the heading 'Aid to Railways' donations of money, land grants, bond guarantees, tax and other exemptions, the value of which, especially in the case of roads constructed in Western Canada, amounted to more than the cost of the roads so aided; and

Whereas it is evident that these enormous subsidies have not been applied to the construction and equipment of these roads from the fact that the liabilities standing against them in stock and bonds are much greater than the cost of these properties;

And whereas notwithstanding those enormous subsidies, and the excessive and oppressive rates levied by these railways on the traffic of the territory they are chartered to serve, to pay interest and dividends upon over capitalization, they have utterly failed to meet the transportation requirements of this country, in consequence of which the people have suffered great hardship and loss, and have been compelled to endure a condition of things exasperating in the extreme and very detrimental to the progress and prosperity of Western Canada;

And whereas the government of Canda can finance the construction and equipment of railways at a much less cost to the people than can any private company;

And whereas the only real solution of our transportation problem lies in the ownership and control by the people of such a system of railways as shall ensure ample traffic facilities, and secure rates on the cost of service and the interest on the bonds issued by the government to pay for the construction and equipment of such railways thereby relieving the traffic of this country from the burdensome rates now levied on it to pay dividends on millions of dollars of watered stock issued in the interest of railway promoters;

Therefore the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association in convention assembled respectfully urges the government of Canada that instead of entering into the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific deal, they proceed to build, equip and operate in the interests of the people such lines of railway as the transportation requirements of the country may from time to time demand.

That is an expression of opinion from an association of farmers, Liberals and Conservatives, met in convention since this government scheme was launched upon the public, and you will see that instead of endorsing it they condemn it in no uncertain tone.

The hon. leader of the opposition has shown that he possesses the attributes of a constructive statesman. He has not contented himself with retreating behind the lines of Torres Vedras, or with calmly folding his arms and saying: it is time enough to prescribe when I am called in; as a certain other party leader did, not many years ago on a certain memorable occasion. But Sir, the leader of the opposition is true to the instincts and to the traditions of the great party of which he is the honoured leader, and he is a worthy successor of his great predecessors. He has courageous-

ly and boldly propounded an alternative policy, and a policy which is in the interest of the people of Canada. That policy has been discussed in this House much more ably than I can discuss it. Briefly, it is the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay, either by the purchase of the Canada Atlantic Railway, or if it is more in the interest of the country, by the construction of an independent line ; it is to connect that line by a line from Scotia Junction, with the town of Sudbury on the Canadian Pacific Railway main line, which will mean the construction of from 100 to 120 miles of railway. It is to nationalize or to acquire by lease that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Sudbury and Fort William, and to have it operated by an independent commission who would give equal running rights over it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway. That portion of that line between Fort William and Winnipeg, the leader of the opposition would assist by making its roadbed so that it could handle the grain with greater facility, by reducing the grades and double tracking if necessary, and on this he would secure equal running rights for those other systems of railway and would also secure absolute control of rates. What does that mean ? That means that the prime necessity which the Premier spoke of, of having another railway in there, especially the Grand Trunk Railway, would be accomplished within the next six months, whereas under the proposition of the government it would take five years at the very least to accomplish it. Under the proposal of the leader of the opposition you will have those other roads in the city of Winnipeg within six months, and the Intercolonial Railway would be in Winnipeg within a year or just as soon as that small link was constructed, and the Intercolonial Railway could be extended if necessary so as to give us absolute control of the rates in the west. As regards that portion of the line west of Winnipeg, the leader of the opposition has proposed that if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway desires to build north of the Canadian Northern Railway through a country sparsely populated, he would assist them by guaranteeing their bonds. But if they decide to go through the country south of the Canadian Northern Railway in a thickly populated district, he would let them do so at their own expense, because there they would have a profitable road from the very first day it is put in operation. As to the mountain section the leader of the opposition suggests—although he does not suggest its construction immediately as the member for Welland says—the leader of the opposition suggests that the mountain section should be constructed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern, and as both of them have access over it, that one line only should receive assistance. Failing that, then the government would build the line itself, allowing equal running rights to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway to the coast. In addition, the leader of the opposition provides for the improvement of our harbours on the Georgian bay, and on ports such as Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, equipping them in the most modern manner for terminals, and placing them in a position to compete with their American rivals. And, Sir, notwithstanding the calculations indulged in by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House—who apparently have not called in their actuary to estimate the probable cost of the Conservative proposition—as has been shown by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) to-day, all that is proposed by the leader of the opposition can be accomplished for less than one-half the money that the proposition of the government will cost. And, what is of far more importance, this scheme of the leader of the opposition will meet the requirements of the people of Canada, a thing which the government scheme will not do.

To summarize my objection to this scheme of the government : I object to it because it entails such an immense outlay of public money and a consequent addition to our public debt. I object to it because it provides for no reduction of rates. I object to it because it cannot successfully compete with the lake and rail route, and will never prove to be a grain carrier. I object to it because after the government has constructed this 1,800 miles of road, it is to be handed over to be operated by the Grand Trunk Railway for fifty years, thus perpetuating the evil that our people are complaining of at the present day. I might go on enumerating very many other valid objections. If the government are to construct as a government line the eastern section through the most northerly part of the country, through a country which will afford little or no traffic, why on earth do they not construct that portion of the road which runs through the prairie section, which will have ample traffic and which will pay its way from the very first. Sir, this road should be an all-government road or an all-company road with proper safeguards in the public interest.

This whole scheme has been conceived in haste ; it has been conceived because of political exigencies. The people will suffer through its iniquities, and the government who devised it will be dead and buried, once the people get an oportunity of pronouncing their funeral knell. And, Sir, in the place of this government will once more arise a constructive government, a Conservative government that will give evidence of statesmanship as they have done in regard to so many other national questions in the past, and which in grappling with

these questions in the past have made Canada what she is to-day. I ask the government to accept the challenge which has been thrown across the floor of the House by many hon. gentlemen on this side, and to allow the people of Canada to express their opinion upon this question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). Mr. Speaker, there is a variety in the arguments advanced by the hon. gentlemen opposite which at least lends charm to their speeches. As was correctly stated by one of them a short time ago, each is a free lance, each can advance such views as he thinks fit, and in this connection I observe that there are as many views upon the proposal of the government, and even upon the proposal of the leader of the opposition, as there are speakers on the other side of the House. Just now we have had an interpretation from the member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) of the proposition of the leader of the opposition, which differs entirely from the interpretation put upon it by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). The view of one gentleman did not harmonize with the view of the other, nor does the view of either, harmonize with the view of the leader of the opposition. I should judge by the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) that although coming from the North-west, he is not altogether favourable to the scheme proposed by the government.

I should judge also, from his observations, that he is almost equally opposed to that of the leader of the opposition. I should judge, from the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) that he also is opposed to the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition. The situation has undergone a change, Mr. Speaker, since this question was propounded in parliament on the 30th of July last by the Premier of Canada. On that occasion, after the presentation of the case, the hon. leader of the opposition arose; and, although he confessed that he had no knowledge of the scheme, and was utterly unable to understand it, he was quite able to manifest a very marked hostility to it. He spent an hour in abusing and condemning it, from time to time throughout his speech expressing his ignorance of the nature of the contract. Although the government had given many months to its consideration, the hon. leader of the opposition, in a moment, without knowing the scheme, was able to pronounce against it. Well, Sir, as time went on, I think, he learned his mistake. He said that we had manifested undue haste in preparing our scheme, when every one knows that it has engaged the attention of the government and of the country for the best part of a year. He was apparently opposed to our undertaking the construction of the railway, and grew wrathy at the undue haste which he said we had been guilty of. Instead of reserving judgment, he listened, I suppose, for a few days to the voices from without, and eighteen days afterwards came down with a scheme of his own. If there is anything, Mr. Speaker, that commands my admiration, it is that the hon. leader of the opposition, in a period of eighteen short days, should have been able, unaided, except perhaps by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to bring forth and submit to parliament a proposition of the gigantic character that is now engaging our attention. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) did not take long to discover the hon. gentleman's mistake. The hon. leader of the opposition propounded a scheme which every person who analyses it will, I think, pronounce, as the late Minister of Railways and Canals of this government (Hon. Mr. Blair) described some of it, as moonshine. The thinking business public, understanding the scheme propounded by the hon. leader of the opposition, have given a very good indication that it was necessary for the opposition at an early stage to recede from the false position in which their leader had placed them. And so we have the hon. member for Bothwell to-day professing to give an interpretation of the meaning of his leader's proposition. At one time, two or three weeks ago, in the estimation of the opposition, the government scheme to build a railway from old Canada to new Canada was wrong—there was to be no railway built. Eighteen days afterwards the hon. leader of the opposition said there should be two transcontinental railways built. To-day the hon. member for Bothwell says that all that the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition means is to build a railway from the city of Montreal to Winnipeg. A little later the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) rises and says that the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition is even bigger than that described by the hon. member for Bothwell. It is a scheme to construct a railway, as the hon. member for Bothwell says, as far as Winnipeg; but it proposes also to do some other things. It proposes to aid the Grand Trunk Company to build a railway to the mountains, and, I suppose, a railway through the mountains to the coast. He also frankly said that it contemplated some operations in other directions. He was getting nearer to the scheme than the hon. member for Bothwell. He was rasher too, although I am afraid that his friends in the North-west, who are especially suffering for the want of railway communication, and who desire the line proposed by the government to be built, will feel that he has not quite responded to the needs of the great North-west. But inasmuch as these hon. gentlemen differ with the hon. leader of the opposition as to the meaning of his scheme I will take the liberty of going through it as I understand it, and will endeavour to make good my points, if challenged, by

reference to the words of the hon. leader of the opposition himself. Probably those words will be considered as indicating to some extent his true meaning.

Before proceeding to that, however, I would refer for a moment to one or two points sought to be made by the hon. member for Marquette. In seeking to prove what would be the cost of this enterprise as proposed by the government, he said we would lose one-half of one per cent for the term of the lease, being the difference between the rate at which the money would be borrowed and the rate received from the company for the lease of the eastern division ; whereas everybody knows that while we have permission to pay as high as 3½ per cent for borrowed capital, we will not pay more than the market price requires.

Mr. BROCK. Probably 4 per cent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend may be right, but the credit of Canada has never been such, since the Liberal party came into office, that we have had to pay 4 per cent. There was a time when we had to pay 4 per cent, when the hon. gentleman's friends were financing, and when this country was still in the condition of stagnation and depression into which they had brought it. If they were in power to-day, we would still have to pay 4 per cent; but thanks to the intelligence of the people of Canada, they called to take charge of their affairs a competent government, so that we do not now have to pay 4 per cent. We will lose nothing in the difference between the interest to be paid on the borrowed capital and the interest we shall receive from the company ; so that that half of one per cent which in the hon. gentleman's mind runs up to millions, may be wiped away as simply a vision of his imagination.

He stated that we would be obliged under the contract to expend large sums of money for the betterment of the road between Moncton and Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman, I am afraid, like the hon. leader of the opposition, has argued without reading the contract. The contract does not oblige the government to spend one brass farthing on betterments after the completion of the line. If any one says that is not correct, I think the hon. leader of the opposition, who is a professional gentleman, if he had seen such a contingency, would have pointed it out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in what respect I misstated the contract ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no reference to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Just a moment ago the hon. gentleman said that the hon. member for Marquette, like his leader, had not read the contract. In what respect have I given evidence of that?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman on the 30th of July, explained that he had not seen the contract, but argued against the measure; and the hon. member for Marquette to-day alleges that this contract provides in one of its clauses what I say it does not provide. He says it obliges the government during the currency of the lease from time to time to expend capital upon betterments. Now, section 16 reads as follows :

> In case, after the completion of the said eastern division and the taking possession thereof by the company under the lease thereof, hereinafter referred to, or at any time thereafter during the continuance of the said lease, the government shall deem it necessary to expend any sums of money for the improvement of the said eastern division, the replacement of structures by others more modern, or otherwise upon capital account for betterments, and not being 'working expenditure' payable by the company, the government may expend such sums

And the amounts, if expended, shall be added to the capital cost, and bear interest. If we choose to invest any money in betterments, we can submit to our tenants, the railway company, items of proposed expenditure; and if they consent, we can proceed to make the betterments, and they will become liable to pay rent, which is equivalent to interest, upon that expenditure. But if the government should prefer, it need not make those expenditures. Therefore, when my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) builds up a great structure of expenditure on capital account and presents that as indicating another weak point, you will observe that he has read inaccurately the contract and has not seized its true meaning. His statement is about as correct as that of the junior member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), who estimates that the eastern division alone will cost the people of Canada no less than $560,000,000. I am not surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite should repudiate, as they have done so far, the estimate of their great financier. Even the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) only claimed that this eastern division would cost the country $112,000,000, whereas this financial leader estimates its cost at $560,000,000. I should not be surprised if, after a few more speeches, we will find hon. gentlemen opposite getting better informed and gradually coming down to the actual facts.

However, as it is hardly worth while to seriously discuss figures given with such rashness, I shall confine myself to the text furnished by the leader of the opposition. We have two policies before the House. At first there was but one proposition. It was simply a question whether or not there should be a transcontinental railway. The opposition took side against us, and the issue was a railway or no railway. That was the issue on the 23rd of July, but that is all changed, and every one now appears to agree that we must have a railway and

build it at once. The only question is whether it should be the railway proposed by the government or that proposed by the leader of the opposition. It therefore becomes us to consider which scheme has the more merit. Ours is a very modest one. At one time we had it attacked as being a scheme of great magnitude; but when compared with the proposition of the leader of the opposition, its dimensions are considerably lessened. It only contemplates the building of a railway from Moncton via Quebec to the coast, a part of which is to be operated by a railway company, and which will only cost the people of Canada $13,000,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Hon. gentlemen opposite are so accustomed to big figures that they cannot understand small ones. Their financial leader has given them so large an estimate, $560,000,000, that they are ashamed of anything moderate. And finding that they had made a great mistake in opposing our modest business-like and meritorious scheme, they set to work and brought down a scheme of their own. Ours is so well known that I need not explain its details. But what does my hon. friend the leader of the opposition propose? We are told by the hon. member for Marquette that he has manifested the genius of constructive statesmanship, that he is a constructive statesman. Well, I welcome to parliament any one possessed of this quality, because that is the class of man we require in Canada. If he is possessed of the genius of constructive statesmanship, we will no doubt find proof of it in the scheme that he has propounded. Eighteen days was all he required, in which to bring forth this scheme, and certainly any one who can bring forth a scheme of this magnitude in eighteen days does manifest genius. What is his scheme? It is, first of all, to get a through line from Montreal to the coast by buying up old lines and building new lines. The first part of the line from Montreal to Winnipeg is to be a government line. The intervening section to the mountains is to be a company line, and the mountain section is perhaps to be a government line. Well, we were told that our system is a mongrel one, that we had a line which was neither one thing nor the other, which was neither fish, flesh nor good red herring, that the government was to own part of the line, and that the whole line was to be operated from ocean to ocean by a company. That did not satisfy these hon. gentlemen. Yet, dispite this criticism, we have a proposition that the government should build and operate a line as far as Winnipeg, that a company should then build and operate a line to the mountains, and that the government should build and operate a line from the mountains to the sea.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is not stating my proposition correctly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I shall show by the hon. gentleman's ipsissima verba the correctness of what I am saying. I say that his speech on the 18th of August, as reported in 'Hansard,' involved the following scheme: First, to build a railway from Montreal to Coteau. Second, to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway from Coteau to Depot Harbour, a distance of 342 miles, or if that road could not be bought, to parallel it. He did not say to parallel it directly, but it was to terminate at Depot Harbour, and the hon. member for Bothwell to-day interpreted his meaning. He said that the policy of the leader of the opposition is either to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway from Montreal to Depot Harbour or build another railway which would parallel it to Depot Harbour. The hon. gentleman did not use the word 'parallel,' but the road was to begin at the same point and end at the same point. So that while paralleling in one part of the country is objectionable, in another part it is very desirable. The scheme of the leader of the opposition was to build a railway from Montreal to Coteau, to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway from Coteau to Depot Harbour, and then to build a railway from Depot Harbour to Sudbury.

Mr. BELL. No, to Scotia Junction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, to Sudbury. That is what he said in the speech anyway. What he said was this:

> If we acquired the Canada Atlantic Railway, we could build a line from that point to join the Candian Pacific Railway at or near Sudbury.

I am arguing from what the hon. gentleman said, and if there is any other proposition let us have it. At Sudbury, instead of buying from Sudbury west he proposes to go back on his tracks a little bit and to go easterly and buy the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William. And he proposes to spend large sums of money in making the line between North Bay and Fort William fit for the work which it is expected to perform. Again he proposes to acquire control over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway from Fort William to Winnipeg; to aid the Grand Trunk Railway to build from Winnipeg to Edmonton, and to have the government build a line from Edmonton or some point near Edmonton to the Pacific coast, unless the two companies can be induced to do so on joint account. He has thus got to the coast; then he goes back to the east again. He has heard a voice from the east condemning his opposition to the government's scheme of a road from Moncton to Winnipeg and he lays his plans for a second transcontinental line. He proposes to build from Moncton

to Lévis—practically to Quebec as Quebec is on the other side of the river from Lévis—then to extend the Intercolonial from Quebec to Winnipeg and to build a railway from Winnipeg to the coast. That is not enough ; the sea has to be conquered. First of all, he wishes to acquire and operate a railway line from Montreal to the coast, then he proposes to invade the inland lakes, to purchase the Canada Atlantic Transit Company's fleet and to go into the grain carrying trade on our inland waters. He wishes to thoroughly equip the Georgian Bay ports, to thoroughly equip our national waterways, to thoroughly equip the St. Lawrence route, to thoroughly equip our ports on the Atlantic coast, to abolish if necessary harbour dues on the Atlantic coast and harbour dues on the Georgian bay, to improve the harbour facilities at Port Colborne, to exploit the harbour of Montreal, to make Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John national ports, and free ports and to provide, at a nominal charge, storage equivalent to the capacity of 100,000 barns. Now that is the hon. gentleman's scheme as set forth in 'Hansard,' and I will discuss the details of it after eight o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At six o'clock I had endeavoured to express what I conceived to be the two propositions before the House. I do not understand that at this present date there is any question as to whether there should be a new transcontinental railway, that point appears to be conceded by the leader of the opposition. Instead, however, of accepting our scheme for a transcontinental railway, he propounds another one, meaning in fact two transcontinental railways, together with many other important features involving large undertakings. Before six o'clock I gave to the House in detail the propositions of the leader of the opposition. An hon. gentleman on the other side appeared to question the accuracy of my analysis of the scheme, and I intend to endeavour to defend the leader of the opposition from the attacks made upon his scheme by some of his supporters. What he has done that he should be discredited, I do not know. But some of his supporters are certainly supporting him in a very extraordinary way. He has given us, we are told, a scheme which is the product of a great constructive statesman. Why a scheme coming from such a gentleman should be discredited by those who are bound to support him, who are here to support him, and who applauded his scheme, is something I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. HENDERSON. Or anybody else.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Or anybody else. It does seem a most extraordinary thing that the leader of the opposition should propound a scheme, that it should receive the loud applause of his colleagues about him, and that then they should proceed to discredit it—not in so many words, but saying in effect that his whole proposition was absurd and ridiculous. Why they should hit him in this way from the rear, I do not know. Nevertheless it is my duty and my pleasure to come to his rescue, and to show his supporters exactly what he means. If they do not understand it, surely they will permit me to read it to them, and to dwell upon some of its features. I propose to read to them his own utterances, and to explain them to those hon. gentlemen that they may the better understand the true policy of their leader, for they seem to have read but superficially either the government's scheme or that of the leader of the opposition. Let me summarize the propositions of the leader of the opposition. The government's proposition appears to have commended itself to the judgment of the country, and the country is prepared to adopt it unless a better is forthcoming. The leader of the opposition has presented his alternative, and if it is better than ours, it is our duty loyally to accept it. I am sure if we can convince the majority of this House, and if we are satisfied that public opinion is with us in the opinion that the scheme of the leader of the opposition is better than that of the government, it would be our duty promptly to accept his proposition. But let us understand it first. The confusion that seems to exist in the minds of the members of the opposition justifies a little attention to the details of that important scheme, emanating as it does from a gentleman of such gigantic constructive capacity. But remember I approach it with great deference, because, although it took us a year or thereabouts to evolve our modest proposition, the gentleman who leads the opposition evolved his in less than eighteen days. Again let me give you for careful consideration, for prayerful consideration, the details of the scheme that we are now asked to adopt.

The leader of the opposition asks us to adopt the following proposition :

To build a railway from Montreal to Coteau, 37 miles in length.

To buy the Canada Atlantic Railway from Coteau to Depot Harbour, 342 miles in length, or to build another between the same points paralleling the Canada Atlantic Railway.

To build a railway from Depot Harbour to Sudbury, 120 miles in length.

To buy the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, and to expend large sums of money in making it fit for its work.

To acquire control over the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern

from Fort William to Winnipeg, 850 miles. This may involve, it does in fact involve, the purchase of both those lines.

To aid the Grand Trunk Railway in building a line from Winnipeg to Edmonton.

The government to build the line from Edmonton to the coast unless the company builds it. I have omitted to give the number of miles on these lines, I will tell you their total in a moment.

Then coming back again to the east, to build a line from Moncton to Quebec, 400 miles in length.

Another from Quebec to Winnipeg, 1,400 miles in length.

Another from Winnipeg to the coast, 1,600 miles in length.

In all, to build 7,041 miles of road—that is all up to date, and that is a small portion of the proposition of the leader of the opposition. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that we have taken over fifty years in Canada to build 17,000 or 18,000 miles of railway. Now we are asked to authorize an expenditure to build 7,000 more, nearly 50 per cent of our present mileage. But this is only the threshold of the scheme.

To equip and operate a line from Montreal to the coast.

To equip and operate a line from Moncton to the coast.

To purchase the Canada Atlantic Railway transport fleet, and to operate it.

To go into the grain carrying trade on our inland waters.

Thoroughly to equip the Georgian Bay ports.

Thoroughly to equip our national waterways.

Thoroughly to equip the St. Lawrence route.

Thoroughly to equip our ports on the Atlantic coast.

Abolish any unnecessary harbour dues on the Atlantic coast.

Abolish any unnecessary harbour dues on the Georgian bay.

Develop harbour facilities at Port Colborne.

Accept the harbour at Montreal.

Make Montreal a national port; make Montreal a free port.

Make Quebec a national port; make Quebec a free port.

Make St. John a national port; make St. John a free port.

Make Halifax a national port; make Halifax a free port.

Provide storage, at a nominal rate of the capacity of 100,000 barns, with the result that the government is to embark in the warehouse business.

Those are the leading features of the scheme of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. DAVIS. They are going to build barns.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and they will be getting under the barns pretty soon. Now, Mr. Speaker, in introducing that scheme, the hon. gentleman declared that it would involve a limited expenditure of money. But what is money for, he asks. Money is made to spend, he tells us. Now I do not want to misquote the hon. gentleman, and I will try to prove step by step what I attribute to his authorship, especially as I do not observe him in the House. On page 9003 of the 'Hansard,' he says:

> The people of this country are not afraid of spending money if it is spent in a sane and reasonable way.

Then he proceeds to give his ideas of sanity. I have myself given you these particulars. He says after referring to some of the government's proposals:

> There is no reason to be afraid of spending money. I am not afraid of spending money and the country is not afraid of spending money.

He tells us that neither he nor the country is afraid of spending money and he asks us to adopt that policy. Now, although the hon. gentleman may not be afraid of spending money, perhaps those who are responsible for the expenditure and perhaps the taxpayers as well would deem it not a waste of time to consider from the standpoint of cost alone what the scheme of the hon. gentleman does involve. Our scheme, limited to an investment with the exception of a few years at the commencement when we pay interest or forego rent, involves a cash outlay by this government, not to be recovered, of not exceeding $13,000,000. That is the cost to the country of the government proposition.

Mr. CLANCY. How does the hon. gentleman know that it is going to be $13,000,000?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, that is a little over the estimate. The actuarial estimate puts it between $11,000,000 and $12,000,000, but I have given a margin. Thirteen million dollars is all that our little modest scheme involves in the way of money going out that does not come back. I must say that I blush at our modesty when considering what is involved in the magnificent scheme propounded by the hon. leader of the opposition. Let us analyze it. I do not think there will be much difference on either side of the House as to the cost excepting always of course the view of that hon. gentleman, who puts down the cost of our scheme at the trifling sum of $560,000,000. I am surprised at his modesty. But, taking the scheme and trying to actually reach an intelligent idea as to what the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition involves, I think we can, without much difficulty, arrive at a fair conclusion. For example, we are told that it involves the building of 37 miles of a railway from Montreal to Côteau.

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) allowed that the cost of that piece of road would be $1,200,000. I am not going to put it that high. I am putting it down at $1,110,000. Probably no exception will be taken to that item. We then proceed to the next link of this railway, that from Coteau Junction to Depot Harbour, involving the purchase of the Canada Atlantic Railway. The Canada Atlantic Railway Company owns, I am told, 400 miles. The hon. leader of the opposition told us that, and I give him as my authority. Of this 400 miles of railway fifty-seven miles of it are in the state of Vermont. If the hon. leader of the opposition proposes to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway system he will have to buy it all. Do hon. gentlemen opposite only figure upon buying 342 miles of railway from Coteau to Depot Harbour, or do they propose to buy it all ?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is quite well aware that there has been an offer open to the world for not only the whole Canada Atlantic Railway, but for the whole system, including steamers and elevators, for $11,000,000. Although I did not include it to-day it has to be included in it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman says that the whole Canada Atlantic Railway system was at one time offered for $11,000,000. That may be, but we are not speaking of one time ; we are speaking of now.

Mr. CLANCY. That is within twelve months.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am assured that there is no government or person who can acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway for anything like $11,000,000. I understand that the minimum price placed upon the system is not less than $17,000,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have information exactly the opposite.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To what extent does the hon. gentleman's information go ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have information that it can be bought for $14,000,000 at the outside, and probably for $12,000,000 in cash.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. leader of the opposition says $14,000,000 and the hon. member for Bothwell says $11,000,000. I am told that the market price is not less than $17,000,000, if it can be purchased to-day. At all events, between these prices we can put it down as $15,000,000, and that includes this fifty-seven miles of railway in Vermont. What the government of Canada is going to do with fifty-seven miles of railway in the state of Vermont, I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much has the Grand Trunk Railway in the United States ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am speaking of the government buying railways in the United States ; I am not speaking of private citizens doing so. If it is proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition or by the party supporting him to expend the people's money in the acquisition of railways in the United States, then, a different proposition is involved. If we were going to make such a purchase, I question very much whether the people of the country would consent to their money being used for acquiring such a road. But an alternative is proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, and if at any stage in my observations I misquote him, I shall be only too thankful to him if he will correct me. I do not wish to delay the House unnecessarily by quoting his exact words in 'Hansard,' but I am prepared to do so in support of anything I may say, if the accuracy of my statement is doubted. The hon. gentleman said that he was prepared either to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway, or to build another line between Coteau and Depot Harbour paralleling it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is not correct. I said to a point on the Georgian bay.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The whole story of the leader of the opposition had reference to the Canada Atlantic Railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not confine myself to Depot Harbour.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not care whether it is Depot Harbour or the Georgian bay. The Canada Atlantic Railway goes to Depot Harbour. The hon. gentleman says :

> The Canada Atlantic Railway extends from Depot Harbour on the Georgian bay to Coteau Junction a distance of 342 miles.

Then he proceeds to point out the possibility of connecting with that point. Having stated that the Canada Atlantic Railway extended from Coteau to Depot Harbour, he proceeded to point out what a magnificent harbour Depot Harbour was, and he said that the tonnage that had come to Depot Harbour, proved that it was a magnificent connection between Duluth, Fort William and the west with the east. Having so described Depot Harbour he proceeds :

> Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not wedded to the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway. I am only propounding a policy which I think ought to be followed, namely, the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to a Georgian Bay port. May be that after expert advice has been obtained some other scheme may be found that would be better than the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway. So let it be. If, however, the Canada Atlantic Railway commends itself to the judgment of experts, and from what information I can obtain with re-

gard to it, I should think it ought so commend itself, and I would think that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway between Coteau and Jacques Cartier Junction, and the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway to Depot Harbour, would place the Intercolonial Railway in a very much better position than it is at present.

The hon. gentleman says he did not pledge himself to build an alternative paralleling line to Depot Harbour. Is that not playing upon words when he is seeking to get to Georgian bay, and to get the traffic that now comes to Depot Harbour? It is not the particular terminal point that is involved; it is the traffic that is involved. The leader of the opposition is prepared to build a competing line to Depot Harbour, or some point on the Georgian bay, to parallel the Canada Atlantic Railway and to destroy it by the expenditure of public money. That may be constructive politics, but I think it is destructive politics, and any way it would cost the taxpayers of Canada at least $15,000,000. Again, the hon. gentleman proposes to build a railway from Sudbury to the Georgian bay and on this point he says:

> I have referred to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian bay. If we acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, we could build a line from that point to join the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Sudbury.

And the hon. gentleman says that the mileage would be 120 miles. I think my hon. friend from Bothwell figured it at a higher mileage, but I will be content to put the figures at 120 miles, and then the cost would be $3,600,000——

Mr. CLANCY. I mentioned Scotia Junction and by actual measurement it is 104 miles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There again the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is at variance with his leader. Scotia Junction is an inland point many miles from the Georgian bay, but the leader of the opposition wants to build from the Georgian bay. When the leader of the opposition makes his connection at Sudbury he looks westward to get to Fort William, and Sudbury is 73 miles westerly of North Bay, and is a point upon the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The leader of the opposition proposes to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, a distance of 634 miles, and on that point I might as well give his own words, spoken on the 18th of August, as follows:

> I say it would be a proper thing and a wise thing for this government to acquire this railway from North Bay to Fort William.

Not from Sudbury as the hon. member for Bothwell says, repudiating his leader, but from North Bay, which means a few miles more to be thrown into the bill of costs. Thus the leader of the opposition proposes to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway for 634 miles from North Bay to Fort William, and when it is acquired to spend a few millions on it in betterment to make it fit for the traffic which it is supposed it will carry.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has not quoted all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What have I left out?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This:

> You could acquire either the ownership of that railway or the absolute control of running rights over it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman says we could acquire the ownership or absolute control of running powers, and I suppose he would argue that running powers are equal to ownership. His scheme is not merely that the Canada Atlantic Railway should have running powers over the road he is arranging for between Montreal and the west, but that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have running powers as well. He proposes in his scheme to secure if possible a national railway highway; one that will be available on fair terms for all railways. now, if I can show that the hon. gentleman's opinion is, that no railway under the control of any one company will meet his expectations in that regard, I am sure he would not for a moment propose to deceive the House by pretending that he did not mean the actual acquisition by purchase of the ownership of that road. You will remember that in the government scheme we propose to own the railway from Moncton to Winnipeg and to reserve authority to enable us to grant running powers, just, and equitable and ample to all-comers. We attach a great deal of weight to that feature of that scheme, and we presented it to parliament with a great deal of confidence, but the leader of the opposition expressed his opinion on that question. The Prime Minister spoke on the 30th of July last, and the leader of the opposition in criticising the Prime Minister's remarks, expressed himself in these words:

> It is well known, not only amongst railway men but to those who are not railway experts, that the company which has the management or control of the line can regulate the running powers granted to other railways in such a way that they are of no practical advantage to the railway having these running rights. I do not think there is any doubt in the mind of any railway man in regard to that, and therefore I think that the running powers which are proposed to be granted over the line from Moncton to Winnipeg are of no real value.

Now, if on the 30th of July it was the opinion of the leader of the opposition that running powers even over a government

road reserved for other lines, were of no value; what does the hon. gentleman wish us to infer from his statement of to-night, that he only proposed to acquire running rights over the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Winnipeg. Why, Sir, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in expounding the proposition of his leader, understood this to mean the actual purchase of the road. The leader of the opposition proceeded to elaborate upon the principle of eminent domain and the right of expropriating railways if needs be in the public interest, and all his followers in giving their estimate of the cost of such scheme figured it out upon having to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for its railway from North Bay to Winnipeg. But now for the first time to-night the leader of the opposition intimates that he did not mean that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I merely directed his attention to a portion of my remarks that he had not quoted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, if the remarks have any meaning at all, what is the meaning of them? The hon. gentleman advocated his scheme to buy from North Bay to Fort William, because among other reasons, the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern Railway, the Grand Grand Trunk Railway should have running rights over that road. But he told us on the 30th of July last that running rights were no good over a company owned road, and, therefore, what good will that line be if the Canadian Pacific Railway owns it and only running rights are acquired in it. The hon. gentleman either means something or he means nothing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman wish me to answer him?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am willing that the hon. gentleman should do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the one case, there is a lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific giving it control over the road. In the other case, which I have just suggested, the government would have either the ownership of the road or the absolute control of the running powers. In either case the running powers over that road, so far as all the companies are concerned, would be regulated by an independent power.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. May I read to the hon. gentleman, for his information, a clause in the proposed lease, which he criticised on the 30th of July last? As the hon. gentleman is aware, the government is to own the eastern division, to be the landlord of it, and is to grant to the Grand Trunk Pacific a limited interest in it. This clause says:

The said lease shall also contain proper and usual provisions,—

(a.) Reserving to the government in respect of its ownership, present and future, of the Intercolonial and any other line or lines of railway, running powers and haulage rights over the said eastern division upon equal terms with the lessees, subject to such reasonable restrictions as may be necssary to secure safety and convenience.

And so on. Then, as regards outside companies:

(b.) Reserving power to the government to grant running powers and haulage rights sufficient to enable any railway company desiring to use the said eastern division, or any part thereof, to do so upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the companies, or, in case of their failure to agree, then upon such terms as may be deemed reasonable and just by the government, having regard to the rights and obligation of the lessees.

Under that wording, the government remains in possession to the extent that is necessary to give to all railways such running power as the government deems reasonable and proper.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Having regard——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Having regard to the rights of the lessees, and the rights granted are subject to the reservation. The reservation is as large as the rights, and all have to be read together as one scheme, and the government is the tribunal who determines the rights of other companies and the terms upon which other companies shall use the road. And yet the hon. leader of the opposition expressed his opinion on the 30th of July, not only with reference to these words, but generally, that running rights such as these are of no practical value. If so, what is the meaning of his scheme to acquire the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, with the few words thrown in, that perhaps running rights might also meet the case? The hon. gentleman's own colleagues all understand his scheme, which contemplates the purchase of the Canadian Pacific Railway from North Bay to Fort William, a distance of 634 miles; and the question is, what will that piece of railway cost? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not in the habit, I think, of giving anything away at less than its value. I would not blame them for hanging on to their own; and if the hon. gentleman thought of expropriating—and this is what he hinted at—this line of railway, he will be confronted at once with an estimate of what it cost. The hon. gentleman's own colleague, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), speaking no doubt from his experience as Minister of Railways and Canals, stated that the cost of the railway from Fort Wiliam to North Bay had been $60,000 a mile. If we got it at cost, I think we would be very fortunate. I do

not propose to put it higher than cost; but I do say that the hon. gentleman will not succeed in expropriating that piece of railway from the Canadian Pacific Railway at less than its cost, as stated by the hon. member for South Lanark.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman know what estimate was put upon it by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) last night, which was less than was put upon it to-day, and that from the authority of an engineer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I only know the estimate put upon it by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals of the late administration, who, with all the knowledge his office gave him, spoke officially in fact when he told us that the cost was $60,000 a mile. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) himself told us that he put the cost at $45,000 a mile, in addition to which he was going to allow $5,000 a mile for betterments.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that I distinctly said that I did not put any estimate upon it. It was an estimate put upon it by a competent authority.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman, at all events, in trying to satisfy this House what it would cost to carry out the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition said that the estimate was that this particular railway would cost $45,900 a mile, and that a large sum would have to be spent for betterments, which I think amounted to $5,000 a mile. So that the hon. member for Bothwell put the railway from North Bay——

Mr. CLANCY. No, from Sudbury.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman started from Sudbury, but the hon. leader of the opposition started from North Bay. You see, our hon. friends opposite are not in harmony, and I am defending the hon. leader of the opposition. That hon. gentleman is buying the whole railway from North Bay to Fort Wiliam, and the hon. member for Bothwell puts the price at $50,000 a mile, and it is a question whether we will take his figure or the figure of the hon. member for South Lanark, viz., $60,000. I think it probable that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has a more accurate knowledge of the facts. At his figure, then, the 634 miles from North Bay to Fort William will cost us $38,040,000.

We have now reached Fort William. There we meet two railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway. The hon. gentleman proposes to acquire some estate over the Canadian Pacific Railway. His scheme is to get a continuous line of railway from Montreal to Winnipeg available for the Intercolonial Railway and all other railways. He has already told us that running powers are a delusion, that they cannot be acquired so as to be of any value. Therefore, when he proposes to make use of these two roads in a certain way to make them effective, it cannot be under the old scheme of a company owning a line and giving running powers over it to others. He says:

> The third point which I would submit to the consideration of the House, as a sound policy, is to assist in improving the grades of one or both lines from Winnipeg to Fort William, upon the condition that complete control of rates is obtained and that the Grand Trunk Railway as well as the Intercolonial Railway shall have running powers from Fort William to Winnipeg.

His object is to secure a highway available for the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Intercolonial and the Canadian Northern. He has already told us that running rights cannot be acquired where a company owns the lines. How, then, is he going to acquire a proper highway to meet the services he is seeking? He is going to expend public money upon the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern Railway or both between Fort William and Winnipeg. There is only one way, he says, by which the public money expended on those roads will be saved, and that will be by the public owning those two roads. He might as well have said frankly that his purpose was to purchase these roads out and out, and that is practically what is admitted by his friends behind him. But, if he buys only one, which one will he buy? Does he pretend that he could buy the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to Winnipeg and use it in rivalry with the Canadian Northern Railway or vice versa? I question if that would be considered a just arrangement. He must either buy both or none, for each has equal rights, and if he proposes to buy one, that carries the responsibility of buying both or ruining the other. But if he should buy only one, which one? The government of Canada built the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to Winnipeg and paid for its construction $15,638,549. The government then made a free gift of it to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Without adding one penny to the original cost of that line from Fort William to Winnipeg, it would cost us, if we only had to pay what was originally expended upon it, $15,000,000. Then take the Canadian Northern Railway, which runs side by side, that cost $25,000 per mile, and no one will say that that is an over estimate. If that estimate be satisfactory, it means that the purchase of the Canadian Northern Railway from Fort William to Winnipeg will cost $10,625,000. Now, the purchase of these different roads and the construction of two pieces would aggregate in all $841,015,549. And when he has this road to Winnipeg, I presume he pro-

poses to equip it with rolling stock. How much he proposes to expend on rolling stock, I do not know, but if the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway consider $20,000,000 not too much to expend on rolling stock, with which to equip its proposed new line, at least half that would be required to make this extension of the Intercolonial Railway effective. If so, that would mean $90,000,000 odd for bringing the Intercolonial to Winnipeg.

Assuming that the leader of the opposition has carried out his policy, assuming that he has expropriated the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to North Bay, I would like to know what effect that is going to have on the railway system of the Canadian Pacific Railway and our western trade ? Everybody knows that the 634 miles operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway between Fort William and North Bay is about the most unprofitable piece in all Canada. Everybody knows that the Canadian Pacific Railway have an alternative route from Duluth to Sault Ste. Marie, a distance of nearly 400 miles, which they would be only too glad to use if they could get rid of the expensive north shore piece of railway. The hon. gentleman proposes to take out of the Dominion treasury $38,000,000 and hand it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purchase of its railway from Fort William to North Bay. The Canadian Pacific Railway could then turn around and build a short line of railway, 360 miles in length, from Winnipeg to Duluth, side track Fort William and Port Arthur, and divert the whole traffic west through Duluth, going down from and coming back to Canada by the Sault Ste. Marie. The Canadian Pacific Railway is at present maintaining two lines of railway for its western traffic going east, with the exception of a short link between Winnipeg and Duluth of 360 miles. Every day it runs a train from Fort William to North Bay, it loses money. I am not in a position to say how much but an hon. gentleman opposite—speaking with I do not know what authority—suggests that $1,000,000 is the annual loss in operating the railway between Fort William and North Bay. That may or may not be correct. But that line follows a rocky coast, as every body knows, on which there is not sufficient traffic to make it pay, and besides the grades are bad, the curves are severe, and it is altogether an expensive road. Nothing therefore would suit the Canadian Pacific Railway better than to be relieved of the cost of keeping open that road; and were the hon. gentleman's policy carried out and the Canadian Pacific Railway paid $38,000,000 of the people's money to sell out what is a dead horse, namely, the line from Fort William to North Bay, they could take $13,000,000 of that money and build a road from Winnipeg to Duluth. That would be the outside cost, and they would then have complete connection between Winnipeg and the Soo, around the south shore of Lake Superior and could divert all the Canadian traffic over that route from the hon. gentleman's common national highway. The hon. gentleman proposes to give the Canadian Pacific Railway $38,000,000 to divert traffic from Canada to the United States, to destroy our own ports, Fort William and Port Arthur, and to build up Duluth in their stead. We, on the contrary, aim at having a Duluth of our own on the north shore of Lake Superior. The hon. gentleman proposes to Americanize the Canadian Pacific Railway, to rob it of its national character, to divert the commerce of Canada to the United States, and build up the rival city of Duluth as against Canadian ports. What would be the effect of the hon. gentleman's scheme if he could carry it out ? If the grain of the North-west, which the Canadian Pacific Railway carries, were brought to Duluth instead of to Fort William or Port Arthur, Canadian shipping would immediately be made subservient more or less to the laws applicable to the United States, mercantile marine. It would mean the driving away largely of Canadian mercantile marine from the lakes, and all for what purpose ? Can any one tell us what purpose will be served ? Who has been the hon. gentleman's adviser ? Does the hon. gentleman feel proud of this scheme, the products of eighteen days reflection ? It cannot be that it is the outcome of eighteen days reflection. It must have involved long consideration by persons better versed in these matters. As the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) once said, there must have been some gold bricking done; and I submit that on this occasion a very considerable gold brick has been passed on the leader of the opposition by the Canadian Pacific Railway. What are we to gain by spending $54,000,000 to buy up the existing roads between Montreal and Winnipeg ? The expenditure of that money will not open up for settlement one additional square mile of country. It will transfer many millions of the people's money into the treasury of some company, but it cannot possibly be of any service to the people of Canada. It will take $84,000,000 out of the treasury of Canada and put it into the treasury of some railway companies which have already been well subsidized. It will do worse. If will throw upon the country for all time the cost of maintaining an unprofitable section of railway between Fort William and North Bay. In every way, it will be adverse to our interest and yet we are told by our hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) that it is a work of constructive statemanship. The hon. member for Bothwell, in his description of this scheme, stopped at Winnipeg. Why did he go back on his leader ? His leader did not stop at Winnipeg. The hon. member for Bothwell either did not understand the scheme or he is going to repudiate

it all west of Winnipeg. Let me again come to the rescue of the leader of the opposition; his is a larger scheme than that:

The fourth point——

Now, this is the fourth point. It is not a casual observation, it is a point, it is number four; I am quoting the words of the leader of the opposition.

The fourth point on which I propose this policy is this. It will assist the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway on reasonable terms, if they guarantee to build a line north of the Canadian Northern Railway and as far west as Edmonton or some adjacent point.

During this discussion we have estimated the prairie section at 1,000 miles. The hon. gentleman supported a short time ago a guarantee of bonds by this government to the extent of $13,000 a mile, to the Canadian Northern Railway for some eight hundred miles; their line did not cross the whole prairie.

When you get to Edmonton, the point to which he is prepared to help the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway you have reached a point some thousand miles west of Winnipeg. I presume that the hon. gentleman is prepared to aid the Grand Trunk Pacific Company on the same scale as the Canadian Northern was aided, namely, $13,000 a mile. If that is so, $13,000,000 must be added to the cost of his scheme for the aiding of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to the point in question. The hon. gentleman having got west of Winnipeg, the question arises, what next? There he expects a conjunction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern and if those two roads are quite agreeable to building a railway from a common point to the coast let them do it, but if they are not prepared to do it, then the hon. gentleman is willing that that railway should be build at once at the cost of the treasury of this country. These are his words:

At some point on this side of the Rocky mountains, there should be a common point a junction between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. From that on to the coast there should be one line. That line should be built by these companies, on such an arrangement as would give them joint control. Should there be any difficulty in coming to such an arrangement, the government should build that line itself and maintain control and give these railways for a term of years running powers over it.

Thus, Sir, he is prepared, unless the two railways will build, to build a railway and to give running powers over it. The length of that railway will be 600 miles and no one will estimate the cost of the mountain section at less than $50,000 a mile.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. the Minister of Finance stated that the length of that section would be 480 miles.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the figures of the Minister of Finance before me, but I understand that from this point at Edmonton it will be some 600 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that it would be 480 miles from Edmonton.

Mr. CLANCY. The statement was that the mountain section would be 480 miles.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not from Edmonton.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Taking the length of the line from Edmonton to the coast at 600 miles, and estimating the cost at $50,000 a mile, we will have $30,000,000. Thirty million dollars added to the $84,-015,549 which it has cost to bring his railway to Edmonton makes $114,015,549. That is the cost of the extension of the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to the coast, including aid to the prairie section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has got one railway to the coast and you would think that that scheme ought to have satisfied the ambition of any ordinary man. But not so on this occasion. The hon. gentleman told us, and he told us particularly, that the country was not afraid of spending money, and the hon. gentleman is not afraid of spending money. I take him at his word, I have not the slightest doubt of the accuracy of that statement, because, having got to the coast, he turns back again to the east with an eye to Moncton and Halifax—and I do not blame him for that. He considers how he is to square himself with the people of the east on the unfortunate position in which he placed himself on the 30th of July last. So he approaches the question a little gingerly but still his meaning is not difficult to discover. On the 18th of August, addressing himself to the subject of a government line, he says:

I say that if there is a better line between Lévis, or Rivière du Loup, or any such port on the Intercolonial, and Moncton, a line the construction of which will give to Halifax and St. John a better fighting chance for western traffic than that which they have at present, I will support the construction of that line. But I will not support it with the object for which this Bill provides. I will tell my hon. friend how I will support it. I will support the construction of that line as part of the Intercolonial Railway.

Therefore, he says, if a better route can be obtained he is prepared to extend the Intercolonial from Moncton to Lévis. It is not a question of cost; it is not a question of paralleling the Intercolonial. He is prepared to build a railway from Moncton to Lévis; he is prepared to take the through traffic or all traffic if needs be off the main line of the Intercolonial which now follows the south shore of the St. Lawrence; he is prepared to incur all the expense if a better road can be obtained. It is not a question of cost, he commits himself up to the handle because every one knows that a better road

than the existing line of the Intercolonial can be obtained if you do not object to the cost. Engineers can get you what you are prepared to pay for. It is a question of a better line and money does not concern him because as he said :

> The people of the country are not afraid of spending money, if it is spent in a sane and reasonable way. . . .
> There is no reason to be afraid of spending money, I am not afraid of spending money. And the country is not afraid of spending money. But let us spend it in a reasonable and proper way.

Every one will concur in the hon. gentleman's statement that he is not afraid of spending money after the words I have quoted from his speech. He is prepared, if a better line can be got, to build from Moncton to Lévis and I am sure the hon. gentleman could not go back to Halifax to-day and say that he was not honestly in favour of the construction of a line between Moncton and Lévis—not only in favour of constructing such a line, but of constructing it at the earliest possible moment, and I expect that before this debate is concluded the hon. gentleman will come all the way over and say that he heartily approves of the immediate construction of a line from Lévis to Moncton.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to say that he has misquoted my remarks in that he has not given my entire statement, on this point. I said, immediately following the words the hon. gentleman has quoted :

> In all this, act reasonably, survey your country, consider your course, consider the distance to be saved, consider the cost of haulage to be saved. Do not plunge into the thing rashly, do not undertake to build it upon a survey made thirty or forty years ago when railway conditions were different from what they are at present. Go into the enterprise sanely, after having obtained information which would justify you in believing that it would give a better chance for trade to the people of the maritime provinces.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Sir William Mulock). The hon. gentleman has not at all disputed anything that I said. I did not pretend to read all his words. I read the portion of his remarks wherein he said that if a better line can be procured he is prepared to build a line from Moncton to Lévis. The question of cost is a circumstance, but it is not a controlling circumstance with the hon. gentleman, who, I am sure, will not say in this House that he is against the building of a line from Moncton to Lévis, nor for that matter from Lévis or Quebec to the Pacific ocean. The hon. gentleman is prepared to build a line from Ottawa, to put it under contract from Moncton to Lévis if an engineer can tell him that a better line than the existing Intercolonial line can be obtained. That is his position, he has put himself on record and from it he cannot recede. Either that is true or he did not intend to express himself as he did in the language which I have quoted.

Hon. gentlemen have said that it will cost $10,000,000, I think they say $15,000,000 to build from Moncton to Lévis. If that line would be 400 miles long and $25,000 a mile is put down as the cost, it will cost $10,000,000. I am sure there is not an hon. gentleman in the House who will say that this is an unreasonable estimate.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Too low.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I won't say whether it is too low or not. The Minister of Finance, I think, estimated it at something like that. Now we have to go to Lévis at the south side of the river St. Lawrence, a mile or two from the city of Quebec. What is his policy when he gets to the city of Quebec ? Again, I will read his words :

> So far as the line from Quebec to Winnipeg is concerned, I am not disposed to minimize the possibility of that northern country. Looking at the history of the great west, there may be a great flood of settlement into that country north of Lake Superior, some day or other, at least up to a certain point west, but I do not think we know enough to justify us at present in saying that there will or will not be, because I do not know how far that country is capable of competing, in the early future, with the magnificent country we have in the North-west. I have some doubts as to whether or not that great northern country may compete as early as we would desire with the great western country. But I am not disposed to minimize its importance in any way, and to my mind the rational way of dealing with that road from Winnipeg to Quebec is this. To thoroughly explore and understand it, and then to build that line from Quebec to Winnipeg, as a colonization road, according as the requirements of the people and colonization demand. To build it after you have obtained the fullest possible information and obtain that information with the least possible delay. You may find curious conditions surrounding you when you get into that country. You may find that the road, which is the most direct line to the Pacific coast, will not be the road that will open that country for colonization. You may find the road running one way for colonization purposes and another way direct to the coast.
>
> You may also find that a line running north from the northern part of Ontario will be required for the development of that country. You must go upon information, upon sound and reasonable lines, and when you do that, give to that country all the development which the people require. Not only build that line, but operate it as a government line. A government line, it seems to me, would be peculiarly suitable to that country for colonization purposes, and I see no reason why the problem should not be solved in that way. If within a certain number of years, a practical route be found, then extend that road to the Pacific coast ? Build it as a government road from Quebec to the coast. Be not afraid to undertake that project, but do not undertake it until you have the information, the data which will enable you to deal with it. I am not saying this for the purpose of delay. I

believe in going ahead with the work once you get the information and the data which are necessary.

I have read all that the hon. gentleman has said on that point, and I think the fair deduction from it is this: The very moment you get enough information, go ahead with the road. Surely the hon. gentleman, in this age, is not going to say that the people must go into that terra incognita before there is a railway. To-day railways are the pioneers of settlement. If that country is to be settled, railways must go first. The hon. gentleman says that as soon as there is information obtained about that country, go ahead with the enterprise.

I am not saying this for the purpose of delay, I believe in going ahead with the work once you get the information and the data which are necessary.

Now, if to-morrow the information and the data were forthcoming, then the hon. gentleman would believe in proceeding at once with the work. As the First Minister has explained, there are mountains of information upon this subject.

An hon. MEMBER. Where are they?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are everywhere. There are more on the Table of this House than any hon. gentleman of the opposition has waded through. The library is full of them, the woods are full of them. There are survey parties in every part of that district to-day, and in a few short months, probably, there will be no part of Canada better known than the country between Winnipeg and the city of Quebec. As soon as the snow goes away next spring, I have no doubt that the surveys will be in that forward state that the actual work of construction may be and will be undertaken. Now if the information is forthcoming the hon. gentleman's policy is to build at once, not to wait. Now, we have him on his second transcontinental trip across the continent. We have got him as far as Quebec. Now to Winnipeg the distance is 1,400 miles. I will allow that here he proposes to build a colonization road. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by a colonization road. I suppose he means a cheap road, a road inexpensive to operate. If so, I would take exception to the wisdom of putting in a cheap road in a country that is about to be settled up. If there is any class of people who are entitled to cheap rates, to the best railway facilities for their commerce, it is those people who are the pioneers of settlement in the unknown solitudes of the north. Why the hon. gentleman will pass upon them a cheaply constructed road, though expensive to them, I am at a loss to understand. However, he proposes to treat these people with a colonization road, a cheap road to the country, a dear road to them. If so, if it costs the government $25,000 a mile to build a first-class road from Winnipeg to Quebec, I will take off $5,000 a mile, and suppose that we can get his cheap colonization road at $20,000 a mile.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister of Finance put it at $28,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Minister of Finance was speaking of a properly constructed road. The Minister of Finance proposed a good trunk line, useful for other purposes as well as for colonization: the leader of the opposition proposes what he calls a colonization road, which I suppose is not a road of this character, but a road of severe grades and many curvatures, a cheap but expensive road for the purpose of supplying traffic. I would not favour that kind of a road; but as the leader of the opposition is now submitting his policy, I am endeavouring to present it fairly to the House. Fourteen hundred miles of a colonization road between Quebec and Winnipeg could be built for $20,000 a mile, amounting to $28,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman proposes to extend that line across the continent. I do not see why, after building a government line from a point near Edmonton to the coast he should build another. Speaking on page 9295, on the 18th of August, the hon. gentleman says:

Not only build that line, but operate it as a government line.

Then he proceeds to say:

Then extend that road to the Pacific coast.

I would have thought it more economical to endeavour to connect that road with the mountain section which he is going to build from Edmonton to the coast, but the hon. gentleman probably had some other scheme in his mind. Therefore, we have to figure this line through to the coast, and if so, we have to allow, I suppose, at least $20,000 a mile for 1,000 miles, costing $20,000,000. Then there is another $30,000,000 for the 600 miles of the mountain section, making in all $93,000,000. So his second transcontinental railway will cost the trifling sum of $88,000,000. His first transcontinental railway has cost $114,115,549. Add to that the cost of his second transcontinental railway, $98,000,000, and his two lines will cost $202,113,549. He is not afraid of spending money. It will have to be equipped with rolling stock, both these lines are to be operated as government roads. The Grand Trunk Pacific undertake to put $20,000,000 on their line, it will take twice that to equip the two lines. I add, therefore, $40,000,000 for equipment of the two lines, and you have the total cost of the two lines as $242,113,549. I am ashamed of our modest scheme involving an expenditure of only $13,000,000. Now, let us leave the railway. There are other features of this scheme. The hon. gentleman proposes to purchase the Canada Atlantic Railway transit fleet. What does that involve? Let me give the hon. gentleman's words. Having pointed

out the great service performed by the Canada Atlantic transit fleet, he proceeds to say :

While there may be some difficulty in the Crown owning steamers which ply in foreign countries, I should suppose, though I did not consider the question very carefully, a difficulty of that kind could be overcome by maintaining the present organization ; or in other words, the legal title to the steamers would remain vested in the company, and the government could own stock in the company in the same way that the British government can own stock in the Suez canal.

He proposes that this government shall go into the grain-carrying trade on the upper lakes. What effect will this action have upon private ventures of the same kind ? There are many millions of dollars of Canadian money at the present time invested in vessels upon our inland waters engaged in the grain-carrying trade. How will the owners of these vessels be able to compete with the government steamers engaged in this same line of trade ? Will it be fair to them that they shall be liable to the competition of the government fleet of steamers ? Why, Sir, it is only necessary to propound that proposition to cause any hon. gentleman to withdraw from it as an unsound policy. Either the government has to engage in the whole grain-carrying traffic on the lakes or nothing at all. The government cannot engage one ship in the grain-carrying trade on the upper lakes in competition with private capital, without being called upon to purchase all the vessels engaged in the traffic and be responsible for the whole traffic. It is either all or none, and as to what it involves anybody can form a fair estimate. It means the government buying up all the vessels now engaged in the traffic, it means putting an end to all private enterprise of this character, it means a system of paternalism in connection with the carrying trade that no business man would seriously propose and yet that is what the hon. gentleman proposes in this scheme. He says :

Thoroughly equip our Georgian Bay ports——

What does that mean ? Everybody is in favour of the equipment of the ports as rapidly as the circumstances of this country will permit. But it cannot all be done at once. The demands upon the treasury of this country are great. I doubt if there is any five millions of people in the world having greater responsibilities and rising more to the occasion than the people of Canada, but we cannot equip our great inland waters all at once. Remembering that we have inland seas and rivers 2,000 miles in extent it is impossible for any government at once to be able to complete the equipment and put everything in a perfect state such as only time and the greatest experience and expenditure will produce. But he says :

Thoroughly equip our Georgian Bay ports, our national waterways——

I sympathize with that proposition.

—our St. Lawrence route——

I sympathize with that proposition.

—and our ports on the Atlantic coast.

I sympathize with that proposition. Then he says abolish if necessary the harbour dues on the Atlantic coast and on the Georgian bay. Will the hon. gentleman tell us what is involved in that ? Has the hon. gentleman considered the consequences of abolishing the harbour dues in any harbour in Canada ? Take for instance the harbour of the city of Quebec. The city of Quebec collects dues upon shipping. It is a practice common in all parts to impose dues upon shipping, these dues being funded and expended in improving the harbour facilities, the construction of docks, dredging, elevators and providing other harbour advantages. The harbour commissioners have to incur debts in order to provide these facilities and the only revenue wherewith they can pay their debts is derived from the dues collected from shipping. The hon. gentleman proposes to make free our Atlantic ports, our inland ports, the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and others. It is in the power of parliament to abolish the dues collected by the city of Quebec. The city of Quebec to-day has borrowed and owes for money expended in improving its harbour, $5,803,538, and the only way whereby it can pay that money is by imposing dues upon shipping. The hon. gentleman proposes to abolish those dues. If he abolishes those dues he has to assume the debt of the Quebec harbour. You then have to add to the cost of this scheme the debt of the harbour of the city of Quebec, amounting to $5,803,538. Then, coming to Montreal, the harbour commissioners of Montreal have been doing their best to improve the harbour of that great city, and they have expended and are authorized to expend $8,054,156. If, Mr. Speaker, we carry out the hon. gentleman's policy and wipe out the dues upon the shipping that comes to that harbour, no matter how desirable it would be if the circumstances allowed, how are we to meet the debt of the harbour commissioners of the city of Montreal ? We have to pay that debt as well. Add that debt to the debt of the harbour of Quebec, and add that to the other Bill and we have $255,971,233, as the ascertained cost in giving effect to the hon. gentleman's scheme. Again I deplore the insignificance of our little scheme alongside of this one. That represents the two harbours of Quebec and Montreal, and I am proud to say they are not the only harbours in Canada. There are other harbours that have debts. I need not mention them all. We have harbours on the Atlantic coast. I do not know to what extent they are in debt.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). There is no debt on the harbour of Halifax.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Happy Halifax. Perhaps that was a circumstance that led my hon. friend into this mistake, but there are harbours where there are debts. What about the harbours on the Pacific ocean, and what about the harbours on the inland waters? Are all these to be made free harbours? You cannot make one a free harbour at the public expense without making them all free harbours, and we can contemplate the cost that would be involved in paying the debts of all the harbours of this great broad Dominion. That is involved in the policy of the hon. gentleman. Then, there is one extraordinary enterprise in which he proposes to embark. I do not wish to misrepresent him, and therefore I will again quote from his words. Speaking as to terminals, he goes on to say:

The elevator question in the west, in connection with these terminals, is a very important one, and it is one that will have to be dealt with by the government, and dealt with under the best possible expert advice. We know that in the western states a farmer, on putting his grain in the warehouse, gets a certificate which is guaranteed by the state, and which is practically so much money to the person for whose benefit it is given. He can go to any bank and draw the amount at once. This is a matter that I have not studied or carefully considered——

I am inclined to agree with him.

—but it seems to me it would be a proper subject for this government to fully investigate, with a view to deciding whether some similar system could not be adopted in this country, so that the farmer of the west, putting his grain into warehouse would receive such a certificate, would, if necessary, have the whole faith of the country pledged to the accuracy of the certificate, and be able to realize upon his grain at once.

Well, Sir, there are a large number of people in Canada pursuing the business of warehouse men as a calling. They have their warehouses and their business arrangements, and if this government is going into this business of warehousing grain for hire, what is to become of those who have already invested their capital in it. They could not compete with the government, they would have to retire from business, and so the hon. gentleman proposes to displace the warehouse business in which hundreds of people in Canada are engaged, and to have that business carried on by the state. It may be a forward movevent; it may exist in some places in the world, although I am not aware of any government ever having taken upon itself such a responsibility as that. But most extraordinary of all, the leader of the opposition proposes to go into the business of building barns, and storehouses, and elevators and warehouses, and he goes on to say:

We shall have enormous grain crops in the North-west, and it would be an economic waste, it seems to me, for 100,000 farmers to build 100,000 barns or warehouses, when, by means of proper transportation facilities, their grain could be stored for a merely nominal charge in elevators erected as a common enterprise.

There he proposes to go into the elevator business as a common enterprise, and not as a mere business transaction, but to carry it on at a nominal price. Let us read it again:

We shall have enormous grain crops in the North-west, and it would be an economic waste, it seems to me, for 100,000 farmers to build 100,000 barns or warehouses, when, by means of proper transportation facilities, their grain could be stored for a merely nominal charge in elevators erected as a common enterprise.

That is the policy which the hon. gentleman proposes to us. I wonder if he formed any estimate of what is involved in that proposition to provide elevators for him to store at a nominal charge all the grain that would be stored in 100,000 barns in the North-west. Is he going to provide elevators for other farmers than those of the North-west? There are to-day millions of dollars invested by private capital in elevators and warehouses and is the hon. gentleman prepared to buy these concerns. If he is going to build elevators what becomes of those now existing through private capital and which in order to make them pay have to impose substantial charges, and not merely nominal charges. If he provides elevators and warehouses for 100,000 farmers in the North-west to store their grain at a nominal charge, does he not think that he would have to build as many elevators and barns and warehouses as would be necessary to store all the grain of Canada at a nominal charge. If you build warehouses and barns and elevators for 100,000 farmers in the North-west, why should you not do the same thing for the farmers in other parts of Canada.

Mr. COWAN. That's a barn-yard policy.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And although the leader of the opposition takes very little heed of money, this government having that careful regard to the public treasury which has always characterized them, must take note of the cost that such a mad and wild-cat scheme as that proposed by the leader of the opposition would involve the country in. The hon. gentleman proposes to spend $84,000,000 to get the Intercolonial Railway extended to the North-west, although it would be of no public service to the Dominion, and indeed would not be a service but would be a positive injury to the people of Canada. He proposes as part of his scheme to take a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway line and to force them to divert a large part of their traffic from the north shore of Lake Superior to and through the United States. He proposes to ignore practically, until some period that may suit him—he says when he has had surveys made—the great country

lying between Quebec and Winnipeg. In fact, Sir, in the matter of ignoring Canadian interests his scheme is more in favour of the United States than it is in favour of Canada.

My opinion is that we cannot at too early a moment build this railway, and particularly that portion of it from Moncton to Winnipeg which has most received the active hostility of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a feature in connection with our scheme that must commend itself to all those who fairly understand it. From the commencement to the end; from Moncton through New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia; from ocean to ocean in addition to being a trunk line it is a colonization line opening up and making valuable millions of acres of productive land which is at present valueless to the people of Canada. A few days ago an hon. gentleman opposite asked: What is this going to do for the province of Ontario, and he argued that a large portion of the cost of the enterprise was going to fall upon that province. I depreciate sectional appeals, but when I am asked what good this railway is going to be to Ontario, I at once remember that we have in that province of Ontario, lying in the track of the line in question, an area of country, an empire in extent and in wealth, 16,000,000 acres of land all of which will be made merchantable and valuable by means of this railway. Suppose this railway would make this land only worth a dollar an acre, these 16,000,000 acres would more than pay the whole cost to the Dominion of this enterprise. There is not a man who regards his status in this country who will say that that property will not be enhanced in value many fold over one dollar an acre by the construction of this line. Why, Sir, if that 16,000,000 acres in Ontario alone, is made to be worth three dollars an acre, there we have a value of $48,000,000 given to what is now a valueless estate. The Minister of the Interior told us that it would also make valuable a large tract of Crown lands in the territories—I think he said some 20,000,000 acres, which at only two dollars an acre would at least be equal to $40,000,000. I say nothing of the province of New Brunswick, because I am not quite so familiar with the geography of that province, but we know from the map that this road will traverse a new district, and that throughout its whole distance it will be from 35 to 75 miles away from the existing railway. Fancy the value it must give to the lands that will be made accessible to the market by the construction of the railway through the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick.

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). Does the hon. minister mean to say that this road will be from thirty-five to seventy miles from any railway existing to-day in New Brunswick or Quebec?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. From the Intercolonial Railway. It may cross a railway; but it is because it is going to be so productive that we find public opinion in New Brunswick to-day overwhelmingly, unanimously, in favour of this scheme. The voice of New Brunswick speaks for itself. I cannot say from my own knowledge how it will affect the province of British Columbia; but I had a letter put in my hand to-day from a gentleman in Victoria, B.C., who, speaking of this measure, expresses himself as follows:

> With regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme, it is very well received all round. Of course, there are some who would kick anyhow; but, so far as British Columbia is concerned, I think it is a scheme which will be found acceptable to the large majority of people in the country. At any rate, it is one which I think people will be very foolish to pass, now an opportunity of that kind is afforded, and, if knocked on the head, of which I do not think there is the slightest prospect——

Nor does any one here——

—it would be very difficult to get the same scheme again, or one which affects the country so well.

That is from a gentleman in high standing in British Columbia. The name of the writer of this letter is H. G. Helmken, K.C. He is president of the Conservative Association of the city of Victoria.

Mr. Speaker, it has been stated by a number of the members in opposition that we have no mandate from the people to build this railway. A number of them challenge us to go to the country first. We had some challenges of that kind thrown across the floor of the House to-day. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) particularly sought to make the point that the government had no mandate from the people to build a transcontinental railway. If the government twice sustained at the polls has no mandate from the people to build one transcontinental line, may I ask whence the opposition, twice defeated at the polls, derive their authority to build two transcontinental lines? If, according to their reasoning, each defeat carries with it a mandate to build another transcontinental line, perhaps I would not be inaccurate in prophesying that in the not distant future they will receive a mandate to build a third transcontinental line. Why, may I ask, did the people in 1896 summon the Liberal party to power?

Mr. WILSON. God knows.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Was it in order, Mr. Speaker, that the country might remain in commercial stagnation, and mark time, as it did for many years under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite? It was not necessary to have had a change of government in order to maintain that state of affairs. The hon. gen-

tlemen opposite manifested through long years their capacity to keep the country at a standstill. The people doubtless called upon the Liberal party—one hon. gentleman says, Deity knows why. He orders all things well; He and the people of Canada evidently thought alike. The people of Canada, by their decision at the polls, manifested a desire that this country should take on an onward policy, should have an onward Canadian party, and that Canada should enter upon a period of vigorous, robust and healthy growth towards manhood, until she should win for herself her proper place amongst the nations of the earth. Even if I were to take the argument of an hon. gentleman opposite, that we had technically no mandate from the people to build a transcontinental railway at this moment, I submit that events are happening which in themselves amount to a mandate. Before this line can be completed, circumstances will justify, even more than they do now, the wisdom of the course we are pursuing. Magnificent streams of population are pouring into the great North-west. Before this railway is completed, the population west of Lake Superior—a population largely composed of people not of our own race, although they are welcome here—will equal one-half, and by the time the railway is five years in operation, will wholly equal the population of old Canada to-day. Geographically their neighbours will be the people to the south in the American republic; and already we see the most active efforts being made by the enterprising citizens of that country to divert the commerce of our western territories into United States channels. Between old Canada and new Canada, between the west and the east today, there lies extending from the city of Quebec to the city of Winnipeg, a territory nearly 1,300 miles in length, and averaging nearly 300 miles in width, and having an acreage of no less than 240,000,000 acres—240,000,000 acres of land rich in agricultural, mineral and various other kinds of wealth, and ready to yield up this wealth to man if only we will put transportation facilities within its reach. A slight examination of the map of Europe and of the map of Canada will give some idea of the area of this vast country. It exceeds by 175,000 square miles the area of Germany, with its 56,000,000 population. It exceeds by 180,000 square miles the area of France, with her 39,000,000 population. It is 250 per cent bigger than Italy, with her 33,000,000 population. It is larger than thirty Belgiums. It is many times the size of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with its 41,000,000 people. It exceeds by 25,000,000 square miles the total area of the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida and Alabama; being the whole of the Atlantic coast states of the United States, extending from the state of Maine, within a few miles of our own River St. Lawrence, down to the coast of Florida, and around to the Gulf of Mexico. That vast solitude is lying to-day as a wedge of separation between old Canada and new Canada.

For my part, I am unable to understand how the millions of people who are to settle in our great North-west, many of them citizens of foreign countries, are going to have implanted in their hearts the feeling that they are living in a united Canada, I fail to understand how we are going to cultivate in them a love for Canada, a determination to stand for all Canada, and to die, if need be, for all Canada, if there is to be continued commercial and social separation between the east and the west. In my opinion, the national life of Canada is involved in this enterprise. We see in the east the consequences of separation. We all deplore, every day of our lives, the circumstance that the state of Maine projects into Canada to a large extent, separating the maritime provinces from their sister provinces in the west, and yet this land of solitude, unpeopled and undeveloped, between Quebec and Winnipeg, is larger in area than a dozen states of Maine. The question before us is whether we are going to have one Canada or two, one people or two peoples. In my opinion, you cannot have one people if you have this hiatus of settlement. In order to have one people you must have a continuous settlement from ocean to ocean, from Quebec to Winnipeg, and on to the waters of the Pacific. We are urged to delay. The First Minister said, and said wisely and rightly—and in saying it he touched the hearts of the people—there is no time for delay. The occasion demands action. We have a tide of immigration flowing into Canada to-day exceeding that flowing into any other country in the world. Let this tide of immigration be checked, and how many years will be lost before the movement can be started again? Now is the time to strike. Hon. gentlemen opposite want us to wait until depression overcomes the land. One would imagine they were praying for depression. Well, we have had depression and may Heaven prevent Canada from its return. Wait, they say, until depression overtakes us. Why, Mr. Speaker, Canada to-day is a country of promise; and it is because it is a country of promise, because our outlook is so bright, we have been able to make such a satisfactory bargain. Now that we have the opportunity, let us clinch the bargain. Let us strike while the iron is hot, get the railway completed at the earliest moment, and give permanency to that prosperity and development which now so happily blesses this country.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Nothing could be more gratifying, Mr. Speaker, than the

sentiments expressed by the hon. the Postmaster General. The strong language he used in favour of one Canada instead of two Canadas could not fail to arouse a great deal of kindly feeling, and received a warm welcome on this side of the House. I think that we ought to commend the language of the hon. the Postmaster General. We welcome it, we are delighted to hear it, because it was not always the language of that party to which the hon. gentleman belongs. There was a time when an effort to overcome that great hiatus, which lies between the east and the west of Canada, was being made by a Conservative government. In those days, did the hon. gentleman or his political associates have a word to say in favour of one Canada as against two ? Not one word, Sir. Every effort these hon. gentlemen could make was directed to preventing the unification of Canada, and every word they spoke to the people taught them that the people with whom we should do business, the people who are our proper customers, are the people who live to the south of us. There was a whole school of Grit politicians who spent the best years of their lives doing all they could to prevent the unification of Canada. And now that we hear statements made, with such apparent sincerity, by the Postmaster General on behalf of Canadian unity, for my part, I welcome those sentiments, and hope they are heartfelt. But there is always a danger of a relapse, there is always a danger of backsliding in the case of gentlemen who show their conversion under peculiar circumstances. There was a time in the province of Nova Scotia, when the political associates of the hon. the Finance Minister welcomed the visit of a Governor General of Canada with a very liberal display of Yankee bunting. But when the Liberal party came into power, in 1873, those American flags disappeared, and there were no more loyal people to be found anywhere than those same Grit rebels or pseudo-rebels so long as Mr. Mackenzie remained in power. But our Grit friends' loyalty is not of the right stamp. It is not all wool and a yard wide. It does not wear well in adversity, and the consequence was that when Mr. Mackenzie was defeated and these gentlemen came into opposition again, we found that Farrar and his friends became their advisers. They then had no word for the unification of Canada. They were for continental trade, commercial union, they preferred the American dollar to the British shilling. They were rebels, so far as they could be rebels without danger to their persons ; and when these gentlemen come here now with professions of loyalty while we welcome their professions, they must not expect us to accept them as altogether reliable. We have had experience, and our experience has not been in their favour. However, let us hope that this time they are more sincere, because it would be a dreadful thing if they were to backslide a second time ; and we hope, for their own credit and the good of our common country, that when they go again into opposition, which may be at a very early date, their loyalty will prove to be of the kind that stands adversity, and not simply of that fine weather order which manifests itself only when they have control of the treasury.

I am not going to waste my time in following the hon. Postmaster General through the extraordinary speech he made to-night. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition owes a great deal to the Postmaster General for the very unkind, unsympathetic manner in which he expounded the policy of the leader of the opposition. His criticism was too carping, too biased to affect the judgment of any reasonable person. His intention to be unfair was too manifest. The suppositions he put into the mouth of my leader were too absurd and too remote from those that hon. gentleman stated. He did not attempt to answer the speech of the leader of the opposition, but insisted upon making a speech for him, and as he went along the thing became grotesque. I shall, however, refer to one or two things. The Postmaster General is very much shocked at the idea of our forgiving the debt of the harbour commissioners of Montreal and the harbour commissioners of Quebec. He speaks as though it was a perfectly improper thing that the government of Canada should intervene to relieve the commerce of the country from the burden which is imposed by the exacting from that commerce of the tolls and charges which make up the revenue of those boards. What has the government done during this present session, this same government which now you would think looked upon it as the height of folly to relieve commerce of charges at certain points ? This same government, a few months ago, took off the canal tolls. If it had been the purpose of the Postmaster General to make himself and the government he represents supremely ridiculous I am sure he could not have selected a more effective way to accomplish that result. Why should we not make the harbours of Canada as free as the canals ? Our canals have cost $80,000,000. Who would advise that we should exact from the commerce of Canada to-day, sufficient money to pay the interest on that $80,000,000 ? Not the government of to-day, because as I have said they have during the present session relieved that commerce of this precise charge. Therefore, when my hon. friend the Postmaster General scouts the idea that a premier of Canada should act as our leader suggests and relieve commerce of that imposition, then I say he is making the case he represents, he is making himself and the government supremely ridiculous. The Postmaster General in establishing to his own satisfaction, I hope, for he did not to

the satisfaction of any other person, the allegation that the proposition of the leader of the opposition would cost the people of this country $254,000,000. I think he made that quite as clear as he did the allegation that the proposition of the government would cost just $13,000,000; one is as obvious as the other. There is not one single feature in the scheme propounded by the hon. leader of the opposition which the gentleman who has just criticised it from the government side could successfully attack, and he resorted to the very extraordinary position in his great efforts to find something to challenge, of charging that the proposition of the leader of the opposition would involve the paralleling of some railways. He said that it is unfair that the government should build a road to parallel an existing railway at the same time he is here advocating the building of a railway which is intended to parallel, not only the Intercolonial, but the Canadian Pacific Railway, in so far as it runs from the neighbourhood of North Bay into the city of Winnipeg. To that extent the railway proposed by the government is practically paralleling the Canadian Pacific Railway and depriving it of the business which it at present enjoys. This government not only proposes to construct a road which will, in the east, parallel the Intercolonial in the sense of taking traffic but will parallel the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west. More than that will any one for an instant deny that the proposition now being made to subsidize or to aid with a guaranteed bond issue the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway west of Winnipeg? The line shown on the map which is displayed in the Railway Committee room to-day, is paralleling the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Winnipeg, there cannot be any doubt of it, the line is drawn through a country already fully occupied. In order to find something in criticism of the proposition of the leader of the opposition the hon. gentleman is compelled to go to the length of condemning the very system that his government is to-day submitting to the people of Canada, because it is open to the charge of paralleling other roads and of instituting an unfair competition with private capital or with the capital of corporations. Thus we may attribute the whole speech of the Postmaster General to a vain and ineffective attempt to find something to say in criticism of the reasonable speech of the leader of the opposition. Now, I shall not for the very obvious reason that it would be absolutely unprofitable, follow the Postmaster General through all his speech, but I have here an estimate made up in the most careful fashion, not by guess work but by information obtained from competent authorities, which shows that the whole scheme as laid down by the leader of the opposition would cost the people of Canada only $60,000,000. That would give to the Intercolonial Railway, would give to the Grand Trunk Railway, and to the Canadian Pacific Railway communication with the city of Winnipeg. It would unite Winnipeg with Halifax by the Intercolonial and with St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway and with all the points in Ontario and Quebec reached by the Grand Trunk Railway via that railway. It would afford all of that at a cost of $60,000,000 because, as I said, these estimates are not guess work, they are not made by assuming a distance of so many miles at a cost of so much per mile, but are derived from figures compiled by persons of competent knowledge. That being the case, it is not hard to see that when the Postmaster General attacks such a scheme as this it is necessary, not to attack that particular scheme, but to imagine and set up an entirely different proposition against which he could direct his attack. His speech before its conclusion really seemed perfectly absurd. He was not doing himself or the government he represents any credit or any good and was expounding his case very ineffectively. It required no penetration to see that he was criticising in the most unfriendly manner the proposition which has been laid down by the leader of the opposition after the most mature consideration and with the support of his followers. There could be nothing more amusing than to see the solicitude of the Postmaster General to defend the hon. leader of the opposition from the attacks of his supporters. There can be no doubt at all that those gentlemen on this side of the House who cheered the hon. leader of the opposition when he presented his scheme to the House understood what he proposed, that they knew exactly the scope of that proposition, that they knew what it was intended to effect, that they knew all the limitations and the conditions of it and that when that hon. gentleman proposed to the people of Canada a scheme that would cost a sum in the vicinity of $60,000,000 and which in his opinion and in their opinion would at once effect for the people of Canada all that they could hope to effect by the scheme proposed by the government. My hon. friend the Postmaster General when he insisted that the leader of the opposition was pledging the Conservative party and this country to immediate action in connection with the road between Quebec and Winnipeg was simply distorting the language of the hon. leader of the opposition. His attempt was in absolute defiance of the plain and explicit terms in which the leader of the opposition had challenged the government for acting hastily and had laid down the proposition that whatever was commendable in their scheme could best be carried out after full and complete inquiry had placed us in possession of necessary information. I am glad that the leader of the opposition took the trouble to make it perfectly clear to the people of this country

that we as a party, and he as our leader, are not standing in the way of any legitimate expenditure of money required to make our country more progressive, more happy, more prosperous, than it is at the present. We are not afraid to spend money when it is properly spent, we never have been, as a party, afraid to spend money when we thought it was proper to spend it.

There can be no question that this scheme, although it seems large, still so far as boldness is concerned, so far as an effort on the part of the people is concerned, it bears no comparison with the scheme that was propounded to the people of older Canada by Sir John A. Macdonald when, in 1873, we undertook to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. That railway, for the people of that day and for the government of that day, was an infinitely bolder scheme, involving more sacrifices, and throwing a greater strain upon the country than this scheme proposed by the government to-day. The reason we are objecting to their scheme is not because it is going to cost money. You cannot have any results without expending money; you cannot have a prosperous country very long which thinks too much of economy and too little about a legitimate expenditure. The man in private life, the village, the town, the city, the country, which shows itself to be careful about expenditure, which pays too much attention to small economies, is not the wisest man, the wisest community or the wisest country. It is the country which utilizes its resources the best, which most wisely makes liberal expenditures, which will prosper the best. It is not because the scheme of the government is going to cost money that we attack it, it is because it is not an advisable expenditure. Now what do we find when we come to consider the proposal made by the government?

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. gentleman states that the cost of the opposition scheme will be $60,000,000. May I ask if he includes in that the building of a road from Lévis to Moncton?

Mr. BELL. No, that is not included. It will be remembered that it was stated by the leader of the opposition that that would only be built in case full inquiry should show that, for a reasonable cost and with regard to the requirements of the situation, a better road than the Intercolonial could be obtained. It was not a fixed part of the proposition made by the leader of the opposition, it was one to which conditions were attached; therefore there is only included in this estimate what has been proposed to be carried out with reasonable haste. Now the proposal made by the government is one which involves, in the first place, a very regrettable and a tremendous lot of doubt. It is not possible, however anxious one may be, to know what that scheme involves, what is its extent. It is not possible for any one to satisfy his mind upon that subject. We are told by some persons that the road is of this length; we are told by others that it is of another length; there have not been two supporters upon the government side of the House who exactly agree as to the length of the whole road, or as to the length of any part of it. As I do not know the length of the road and the government have not the plans or figures upon the Table that will inform me, I am taking what I suppose to be the fairest estimate, and that is an average of the estimates made by gentlemen who have spoken for the government, by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Finance and by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who, on this occasion, was put up by the government in such a manner as to make it reasonably fair for us to assume that he was speaking for the government. The fact that he was put up to reply to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, and come to his task evidently thoroughly prepared, would seem to justify us in assuming that on this occasion he spoke for the government. Now, taking all these estimates and averaging them, it will be found that the eastern section of the road will be about 1,840 miles in length; the prairie section 1,200 miles, and the mountain section 500 miles. As I say, no two speakers agree exactly, and I am taking an average. Now the 1,840 miles will cost, at the estimate made by the Minister of Finance, and I assume he made a careful inquiry, because in this respect he represents the government—that eastern section of the road will cost $51,520,000; the mountain portion will cost, in guaranteed bonds, $15,000,000, and the prairie section, $15,600,000. Now, what would the cost to Canada be? It would be the cost of the eastern portion of the road, the interest on the bonds, on the cost of construction, because we will assume that the bonds which are guaranteed by the government will be carried forward in the course of time by the company. Now, the interest on these bonds and the interest on the road manifestly have to be paid for ten years; the contract says for seven years, but it makes provision that for three years longer the interest may be paid by the government, and I think it is fair to assume that that will be taken advantage of. Now, that will make about $20,000,000. The interest on the bonds and the interest on the road for ten years will make $20,100,000. The Minister of Finance added as interest during the period of construction $3,309,676. That makes $74,929,676; say $75,000,000. There was an estimate made by the Toronto 'News,' a paper friendly to the government, putting the cost at $79,000,000. Therefore I think we may fairly assume that the cost of this road will be about $77,000,000 or $78,000,000. Now what does this estimate depend on? It depends entirely on the cost of construction,

which is here placed at $28,000 a mile for the section from Quebec to Winnipeg; at $25,000 a mile for the portion of road in New Brunswick between Lévis and Moncton. These are the estimates of the Finance Minister, I am taking them throughout.

Now, I think all the evidence we can secure on the subject goes to show that the road cannot be built for any such figures. The quality of the road must manifestly be the consideration which will determine its cost. Now, what kind of a road is this to be? The hon. member for North Norfolk, whom we may fairly assume was speaking for the government, describes the road as to be of the highest class. But if you are not satisfied with the authority of the hon. member for North Norfolk, I will quote to you what the Minister of Agriculture said, who specified that the road should be one which should have no grade exceeding one-half of one per cent, or 26 feet to the mile. Now I need scarcely say that a road with grades not exceeding one-half of one per cent, if it is to be a first class road, must have curves of an easy degree, must have an equipment of a first rate kind. I will refer again to the authority of the member for North Norfolk, who not only demands a grade of not more than twenty-one feet to the mile, but he insists on 90 pound rails being laid; he insists on locomotives weighing 100 tons, on cars which shall convey fifty tons of load each; he demands bridges which shall not only carry this heavy rolling stock, but which shall be fifty per cent in advance of its requirements, which shall be able to carry a tonnage fifty per cent greater than that I have mentioned; a road in word so equipped as to bear trains drawing loads of 2,000 tons.

Now we are fortified in that idea by another consideration. What is this road being built for? What did the right hon. gentleman undertake to build the road for? What did he tell us? It is built in the first place and mainly to compete with water and rail carriage and to carry wheat from Winnipeg to St. John, in competition with the ports of New York, Boston, Portland and Baltimore. It is very manifest, that, if the right hon. gentleman is to be gratified, if his road is to succeed in carrying wheat and that is a point of as much importance perhaps as its ability to compete, he must carry his 2,000 ton trains and he must carry them on a road that is of the highest possible class; otherwise the object which the right hon. gentleman has will fail of accomplishment. What reason have we to believe that a road can be built of the character that I have just specified for $28,000 per mile through a country which is admittedly one of great difficulty? It is not a prairie country, and it is not such a country as extends between Ottawa and Montreal. It is a country which is manifestly one of some difficulty. If we are to believe what we see described to us as the route of the road it is one that crosses innumerable rivers all of which are making their way to Hudson's bay. It is to have many bridges and they must be costly bridges to carry heavy railway trains bearing a 2,000-ton load. Everything that has been said by the government goes to demonstrate that no such road can be built for $28,000 a mile. We may ask the government to point out to us some roads of equal construction, of equal quality which have been built somewhere for $28,000 per mile. Can the government in all North America find a road 1,800 miles long which will satisfy the conditions laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk? There is nothing like it either in Canada or in the United States. They may find small portions of the road, such as the road 400 mile in length between New York and Buffalo, but they cannot find any road of this extent that equals in character the description of the road which is exacted by the government as represented by the hon. member for North Norfolk. But, we have a few examples to refer to, and if the right hon. gentleman had not been in such an awful hurry and if time would wait a little while, for him, he could have satisfied himself by looking at the reports which he can find in his own government offices, in which eminent engineers in Canada give good ground for the opinion that a road of that kind cannot be built for $28,000 a mile. In the library the right hon. gentleman could have found the report that Sir Sandford Fleming made upon the Intercolonial Railway, made upon the very road which the right hon. gentleman is contemplating constructing between Lévis and Moncton. What does Sir Sandford Fleming say? He says that the road from Rivière du Loup to Truro upon which he had run fifteen trial lines through central New Brunswick, through the country through which the right hon. gentleman is proposing to construct a road as a betterment of the Intercolonial Railway, would cost $46,000 per mile. Does the right hon. gentleman think that by any witchcraft he can succeed in securing the construction in 1903 for $28,000 per mile of a road which it was estimated in 1864 would cost $46,000 per mile, at a time when the requirements in respect to railways were not at all as exacting as those of the hon. member for North Norfolk, at a time when labour, as the right hon. gentleman is aware, was probably thirty or forty per cent lower than it is to-day in Canada? Still the right hon. gentleman comes before the parliament of Canada and before the people of Canada and tells them that a road of which he has proof cannot be built for less than $46,000 per mile, is going to be built for $25,000 per mile. As represented by the Finance Minister (Hon. Mr. Fielding), he is not even going to give $28,000 per mile; he is going to give $25,000 only to construct a road capable of transporting loads of 2,000 tons over a route by which Sand-

ford Fleming in 1864 said that it would cost $46,000 a mile to build a road.

Mr. CLANCY. And not that kind of a road at all.

Mr. BELL. Of course the road that Sir Sandford Fleming estimated for was not of the class at all that the government demands. The road that Sir Sandford Fleming, as I will show in a short time, estimated for, had grades upon it of one per cent to the mile, or grades of 52·8 to the mile, but the fact is that Sir Sandford Fleming was going to build the road in the country, or expected to build it, while the right hon. gentleman is going to build his road in parliament with words. The difference between talk and deeds is just about the difference between $25,000 a mile and $46,000 a mile. One was an actual business proposition, the other is, to my mind, not an actual business proposition. But, we have other evidence. We know that it has been stated here to-night by the right hon. gentleman's colleague, the hon. Postmaster General (Hon. Sir William Mulock), in his criticism of the policy propounded by the hon. leader of the opposition, that the road built by the Canadian Pacific Railway along the north shore of Lake Superior cost $60,000 per mile. We do not know by what route the right hon. gentleman proposes to carry his road from Moncton to Winnipeg, but we know the two ends of it. We know the road from Moncton to Lévis. We know it from what the engineers have told us, we know it not by guess, but by the statements of thoroughly accomplished engineers. We know the road between North Bay and Winnipeg. We know, although the right hon. gentleman says that it does not exactly coincide with his proposed road—we know the road between Fort William and Winnipeg, and we know that the hon. Postmaster General has, here to-night, standing beside the right hon. leader of the government, stated that that road cost $60,000 per mile. If it be a fact that the Intercolonial Railway at one end cost $53,000 a mile, as shown by the returns given to parliament every year in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway, at the other end of this proposed system, cost from $50,000 to $60,000 per mile, according to the authority of the hon. Postmaster General, may I ask the right hon. leader of the government upon what extraordinary expectation he bases his hope that he is going to be able to build that road in part for $25,000 a mile and in part for $28,000 a mile, more particularly when the roads to which I have referred are not at all of the class specified by the right hon. gentleman, and why he is going to throw away this Intercolonial Railway, which cost $53,000 per mile in order to supersede it with a better road, which he is going to build for $25,000 per mile through the same country? Therefore, I say there is not one jot, not one tittle of evidence to show that that road can be constructed for $28,000 per mile, and although not an engineer, I do not believe I will be at all departing from strict veracity when I state that a road of the class described by the government, or by the hon. member for North Norfolk, could not be built over that country for $100,000 per mile, unless it were lengthened to such an extent as to make it a perfectly farcical operation. We all know very well that if a railway has to overcome an eminence of 400 or 500 feet and is limited to a grade of twenty-one feet to the mile——

Mr. WADE. What section of the road is the hon. gentleman speaking about?

Mr. BELL. The whole section from Moncton to Winnipeg if built of the quality specified by the member for North Norfolk and kept at a reasonable length. We all know that if a railway has to overcome an eminence of 400 feet, it would take 20 miles approach to get over this 400 feet of eminence at 20 feet to the mile, and we will take 20 feet to the mile instead of 21. The right hon. gentleman would have to lengthen his road by curving—as is done in the mountains of British Columbia, notably on the short road between Trail and Rossland—back and forward to an extent that would lengthen his road over four times that of the air-line which he is going to cover, or else, he has got to construct enormously expensive works of excavation, filling or tunnelling to keep his road within a reasonable limit distance. In one case if he resorts to the policy of lengthening his line so as to overcome these grades, he is going to have a road that would be absolutely out of the question as being of any value as a commercial road. If he is going to take the other course, I can tell him that it would require some of the magicians, the genii of the Arabian Nights to build such a road as he proposes at the price he has set down, of from $25,000 to $28,000 a mile. It cannot be done by engineers. If such a road is to be built, it can be built of course. The Czar of Russia, I am told, if he wants to build a railway draws a line upon the map and says: That road has got to go there; and with the almost inexhaustible resources of an empire at the back of him, an engineer can put it there. But an engineer could not put it there if he was limited to $25,000 a mile. He would be worse off than our old friends, the Jews, when they were expected to make bricks without straw, if he were expected to construct a road capable of drawing trains of 2,000 tons, from Quebec to Winnipeg, to compete with water and rail carriage and to do it at a cost of $25,000 a mile. Now, the Intercolonial Railway, on the authority of the government blue-books, cost $53,000 a mile. The Canadian Pacific Railway, on the authority of the Department of Railways,

cost $52,000 a mile. The Canadian Pacific Railway along the north shore of Lake Superior, cost $50,000 a mile. The Canada Atlantic Railway is stated to have cost $50,000 a mile. But there is a better example still which was quite within the knowledge of the right hon. gentleman, and that is the Grand Trunk Railway road which he is particularly interested in now, and if we can believe the figures that are given to us—not in books which the Prime Minister could not find, but in the report which is published every year on the authority of the Minister of Railways—the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada in all its branches cost $106,000 a mile. This road in which the right hon. gentleman has great confidence; this road to which he is going to entrust his new line; it cost $106,000 a mile, and he is confidently going to bring together the fat and the lean in this case, by adding to the Grand Trunk Railway system of $106,000 a mile a new system of $25,000 a mile. The right hon. gentleman undertakes confidently and coolly to do away with the Intercolonial Railway, to do away with it at a great cost to the people of Canada, and to make what is now not a very profitable asset to the people much worse by giving it competition, and taking away all through-traffic from it. The right hon. gentleman is undoing what his government has done for the last five years, in buying the Drummond County Railway and expending large sums of money to better it in order to enable it to haul through-traffic. He is now deliberately undertaking to wipe the Intercolonial Railway out of existence as a through carrier, and he is going to substitute for it a road to be built at a cost of $25,000 a mile. And, with what kind of a road is he going to supersede the Intercolonial Railway? The maximum gradients on the Intercolonial Railway are few. At Bedford there is a grade of 1·41 miles of 63·8 feet to the mile, and that is in favour of the grain traffic going to Halifax. At Folleigh Lake, where the road crosses the Cobequid mountains for 2·77 miles there is an average grade of 51·6 to the mile. And at the most difficult point on the line where it crosses the range of the height of land between the St. Lawrence and the Restigouche, for a distance of 6·21 miles over an elevation of 299 feet, there is an average of 48·3 feet to the mile. The Intercolonial Railway is a first-class road. There is no other grade on the whole of it which exceeds one per cent, and where that occurs on curves is compensated for curvature. It has cost $53,000 per mile and the right hon. gentleman is going to send it to the scrap heap, and to supersede it with a road to cost $25,000 a mile built through much more difficult country. If the right hon. gentleman had not been in such a hurry; if he could have put a little more confidence in time; if he could have made himself believe that time might wait for a day or two, he could have discovered with very little difficulty that the best pass to be found between the basin of the St. Lawrence and the basin of the Restigouche, is the pass which is used by the Intercolonial Railway where it goes down the Matapedia river. The member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) gave us figures showing the elevations which have to be crossed at various points between the St. Lawrence and the Restigouche, and in every instance they were very much in excess of the elevation which has to be overcome on the Matapedia. But the right hon. gentleman has not left us in doubt. He has put on the walls of the committee room a plan. It is not much of a plan, and it only shows about 37 miles of the road. It is largely drawn from the imagination of the engineer, and being an honest man the engineer has been careful enough to put a note upon the plan telling us that the real line is a very difficult one, and that the shaded line is one which he has derived from his imagination. He is an honest man; I think the government might do well to employ him; he is careful enough to see that he is not held responsible for any plan which springs from his imagination. And what does that plan of the engineer reveal? It reveals the fact that in place of getting over an elevation of 744 feet, which has to be overcome by the Intercolonial Railway, he has to look around until he has found a level of 1,423 feet somewhere near a place called Lake Pohenegamook. He tells us that after a good deal of difficulty he gets down to this lake with an almost unpronouncable name, which forms the boundary of the north-east angle of Maine and extends for some considerable distance north. Here the right hon. gentleman is going to keep his word in respect to making this an all-Canadian route, and to do it he has got to go to the outlet of that lake and put a trestle over it so as to keep on the sacred soil of Canada, and then he gets across the lower end of that lake at a level of 651 feet above the sea. He has then managed to get from an elevation of 1,423 feet to reach an elevation of 651 feet; 90 feet lower than the very highest summit upon the Intercolonial Railway. This road which is to have grades of 21 feet to the mile and is to carry train-loads of 2,000 tons at a time has to make a descent without a break, of ten miles, at the rate of 76 feet to the mile, so far as I can judge from the plan. The engineer has specified 71·28 feet to the mile as his opinion of the grades, and he must be correct, but judging the distances on the plan there is a continuous grade for ten miles of 76 feet to the mile, or 71·28 feet to take the figures of the surveyor, to get to a point which is only 90 feet lower than the highest summit of the Intercolonial Railway. All this goes to show that when the right hon. gentleman tells us that he is going to build this road to supersede the Intercolon-

ial Railway, to carry a greater traffic at a lower rate than the Intercolonial, he must mean something that we do not understand. There must be some reservation, something held back. His language cannot be reconciled with the facts as they have been submitted to parliament. His statement cannot be reconciled with the plan which the right hon. gentleman has affixed to the walls of the Railway Committee room for the use of the members of parliament. There must be some reservation, some holding back.

But to show in another way how absurd it would be to try to better the work of the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Moncton by the system proposed by the right hon. gentleman, I will take another illustration. The Minister of Finance drew an air-line from Lévis to the north-east corner of the state of Maine, and another air-line from the north-east corner of Maine to Moncton. He called attention to the fact that this was not one air-line, but two, having an angle in the middle, and representing a distance of 351 miles. Of course, he first proposed, very generously, to add 10 per cent to that for curvature, making the road 386 miles long. How much is added to that 351 miles by the present despised route of the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Moncton? The Intercolonial Railway engineers added 40 per cent to the air-line distance; but then they were building a railroad with picks and shovels, with theodolites and levels, while the Minister of Finance was only talking about a railroad. If he is going to better the grades on the Intercolonial Railway between Lévis and Moncton, he has to do it in either one way or another; he has to add even more than 40 per cent to the length of the line, or he has to resort to an enormous expenditure to cut down those mountains and fill up those ravines or tunnel through some of those rocks, in order to get within the limits he has fixed for himself. The Intercolonial Railway, with an easier route and with 40 per cent added for curvatures, cost $53,000 a mile. Let us knock off $7,000 per mile and call it $46,000 a mile as the estimate of Sir Sandford Fleming. On a route which manifests enormously increased difficulty, the Finance Minister is going to build for the Premier of Canada a road good enough to supersede and to send to the scrap heap the Intercolonial, for $25,000 a mile. The whole thing is, I regret to say, so far as that part of the line is concerned, an absurdity—an irreconcilable contradiction. There cannot be the construction of such a road for the price named. In my estimation, the road can be built if the people want to build it, and if they are willing to pay from $60,000 to $75,000 a mile to do it. But the right hon. gentleman cannot get a competent engineer to say that such a road can be built for $25,000 a mile; and if he cannot, he is not treating the people of Canada fairly in representing that he can build that road for any such money. Everything we know contradicts that statement, and, much as we are disposed to accept everything which the right hon. gentleman says, with that parliamentary courtesy which requires us to do so, there are difficulties in the way of our accepting that opinion of the right hon. Premier which, to my mind, are insuperable. The whole possibility of making that rather surprising statement which the right hon. Premier has made, and which the Finance Minister and one speaker after another has repeated, that this road is going to cost the people of Canada only $13,000,000, depends on the other statement of the government that it is going to build this part of the road for $25,000 a mile. If they frankly admitted what the cost of that road would be, it would be no longer possible for the government to maintain that extraordinary contention that for $13,000,000 they are going to give this country a road of the class spoken of by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and by other hon. gentlemen on the government side of the House.

That is the first condition upon which the whole case of the government depends—that the road can be built for from $25,000 to $28,000 a mile. We have seen that that is exceedingly improbable. There is another condition that must be complied with, even if the road is built for $25,000 a mile, before the right hon. Premier can make good his assertion that he is going to build the whole road for $13,000,000; that is, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company will implement its part of the contract—will take this road when it is built, and pay 3 per cent per year upon the cost of its construction. Now, as the people of Canada are making a very important bargain with the Grand Trunk Company, it is only a matter of common sense and caution to find out as much as we can of the people with whom we are making our bargain. The Grand Trunk Company recently held its semi-annual meeting in London. I find published in all the financial journals a statement of the affairs of that company. I find that its whole capital—not all its capital, but all those portions which the papers think it necessary to enumerate—come to £41,656,364. Turning that into our currency it amounts to a little more than $202,000,000. On the 30th of June, 1902, the Grand Trunk Company paid £253,026 in dividends, and carried £2,609 to the reserve account. Its total net earnings for the half-year were £255,635. At the next half-yearly meeting it declared a dividend of £324,673, and carried forward £4,000, although I see that another and perhaps more authoritative statement represents that these £4,000 are a deficit. For the half-year ending June 30, 1903, the company divided £258,626 among its shareholders and bondholders and other creditors. It declared a dividend upon its 4 per cent guaranteed stock, its first preference stock and its sec-

ond preference stock. In December last it declared for the first time in its history a dividend on its third preference stock, and passed the dividend in the following June. Practically the position of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is this, that it pays interest at the rate of 4 per cent or 5 per cent on one-fourth of its liabilities, while upon three-fourths of its liabilities to its shareholders and the public from which it has obtained its money to carry on its business, it is not paying one cent of dividend. Those who are curious to see the facts for themselves will find it by referring to any of the hand-books issued by any of the investing companies. These give the full particulars, showing that practically this concern, which stands on that lease between the government and the people of Canada, and the necessity of paying interest not only on the cost of the eastern division of this railway, but possibly interest on the bonds on the western division as well, has only paid interest at the rate of 4 per cent on about one-fourth of its capital, or interest at the rate of 1 per cent per annum upon its whole capital.

Now, there is another way of looking at this thing. The Grand Trunk Railway, we are told by its friends, has 3,142 miles of road, and the dividends it has declared amount to about $800 per mile of its system. That system is operated in a good country, largely in the province of Ontario. It has a branch to Chicago, and a large through-traffic over that branch, and it does an important business in Portland. In Ontario its operations are carried on in a country thoroughly settled and filled with wealth. And on that system, on which it owes $202,000,000, and on only one-quarter of which debt it pays interest, it manages to earn $800 per mile. Yet we are told that the First Minister places his full trust in the fact that this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is going to take off the hands of the government a road which the government estimates will cost $28,000 per mile, but which is more likely to cost $50,000 per mile, and pay 3 per cent on its cost. Should it cost only $28,000 per mile, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will have to pay $840 per mile to the government as rental, or $40 per mile more than is earned by that magnificent system concerning which we have heard such laudations. Should that road cost $50,000 per mile, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will have to pay a rental of $1,500 per mile. How is that road going to earn that amount of money, when the Grand Trunk Railway, running through a magnificent country, and paying no interest, can only earn $800 per mile? If the Grand Trunk Railway cannot earn more than $800 per mile on its own road, running through a thickly settled country, how can the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway be expected to pay from $840 to $1,500 per mile on a road running through a country which for years will provide very little traffic? The right hon. the First Minister has shown by his speech that he has a great deal of piety and faith in his composition. No one without the most abundant stock of faith could ever put his trust in two such absurd propositions as the propositions that the road from Moncton to Winnipeg could be built for $28,000 per mile, and that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or any other lessee, could take it over and pay $840 per mile for the use of it. Still, in face of these facts, which cannot be controverted, we are assured, from day to day, that the whole programme is to go through, that the road is to be built at a cost of $28,000 per mile, that the lessee will pay 3 per cent on its cost, and that the Canadian people will not be liable for a cent. And side by side with that statement, you have the statement made, and not contradicted, that the Grand Trunk Railway Company exacted from their president, when he met them in London, the promise that not one dollar of liability should be attached to them in connection with this enterprise.

Just see what a programme the government is offering the people. It is very manifest that this is not a commercial, but a political railway. Why, in introducing this question to the country and parliament, neither the First Minister nor any of his supporters was willing that it should be discussed on its merits. No, they defied any one in the opposition to attack it because it was agreeable to the people of this province and the other. In the lower provinces, the scheme could not be attacked. The government could not take the road to St. John, where possibly grain might be taken, although ostensibly the road was built for the purpose of finding a winter port. That, however, would interfere with the political character of the scheme, and the road had to be dragged this way and that, until, in compliance with the demands of the government supporters from the maritime provinces, it was located at a compromise point and brought to Moncton. Was it brought there to cheapen the cost of transporting grain to St. John? No, but it was brought to Moncton in order that the maritime supporters of the government might be able to go back to their constituents and say to them: See what we have done for you, we could not get the road into the province of Nova Scotia, but we got it as near as we could.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Is the hon. gentleman opposed to the road going to Moncton?

Mr. BELL. I am criticising this scheme. I say this, that if the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, wants the road to go to Moncton, it is not because he is very anxious to see grain shipped by Halifax or St. John, but because he wants to have some

kind of an excuse to offer his people for supporting such an absurd proposition.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Then the hon. gentleman is opposed to it ?

Mr. BELL. The hon. gentleman is prepared to stand by the declaration made by his leader. This being the character of the scheme before the House, let us understand the reasons advanced by the First Minister for introducing it. What are these reasons ? I suppose we should take them in chronological order, and begin with that vein of piety which broke out in the hon. gentleman, and his regard for the passage of time ? He could not wait ; there was great urgency. As an hon. gentleman said in this House, there was a crisis somewhere. And I think the suggestion was that somebody had it in his pocket. But apart from that urgency which has such an influence on the right hon. gentleman, there was the danger of the abrogation of the bonding privilege. Well, the right hon. gentleman has been Premier of Canada for seven years, and this urgency never seemed to strike him until now. Was he afraid of the abrogation of the bonding privilege at any other time ? Does he consider that this tide in our affairs never began to flow until the year of grace 1903 ? Have the susceptibilities of the right hon. gentleman received a sudden awakening in 1903 ? Or can it be possible than an election believed to be imminent has anything to do with his sudden zeal ? Well, let me first deal with the question of the bonding privilege, you can fairly estimate the chances of anything happening by experience. You can calculate the chances by what has occurred. What chance is there that the bonding privilege may be interrupted. Has it ever been interrupted ? How long has it been in force ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). It has been threatened.

Mr. BELL. Might I ask the First Minister how long the bonding privilege has been in force between the two countries, and when it was put in force ? It has been in force, Sir, between the United States and Canada at least forty-seven years, and has never been interrupted. It has possibly been in force fifty years without interruption. It has been threatened, as my sagacious friend from Victoria says, but he ought to know, as a good Scotchman, that a threatened man lives long. When was it threatened ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). By the President of the United States.

Mr. BELL. I am much obliged to my hon. friend for the valuable information. It was threatened by the President of the United States at a moment when an election was imminent. It was rather a remarkable coincidence that just as President Cleveland used the bonding privilege on his side of the line for electioneering purposes, so the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier uses it on this side for like purposes. And neither of them meant a word he said, I am afraid in this connection. We have very good reason to believe that President Cleveland was not very much in earnest. He played his capers quite frequently when an election came on, and I am quite sure in saying that the right hon. the First Minister never lost any sleep on account of his fear that the bonding privilege might be interrupted, and is not likely to lose any. It has been in force fifty years and never been interrupted, but it has been threatened and idly threatened. We have no need to be afraid. The bonding privilege is quite as valuable to the people of the United States as to the people of Canada. It rests upon our treaty rights with the people of the United States. The right hon. gentleman shakes his head. It is true that the treaty of Washington has been repealed, but there is a much older arrangement between Great Britain and the United States, made in 1830, under which the people of the United States were admitted into the West Indian ports on condition that Canadians should be admitted on equal terms into American ports. There is, therefore, no reason why we should doubt that the bonding privilege is unassailable. If the Americans were to take so unfriendly a course as to refuse us admission into their ports, ipso facto, their ships would be refused admission into the West Indies. And now that the different portions of the empire are drawing a little closer together they might even find that the mother country is not disposed to give up her coasting trade to the Yankee ships if the United States should attempt to treat the people of Canada in an unfriendly way. But apart from that there remains the fact that the bonding privilege is more valuable, if possible, to the people of the United States than it is to the people of Canada. The returns show that in the course of the last year the total amount of Canadian trade that passed through the United States was 98,000 tons, 78,000 tons of foreign merchandise coming or going through the United States between Canada and foreign countries and 20,000 tons of domestic freight that passed from one part of Canada to the other. Why there is crossing over the Canada Southern Railway every year between one part of the United States and another, 4,000,000 tons of freight, a large portion of which unquestionably belongs to the United States. One-tenth of the trade carried on railways in Canada is carried under this bonding privilege, and the United States would certainly make a very great mistake in withdrawing the bonding privilege, and they have not the remotest intention of doing so. The question is raised occasionally in the United States by gentlemen of President Cleveland's stripe, and what do you see? At

once every powerful, intelligent and leading community in New England raises its voice against any such absurd proposition. I venture to say that nothing in the comic papers this year has amused the people of the New England states one-half as much as the Premier's statement as to the bonding privilege being in danger.

Through the Welland canal every year the people of the United States send 200,000 or 300,000 tons of freight each way. They enjoy all the privileges of our waterways. The approach to the great city of Detroit is partly in Canadian waters and might be closed if the people of this country found it necessary to answer unfriendly act with unfriendly act. There is no more danger of the bonding privilege being interrupted than there is of the comet striking the earth and changing the length of the day, and the right hon. the Premier knows it as well as any person in this country. In every case in which an attempt has been made by the United States to act towards us in an unfriendly manner it has failed. An attempt was made to smuggle into a tariff Bill a discrimination against Canadian exports: it was set aside and disallowed by a competent authority in the United States. Our rights rests upon legislation in the United States and that cannot be easily interfered with. If it should be interfered with, why would it hurt us to have to move over our railways 98,000 tons of freight that we do not move to-day.

But in addition to all that we can get in from the sea without depending on bonding privilege. We have the Intercolonial which is capable of handling that 98,000 tons ten times over in the course of a year. In addition to that we have a second road from St. John to Rivière du Loup, tapping the Intercolonial at that point. The construction of 120 miles of railway by the Canadian Pacific Railway from Quebec to Edmundston would give two roads utterly independent of one another from the sea coast through the maritime provinces into Canada. But to avoid this awful danger the right hon. gentleman is going to build 3,600 miles of railway which fortunately, however, will cost only $25,000 a mile. So much in respect to the bonding privilege.

Then there is another very important matter engaging the attention of the Premier and it was in connection with this that he found it impossible to wait. That is the diversion of the trade of Canada through the United States. How am I expected to know the right hon. gentleman's authority for the opinion that we are losing trade to the United States? If he looks at the daily papers, he will find that even more United States grain than Canadian grain came into Midland and Georgian Bay ports this year, and that 20 per cent of the grain that went out of the United States by water came to Canada. We are if anything taking away the trade of the United States. There is one physical factor in the geography of North America that guarantees that we will continue to take it away if we do not abandon our chances, and that is the fact that, as the hon. member for St. Mary's (Hon. Mr. Tarte) said last night if we make Lake Superior the key to our transportation system we are undoubtedly going to take the trade of the United States. We can draw to Lake Superior ports with greater advantage than it can be drawn anywhere else grain, from a distance of 600 miles within the United States and turn it into the St. Lawrence route.

We have in the St. Lawrence river the power not only of holding our own but of taking to the ports of Canada trade from every port and from every tract of country tributary to every port in that great lake system with that magnificent water-way there, the right hon. gentleman would go hundreds of miles north into an unknown country to endeavour to keep the trade of Canada from passing into the United States, overlooking the advantage of the situation. Overlooking the fact that the key of the situation is to be found in these waterways, the hon. gentleman would build this railway through northern wilds where it will have no more effect upon the carriage of grain between the North-west and Europe than if it were built in a straight line towards the North Pole. The line could not compete with the Canadian water-ways. It will never have an opportunity to compete. There may be a small quantity of wheat coming out in the winter brought out by the Canadian Pacific Railway and other lines to be ground at Canadian mills or by the Canadian Pacific Railway to furnish a ballast for their ships, but the great bulk of Canadian trade will go down through the lakes and the St. Lawrence and for a time a certain part of it may take the lake and rail route via the Georgian Bay ports and thence across Ontario to Montreal or Quebec.

A good deal of the discussion during this debate has turned upon the question of railway freight rates versus water freight rates. Most ingenious arguments have been built up by hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that the railway rates can be cheaper than water rates, at least, I presume that is what they are trying to do. The government of the day need not go very far afield, they need not go to any interstate commission for their authority, they may go to their own blue-book in which they will find on this point evidence so clearly and succinctly put by their own officials that I might say the whole matter is put in a nutshell. In the report of the Department of Railways and Canals we are told that for ten years the average cost of water-borne freight has been 1·07 mills and for the last five years ·95 of one mill. The average freight and I think, in this case, the lowest freight rate between New York and Chicago, (the Lake Shore and

Michigan Southern Road being selected on account of the advantageous alignment and good roadbed which it possesses and the great competition and low rates to which it has to submit) was 3·20 mills. Let us take the average water rate as 1 mill and the average all rail rate as three mills, not 3·20 mills but three mills, and there you have the statement supported by the authority of the government officials that it costs three times as much to carry grain by rail as by water. Our North Shore road, away in the north country, a $28,000 a mile road, I do not think can equal the rates of the Lake Shore and the Michigan Southern. The average rate from Chicago to New York for lake and canals is 6·96 against 12·97 as the average by all-rail. This is a matter that seems to have been settled years ago; still, in order to try and make up some kind of an argument to support this preposterous scheme of building a road to haul wheat from Manitoba to Quebec and St. John by rail, it is necessary to disprove the most obvious facts of economic knowledge; and things that have been admitted for years are now denied, and an effort is made over and over again, and sometimes not in the fairest fashion, to disprove them. For instance, what was the Minister of the Interior driven to do ? He quoted to this House a rate of freight from Kansas city to Chicago of five cents per 100 pounds, and he figured that out to be three cents a bushel. Now, the very page of the Inter-state Commerce Commission report from which the hon gentleman was quoting, stated, not what he told the House, but something that I might almost say was the very opposite. Let me read what it says :

> The railway lines from this city, leading to the eastern Atlantic seaboard are the oldest and most powerful. But the distance to the gulf ports is much less, and the railways serving these ports, insist that a considerable portion of this grain should be exported by that route.
>
> The conditon has given rise to the most active competition between rail lines leading in various directions from Kansas city and the result has been a very low rate upon export grain from that section. . . . . During the past summer the open traffic from Kansas city to Chicago has been twelve cents per 100 pounds ; but the actual rate at which wheat has moved has been as low as five cents. The published rate from Kansas city to Lewiston has been fifteen cents for export while the domestic rate for the same service has been thirty-seven cents.

Now, the Minister of the Interior was so desperately driven to try to make an argument for his case that he suppresses all these facts, which he had under his eye and hand, and he culls out of that extract the one statement that wheat has been carried as low as five cents a bushel, an exceptional rate, and he comes to parliament and submits that, as the rate on wheat between Kansas city and Chicago, and argues therefrom that wheat can be carried by this precious new road from Winnipeg to Quebec.

There is another very ingenious argument which the right hon. gentleman has been using with a great deal of force, namely, that one reason why he wants to build this railroad, one reason why time won't wait, is to open up a tremendous tract of country for colonization purposes. That is to a certain extent a very unselfish idea on the part of the right hon. gentleman, because no country that is unsettled has votes. But after all, it was rather a persuasive argument to be adduced by a member of the government, who said that Quebec and Ontario ought to support this scheme because the government was actually going to build colonization roads for them for nothing, an argument that looks very much like an act of wholesale bribery, and which might have some effect in those provinces. In this country we have already a tremendous area of lands open for settlement, lands supplied by many railroads, but which are unable to hold the people that are upon them. The fact is well known in Quebec and in the maritime provinces, and indeed in some parts of Ontario, that the temptation to go to the west, to that garden country where a man can for a comparatively small sum procure a farm already fit for the plough, where the harvest conditions are almost perfect, where the farmer's lot is cast under the most happy circumstances—these conditions, I say, render it almost impossible to keep the people of the older provinces on their farms. Under these circumstances, with provinces that are amply supplied with railroads, with lands upon which it is almost impossible to keep the people to-day, to undertake to transport people hundreds of miles into a new country, no matter how good it may prove to be, where there is neither settlements, nor civilization, nor the conveniences of life, nor the comforts of home, is certainly not a commercial proposition.

Mr. BROCK. They won't go.

Mr. BELL. We are told they won't go. It has been the experience of every country in the world that in settling public lands the best lands are taken first. It is a fundamental idea in economics that so long as there is good land open to a settler he will not go on to inferior land. What reason is there to believe that you are going to stop and direct elsewhere that tide of immigration that is now landing in Halifax and Montreal and pouring past the eastern provinces and going thousands of miles into the west, making for the goal of their ambition, the point they had in view before they left home, those magnificent wheat fields of western Canada ? What reason has the government to suppose that by building this road they are going to stop these people from going into the North-west, and are going to induce them to settle in this abso-

lutely unknown country, a country that we are told is wooded, but to clear which involves a life of labour, hardship and self denial, a life, however, which the pioneers of eastern Canada did not shrink from undertaking? Why should the right hon. gentleman expect any great results from his colonization scheme?

We are told—and it is very singular how hard put some hon. gentlemen are for illustrations—we are told in some of these reports of that northern country that it is very much like the county of Rimouski. That expression occurred in one or two of the reports I heard read in this House. What has been the experience of the county of Rimouski? The county of Rimouski has a railroad, the county of Rimouski has churches and schools. It is a county in which there is no lack of room. It has 3,574,469 acres of land, which would compare not unfavourably with the magnificent tract about which the Postmaster General waxed eloquent. It is pretty large, 5,585 square miles. The population of that county, in 1871, was five to the square mile, or 27,000 in 1881, six to the square mile, 33,000; in 1891, six to the square mile again, 33,430; in 1901, with the assistance of an admirably taken and economical census, the population rose to 7·02 per mile, or 40,000 people. If the county of Rimouski be, as we are told, a fair sample of this country that is proposed to be opened in the north, I would like to know what rational man would leave the county of Rimouski, where there are certainly all the evidences of a railroad, or any other county that is equally fit, and many of them are better off—what rational man would leave that county to go into this northern wilderness? As a colonization scheme, it strikes me that this effort of the Premier may be fitly called a howling success because it is to be carried out in a howling wilderness.

There is no need so far as room is concerned to open up new lands. I take the county of Rimouski as an example of how the people are treading upon one another. It has only 7·2 people to the square mile, which evidently indicates a thronging population. Where is the crowd of people? If it is necessary to make room somewhere, to my mind it would be a very futile undertaking on the part of the government to make room in any of the older parts of Canada so long as the government are in a position to open either for the people of this country or for immigrants from the older countries, such lands as are to be found in the North-west Territories. There are difficulties connected with the building of this road through this country which would seem to be almost inconsistent with its construction for $28,000 per mile. It taps the water at Quebec, at one end, and you can take in supplies from Winnipeg at the other, but how can supplies be taken into those portions of the road that lie from 150 to 200 miles away from anywhere? One of the great difficulties in constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, notwithstanding the fact that it ran comparatively close to the lake shore, and one which affected the cost of the road was the difficulty of getting supplies in to the road. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) informed us here the other night that the very lucrative business of bringing out pine timber could not be carried on very far up the Ottawa, because it costs too much to bring out the wood on account of the cost of getting supplies in. There is no doubt that the cost of getting supplies in is going to form a considerable part of the cost of this proposed road which the right hon. gentleman says can be built for $28,000 a mile. It is a costly undertaking and it will likely eat into the $28,000. The right hon. gentleman submits this scheme to parliament as a colonization scheme, but he at the same time submits it as a great through-traffic road for transporting the grain of the west to the market at the lowest price. Not one foot of the road is located, as far as we know, and a large portion of the evidence laid before the House was the evidence afforded by the Trans-Canada railway promoters, not at all the same road, not at all going where this road goes, a road passing fifty miles from James bay and an average distance of 100 miles from the line along which it is proposed by the government to carry this road south of Lake Abitibi and north of Lake Nepigon. The testimony given by the Trans-Canada Railway promoters does not apply to this country. The project is an entirely different one, and as was very properly observed by the hon. leader of the opposition, if this work is carried out, it may be found that it will be perfectly impossible to reconcile the features of a colonization road with the purposes of a road constructed for through-traffic. I hope that we will be able to undertake the construction of that road. There are features of it which are of the highest importance to the people of Canada. It may be constructed by a line from Quebec to Port Simpson which would constitute the shortest transcontinental railway in North America. If we can believe the engineers' estimates we may be able to secure a comparatively level road, and if it could be carried out in connection with a fast Atlantic service to the maritime ports, with a class of steamers equal to any on the Atlantic, we might hope to get a great volume of passenger travel between the east and Europe, passing over this line. This is a road which might at some day give to Canada a magnificent advertisement, it might be the means of turning a large part of the traffic between the east and Europe across our country and it might have some good effect by giving us greater depth of territory, a greater development of mining wealth, a development of agricultural wealth, and therefore, it is a

work to which I believe the people of Canada should turn their attention. But, I will say that they should turn their attention to it just on the basis which the hon. leader of the opposition has suggested, not by plunging into this undertaking at once, not by saying there shall be such a road going from Quebec to Port Simpson, we know not where and we know not how, but by devoting a sufficiently large portion of the wealth and the resources of Canada to making the people so thoroughly acquainted with that country that they will know where that road ought to be built, and as soon as it can be shown that it is a feasible undertaking, as soon as we can realize that by the construction of the road we will gain these desirable ends, then, I say, this is a proper undertaking for the people to enter upon, and I am glad that I am in this respect as in respect to other matters, in a position to support the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition.

Now, in conclusion, we reviewed the character of the road to be built, we have reviewed the grounds there are for believing or for not believing the figures which have been given by the government as to its cost, we have dealt with the bonding privilege, we have realized the strength and value of that bogey, we have dealt with the matter of colonization, we have dealt with the matter of freight rates, and from every point of view I say there is no reason, at all events, which has been put before parliament, why parliament should proceed with this work as it has been suggested. There may be other and better reasons. We have been told by one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House that he was in favour of the railway, but not for the reasons which have been stated by the right hon. gentleman. There is one very peculiar suspicious and unsatisfactory feature in connection with this whole matter, and that is the mystery in connection with it. Why did the right hon. gentleman not submit this scheme at an early stage in the session? We are told that they had a whole year to prepare it. The hon. Postmaster General has informed us that the government have dealt with this matter for a year, that they have considered it for a year, and after having considered it for a year they kept parliament sitting here since the 12th of March for some four months, and then they submit their scheme without one vestige of information, without an estimate, without a scrap of a plan, except the few feet of tracing paper which is affixed to the wall of the Railway Committee room, and which represents a railway which is absolutely too ridiculous to discuss, a road with a continuous grade of no less than seventy feet to the mile and bearing upon it the inscription of an honest engineer to the effect that he did not hold himself responsible for the imaginary line there traced. The right hon. gentleman proposed to the people of Canada in the early part of the session, at a time when he must have had this matter under consideration, if the hon. Postmaster General is not misrepresenting matters, that he would submit it to a commission that would deal with all the different details of water routes and rail-routes, improvements to harbours, improvements to waterways, improvements to ports, with every feature of the scheme; yet, the government of Canada, after making a promise to investigate all these matters, have absolutely failed in every jot and tittle of that promise. Criticism is addressed to the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition because it is manifold, because it deals with all these subjects and because in that respect it carries out in a much greater degree the original programme of the government than does the scheme which the government has proposed. The plan of the hon. leader of the opposition follows closely the details of the submission which was to be made to the commissioners by the decision of the Governor in Council. In that respect it shows very much more regard for what was outlined as the policy of the government than does the programme submitted by the right hon. gentleman. But the right hon. gentleman is disposed to be facetious in dealing with the opposition. He knows very well that parliament has been kept sitting for at least a month past its accustomed time for adjourning, and when he brings down at this late hour of the session a programme so important as this, he is inclined to laugh at us, and when we ask for information he says there are mountains of information in the departments and in the library. And then, in order that the right hon. gentleman might stamp upon the pages of 'Hansard' the contemptuous manner in which he was dealing with the parliament of Canada, and with the people of Canada, he laid upon the Table of the House these mountains of information.

Fleming's Canadian Pacific Railway report, 1873; Fleming's Canadian Pacific Railway report, 1874; Fleming's Canadian Pacific Railway report, 1877; Fleming's Canadian Pacific Railway report, 1878-9; Fleming's Canadian Pacific Railway report, 1880; Marcus Smith, Canadian Pacific Railway survey, 1878; Canadian Pacific Railway maps, 1874; report of Pine River survey by Joseph Hunter, 1878; report proposed short line between Montreal and maritime provinces, 1885.

And that report was as to a line across the state of Maine inconsistent with his all-Canadian route.

Report of survey for most practical route between Montreal and Halifax or St. John, 1885; report Commissioner of Public Works, Quebec, 1871; report Commissioner of Crown Lands, Quebec, 1885; explorations at Lake St. John and James Bay, O'Sullivan, 1901.

That is the last but not the least; it is only two years old—all the rest are old enough to vote. This government has come to

the country absolutely without information on this subject, and the proof of that is in these documents which the Premier has submitted to parliament as those upon which he bases his proposition. The result of the investigation which I have been able to conduct for a short time to-night, goes to show that he did not take the trouble to even read these reports, for his proposal is absolutely inconsistent and absurd in the face of the knowledge that is to be found in these reports. That is a nice way to deal with such a condition of things in this country. There must be some very urgent reason why the people of Canada are asked to decide upon such a question absolutely without information. It is not an unfair challenge that is being made to the government, to submit this matter to the people. It is perfectly evident that the government have not taken the trouble to make themselves acquainted with the facts necessary to form a solid judgment on the subject. The Postmaster General throws back the suggestion that the government should go to the country, and in that the hon. gentleman showed how little comprehension he has of the position in which the government is. The proposition made here by our respected leader is one that must be submitted to the people before we can have an opportunity of putting it into effect. We are not in the position the government is in, of being able to make a hard and fast bargain, with even such a company as the Grand Trunk Railway, and put it through parliament with the power of a majority, and then go to the country and say : there is the contract, and you have to accept it or pay such damages to the company as they can exact in the courts. We on this side have to take the risk of our proposition, and we are ready to do it, because we know that that proposition will commend itself to the people of the country.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). What if we accept that proposition.

Mr. BELL. You dare not do it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). What would you do if we did?

Mr. BELL. We would decide when we come back from the country in power. There is no trouble about us getting back.

Mr. KENDALL. Lots of it.

Mr. BELL. My hon. friend is not likely to get back, from what I hear. However, I do not care to make personal suggestions of that kind, because they are cheap things, easy to be made and not worth much very often. There is this feature about the thing, and that is the humiliating position in which this parliament and the Railway Committee were placed, on account of the trifling that went on. We sat there week after week discussing the details of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill, and we met from the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway the most ready acquiesence. When he was asked: Will you go to Quebec, he answered : Certainly. Will you go to Moncton : Certainly. And if he had been asked to go to Newfoundland, he would have said : Certainly. All the time that he and the gentlemen associated with him were keeping the Railway Committee and parliament playing with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill, he was busy in the council room negotiating an altogether different arrangement with the government. They were dangling the Bill before parliament and before the committee in order to keep them quiet, because they had to keep us 141 days before the Bill could be submitted by them. They were trifling with parliament, they were trifling with the committee, but they were not trifling with Mr. Hays, without some bad results to the country. Why is it that it took so long to make the bargain ? Perhaps they were trying to make the best bargain they could with the Grand Trunk Railway, but whether or not there must be some very imminent reason for driving them into this bargain in such mad haste. There is no doubt that the best part of it goes to the company, and the probability is that the company just took what it would take. There is very little doubt but the government tried to persuade the company to take the whole road, and the company said : No, thank you. It is probable that the road through the prairies, if we may judge by the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will pay from the start like a mine that will pay from the grass roots down. There is no doubt that the Grand Trunk Railway told the government that they had better keep the eastern section for themselves. They would undertake to operate it and promise after ten years to pay 3 per cent for it, but they would do nothing more. The Grand Trunk Railway took no great risk in making that promise. I am reminded of a story in this connection. There was a wonderful magician at the court of one of the eastern potentates, who could almost bring the dead to life, and do most wonderful things. On one occasion when he had given a very surprising exhibition of his skill, the Sultan said to him : If you don't make that white mule of mine speak within a year I will take your head off ; and the magician said: Certainly, master, I will make that white mule speak in a year. And a friend who had the welfare of the magician at heart said to him: Are you not a crazy man to undertake to make that mule speak in a year; you know you cannot do it. Oh, well, said the magician, I have three chances; in a year the mule may be dead, or the Sultan may be dead, or I may be dead. And so the Grand Trunk Railway had not great difficulty in undertaking to pay 3 per cent in ten years

after the completion of the road (which will probably take 20 years to come about), when they could enter into immediate possession of the valuable franchise of having a road through the prairie section and getting a government guarantee of the bonds on it. Even if at the end of 20 years it were necessary for them to forfeit the $5,000,000, which is the only guarantee the government of Canada has to compel the company to the performance of its agreement, it would not be an extravagant price to pay for 20 years' franchise of a road hundreds of miles long through the prairies. And at the end of 10 years who can tell what may happen. It may be the government would not have built the road; many things may happen before that time, so that the company do not undertake a very great risk. In several other respects it is not hard to see that this guileless Mr. Hays is a good hand at making a bargain. There was one amusing feature in the elaborate speech of the Minister of the Interior, and that was when he told us how the government had protected the interests of the country. First of all, he said, the Grand Trunk Railway wanted to build to North Bay, and that would mean that they wanted to take their trade to Portland, and the government stood up in the defence of Canada's rights, and said, We will make you build a road away north of North Bay, and will allow you to bring a branch into the city of Toronto; which the Minister of the Interior immediately thereafter, forgetting what he had said, informed the House was a shorter route to Toronto than the route he would not let them build; so that this safeguard to prevent the Grand Trunk from diverting its traffic to Portland only resulted in giving it a route more advantageous for that purpose.

The hon. Minister of the Interior told us another wonderful thing. He has made a wonderful departure. He is going to have in a short time millions of acres of the lands of Canada at his disposal, and he has made up his mind how he is going to dispose of them. He deserves a great deal of credit for his decision. You would think it took a great deal of profound thought to decide that he was going to sell those lands. Another unheard of decision of his is that the people who are settled in the country adjacent to those lands will have the first preference of purchasing them. This is a feature which has characterized the administration of the Dominion lands ever since we had any lands to sell—that a man who had a homestead would have the first preference in purchasing the adjoining land. Yet, according to the statement of the Minister of the Interior, you would fancy that this marvellous government had for the first time developed this wonderful scheme of selling the land, and selling it in the first place to actual settlers.

But in the course of that speech the hon. Minister of the Interior gave rather a black eye to the hon. member for North Norfolk. That hon. gentleman, having dragged it out of one of his old speeches, had laboured for hours to inform us that the country had given the Canadian Pacific Railway, in every acre of land granted to it, $3. But the unfeeling Minister of the Interior told us that there were no less than 20,000,000 acres of these lands coming back to the country which were without value because they had no railway near them. If these lands are without value now, with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway running through the country, and the promise of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, how is it that that land, promised to the Canadian Pacific Railway, when there was no line there at all, was worth $3 an acre? There is a difficulty which the hon. Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for North Norfolk may settle between them when they next meet. The fact is that such a ridiculous effort to prove that the land beyond reach of railways was worth $3 an acre, was well worthy of the right hon. gentleman who made it, and it was only an act of poetic justice that he should receive the coup de grace at the hands of the hon. Minister of the Interior.

Then, there has been a tremendous amount of ability displayed about the construction of this scheme. The hon. Minister of Finance had to be reckoned with, and you can see the trace of his cautious hand in the provision that the government shall not pay more than 3½ per cent for money. The hon. gentleman had the pleasure of placing a loan a short time ago at 2½ per cent; and, although he did not get par for his loan, it netted him 2⅞ per cent. But it is possible that fluctuations may occur, so that 3½ per cent is not an impossible rate. The Postmaster General has scoffed at the idea that the credit of Canada would ever fall so low that its securities would be worth 3½ per cent. The Minister of Finance deserves credit for having put in this cautious and safe provision. I suppose that few people would argue that the credit of Great Britain is not as good as the credit of Canada, or that British consols are not as good value as the 2½ per cent subscribed stock of the Dominion of Canada. In the course of the last two or three years Great Britain has been spending a good deal of money. In 1897 the average price of consols was 112⅛. in 1902 they were quoted at 94¼. that is a drop of 18 points. In the course of that time the British government had borrowed £69,000,000 additional of consols, and added 12 per cent to the amount of their consolidated bonds, with the result that there was a drop in the price of consols of 18 points. Would my hon. friend the Finance Minister inform me where the securities of Canada issued at 2½ per cent would be, and what they would pay if the securities of Canada dropped 18 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But they did not.

Mr. BELL. The hon. gentleman has not spent his money yet; he is only talking about it. The people of Great Britain cannot say their securities did not drop. The Finance Minister of Canada proposes to increase the debt of Canada by at least 50 per cent in the course of the next ten years, and would it be surprising if with such an increase our securities dropped 18 per cent? And if they dropped from 89 to 71, what would they pay? They would pay 3½ exactly.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him what he understands governs the value of consols?

Mr. BELL. I have no doubt, like everything else, it is governed by the demand for them.

Mr. KENDALL. Certainly, and what makes the demand?

Mr. BELL. I hope the hon. gentleman is not trying to puzzle me with conundrums. I presume that what makes the demand is the presence of buyers.

Mr. KENDALL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will explain that the value of consols depends on the value of money in Great Britain, and the value of money depends on the demand for money for other enterprises.

Mr. BELL. I suppose we might argue that the value of the 2½ per cent inscribed stock of the Dominion of Canada depends on the value of money in Great Britain, because the market for it is in London. So that I think the hon. gentleman is endeavouring to show us that he is very wise to very little purpose.

One feature that has not been very nice in this debate has been the manner in which the Liberal party have seen fit to treat a very recent friend of theirs, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair). A good many gentleman would have acted more becomingly if they had held their peace. Some gentlemen who perhaps owe a good deal to that hon. gentleman, some who owe their presence in this House to him, felt at liberty to score him very freely, and the whole Liberal party seemed to take much relish in that performance. A very profound thinker, speaking of a party not very far from the party I am addressing on the other side of the House, recently spoke as follows:

> Were it needful to dwell on indirect evidence, much might be made of the behaviour of the so-called Liberal party, a party which, relinquishing the original conception of a leader as a mouthpiece for a known and accepted policy, thinks itself bound to accept a policy which its leader springs upon it without consent or warning—a party so utterly without the feeling and idea implied by liberalism, as not to resent this trampling on the right of private judgment, which constitutes the root of liberalism—nay, a party which vilifies as renegade Liberals, those of its members who refuse to surrender their independence.

That is the position in which the Liberal party have chosen to put themselves in reference to an hon. gentleman who recently occupied a very important position in their councils, and, in the opinion of this writer, who is apparently a gentleman of some discrimination, they have not reflected much credit upon themselves in so doing.

One of the most striking features of this debate has been the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite that the whole cost of this railway will not exceed $13,000,000. The Minister of Finance puts it far less—at $8,000,000 or $10,000,000. He does that by anticipating the payments, which he has no more assurance of than the Minister of the Interior has of the sale of his lands. It is true that money out at interest accumulates. If you have to pay a debt next year and will deposit with any reliable banker a sum which, with the interest, will amount in a year to the sum due, you will have in that time the money to pay your debt. There is nothing new about that, and I do not see why the Minister of Finance went to the trouble of introducing it into this question; and I am certain that when he hears what is said in reply, he will find that he will get very little thanks for his pains.

The right hon. gentleman bases his calculation on the supposition that the road will be built for about one half what it will actually cost, and then he pays off this amount, not when it becomes due, but a year or two beforehand, by means of a deposit at 3 per cent interest. That is the very business which the Finance Minister is doing to-day for Canada. By means of a sinking fund, he is accumulating capital and interest in order to pay off the debts of the country as they mature. But is he realizing 3 per cent on his deposits? Let us turn to the blue-books, and we will find that he is realizing 2 per cent, and not 3 per cent, for the people of Canada; and the institution with which he has invested the sinking fund are much better financiers, because they can realize 50 per cent more from the investment. All the members of the cabinet are contributing to this scheme. The hon. the Postmaster General has done a great deal. He has given us a speech, but that is nothing to what he may yet do. And possibly Sir William Mulock, Postmaster General and Minister of Labour, may put out a new issue of postage stamps—not Jubilee stamps this time—but inter-oceanic transcontinental railway stamps, in commemoration of a line of railway which is to be built from ocean to ocean, on all-Canadian territory, built with Canadian material, by Canadian labour, and without the slightest taint of water connection. This

government is not only imitating the example of its opponents, but going back, to a large extent, on its former leader. That policy of Mr. Mackenzie was one which combined railway stretches and water stretches, but water stretches are very obnoxious to these hon. gentlemen now. There are to be no water stretches; they will take it straight. They show not only their admiration of Sir John Macdonald by imitation which is the sincerest kind of flattery, but actually turn their backs upon their great leader, who, to their great discredit, they did depose during his lifetime. The First Minister has been associated with a good many cries in this country. He has instructed his supporters to preach loyalty here to-day, but not many years ago men talked about Laurier, Farrar and commercial union. Within a very recent period it was possible to suggest that 'Laurier, Stratton and purity' might be associated, and now we have the rallying cry of 'Laurier, Cox and caution.' The right hon. gentleman has precipitated his party into this extraordinary contract. Why has he done it? Why has he failed to take ordinary precautions? Why did he not acquaint himself with the details of the Bill he is presenting? Why did he not avail himself of all the information that was lying about him on every hand in the blue-books? He tells us it is because time will not wait, and he pays the English speaking members a very high compliment, when in order to illustrate his position, he quoted from the greatest writer in the English tongue. It was William Shakespeare who said:

> There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

It is a compliment to us, but a poet's dream is a very poor basis on which to construct a transcontinental railway. What impelled the right hon. gentleman to go into this measure? Why did he decide to keep parliament sitting over four months and then commit the country to such a scheme? Why has he not faith enough in Providence and time to wait a few months and call an early session and meet parliament with a proposal supported by information on which hon. members could make up their minds? I fail to see any reason except one. The right hon. gentleman feels that he has to improve his opportunities while he is in power. That may not be very long, and he desires to erect to his memory a monument in this great scheme of a transcontinental railway. In everything he has done since coming into power, he has imitated the conduct of his predecessors, and condemned every act and word of his former political life. He has not had a policy of his own, but has adopted that of his predecessors. Although he canvassed the country in favour of free trade, he has adopted the national policy, and now it strikes him, as he expects that the time may not be far distant when he may have to leave the sphere of politics, that this is the opportunity in which he must recant all he ever said or did and imitate these men, who, in the face of every difficulty and obstruction, did build a transcontinental railway to link together the separated parts of Canada. Now, he says, the time is ripe, when I must set my seal of approval on those acts of my great predecessor to which I was opposed. Now I must set the seal of flattery on that great project of that great Canadian, by imitating it, in my own feeble and ineffective fashion. It is true that there is no great necessity for such another railway to-day. It is not a matter of life and death, and it is a comparatively easy thing to do. We know all about the western country. We have companies only too anxious to build railways in that country, but if I can only go down to posterity as having built another transcontinental line, even if it be a poor second edition of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I will have done something to make my name live in the country. If that be the right hon. gentleman's opinion, we must look with a certain amount of charity on his desire; but I sympathize to the fullest extent with a gentleman, one of his supporters, who remarked that while he was prepared to support the government scheme, he found it very hard to swallow the reasons given for its support, and that if he could not divise better reasons for the construction of the railway, if better reasons did not inspire his conduct with reference to that matter, he would not have voted for the Bill before the House.

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

ADJOURNMENT—TREADGOLD COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before that adjournment I would like to bring to the attention of the House a telegram from Dawson city which I will read:

> Commission refuses peoples solicitors concession; files brought from Ottawa by special official. Put question, ask commissioners be instructed by wire to produce them. Inquiry balked. Mass meeting to-night. People greatly incensed.

Does the hon. gentleman know anything about this matter? I do not know anything about the circumstances beyond what is contained in this telegram.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What is the signature.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). W. A. Beddoe. I do not know anything about the circumstances beyond what is contained in the telegram, but I thought it might be better to bring the telegram to the attention of the government and to make the inquiry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but, I will cause inquiries to be made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I might also mention that the Prime Minster stated the day before yesterday or yesterday, I am not sure, that he would to-day give us the information as to the formation of the Transportation Commission. It may be that the information was given in my absence from the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A gentleman has been agreed upon to replace Sir Wm. Van Horne, but I would prefer that the Prime Minister should give out the name. If my hon. friend will renew the question to-morrow I have no doubt the Prime Minister will make an announcement.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, August 27, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTION.

FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE—OFFICERS' MESS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Have new regulations been issued for the guidance of the officers and men on board the Dominion government steamer 'Quadra'?
2. If so, when were they issued ?
3. Do they provide, among other stipulations, that the amount allowed for feeding the officers of the vessel is reduced from 50-55 cents per diem to 33 cents a day, or 11 cents a meal ?
4. Is the following the bill of fare for the officers' mess on the 'Quadra'?

OFFICERS' MESS.

(Sunday).

Breakfast—Ham and eggs, baked beans.
Dinner—Soup, roast and boiled meat, boiled ham, roast or boiled poultry, potatoes and vegetables, plum pudding and jelly.
Supper—Cold meats, fried potatoes, preserves.

(Monday)

Breakfast—Porridge, mutton chops, cold ham.
Dinner—Soup, Irish stew, roast beef, potatoes and vegetables, pastry.
Supper—Curry and rice, cold meats, chipped potatoes.

(Tuesday).

Breakfast—Porridge, beefsteak, bacon.
Dinner—Soup, roast mutton, corned beef, potatoes and vegetables, Queen pudding.
Supper—Cold meats, fried potatoes, baked beans.

(Wednesday).

Breakfast—Porridge, salt cod and pork scraps, liver and bacon.
Dinner—Pea soup, corned beef, beefsteak pie, potatoes and vegetables, pastry.
Supper—Fish patties, cold meats, fried potatoes, Washington pies.

(Thursday).

Breakfast—Ham and eggs, baked beans.
Dinner—Soup, roast or boiled poultry, boiled or roast meat, potatoes and vegetables, apple and plum pudding, fruit.
Supper—Haricot meat, cold meat, fried potatoes, tea biscuits and preserves.

(Friday).

Breakfast—Porridge, salt herring, lamb chops.
Dinner—Pea soup, fresh fish, beefsteak and kidney pudding, potatoes and vegetables, blueberry tarts.
Supper—Fish patties, cold meats, doughnuts, marmalade.

(Saturday).

Breakfast—Porridge, beefsteak, boiled eggs.
Dinner—Soup, corned beef, roast lamb, potatoes and vegetables, bread and butter pudding.
Supper—Irish stew, cold meats, chipped potatoes.

5. Have the officers to provide out of their pay the difference between the cost of this bill of fare and the allowance made by the government ?

6. Has the government taken steps to ascertain whether the meals can be furnished at 11 cents.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine) :

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. The existing bills of fare have been in force for many years, and no reduction has been made. The agents are empowered to alter them if articles mentioned cannot be obtained at reasonable prices.
4. Yes.
5. No.
6. Not necessary. Agents report at the end of each season cost of vitualling the crews of the different government ships, which is entirely controlled by the market, and the inspecting officer reports that no complaints have ever been made by any of the officers or crew.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, and the motion of Mr. Puttee in amendment thereto.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, there has been so much said on

this question by different hon. members on both sides of this House that it is difficult for one to present any new facts or matters that will be of interest to the House. At the same time I do not feel that I can allow some statements that have been made to pass unchallenged, and I do not care, upon a project of such vast importance to Canada as this is, to give a silent vote. I believe that every man who has taken part in this discussion, that every man who has thereby aided in pressing this scheme forward, that every man who records his vote in its favour, will in the future have cause for congratulating himself that the privilege was afforded him here and that he improved the opportunity. In the first place up to a few weeks ago every person almost through the length and breadth of Canada, not admittel, but contended, that this project was absolutely necessary, and that it was an incumbent duty upon the government to proceed at once with the work. I would like to know what would be said of the government to-day by the opposition press if parliament had prorogued without the government bringing down a scheme for another transcontinental road. The whole country, the whole opposition press would have been up in arms soundly denouncing it, and I believe properly so, because the government would have been recreant to its duty if it had not brought down this measure. The project then was necessary, the people demanded it, the country required it, and the only objection that is now taken is that the government has not delayed long enough, that it has not taken sufficient time to obtain the necessary information. Well, I mean to say, Sir, the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would be very loth indeed to support this scheme were they not convinced that all the information necessary was at hand. I for one would be loth to do so. Do hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House suppose that we have been sitting quietly by all these weeks and months and years, and that we have not possessed ourselves of sufficient information? I mean to state here that my judgment has been convinced that this road is necessary, and that the government has all the information in its possession for the purpose of entering into the contract that has been made. Now, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked if ever a company had made a contract to build a railroad with such slight information, or if ever a contract for the construction of a railroad had been entered into before instrumental surveys by engineers had been made. I need not go very far afield in answering that question. Let me refer him to a railway at his own doors—the Halifax and South-western Railway. In 1891 the Premier of Nova Scotia entered into a contract with the South-western Railway Company to build a railway from Halifax to Barrington, connecting with the road to Yarmouth. There had been no survey. There was no such information as we have in regard to this. For years and years the people had been clamouring for the road, and for years and years it had been persistently stated that the road could not be constructed along the south shore of Nova Scotia. When the contract was entered into by the Murray government, what did we find the opposition press and the party, of which my hon. friend is the leader, doing? We found them unanimously denouncing the scheme, we found them stating exactly what the hon. gentleman is stating here, that the government had not sufficient information, we found them stating that the road could not be built, and we found them stating that the engineering difficulties were insuperable. They denounced the scheme as being wild, reckless and fantastic, and all these phrases that we have listened to coming from hon. members on the other side of the House might have been culled from the opposition press of Nova Scotia at that time. The scheme was presented to the people, these statements were made in regard to it, and what did we find as the answer which the people made ? In the province of Nova Scotia there were returned only two gentlemen as the opposition in the legislature, and I understand that in that province the leader of the opposition, who has one man behind him to second his resolutions, is to organize that province in a campaign against that project; and I believe further, if I am informed correctly, that he purposes coming in opposition to the hon. member who spoke to the House last night. That was the position that the opposition took in regard to that railway. What are the facts ? The facts are that the construction is proceeding along the whole line of the road to-day, the facts are that a splendid line has been secured, the facts are that within another year probably the road will be in operation from one end to the other, and that in face of the united opposition of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, and this road will be built and carried through in spite of their opposition. It is a surprising thing to me when I look back over the history of railroad building in Nova Scotia that we find from the earliest times—and the earliest times were in 1854, when Joe Howe introduced his first railway legislation into the provincial legislature—the Conservative party unitedly denouncing him and denouncing his scheme, and saying that it would bring ruin and destruction to the province of Nova Scotia. Almost continuously from that time forward we have had to meet the opposition of these gentlemen. Let me say in passing, that after this road is built and is successful, I would not be surprised to find these gentlemen on the Conservative benches coming forward and claiming credit for the whole business ; just as they did

after the Dominion coal legislation, which was introduced by my hon. friend the present Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) in the province of Nova Scotia, the result of which was virtually to save that province from serious financial disaster, and after the Conservative party had denounced it in the press and denounced it on every platform throughout the length and breadth of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FRASER. And in this House.

Mr. WADE. Yes, and in this House, and after it became an accomplished fact and a huge success and that province was rescued from its financial difficulties; we had then the hon. Sir Charles Tupper running in Cape Breton county and claiming credit for it all—'me, and Betty, killed the bear,' as the old saying goes.

I think it will be incumbent on me to make a few remarks here with regard to the statement made by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) last night. Whom the gods wish to destroy they first made mad; and when a man has no argument and feels the weakness of his position, his temper is very near the surface and he is liable to make statements which in his calmer moments he would regret. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) last night saw fit to premise his argument by the statement that the loyalty of the gentlemen upon this side of the House was not all wool or a yard wide, to use his own elegant expression. He made statements reflecting upon the loyalty of the people of his own province of Nova Scotia. He did not stop there, but he made use of these words :

> They were rebels to all intents and purposes.

I wish to tell the hon gentleman now, that those were unwise words. He has stigmatized the majority of the people of Nova Scotia as no better than rebels. He has spoken of the people of Pictou county, the Liberals of Pictou county, as no better than rebels, and yet, Sir, I am informed that every Liberal in the county of Pictou has at one time or other voted for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell). Who was it that first brought forward charges like this in this House and in this country ? The hon. Sir Charles Tupper was the first I believe to start the cry. A more unfounded; a more cowardly statement was never made in any place. While he was High Commissioner in England, he induced the people there to believe that the great Liberal party of the Dominion of Canada were absolutely disloyal to the Crown, and at the time this government assumed power in 1896; at the time when the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier made his celebrated speech in Montreal, the English papers next morning announced surprise to find that he was loyal to the empire. Why did they express that surprise ? It was because our paid agent in London had been over there slandering us.

Now Sir, I ask, who is the meanest kind of a traitor ; who is the most contemptible kind of a traitor, if it be not the man who charges his fellowmen; who charges the majority of the electors of the Dominion of Canada with being traitors and disloyal. The statements made by Sir Charles Tupper have followed him into oblivion. The position he took in that connection, I believe, has done more to destroy him politically than anything else. And, I wish to say to the hon. gentleman who represents Pictou (Mr. Bell) that I believe that in uttering the words to which I have referred, he was sounding his own political death knell. I will say no more upon that subject. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) smiles, but he does not feel happy.

I wish now to address myself to a few of the remarks which were made by my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) with regard to this scheme. It was mighty difficult to find out just where he stood in the matter. He was certain as to all expenditures west—all these gentlemen yonder are satisfied about that; there is no difficulty in their minds about spending millions and tens of millions of dollars all along through the west, through British Columbia, through the wilds of Lake Superior, and even down to North Bay. But then their consciences begin to prick them. They will, some of them, permit expenditure as far as Montreal, and a few of them will go to Quebec, but not a living soul of them will permit one dollar to be expended beyond Quebec. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) spoke very strongly in favour of the project of the leader of the opposition, until it came down to Quebec. Then he commenced to hedge, but he gave us from his brief facts and arguments which if correct would make it appear that it is absolutely impossible to construct a road from Quebec to Moncton. That is his argument; that was his array of facts.

Mr. BELL. He did not say so.

Mr. WADE. Well, if he did not say so, then my ears misunderstood him entirely.

Mr. BELL. He said the very opposite.

Mr. WADE. He pointed out the difficulties of grades, and said that no such road could be built to Moncton because of these grades and these curves, and because of other reasons that I will refer to later. He then quoted or rather misquoted from the report of Sir Sandford Fleming, a report which does not touch this road at all, which was a report upon the building of a road from River du Loup to Truro; and we are not going to River du Loup, and we have been saying that you cannot go to River du Loup. But, Sir, when the hon. gentleman was asked a plain question; when it was put to him fairly and squarely; do you approve of building from Quebec to Moncton; did he answer ? Did this valiant loyal

gentleman make his answer to that question in the interest of the maritime provinces ?

Mr. BELL. Yes he did.

Mr. WADE. What was his answer.

Mr. BELL. His answer was——

Mr. WADE. I will tell him his answer; he need not interrupt me.

Mr. BELL. I must be allowed to state my answer. I answered that I supported the proposition of the leader of the opposition, and that is a straight enough answer.

Mr. WADE. The answer that the hon. gentleman gave was this : I will support the proposition of my hon. friend and leader.

Mr. BELL. Exactly.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) need not have become restless about this thing. I was not going to quote him incorrectly. I am not intentionally stirring him up.

Mr. BELL. I want to keep you right.

Mr. WADE. He said : I adopt the policy of my leader.

Mr. BELL. Exactly.

Mr. WADE. Now, what is the policy of his hon. leader with regard to Moncton ? As far as I can gather it was that some time in the dim and distant future, when the walking is good around River du Loup, he will go there and see whether there can be a good line obtained, but he has first convinced himself that a good line cannot be obtained, and the whole burden of his argument was to aid and strengthen the contention that a good line cannot be obtained. Therefore, the leader of the opposition does not propose to carry out any such proposition as that, but, as a representative of the lower provinces he dare not take a position flatly and honestly against the construction of the road from Quebec to Moncton. Now, there was a statement made by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) that this road should have been built long ago from Quebec to Moncton. We have a similar statement from Sir Charles Tupper away back in 1884. We have statements from scores of public men to the same effect, and there is no doubt that the Minister of the Interior was perfectly correct when he said, if the government had to deal with western members instead of members from the maritime provinces, that road would have been built long ago.

I believe that is correct. The hon. leader of the opposition took him to task on this point, and undertook to show that he had cast some reflection on the members from the maritime provinces. Nothing was farther from his mind. What he meant, and what we understood him to mean, and what the country will understand him to mean, is this : That if there is a matter of importance or of interest to the west, say to the province of Manitoba—something that is going to build up that part of the Dominion—we would find all the Manitoba members standing together as a unit, and claiming and demanding it. But, Sir, when we are endeavouring to obtain this matter of vital importance to the maritime provinces, do we find all the members from the maritime provinces standing together ? No, Sir ; we have the sad spectacle of the hon. leader of the opposition, who represents the city of Halifax, and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), doing their utmost to discredit that portion of the scheme, and to prevent this road being built to the maritime provinces, though it will be the salvation of the situation so far as those provinces are concerned. That is what the hon. Minister of the Interior meant, and these are the cold, clean facts as demonstrated before this House during the progress of this debate. I wonder why it is that there is such a deadly antipathy on the part of some members on the other side of the House towards the maritime provinces.

Mr. CLANCY. Hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. 'Hear, hear,' says that delightful member from Bothwell. He knows what the reason is—will he be kind enough to tell us some day ? That that feeling does exist we know. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the maritime provinces have a population of about a million. That they are among the older provinces of the Dominion of Canada ; that they have interests to be conserved and looked after ; and I want him and those of his ilk who have this feeling against the maritime provinces, to understand that we of the maritime provinces are determined to protect our rights and to look out for our interests, and that when there is any great scheme before the public for the up-building of Canada, we wish to be in that scheme. We want to be benefited and developed and increased to the same extent as the other parts of the Dominion, if we can.

Now, I did not take any sectional view of this scheme when it came before the Railway Committee and was discussed there. The position the maritime members took was this, that if a railway was to be built from the Pacific ocean to Quebec, that road railway should be extended through the lower provinces to a maritime province port. We did not ask that any burden should be placed on the western farmer ; we did not ask that he should be compelled to pay one dollar more freight on his grain. But we did say this : If we do not interfere with the routing of your grain, if we do not add an additional fraction of a cent on the wheat you sent to market, but if at the same time we can cause the shipping of that grain or a portion of it through maritime province ports, we do not think

you should object. That was the proposition.

Let me refer for a few moments to the history of this movement—and I will be as brief as I possibly can. For years there has been talk of another transcontinental railway. Last year that was crystallized to a certain extent. The hon. leader of the opposition, speaking from his place in parliament, declared that he would support any reasonable scheme for the purpose of providing an outlet for the grain grown in the Canadian North-west. These were his words :

> When the hon. gentleman brings down any reasonable scheme for increasing the means of Canadian transportation, any scheme by means of which the grain grown in the Canadian North-west, will be assuredly carried over Canadian lines to Canadian ports, and shipped thence to Europe, he will have my support, and I believe the support of every other man on this side of the House.

That was the declaration made by the hon. leader of the opposition upon the floor of this House last session. Now, the scheme has been brought down, but he seems to think that scheme is not worthy of his support. The first authoritative utterance which we had upon the project was from the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), who was the first man apparently on the government side who originated the scheme of another transcontinental railway ; and where did he first launch his determination on that subject ? Speaking in Vancouver last October, he said that we not only wanted another transcontinental road, but we wanted it right away—almost that evening, he was so much in earnest. Further than that, he said that he was doing his all in order to secure that road, and he led the people to believe, and properly so, that the scheme would be before this parliament at its coming session. All over the Dominion the question of a second transcontinental railway was spoken of, and the newspapers were full of it.

The next thing that I pause to note is the introduction of the charter of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and its reference to the Railway Committee. That Bill was presented to the Railway Committee in April, and the first day for the discussion was set for May 7. On that day Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and Mr. Hays made their statements before the committee. Upon the 13th day of May there was a strong discussion, in which the maritime members took the position that the railway should be extended from Quebec to Moncton. Reference has been made to the fact that the Grand Trunk Pacific people did not want to build further east than North Bay, and that the extension of the road to Moncton was forced upon them by the government. If that is the case, I say all credit to the government. If they did not allow the Grand Trunk Pacific to go into the wheat fields of the North-west, and bring the grain down to North Bay and thence divert the bulk of it to American ports, then I say all hail to the government that prevented them doing that. The position the maritime members took on the 13th of May was this, that if Quebec were made the terminus of the road, that port would be closed for five months in the year. It would be a splendid port for seven months ; but for five months there would be no port at all ; therefore we asked that the road should be extended to a winter port in the maritime provinces. Was this a reasonable proposition or not ? Would any sensible railway man build a railway across the continent from the Pacific and stop at Quebec ? I say he would not. This is a transcontinental railway, for the purpose of connecting the Atlantic and the Pacific. All these things must be taken into consideration. At the next meeting of the committee the company themselves proposed an amendment to the Bill making Moncton the eastern terminus of the railway. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals stated here the other day that that amendment was proposed by somebody who wanted to kill the scheme. Surely the hon. gentleman should not have made that statement, because he was sitting next beside the chairman of the Railway Committee at the very time the company moved the resolution themselves to extend the line down to Moncton.

I want to draw attention to the position taken by my friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) before the Railway Committee. I find him reported in the St. John ' Sun ' to have said, and the report corresponds with my recollection with what took place :

> Mr. Bell insisted on the Bill being placed in such a form so as to meet the wishes of the maritime provinces, who were almost unanimous in the opinion that the road must have its terminal at a Canadian port.

My hon. friend I suppose will not doubt the accuracy of this report. That was his position before the Railway Committee. What was the position of some others ? Let me refer to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Hale) while that project was before the Railway Committee, they sent this telegram to the St. John Board of Trade :

> Important that civic bodies take immediate united and strong action re Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Apparent intention is to make Portland winter terminus, and if maritime provinces are to reap the reward for past sacrifices, a fight to the finish must be made.

That was the position taken by these two hon. gentlemen, and I believe that it was in consequence of that position the Board of Trade of St. John send the following telegram, or rather the mayor of St. John :

St. John, N.B., May 13.

Charles S. Hyman, M.P.,
Chairman Railway Committee,
Ottawa.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the common council of the city of St. John this morning :

Resolved, that the city of St. John has heard with regret that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company indicate an intention to build its line from the Pacific to the city of Quebec only and do not propose to construct and extend the same so as to have during the winter season a terminus at the open sea on Canadian soil. Which means that the company will do all its transatlantic business in winter through United States ports. And further resolved that such a course of procedure would do great injustice to the 'maritime provinces' and would be applying the money and resources of Canada to the upbuilding of a foreign city and port.

And still further resolved that this city respectfully, earnestly and most strenuously urges the representatives in parliament from the city and county of St. John and from the province of New Brunswick and the maritime provinces generally to do all in their power to protect the interests of their provinces in the matter of preventing the injury that would be done if the proposed wrong should be carried out. And further resolved that the necessary protection against this impending injustice should be placed in the Act incorporating the company, should any such be passed.

And still further resolved that this city requests the representatives of Quebec, Ontario, and the other more western provinces and territories to so act in securing such protection that the road to be built by the company shall pass from ocean to ocean through Canadian territory in both winter and summer and that such measures may be taken as will ensure the carrying through Canadian ports only of all freight originating or desired for any part of the Dominion of Canada.

WALTER W. WHITE,
Mayor.

That is what the city of St. John thought of the matter. On the 26th of May, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who had for some time been periodically questioning the government as to when they were going to bring down their scheme, again interrogated them. Everybody knew that there was a government scheme to come as a corollary to the charter which went through the House, and frequently my hon. friend claimed the right to know when this scheme was coming forward. On the 26th of May he had become so impatient that he impressed this House with the idea that the moment a scheme would be launched for the construction of a transcontinental railway, so earnest was he in his desire to have that work carried forward that he would leave his place in parliament, seize a pick and shovel, and hasten to work on the construction of the road itself. Let us see what he said on the 26th of May. He put his question to the First Minister, and premised it by quite a long speech. In that speech he told us that the whole country was clamouring for this railway, that the boards of trade, city councils and so forth all over the Dominion, from one end to the other, had passed resolutions demanding the building of this road, and he proceeded to read a resolution which had been passed by the board of trade of the city of Halifax. That resolution was as strong as any resolution could be in favour of building this road and in favour of Moncton. He also stated that the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) had received a strong telegram from the St. John Board of Trade to the same effect. I shall just cite a few words from the speech of the hon. gentleman :

Now, there is a strong feeling in the country, and particularly in the maritime provinces, and one that the government should especially keep in mind, that the government should insist on guarantees that the termini of any road to which government assistance is given shall be within the limits of the Dominion of Canada. Public meetings have been held, boards of trade have passed resolutions, municipal bodies have passed resolutions, not only in the maritime provinces, but throughout the length and breadth of Canada, insisting on this condition. Indeed, I am led to mention this matter to the House now because of a resolution which has just been placed in my hands passed by the Halifax Board of Trade, and which I will take the liberty of reading to the House.

I shall not read the whole of the resolution, but here is a part of it :

And further resolved, that this board protests against government assistance of any kind being granted to any transcontinental railway unless a distinct and binding condition is enforced that said railway shall be built entirely on Canadian territory, and its export and import traffic shall be through Canadian termini, and that the rates of freight charged by said railway shall be as low via the ports of St. John, N.B., and Halifax, N.S., as rates charged via any port on the Atlantic seaboard.

And further resolved, that if aid is asked from the Canadian government by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway the interests of the maritime provinces should be safeguarded by compelling this railway company to commence the construction of the eastern portion of its line at Moncton, N.B., and complete it as far as the city of Quebec.

That is the resolution of the board of trade of the city of Halifax, in the county represented by the leader of the opposition, and in presenting that resolution, he prefaced it by remarks which showed that it had his entire sympathy, and I believe that at that time he was in sympathy with the purpose of that resolution and with the building of a road to Moncton.

An hon. MEMBER. He is now.

Mr. WADE. Perhaps he is, I cannot tell, but the exigencies of party have made him give other utterances. Upon this occasion he also read a telegram, which he said the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) had received from St. John. I do not know how it comes that on the 26th of May, the hon. the leader of the opposi-

tion was in a position to know the contents of a telegram to the then Minister of Railways and Canals. But he says that the ex-minister did receive this telegram, and I am prepared to take his word for it. Here it is :

Unless the Grand Trunk Pacific build their line through to some maritime province port we believe the export business will continue to go through an American port as in the past.

Mr. Hays rightly says shippers can route freight as they please and if the Grand Trunk are interested in route via Portland, shippers can be easily influenced to route practically every ton of export freight that way.

We cannot believe that any arrangement can be made——

Here is the important part of it :

—between Intercolonial and Grand Trunk which will prevent this.

We urge in the strongest terms that no governmental assistance be granted to any transcontinental railway that does not undertake to build their line through to some maritime province port.

And, Sir, in the face of all these things, in the face of the declarations of the leader of the opposition, in the face of the speech made by the ex-Minister of Railways in Vancouver, in the face of all these representations from municipal councils and boards of trade, we had the ex-Minister of Railways standing in his place in parliament, declaring there was no one who wanted this road to Moncton except the people who hoped to make money out of its construction. It was a very strong remark to make against the province of New Brunswick, and I do not wonder that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) resented it, as he did properly resent it in making his speech. I have only a few words more to say with regard to this Moncton business, and then I have finished. The ex-Minister of Railways contends that he left the cabinet because he believed that the construction of this part of the road would destroy the Intercolonial, and we have heard hon. gentlemen on the other side, taking their cue from him, declaring in the most pitiful tones that we are going to slaughter the people's railway. Have you heard one solitary member on this side of the House say anything against the Intercolonial or say that the Intercolonial would be injured by this road ? Not one. And I mean to say here that not only will the Intercolonial not be injured by the construction of this road to Moncton, but it will be benefited. And I will take occasion, before I resume my seat, to prove that to the satisfaction of every hon. gentleman present. But because the ex-minister is so convinced, he says, on that score, he resigned his seat in the cabinet. It is fair for me to see what he has said on other occasions. A few years ago, a charter was given to construct a railroad from St. Charles Junction at Lévis, to Connor station, near Edmundston, and a subsidy was granted to this road. Subsequently, in the year 1901, there was a change desired in the western terminus of the road, and a resolution was introduced to allow the road to go either to St. Charles Junction or to Chaudière. A discussion arose over this Bill. Be it remembered that this road runs substantially over the route of the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific from Chaudière to Connor, near Edmundston. There is no doubt about that. It has been surveyed ; the plans and profiles are in existence, and we know all about the country. Now it is well to see what position the ex-Minister of Railways and some other hon. gentlemen on the other side took with regard to that road. The first I will refer to is the hon. and valiant member from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes). Some hon. gentlemen had taken the position that this road would parallel the Intercolonial and interfere with the traffic. What does the hon. member for Victoria say ?

This will be another through Canadian Pacific Railway line, and when the new bridge is completed at Quebec the Canadian Pacific Railway will then be able to use its line on the north shore in connection with this line as an additional through-road to the sea.

But, though this was the hon. gentleman's position in 1901, to-day we have him telling us that it is impossible to build a road through that country, and, if it were built, the grades would be so tremendous that it would be impossible for it to carry any through-traffic. He spent hours and hours perusing the geological survey reports, and he has discovered that there are mountains in that country. He shows us that there are scores of hills there. Well, I suppose he has seen some hills and mountains elsewhere, and he has seen railways running along the base of those hills. This just shows the inconsistency of these hon. gentlemen. Last year or the year before, they were all in favour of building this road, but to-day, when it is part of the government policy, they change their minds. The next man I will refer to is the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler), who said :

While it is important that nothing should be done to interfere with the Intercolonial Railway, it is more important we should find the shortest means of communicating to the west and the seaboard.

Now, let us see what the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) said on that occasion. Referring to the speech of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who had said that this road would interfere with the Intercolonial, the hon. ex-Minister of Railways said :

Solicitous and all as he is, and solicitous as I would naturally be, in relation to anything that would be harmful to the Intercolonial Railway, I would not hesitate to give support and assistance to this project, and in doing so would not feel that I was infringing in the slightest de-

gree on the interests of the Intercolonial Railway. These people have no railway communication. They have a very fine country, as I understand it, and they ought to have railway communication. They have been left practically out in the woods. Why should we refuse to give them the ordinary aid traversing a fertile country, as this railway does, because we might interfere with the local traffic which might be taken up and which might be diverted from the Intercolonial Railway ?

That was the sentiment of the ex-Minister of Railways when, in 1901, he was proposing to subsidize a road to run over the very route of the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific from Chaudière to Connor station, near Edmundston. I am only citing him against himself. I believe that he spoke the truth then. I am obliged to believe he spoke the truth the other day. But I am in a queer fix with regard to it. I have pointed out the situation, and I will allow somebody else to wrestle with it.

Now, Sir, we got to the position of our Bill being before the committee and passing that committee. And still there was impatience on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to have the government scheme. On the 30th of July, the government scheme was placed before them. And even then they were not happy. They had wanted it so badly, they had declared they could not wait, that the country could not wait ; and they had clamoured for the Premier to bring down his proposal. And when the Premier brought down that scheme, and as he unfolded, one by one, the advantages it would bring to the Dominion of Canada, it was interesting to see the changes that came over the countenances of hon. gentlemen opposite. After the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had finished the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) sprang to his feet in a somewhat petulant and angry manner. What was the substance of his speech? He found fault with the fact that he had not been given a copy of this Bill. He made some criticism of the provisions of the Bill, which he has virtually taken back since. And then he informed this House that, notwithstanding the fact that the matter had been before the people of Canada for all this time, and discussed by all these bodies, he, on that thirtieth day of July, was not in a position to tell this House whether he was in favour of government ownership of railways or not. He came here on the 18th of August, and he told us that he had been studying this question about four or five weeks, and then he proposed the scheme that he has proposed.

In the meantime, while he was away preparing this scheme, this great measure, this great act of constructive statesmanship as it has been termed, his followers were left here alone, and they supposed that they would be doing the correct thing in following the lead of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), and they did so, and for this they should not be blamed by the leader of the opposition. They followed the hon. ex-Minister of Railways loyally, echoing his every sentiment. But when the leader comes back and finds out what has been going on he immediately proceeds to cast down the idol that they have reared in his absence, and he gives them his policy, he compels them to come into line and gives them to understand that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals will have some trouble before he can mount the horse of the hon. leader of the opposition. We have the two propositions before the country to-day, and it is between them that we have to decide. The government have announced their proposal, they have entered into this contract, and either this House must ratify that contract, or the government must go out of power ; that is the position. If the government should go out of power the hon. leader of the opposition would be called upon to form a new government, and then the country would have before it as a government proposition the scheme which he has placed before parliament. Therefore the question for us to decide is which shall we have, the scheme proposed by the government or the scheme proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition, and I now wish to contrast these two propositions.

The scheme proposed by the government has been so fully discussed that I shall refer to it only in the briefest possible manner. The first stipulation in connection with it is that the company shall deposit with the the government $5,000,000 in cash. Now, do hon. gentlemen suppose for one moment that business men would deposit $5,000,000 in the hands of the government, where they might lose every cent of it, simply for amusement ? Do these gentlemen, who have now become experts in railway management, railway operation and steamship operation, and who would have us believe that they know worlds about the freight rates and the tolls and the combinations—would these gentlemen set up their judgment against the judgment of the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway. If we were to listen to them we would conclude that that man is a lunatic and does not know what he is doing. He talks about hauling the freight from the west over his railway but these gentlemen say it cannot be done; the leader of the opposition says that it cannot be done. The leader of the opposition says that not six per cent of the grain carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway goes over the road to the north of Lake Superior. Well, if that be true, I must ask him to go to the debates of 1881, and read the speech of Sir Charles Tupper and the speeches of others on his side. Sir Charles Tupper then told the country, and he justified his bargain with the Canadian Pacific Railway by stating, that that road could carry all of the wheat produced in that vast

country of some two hundred odd million acres. That was the position which he assumed and that was the position assumed by all the supporters of that measure at the time. The government of that day desired to make use of the water stretches but Sir Charles Tupper said that could not be done. And a greater man than Sir Charles spoke on that occasion. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was in the House then, and I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you know how many speeches he made in that session. They were happy days then, he only spoke three times, and the longest speech is the one from which I am going to quote, and that covers only two and a half pages of 'Hansard.' No wonder they were jolly in those days! What did the hon. member for East Grey say? As I was leaving the House the other day, I heard him say: 'The idea of carrying freight over 2,800 miles of railway!'

In 1881 he said:

The question is one of the utmost importance to the country from whatever point of view it be considered. If we consider the fact that the road will be a great commercial thoroughfare through a country that is over 4,000 miles long, that it will carry the trade of an area of country that consists of over 250 millions of acres of land, we cannot fail to regard the subject as of surpassing interest to the people of this country.

Then he justifies his not putting it before the electors. He said it was not necessary to put it before the electors and goes on to say:

The people finally concluded that the water stretches were only a sham. In every instance, when I have been able to take the sense of the people, I have invariably found that it was their desire to have the railway built by a company, and not by the government.

And so on. But I think the richest part of his whole speech is where he says that the building of this road was most important, because it would double the debt of the Dominion.

Now, the hon. member for East Grey upon this occasion followed the lead of all the others in saying that the waterways were a sham and could not be utilized. To-day we have him coming back here and saying that we must revert to the waterways.

Another witness has been brought forward here, I refer to Sir William Van Horne. It seems that the Canadian Pacific Railway are taking some interest in this question. One of the directors of that company has made a speech in this House, to which I am going to refer in a little while, but Sir William Van Horne, speaking in New York last year in regard to the Trans-Canada line said:

Canada, he said, has been adding sides to her hopper for a long time, but has neglected to enlarge the spout. She has for many years been spending millions generously in the development of the interior, and her railways, but has neglected her outlet at the Atlantic. Her crops and industries have grown, and her hopper is full to overflowing, and the outlet at Montreal is not large enough. Her exports take the easy routes by the great lakes and the Erie Canal to Boston and New York, simply because Canada sits comfortably by and does not see what she is losing.

He approves the Trans-Canada line in these words. He was asked what effect the building of the Trans-Canada line would have on the Canadian Pacific Railway and he replied:

TRANS-CANADA LINE.

The position of the Canadian Pacific Railway is absolutely unassailable. For that reason it is our policy never to oppose anything. The Trans-Canadian road has started with better prospects than the Canadian Pacific had once. When the Northern Pacific road was built, every body thought it was away up north beyond nowhere. Then the Great Northern was built and people promptly forgot thinking of the Northern Pacific as far north. Then came the Canadian Pacific, and that seemed to run through the Arctic regions. We would hail with delight a parallel route from the Atlantic to the Pacific to help us develop the country. There is enough of it up here for us all.

That was the position taken by Sir William Van Horne in this interview in New York. Let us see what he had to say the other day. In a recent interview he says:

Neither the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway nor any other all-Canadian route,' said Sir William, 'will ever voluntarily carry a carload of wheat by the all-railway route around the great lakes to an eastern Canadian port for shipment abroad, for the simple reason that it will never pay any road to do so. Nor will the transportation problems in the west ever be solved by the construction of an all-Canadian route from coast to coast.'

Continuing, Sir William stated:

The Canadian Pacific Railway shipped every carload of wheat that it was possible to ship by their steamship line on the great lakes from Fort William to Owen Sound, and thence east by rail, or else by way of Buffalo and the Erie Canal.

In the first place, he stated in this interview that he would hail with delight a second transcontinental railway, and in the second interview he says that such a line is not necessary, and tells us that they cannot haul wheat around the north shore of Lake Superior. If Sir William Van Horne would content himself to speak of his own road, I would not quarrel; he would be quite right. The Canadian Pacific Railway, as constructed around the north shore of Lake Superior, could not and cannot carry grain. Why? Because the grades are too heavy. It is not a heavy freight carrying road. It cannot be built for such a purpose. That is the reason. Let me refer the hon. gentleman for a moment to this question of gradients and show what an important part it

plays. I am referring to 'The Economic Theory of Railway Location,' by A. M. Wellington. Here we will find a table which shows the relative resistance of gradients. A locomotive which would draw 250 tons on the level would, with a four-tenth gradient, only be able to draw 125 tons, with a 1 per cent gradient it would only be able to draw 71·43 tons, and with a 1·20 per cent gradient it would only be able to draw 62·50 tons. That shows how important these gradients are, and I assume that the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, in constructing this road, will have that in view. It is a matter of mutual agreement between them as to the kind of road that is to be built, but the purpose has been determined upon, and that is to provide a road that will bring out the grain from the west. If that is done, it will be a road with what is known as normal gradients of four-tenths of one per cent as the maximum gradient. There may be short places on the road where you may get a stiffer grade than that, and where the momentum of the train would carry you over it, but where there is a long gradient, it should not be greater than four-tenths of one per cent. I believe that under this project of the government a line with the maximum gradient of four-tenths of one per cent can be secured. It may be a surprise to some hon. gentlemen opposite to know that in the course of two or three weeks there will be an instrumental survey completed from Winnipeg to Lake Abitibi, and that the engineers will report having secured a line with that maximum gradient. If a road is built of that description from Winnipeg to Moncton, I cannot believe any man would stand here and say that grain cannot be carried to the maritime seaports. I believe that it can be carried there, I believe it will be carried there, and Mr. Hays, the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, believes that it will be carried there. At any rate, representing a constituency in the maritime provinces, I think I am justified in giving him an opportunity to try the experiment of building that road there. I do not believe it is an experiment, all the same. I think it is a fact, a certainty, that if you build the road from Winnipeg to Moncton of the nature and character that I have described the grain of the west will be brought down to the maritime ports. I believe that the bulk of the grain will be shipped from St. John, and I believe that Halifax will get her compensations in the manner which I will state hereafter. This is the contract which has been entered into between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. I shall not go over the different provisions of it, because I dare say hon. gentlemen are tired of it, but I will refer to the scheme which has been propounded to the House by the hon. leader of the opposition as an alternative scheme. Many of the figures in connection with this have been given to the House, but I will find it necessary to go over them, as mine are somewhat different, and proceed upon a somewhat different basis. In order that there may be no mistake about the phraseology of the remarks made by the hon. leader of the opposition, I will quote his exact words:

> If, however, the Canada Atlantic Railway commends itself to the judgment of experts, and from what information I can obtain with regard to it, I should think it ought so commend itself, and I would think that the extension of the Intercolonial Railway between Coteau and Jacques Cartier Junction, and the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway to Depot Harbour, would place the Intercolonial Railway in a very much better position than it is at present.

First of all, I would like to know how that will place the Intercolonial Railway in any better position? The Canada Atlantic Railway to-day is doing a certain business. It is doing that business well. What grain it gets it gathers up in a way that I will describe. What amount of that grain goes east to Montreal and would any more go east of Montreal if the government got this road? Would the road be as well managed under government ownership as it is at the present time? The hon. gentleman says he will either buy that road or build another. Let us say that he will build it. The first thing he has to do is to build 37 miles of road from Coteau to Jacques Cartier Junction, which will cost $1,295,000. To purchase the Canada Atlantic Railway I have put it down as $17,000,000. There has been some question of that being the fair price of the road. There has been the statement made that this road was offered cheaper than that. I believe it was offered for a less sum than that. I believe the road to-day is held at a much higher figure than it was a year or two ago. I have been informed upon the best authority that the road cost the company upwards of $17,000,000, and if the government wanted to get the road they would have to pay that for it. Would the hon. gentlemen expect to pay less than what the road cost?

Mr. HEYD. It cost $20,000,000.

Mr. WADE. An hon. gentleman says that it cost $20,000,000, and there have been considerable betterments made since then. It would cost nearer $20,000,000 than anything else, but let us say $19,000,000. It would cost him to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Depot Harbour $20,295,000. Then he says, at page 9000 of 'Hansard':

> I have suggested the extension of the Intercolonial to the Georgian bay. If we acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, we could build a line from that point to join the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Sudbury. . . . By that means the Intercolonial, besides being extended to the Georgian bay, could be joined by a

line about 120 miles in length to the Canadian Pacific Railway running north of Lake Superior.

This section, estimated by the hon. leader of the opposition to be 120 miles in length, would cost $30,000 per mile, making $3,600,000, so that it would require $23,895,000 to get the Intercolonial Railway to Sudbury. Then, at page 8999, he says:

I say it would be a proper thing and a wise thing for this government to acquire that railway from North Bay to Fort William, and make it a national highway of Canada, ... giving to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern and the Intercolonial as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway running powers over it.

I have figured out the cost of this, getting my information from people who are in a position to judge as to the cost of acquiring that piece of railway, and I find that it will amount to $24,570,000, or to extend the Intercolonial Railway as far as Fort William, we have an expenditure of $48,465,000. Then he says:

The third proposal which I would submit to the consideration of the House, as a sound policy, is to assist in improving the grades of one or both lines from Winnipeg to Fort William, upon the condition that complete control of rates is obtained and that the Grand Trunk Railway as well as the Intercolonial Railway shall have running powers from Fort William into Winnipeg.

It is estimated that to reduce the grades on the Canadian Pacific Railway between Fort William and Rat Portage it would cost $3,000,000, and that to reduce the grades on the Canadian Northern from Fort Wiliam westward would cost $1,500,000.

The leader of the opposition then proposes in this scheme to go to the Canadian Pacific Railway and purchase from them the lean and profitless part of their road. I can now understand why one of the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) comes here and makes the extravagant statement he has made in order to induce the House to uphold that scheme, and to relieve his company of the burden of operating this expensive piece of road, while securing for them this large amount of money out of the public treasury. But this hon. gentleman from West Toronto; this director of the Canadian Pacific Railway is not satisfied with that. He wants $3,000,000 spent upon the other part of the Canadian Pacific Railway towards Winnipeg, and in return for that he will give running powers. And the most striking statement is, that the leader of the opposition proposes also to say to the Canadian Northern: we will spend $1,500,000 upon your road. The leader of the opposition is very anxious to find opportunities for spending money. Here is the striking part of that proposition: Forty-five miles of that road is in American territory, and that forty-five miles is the section which is in the most need of having money spent on it. Therefore, the leader of the opposition would go into an American territory and would spend Canadian millions in the building up of the Canadian Northern Railway. But it has never entered into his head to consult the Canadian Northern Railway as to what they thought of such an arrangement as this, and whether they wanted to give running powers over their road. I cannot conceive, for my part, of them wishing to do so—why, they should want to be troubled with the Grand Trunk Railway and the government road coming over their line, I cannot understand; but that is part of the hon. gentleman's policy. The next point of the hon. leader of the opposition was:

At some point on this side of the Rocky mountains there should be a common point, a junction between the Canadian Northern Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. From that on to the coast there should be one line, and that line should be built by these companies. By such an arrangement we should give them joint control; there should be no difficulty about it, &c.

Now, the cost of building that road, say from Edmonton to Dunvegan, 250 miles at $28,000 a mile would be $7,000,000; from Dunvegan to Port Simpson, 555 miles at $48,000 a miles, would be $26,640,000; the terminals at Port Simpson would be say $1,500,000 making $35,140,000. The leader of the opposition says further that running east from Depot Harbour to Madawaska, a distance of 133 miles the grades are about one per cent, and of course that is an impossible grade for a grain carrying road. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) says he proposes to reduce those grades to a normal grade and this would cost $10,000 a mile or $1,330,000. It is quite evident that to accommodate the traffic, the line between North Bay and Port Arthur would have to be doubled tracked. That is, if you are going to get the business he contemplates, he would have to double track that road, but if he does not get the business he contemplates, namely, the Canadian Pacific Railway business, and the Canadian Northern Railway business, he has got to expend an enormous amount on that section of the road between North Bay and Fort William in order to put it in proper condition for his own use. Suppose he does get the traffic, he will have to double track, and the double tracking would cost him $8,190,000. He will also have to double track the Canada Atlantic Railway, and the double tracking of the Canada Atlantic Railway and putting it in proper condition would cost $4,560,000. Now, I have not figured on one cent for all these elevators, or for the deepening of the canals, or anything of that sort, but we find that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has expended $102,185,000—and how much are we benefited? What has he accomplisned thereby? He has not accomplished any-

thing with the exception of allowing another road to be built from Winnipeg to Port Simpson. Let us see how this scheme of his would work out; let us see whether in the ordinary course of events, applying our common sense to the situation, he would reap the reward he expects. If he buys out the Canadian Pacific Railway he will expect them to use the road he has bought out, and has doubled tracked, and has put in good condition. I make bold to say, that they will not do anything of the sort. They will do one thing or the other, they will either use their Sault line and their waterways, or they will build another line where they should have built this line, namely: where the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is surveying. That is what they will do, and they will leave the government themselves to operate that piece of road. Will the Canadian Northern Railway come over it? Certainly not. They have their own connections, and if they were going to make any other connections these connections would be in the direction of the United States, rather than that they should be compelled to carry their grain over this road located as it is. I am informed upon the very best authority, that no matter how much money you may expend, it is impossible to make the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior a good freight carrying road. The leader of the opposition then has got nothing from the Canadian Northern Railway; he has got nothing from the Canadian Pacific Railway; and who is his other customer? His other customer is the Grand Trunk Railway. He is allowing the Grand Trunk Railway to go into the wheat fields and getting there, the Grand Trunk Railway will get their freight out of the wheat fields—because they have running powers, mark you, over to Lake Superior—they will bring part of it by the lakes, and the balance of it they will bring by rail, but how far? They will bring it to North Bay and to North Bay only, where they will divert it upon their present system, and it will seek shipment from the American ports just as they are doing at the present moment. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) is maintaining this road for the use of the Grand Trunk Railway as far as North Bay, and for the use of himself. He is kind enough to the Grand Trunk Railway to maintain 79 miles of the road east of Sudbury, and between Sudbury and North Bay, which he cannot use for any purpose whatever.

Let us look to his other connections, and what he is going to do west? Why should the Grand Trunk Railway want to build a road from Edmonton to the coast under a scheme of this sort. They would not want to build it, and they would not want to operate it. Neither would the Canadian Northern want to do it under a system of this kind. He would build the road. Who would use it? He would have to use it himself. What is he to carry upon it? He has no connections with the prairies—the Canadian Northern Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway are in there, but they have their connections east—and therefore he would have to operate his road from Edmonton to Fort Simpson as a government operated road.

Now, let us look at the business which the hon. member (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is going to do east. He comes to Winnipeg with his road extended at this immense cost I have spoken of, and when he gets to Winnipeg where is he going to get his freight? He is not going to get it from the Grand Trunk Railway, because they have their connections east. He is not going to get it from the Canadian Northern Railway, because they have their connections. He is not going to get it from the Canadian Pacific Railway, because they have their connections. Then, I ask hon. gentlemen to pause for a moment, and consider where he is going to get the traffic for the Intercolonial Railway extended to Winnipeg; where he is going to get traffic sufficient to pay for the grease upon the axles. It is a most mad and ridiculous scheme, when you come to analyze it. He has expended a hundred odd million dollars, and he has landed us just where we are to-day, with the exception of the betterment of some of these roads.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has not criticised that portion of the government scheme from Winnipeg to the coast. He does not say that the amount we are giving to the company is too great. The only difference between his scheme and our scheme is this: that in building the mountain section he is going to pay the whole of the cost of it, and we are guaranteeing three-fourths of the cost only. In our case we have a company that must operate that heavy section—in his case he would have to operate it himself. His project west of Winnipeg certainly cannot bear comparison with ours.

I must now look to his project, after this expenditure of over $100,00,000 has been made. Now he has got us down to Quebec, with the present Intercolonial Railway and the present facilities. But, he says, I am going now to improve these water-ways; first, I am going to buy out the steamboats of the Trans-Canada Transport Company. This is a very peculiar proposition, and one that should engage the attention of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. In the first place, the Canada Atlantic Railway has connections in the United States. For some fifty odd miles that railway runs down to Swanton in the United States, where it gathers up a large portion of the business carried on its line and on its boats in the shape of package freight, from Portland, Boston and other New England ports. This freight is carried on the boats from Depot Harbour to Duluth, Milwaukee and

Chicago. The company, in order to get over the United States coasting laws, are obliged to have a part of their fleet of American bottoms. Therefore the hon. gentleman's proposition would require the government to engage in this enterprise of operating a railroad running into the United States, a distance of some fifty miles, and a line of steamships, a part of which must be American bottoms, carrying on a coasting trade between Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth and Depot Harbour, and carrying this parcel freight from Swanton, in the United States, up to these points. That is the proposition. The government of Canada is to go into this enterprise, running railroads in the United States, running steamboats in the United States, and owning United States bottoms for the purpose of evading the coasting law. I wonder how long this would continue. Where does the Canada Atlantic Railway derive the bulk of its grain traffic from to-day ? It gathers it up at Chicago, Milwaukee and Duluth. Rob it of that business, and the business of its steamers is virtually gone.

Here is another significant feature of the hon. gentleman's proposition. My hon. friend proposes to run a railway north of Lake Superior, and he proposes to run a line of steamships on the lakes in competition with his own railway. He is running a railroad to carry freight through a territory where hon. gentlemen opposite say it is impossible for it to pay ; and, to further damn it, he is going to run a line of steamships over the lakes for the purpose of competing with that very line. That is the proposition he makes to us.

But that is not so unreasonable as something I will refer to later. The hon. gentleman tells us this is not all of his scheme. He is going to improve the water-ways and the ports so as to enable them to compete with the water-ways and ports of the United States. If he does that, he has first to deepen the Welland canal. Has he estimated the cost of that ? Has anybody been able to estimate the cost of deepening the Welland canal, in order to make it a competing canal with the American canals ? I have not. The amount of money necessary to do that would be enormous. In addition to that, he is going to deepen the Canadian channel of the St. Lawrence river to an extent that will permit deep-draught grain vessels to come down all the way to Montreal. Will any hon. gentleman on the opposition side be good enough to tell me what in his judgment it will cost to deepen the Canadian channel of the St. Lawrence river to an extent to permit vessels of 20-feet draught to pass through that channel ? That question is so hard that I do not think any of them will attempt to answer it. They do not attempt to answer it, because they cannot answer it. No man living has pretended to make an estimate of what that would cost. But my hon. friend in eighteen or nineteen days, has evolved a scheme by which he proposes to do it. My hon. friend would also have to deepen and equip the harbours. Suppose he equipped Depot Harbour like the harbours on the other side of the lake. I do not know what that would cost. I know that the authorities spent $4,000,000 or $5,00,000 on the harbour of Buffalo without reference to the approaches. Suppose my hon. friend deepened all these channels and equipped and deepened all these harbours by the expenditure of an immense amount of money, what would it all amount to ? He is operating the railway from Quebec to Winnipeg for the purpose of making it a great carrier, and at the same time he is operating a competing line by water all the way from Quebec to Lake Superior. This is his proposition. Which is he going to favour ? What part of this scheme does he want to be a success ? Is it the water part or the rail part ? One thing must be certain, that the hon. gentleman could not have considered the effect of what he was saying. That is the true outworking of his proposition, and I will leave it to the judgment of the hon. gentlemen present, and I appeal to the judgment of men who are posted on the transportation question.

Now, the hon. gentleman has got to Quebec. What have we to hope from him beyond Quebec ? He tells us that he will go and look over this route from Moncton to Rivière du Loup and to Lévis, and if he finds it, in his judgment, feasible, he will build this road for us, and will go into the paralleling business again. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied unless he has got two strings to his bow all the time. In speaking on this subject of transportation, I am appealing to the people of the country who have a knowledge of this question. This is transportation, according to the new light that has arisen before us—paralleling your road with water carriage; or, if you cannot parallel it with water carriage, then parallel it with another road, built and operated by yourself. He says it would be a bad thing to have the Grand Trunk Pacific Company operate the road to Moncton, because it would parallel the Intercolonial Railway ; but it would be a splendid thing to have the Intercolonial parallel itself over the same distance. That is the position. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say any more on that part of the scheme.

I want to say something now about colonization, and in that connection I wish to refer to a speech made by the hon. member for Pictou at a dinner given at the Garrison Club in Quebec this spring. See how the minds of great men change. The hon. gentleman made a speech at that dinner in connection with the Trans-Canada Railway, which he thought was the scheme of all schemes that should be carried through. Last night, after he had delivered himself as he did, it occurred to him that he had

made this speech, and he said something that would show the difference between it and the colonization scheme of his leader. The colonization scheme of his leader consists in this, that he would look over this country from Quebec to Winnipeg, and according as he finds it desirable, he will build a colonization road—forty, fifty, perhaps a hundred miles a year—but he will jog along at his own rate. And that is the scheme, which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) is now upholding. But he did not entertain this view after he had been dining and wining so well at the club—I withdraw, Mr. Speaker, the wining. The 'Chronicle' of Quebec says:

With the exception of one, all the members were Liberals. Mr. Bell of Pictou is a Conservative of fine physique,——

This is very flattering.

—agreeable manners and a presence of commanding importance. He has a resonant and captivating voice. He possesses the attributes of a leader of men. He is a man of scholarly attainments, and he at once impressed his hearers. He warmly espoused the cause of the Trans-Canada project. The commoners were fairly well represented on this occasion. No fewer than two representatives from the extreme portion of Canada were present. Mr. MacPherson represented the extreme west. Ontario and Quebec were well represented. He regretted the absence of ministerial representation. But as a member of the opposition he hoped to be in a position to help forward the aims of those present. He was glad to meet the gentlemen present. He was proud of being a Canadian. He wanted to see a real Canadian people. Since 1867 we had become a nation. He stood for nationalism instead of provincialism. He took great interest in the Trans-Canada scheme from early years of his life. He had a keen recollection of General Hewson's famous pamphlet, the route now adopted by the Trans-Canada people, which is really a real colonization route, from ocean to ocean. General Hewson proved that by going further north that we had the opportunity of developing the best resources of the country. From a national point of view, we should have another route, which meant the compacting of our country and an increase of our population. Quebec people had shown a strong national feeling in this matter. Quebec must eventually be the greatest port of Canada—a port which is unrivalled in the whole world. The largest ships afloat can ride safely in the harbour of Quebec. And then Quebec is hallowed ground. It is endeared all round the globe by its historical associations. French and English people have united in making this city strong, historical and national. We want to see the traffic of Canada increase and become the great transportation centre of this country. Quebec should rival New York. In this hope the people of the maritime provinces joined heartily. We must have population. We must have depth, we must have a back country. We are a people of undeveloped resources.

That is pretty good talk, and that is the talk of the hon. member for Pictou, speaking in the interests of Canada, speaking in the interests of the maritime provinces, speaking in the interests of the county he represents, and before the party whip was snapped over him, after the leader of the opposition brought down his scheme.

Mr. BELL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, he will find that what I did say then coincides almost precisely with what I said last night.

Mr. WADE. It coincides with the explanation which the hon. member attempted to make last night, but in which he failed utterly. What is the difference between the location of the Trans-Canada Railway, as contemplated at the moment he made that utterance, and the location of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway as contemplated at present.

Mr. BELL. About 150 miles.

Mr. WADE. About 150 miles, the hon. gentleman says. I do not think he is in a position to tell whether it is 50 or 150; but suppose it is 150, it is that many miles further up in this wilderness they have been talking about, and it is carrying that road back of Lake Winnipeg through an uninhabited country from Quebec all the way across.

An hon. MEMBER. Sub-Arctic.

Mr. WADE. Sub-Arctic was the expression used. These gentleman, when they first started out against this scheme began to belittle and abuse the country; and when the Finance Minister went on to prove that this was a good country and to make use of certain official reports, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) said that these reports were cooked.

Mr. BROCK. I said that the summaries were incorrect

Mr. WADE. We will not go to the summaries, but we will see if the reports were cooked or not I turn up page 36 and I find a summary of the character of the soil made by an explorer:

As regards the soil of this whole area south of Lake Abitibi and extending in a south-westerly direction to the Black river, we can say that it is excellently suited to agriculture, being a fine sandy clay loam, just sandy enough to be easily workable.

This report is signed by M. B. Baker. I would ask the hon. member for Centre Toronto if he knows Mr. Baker. He does not know him. Well, Mr. Baker has sworn to this report as being true before Mr. J. A. G. Crozier, commissioner, can he say anything against that gentleman? Let me turn to another report by Mr. J. M. Bremner and Mr. James M. Milne, who have examined 3,840,000 acres of land. Does the hon. member know Mr. Bremner and Mr. Milne? He is silent. Does he know anything against them? Does he know anything to their discredit? They have sworn to the truth

of their report. In what particular is it wrong? I would refer next to the report of Mr. E. L. Fraleck, does the hon. member know this gentleman or anything to his discredit? Mr. Fraleck tells us about the railway facilities, is there anything the hon. member can say against him? Is he a man who would swear to a lie? Will he tell the truth or not? Would he put a statement on paper which is false and swear to it and let it be published throughout the world? Here is the report of Mr. Daniel Proctor, does the hon. gentleman know anything against him or not? He has appended his name to a report in this book. It is a sad spectacle that in opposing this scheme these gentlemen find it necessary, not only to decry their country, but to abuse and slander public officials.

Mr. BROCK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt? I defy him or anybody else to show that I have attempted to defame any officer connected with the whole thing. I merely spoke of the summary read to the House. I did not allude to a single individual; and did not intend to do it, as the hon. gentleman well knows.

Mr. WADE. I am glad the hon. gentleman sees the error of his ways. Repentance may be late, but not too late. When the Finance Minister quoted this report and said it was a report emanating from the King's Printer at Toronto, an official report, what did the hon. gentleman say? He used these words: 'The whole thing is a humbug.' These gentlemen, when out of office, are dangerous parties to deal with? They abuse every public official almost in every province. They have abused and slandered the judges upon the bench. Truly, as has been said of them, when they are out of office, they are like a she-bear robbed of her cubs the she-lion, robbed of her whelps. They can see no good in any body or anything. If it be necessary to gain their end that they should decry their country and abuse this that or the other man, they do not hesitate a moment to do it. They started out first to assert that the country traversed by this railway was valueless. It has been shown beyond question that it is magnificent country all the way down from Winnipeg to Quebec. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. But we have a mass of testimony to show what kind of a country it is. Is it patriotic on the part of these gentlemen to circulate throughout the world the statement that this great portion of Canada is a wilderness, that it is not fit for cultivation or habitation? Is that a patriotic thing to do? Is that the way they are aiding the building up of Canada? What are they doing it for? Simply for more party exigencies. I know that the common sense of the Conservative party does not commend this course. I know that hon. gentlemen take this course reluctantly. I know it is sad for them to be compelled to adopt it.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) will permit me—he has made a pretty strong statement with regard to some hon. gentlemen on this side. Will he give the name of any hon. gentleman on this side who has indicated the course he speaks of or who has said one sentence in the direction of which he has spent some minutes in describing?

Mr. WADE. Certainly. I would not make a statement of that sort if it were not borne out by facts. The first gentleman to speak on that side after the leader of the opposition on the 30th of July last, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), told us that this country was a series of muskegs and granite ridges, that there was no timber and that the region was unfit to habitation. That was virtually repeated by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) took the same position. I would ask my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) to read the earlier speeches of hon. gentlemen on his own side before their Moses returned from Mount Sinai and cracked the party whip over them. Let the hon. gentleman read those speeches and cull from the remarks made derogatory to the character of the country through which this road is to run, and he will find that he has scores of pages of such statements. I am reminded that the hon. leader of the opposition from the province of Quebec (Mr. Monk) stated that this was a sub-artic region. The hon. member for South Lanark said it was a wilderness, and speaking of the country traversed by the road between Quebec and New Brunswick, he said it was a wilderness and a worthless country. But these hon. gentlemen have found it necessary to abandon that position. They were driven from it; they became ashamed of it. And now they undertake to say that they never said these things. They will wish they had never said them when they get before the people. As to this country between Quebec and Moncton, I refer to the statements of the ex-Minister of Railways when he said that this was a splendid country. But this was in the days before the hon. gentleman had commenced to dicker with gentlemen on the other side. He always spoke the truth in these days. He said then that this was a splendid country and a grand place for a railroad. And we say so to-day.

Now, I wish to make a statement with regard to the building of the road from Quebec to Moncton. The hon. leader of the opposition made some sneering remarks about Moncton being the terminus and the port for this road. These remarks were quite unnecessary. Nobody contemplates Moncton as the end of the road. But Moncton is the objective point, and from Moncton it can run to Halifax over the Intercolonial, and from Chipman it can run to St. John over a line to be built down to

Norton. I wish to make a statement with regard to this. There has been a great deal of disputing here as to whether this would shorten the line or not. Hon. gentlemen on the other side say it will shorten it by forty or fifty miles. It is contended on our side that it will shorten it by from 120 to 140 miles. I will take this position, and I am ready to demonstrate it to any competent railroad authority, that even if this project does not shorten the road one mile, it is necessary, first in the interest of the country, and second in the interest of the project itself, that this railway should be carried to Moncton and should not stop at Quebec. We are told that there is no security for the operation for the extension of this road. If we compel the company to build their road to Moncton and make a through connection to St. John and Halifax, that is the strongest kind of security that we can have that the road will be operated over the whole eastern division, because when we have got them there and obliged to operate their trains, they must bring their business that way in order to make the line pay, and it will be profitable for them to do so.

In the maritime provinces, we are a million of people, we are the older provinces. We are ready to help all other parts of the Dominion, but we want to share in all national movements. And we have a right to do so. We in Nova Scotia did not seek to get into this confederation; we were pitch-forked into it without being consulted. It was unwise for the hon. member for Pictou to refer to the strained feeling at that time. I venture to say that if any other part of the Dominion had been treated as Nova Scotia was treated when it was brought into confederation there would have been a rebellion. The fact that there was not a rebellion in the case of Nova Scotia is proof of the extreme loyalty of the people of that province. We were forced into confederation, but, having obtained better terms we have accepted confederation; we are here to stay and to take our part in working out the future of this country loyally and to the best of our ability. We are prepared to spend money for the development of the great west, for we know that from the great west we have a right to expect a large measure of the prosperity and success of this Dominion. We are prepared to spend money on our waterways and on every other desirable public work. But, while we are prepared to do that, we feel that we have a right to demand to be taken into account in any national scheme that is formulated. Not a mile of this proposed road will be in Nova Scotia, not a mile of it comes within twenty-four or twenty-five miles of our border. But we see the advantages that will accrue to us from the operating of the road, and we have a right to demand those advantages. There was an attempt made in this discussion to foment jealousy between St. John and Halifax. It failed. Members from the province of Nova Scotia, from the province of New Brunswick and from the province of Prince Edward Island, came together and agreed that here should be no jealousy and no bickering, but that we should all unite in promoting the welfare of our maritime ports.

An hon. MEMBER. The Liberal members.

Mr. WADE. Yes, the Liberal members, but we were aided to a certain extent by the Conservative members. Now, I wish to make a declaration. I expect that when this road is built to Moncton it will be necessary to double-track the Intercolonial into Halifax. That would be of enormous value to the city of Halifax, for in its wake will come, if it does not come before, the much-desired fast Atlantic service. A part of the project is to build from a point on this line near Chipman to Norton on the Intercolonial, so as to connect St. John. And I, for one, as a representative of the province of Nova Scotia, will refuse to accept the advantage of the Halifax connection unless the St. John connection is provided at the same time. Let there be absolute fairness between us. We are working together for the common good of the lower provinces, and I believe that there is an honest intention on the part of every member from the maritime provinces to do so. And I make this public declaration that I will stand by my agreement with regard to the city of St. John. Will any man rise and tell me that if we build this road down to Moncton and get the connection from Chipman into Norton and so to the east side of the Harbour of St. John, that that city is not going to be greatly benefited by it? I believe the bulk of the heavy freight trade will go to the city of St. John. I have never been one of those who decried that port, nor am I going to. We have two splendid ports in the maritime provinces. Shall we close them, or fail to take advantage of them? Or shall we shape our national policy so as to develop these ports and bring to them the traffic of Canada? We have in Halifax a harbour capable of receiving the united fleets of the world, a harbour fifteen miles in depth. Is that not a heritage worthy of our pride? Is it not an advantage to the Dominion government to have it there? In St. John we have a harbour nearer to the producing parts of Canada by some miles, and capable of doing an immense business. All she wants is the facilities, and by this project we shall give her the facilities. We are going to give both these cities a chance to live. We shall not give them as the hon. leader of the opposition suggested, a 'fighting chance.' He said that if the road he proposed should be built, it should give them a 'fighting chance.' We are going to give them more than a fighting

chance; we are going to insist on their having an equal chance with the other parts of the Dominion.

Now, let us look to the province of Nova Scotia; how are we to be benefited? Halifax will be benefited by an increase in her population, an increase in her commerce, an increase in her business, an increase in every way. We have within a few miles from our province, St. John, which will certainly advance with rapid strides if this scheme is carried out. We will have these two cities doubling in population, in communication with the outside world, with lines of steamers running from both of them as this contract provides. Let me refer to the county which I represent. Annapolis is forty-five miles from St. John, one of our natural markets and like all of the counties of western Nova Scotia it is in sympathy with St. John. We want to see St. John built up and we will do anything we can to build it up, because it will give a larger market to the people of these counties than it has done in the past. Halifax, too, will give an increased market to the farmers in the county I represent. To-day we are about to build a railway from Middleton, connecting with the south shore system to a point on the Annapolis basin which will give closer connection between St. John and Digby, Yarmouth, Shelburne and Queens counties. These counties will all be benefited by the upbuilding of St. John as well as by the upbuilding of Halifax. Then we are building on the railway along the south shore to Halifax and we are about to build one along the same shore to the eastward. Think of the advantage this road will be in the connection it will give to the fishermen along the shores. To-day the products of the fisheries of Nova Scotia are worth about $8,000,000 a year and they are increasing rapidly from year to year. But where do we sell? We have no market at home and we cannot get into the west now because the rates are prohibitive. We have to send our fish to the West Indies and to South America, we have to seek markets abroad, and these markets are failing. We desire another market and this will be given to us by the Grand Trunk Pacific. As feeders for this line we will have, going west from Halifax, the Halifax and South Western, and the Dominion Atlantic Railways, and the Middleton and Victoria Beach Railway connecting with it, and we will have the other road which is projected eastward to Guysborough. Thus we will have the whole fishing district of the province of Nova Scotia brought at once in touch with this line that runs through into the west. To-day we are not selling any of our fish products to the west at all. Why? Because the freight rate is prohibitive. A member of the other chamber told me that he had paid freight on fish from St. John to the territories $3 a hundred pounds. $3 a hundred!. Almost the first cost of the fish. It is prohibitive. We now get only a small quantity of our dried fish into the western markets and that is the only fish we can sell in those markets. If this road is constructed, it will open an enormous market and we can send one-half our fish products into the west. This will give mutual trade and will provide the railway with freight to carry westward. Heretofore the trade has been all jug-handled, it has been coming from the west to the east, the people of Ontario and Quebec have been sending freight to Nova Scotia, but they have taken scarcely anything from us in return as the figures will show. When this road is completed we purpose changing that condition of affairs to a certain extent and propose sending our products into the west in fair exchange.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. WADE. Mr. Speaker, before the House rose for recess, I was speaking of the advantages to be derived by the province of Nova Scotia from the operation of this railway, and referring particularly to the fishing industry, which is such an important one in that province. I did not finish saying quite all that I intended saying in regard to the fishing trade. The products of our fisheries at the present time do not bring the returns that they will bring when this scheme is perfected and when the western trade that I have spoken of is developed, because fresh fish will be shipped west in refrigerator cars and the produce of the fishermen will bring very much higher prices. This trade has already started in a small way with the limited amount of refrigerator cars we have on the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, the trade has not been carried as far west by any means as we anticipate, but I know that at a single station in the county of Guysborough during the first year the refrigerator cars were put on, the amount collected on the freight traffic from fresh fish alone was $17,000. The trade is one capable of enormous development, and we have a right to expect that with this scheme we shall be put in the position to take advantage of it. I will say in regard to my own county—while I take a general and broad view of these things I have a right to look to the interests of the county that I represent—that we have a great fruit trade growing up in the Annapolis valley. It is increasing by leaps and bounds. During the present year, I believe there will be a shipment from there of 500,000 barrels of splendid apples, and in the course of five or ten years that will be increased to a million. A great drawback to the industry is the lack of adequate transportation from the province to the London market. That is owing to the fact that they have not the proper steamship accommodation. With this scheme perfected and with the com-

pany running lines of steamships from St. John and Halifax, as they are obliged to do under the terms of this contract, this difficulty will be removed. I could go on and enumerate numerous other things that will be of advantage to the province of Nova Scotia. They were detailed at great length and with carefulness by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), and I will not delay the House further on that subject.

Now, I wish to say a word about the line of this road from Quebec to Moncton and to show how everything has been perverted by the other side. It has been represented that we propose to build a line which is to run up over the mountains to Rivière du Loup. We do not contemplate anything of the sort. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has stated in the House and the newspaper controlled by him has led the people to believe that we are going to run an air-line from Edmundston to Moncton. We do not intend to do anything of the sort. Nobody has ever said anything of that kind, and the figures and distances which have been presented to the House show quite differently. The course of the road as proposed will carry it through the following counties in New Brunswick: Madawaska, Victoria, Carleton, York, Sunbury, Queen's and Westmoreland to Moncton, and then with the branch from Chipman to St. John, it will traverse the counties of King's and St. John. Thus, it will traverse nine out of the fifteen counties of New Brunswick. That is the course that is adopted. Hon. gentlemen opposite have cited Sir Sandford Fleming as giving an opinion in his report and in his conversation against that line. I say that Sir Sandford Fleming has never reported against it and that no line can be found in his report against it, and further than that, I say that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who has had a conversation with Sir Sandford Fleming, as he says, entirely misunderstood that gentleman. He does not know the locality, and he is not in a position to understand what Sir Sandford Fleming does say. I have had conversations with Sir Sandford Fleming. I do not feel at liberty to give these conversations here in the House without consulting him, but I can say this much, that Sir Sandford Fleming never expressed an opinion against that line and I will undertake to say that he never will express an opinon against it, and further I would say that if he is consulted about the line I have pointed out he will give it his entire and absolute approval. The distances presented by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) show conclusively the line we are going to take. The line will start at Chaudière Junction and go to Connors Station, from Connors to Edmundston, from Edmundston to St. Leonard, from St. Leonard to Plaster Rock, from Plaster Rock to Boiestown, from Boiestown to Chipman, and from Chipman to Berry's Mills, on the Intercolonial Railway, with the alternative of going from Chaudière Junction to Connors Station, from Connors Station to Edmundston, from Edmundston to the Nashwaak bridge, from the Nashwaak bridge to Chipman, and from Chipman to Moncton and St. John, both of the routes going down the valley of the St. John river, the only question being as to where the road should turn off to go to the eastward. The distance that would be saved by this route would be over 120 miles. I believe that a line of railway can be secured with these distances, and as I said before, if the distance was only 50 miles less, as a matter of railroading, as a matter of transportation, it is absolutely necessary that this road should be built down to Moncton with a dividing of the line at Moncton, from Moncton to Halifax, and from Chipman to St. John, in order to perfect the scheme. But, let us look now at other distances in connection with this line. When this road is completed, with steamers on the Atlantic Ocean and with steamers on the Pacific Ocean, we shall then have a distance from Liverpool to Yokohama of 10,135 miles. By the Canadian Pacific Railway the distance is 10,445 miles, and by New York, 10,830 miles, so that we are making a saving in the distance between Liverpool and Yokohama by way of Halifax of 700 miles over that of the route by way of New York. The distance upon the Atlantic must be taken into consideration in connection with this matter. From Liverpool to Halifax the distance is 2,450 miles, from Liverpool to St. John 2,700 miles, and from Liverpool to New York 3,050 miles. While I am upon the question of distances, let us look at the distances in connection with the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition. From Quebec to Winnipeg by this proposed line the distance is substantially 200 miles greater than from Quebec to Winnipeg by the Grand Trunk Pacific line. If we save 200 miles in the distance between Quebec and Winnipeg and save 120 miles between Quebec and Moncton, then we save 320 miles between Winnipeg and the ocean ports. Now, there was a statement made here that the Intercolonial Railway was going to be destroyed, that it was going to be put out of business. The hon. leader of the opposition went out of his way to try to twist and pervert the words of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), and he stated that the hon. member for Hants had stated in effect that we would either have to give away or sell the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman was not in the House when the hon. member for Hants made his able speech here. If he had been, no doubt he would have heard the hon. member for Hants for ten or fifteen minutes ably demonstrating that this scheme would not injure the Intercolonial Railway in the slightest, but on the contrary would be a benefit to it. That was the position that

the hon. member for Hants took. Now, let us look at this question of injuring the Intercolonial Railway, I mean to say here that this scheme is entirely separate and distinct from the Intercolonial Railway in the purpose for which it was designed and in the purpose which it will serve. It has nothing to do with the extension to the Georgian bay and the Intercolonial Railway one way or the other. Neither has it anything to do with deepening the waterways or the Georgian Bay canal scheme. It does not interfere with any of these projects in the slightest degree. It is an enterprise standing by itself. I want to draw hon. gentlemen's attention for a short time to some figures which I have here in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, obtained from the manager, Mr. Pottinger, in regard to traffic returns, which are as follows :—

	I.C.R. Earnings.
Traffic originating in Montreal and vicinity, and between that and Lévis.. .. ..$	563,177 37
Traffic originating in Lévis and vicinity..	128,959 92
From maritime provinces destined for Montreal and vicinity or points west of Lévis..	304,975 20
From maritime provinces destined Lévis and vicinity..	56,326 39
(A.) Traffic from Drummond and joint section, including Montreal, and from Lévis, Point Lévis and Quebec to maritime provinces.. ..	374,101 00
(B.) Traffic from maritime provinces to Drummond and joint section, including Montreal, and to Lévis, Point Lévis and Quebec..	361,301 59
(A.) Traffic from Ontario from west via Montreal, G.T.R..	671,740 87
From west via Ste. Rosalie, C.P.R.	29,307 08
From west via St. John, C.P.R...	79,938 07
(B.) Traffic to points in Ontario and west via Montreal, G.T.R..	154,694 66
To west via Ste. Rosalie, C.P.R..	71,407 18
To west via St. John, C.P.R... ..	11,115 69
Total.. .. ..$	2,807,045 02

Now, I make bold to say that the only portion of that traffic which will be affected by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will be that portion emanating and terminating in the vicinity of Lévis. That is all. All the freight that is gathered up at Montreal, or which is delivered to the Intercolonial at Montreal by the Grand Trunk Railway, will, when received by the Intercolonial Railway, be carried on the Intercolonial Railway to its point of distribution at the maritime provinces, and not one dollar's worth of that freight will be affected by the new road. All the freight that is gathered up on the Drummond County section of the Intercolonial Railway will be retained upon the Intercolonial Railway and carried to the point of distribution, which is also true of the freight coming back. Therefore, the only traffic of the Intercolonial Railway which we will have interfered with at all will be the portion of the traffic at Lévis, which emanates there and which terminates there, and which is comparatively very small. Now, as a compensation for that to the Intercolonial Railway, let us see what we have. I say that in my judgment the building of this road is going to materially increase the traffic upon the Intercolonial Railway. Nobody on this side of the House has any idea of putting the Intercolonial Railway out of business, or of destroying its efficiency in any way. We hope to see the Intercolonial Railway go forward and progress and become a paying institution, instead of being a drag upon the country. Let us see then what advantages the Intercolonial Railway will get by the scheme that is being propounded. In the first place, we will have a rental from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for the running rights over the Intercolonial Railway from Norton to Halifax and from Norton to St. John. That will be a very considerable item, and that is something that will not cost the country a cent ; it is like that much money found. Then we will have all the traffic emanating upon the new line which is carried to Lévis and is destined for Montreal and points in the west, because this road cannot touch that. This new road will have to deliver to the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis or Chaudière all the freight which it has gathered up from or down to the maritime provinces and which is destined to points upon the Intercolonial Railway and the Drummond County section of it, for Montreal and other points west of Montreal, and vice versa. Then all the traffic that emanates upon the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway for a long distance west of Quebec upon this through line—and it will be large—and which is destined to points on the Intercolonial Railway along the River St. Lawrence or around the north shore of New Brunswick, and up from Lévis towards Montreal ; all that traffic going and coming must be delivered to the Intercolonial Railway, and the Intercolonial Railway will get the advantage of it. The great theory in railway business at the present time is that the more railways you have the more traffic is created, provided, of course, that railways are not in actual competition with each other. In addition to this, if this scheme accomplishes what I expect it will —and we have a fast Atlantic service coming into Halifax, and we have the lines of steamships I have spoken of—by how much would that increase the business that will be carried on the Intercolonial Railway ? I think it is safe to predict that when this road has gone into operation that the business of the Intercolonial Railway from the start will be increased very, very largely, indeed, and that that increase will continue. The talk of the new road injuring the Intercolonial Railway, or putting the Intercolonial Railway out of business, is to my mind ridiculous.

There is one striking thing about this whole matter, and that is, that it is not the friends of the Intercolonial Railway who are talking about any trouble of this sort. That talk comes from the very gentlemen who have been raving against the Intercolonial Railway for years and years. These gentlemen never had any love for the Intercolonial Railway, and they have no love for it now, but they insincerely profess this love in order that they may base on it an argument against the government scheme.

I would like to say a word, Sir, concerning what will be accomplished for the province of Ontario by the construction of this road, so far as its extension to the maritime provinces is concerned. To-day these provinces by the sea are the best markets that the people of Quebec have for their manufactured goods and other commodities. Go to the freight sheds in the city of Halifax and see the immense quantities of material that come down from the province of Ontario—agricultural implements and machines of all descriptions; mowing machines, reaping machines, carriages, carts and everything in the shape of manufactured goods. In addition to that, the provice of Ontario ships down to us enormous quantities of hams, and bacon, and beef, and pork, and butter, and flour, and pease, and beans, and other such products. We are the great market, and we have always been the great market for Ontario. If, Sir, by this scheme the maritime provinces are made more prosperous and their population is increased, is not that market made much larger for Ontario, and will not Ontario be benefited to that extent? That is a simple proposition, and it is a matter of surprise that any man living in the province of Ontario and interested in that province should not be anxious, and deeply anxious, to have the maritime provinces prosper so that the market for Ontario may be extended.

I shall have now, Mr. Speaker, to refer, for a few moments, to some criticisms on this Bill, but before proceeding to that, I would be doing an injustice to my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) and to my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley), if I did not cite them as authorities in connection with this proposition to build to Moncton. When this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway charter was before the House on the 22nd of June, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) delivered himself. These two gentlemen were anxious then to have a provision put in the charter compelling the Grand Trunk Railway to commence the work at Moncton at the same time as they commenced at Quebec and the west. Nobody at that time ever thought of proposing Moncton, except these gentlemen from the maritime provinces, and here is what the member for King's (Mr. Fowler) said:

> I have no objection whatever to the extension down to Moncton. I am in perfect accord with that, but I want something more than a mere provision in the charter to show me that it is going to be built. That may suit the hon. gentleman for Annapolis but it does not suit me.

He wanted to make it perfectly sure and certain; he wanted to have a cast-iron provision put in; he wanted it put in the charter that the company must build to Moncton, and that they must build to Moncton at the very same time that they were building west of Quebec. That was his position then.

Now I must cite another celebrated authority on the other side of the House to show what his ideas were in regard to this matter. I refer to the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley). Hon. gentlemen will remember a discussion which came on in the House over this charter, when an attempt was made to change the terminus from Moncton to St. John. A similar discussion had previously taken place in the Railway Committee, and an amendment was moved to that effect. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals voted for that resolution to build a railroad to St. John, although he now so violently opposes building on to Moncton. The arguments were so strong against his position in defending St. John Harbour that I found it necessary to go to his rescue to a certain extent, and I stood beside him and upheld St. John as a good port, which could do good business for this Dominion. After I had finished and had spoken of our right to have the road to Moncton, the hon. member for Colchester rose and said:

> I have been delighted with the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade). They have the right ring. I think a maritime province man should be big enough to say: Let any port in the maritime province win in the game; bring your route to the maritime provinces and let God and nature determine the port. People are easily caught by catch phrases. Start a catch phrase up in this country and it takes away all the argument you can make in a year. One hon. gentleman deprecates paralleling the Intercolonial. Why, we want railways in this country paralleling every eight or ten miles. Parallel railways every eight or ten miles and you bring in population, you bring in industry, and you produce wealth.

That was the position of the hon. gentleman at that time. He went on to say further:

> I do not want to have to argue that the Intercolonial Railway is a disadvantage to Nova Scotia or an advantage to Ontario, but I want the people of Ontario to understand that we in Nova Scotia regard it more as a national necessity in favour of Ontario than in favour of Nova Scotia.

Let me cite another authority in this connection, an authority which we usually respect, and which I think hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House respect. On this memorable 26th day of May, when the hon. leader of the opposition presented and

endorsed the resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Halifax, the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) made use of this language :

As I said before, we have a choice of deciding between two companies for the building of this road. My opinion is that if the government should decide to give any assistance for that purpose, the company which is entitled to the preference is the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That company has done a great deal to open up this country, they have spent a great deal of money, and have received very little return for it. It may be the fault of the management of the company, but the fact remains that for the vast sums of money which that company has invested and which have had the effect of developing this country more than any other railway except the Canadian Pacific Railway, it has received very little return in the way of profits. I think the policy of the government should be to have this road built as far north as possible, to pass as near as possible to the height of land in order to tap a region of country which has not been opened up at present.

Now, may I be permitted to refer to some criticisms of this contract ?—and I will deal with them just as briefly as I possibly can. One great criticism made is that the capitalization of the company is too great; and the argument is advanced that the freight rates will be based on the capitalization. This fallacious theory has been put forward in this House on several occasions, and also in the Railway Committee. The only authority ever adduced in support of that argument is that is was advanced before the board of railway commissioners somewhere in the United States. But there cannot be found a solitary word or line to show that the decision of any board or tribunal fixing the tolls on a railway has ever been based on its capitalization. How ridiculous that would be. For my part, I would not care what the capitalization of the railway was. If anything enters into the determination of the tolls, of the railway, it is the actual cost, and not the capitalization ; and with the provisions in this contract, by which the government can ascertain to a cent exactly what the road cost, they have full control over the fixing of the rates. There is where government control comes in. So long as you have the company under the control of the government, not only by the general laws of the Dominion, but by a special contract their rates will be under the control of the government. One of the greatest hardships which have existed in the west in the past has been the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were given a free hand to charge any rates they saw fit until their profits amounted to ten per cent, not upon their capitalization or upon what the railroad had cost them, but upon its whole cost, both the portion built by the company and the portion built by the government and given to the company.

I find that the rate of freight by rail and water at the present time from Chicago to Montreal is 3½ cents per bushel, and that the rate from Winnipeg to Montreal by rail and water is 13½ cents per bushel. Now, I am beginning to believe that these gentlemen from the North-west who have been contending about these rates for so long knew what they were talking about. It is a very anomalous condition that grain can be carried from Chicago to Montreal for 3½ cents, while it costs 13½ cents to carry it from Winnipeg to Montreal. I do not pretend to be able to discuss these different freight rates, and I shall not attempt to do it. I think it would have been as well if some of the gentlemen on the other side of the House had been as modest about that matter as I am.

Mr. MURRAY. The Georgian Bay canal would help that.

Mr. WADE. The Georgian Bay canal, as I have explained, is a scheme that stands by itself. It is not affected by this project in the slightest degree. The mere fact that the proposed railway will be constructed does not injure the prospects of the Georgian Bay canal any more than it affects the question of deepening our waterways and ports. We are simply building an all-rail highway across the continent, to connect with two lines of steamships on the two oceans.

Another criticism brought forward was by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Samuel Hughes). He says the grain cannot be carried over this railway. Well, the company are willing to undertake to carry it. They are willing to undertake to build the railway and operate it, and to give security that they will do that. It is a matter for the company; they have to accomplish this. But there is a peculiar fact in connection with the speeches made by some hon. gentlemen from Ontario. Why, the valiant member for Victoria declared that it was impossible to carry grain by rail to the lower provinces; but he showed that it was the most feasible thing in the world to carry it to the Pacific coast, and then put in on vessels and take it around Cape Horn and so on to Liverpool or to divert it to the United States, and take it by way of the Mississippi to Liverpool. It seems that these gentlemen are possessed with the idea that if they can only get the grain out of that country in some way so that it will not go to the maritime provinces, their purpose is accomplished. I do not see why they feel that way about it.

The next criticiser of this contract to whom I wish to refer is the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), and we will see what his criticism amounts to. I wish to refer to the speech which he delivered on the 11th of August. He has referred to the section of the contract regarding running rights. He spoke as follows :

If it were possible to produce the most conclusive and striking evidence that some features of this contract were framed without consultation with and without the advice or the opinion of anybody who knows anything at all about railroading, these clauses in the contract and this clause in the preamble afford that evidence. A more absolutely unworkable, and, in the opinion of every railway man in the country, a more senseless suggestion it would be difficult to make. The idea of commencing a scheme involving all the millions of expenditure which it is proposed that this scheme shall involve, and then saying you will do it in order to establish a common railway highway, so that 'a' company, 'b' company, 'c' company and 'd' company may travel thousands of miles over this railway. I have endeavoured to urge the view, but without the slightest success, that that was not railway usage or practice or possibility; but it is here all the same.

In other words, he said that this idea of allowing running rights was impossible and impracticable, and he went on to state that the dominant railway would impose on the servient railway and there would be all sorts of trouble. Some hon. gentlemen on this side suggested that there was a railway right in Ontario, over which two railway companies had joint running rights. Of course we do not presume to know all about railways, but the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals evidently does not either, for he was not aware that there are two railways right here in Canada operating the same line jointly. I refer to the Wabash Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway. Some question was raised here as to how the railway is operated by these two companies, and I have taken the trouble to get a copy of the contract between them. I find that this is the agreement between the parties. They operate 229 miles in common. The trains of both companies run over that road. There is but one train despatcher, who is the joint officer of both companies. The station men and the permanent employees at the stations are joint officers of both companies. The trains of both companies are given the same privileges, and there is one despatcher for all the trains. Stallage is rented to the Wabash Company for its engines, and the Grand Trunk Railway sells coal to it at cost and charges if it wishes to buy, or it can buy its own coal. Here is a line 229 miles long, with two divisions, and it is operated by both these railway companies in harmony. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) undertook to say the other night that the Wabash was not interested in the local freights. He is entirely wrong. I have the contract under my hand, and under that contract, the local freight is carried on joint account, both companies getting the advantage. The working out of this arrangement is as simple as it can possibly be and has been going on for years without the slightest trouble. If you can operate 229 miles of railway in the way I have indicated, why not a thousand? What is the difference? The hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) drew a most ridiculous picture here of a train starting from Moncton or Halifax for Winnipeg. He supposed that the same train hands went all the way through to Winnipeg. Whoever heard tell of a railway being operated in that way? This railway will be operated by divisions, just the same as any other road.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman, I understand, has the contract between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Wabash for running rights over the southern division of the Grand Trunk Railway between the Detroit and the Niagara rivers?

Mr. WADE. I have.

Mr. COWAN. It was stated by the hon. member for Hamilton that the Wabash is not interested in the local freights, in which he was contradicted by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) at the time.

Mr. WADE. Here is the agreement:

The local freight traffic originating and terminating on the joint section, as described in subsection 'a' of this clause, shall be done by joint freight trains, the employees of which shall be joint employees, and all revenues shall be the joint revenues of both the parties thereto.

That is the arrangement. If hon. gentlemen would read the provisions of this contract, they would get rid of some of the notions put into their heads by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. I am ready to yield all deference to the ex-minister as regards his railway knowledge, but I cannot close my eyes to the fact that he has only been in the railway business some six or seven years; and I am speaking mildly when I say that the school in which he has been educated can scarcely be called a modern one. Any one who is going to operate a great railway system at present, must not be a man who acquired his knowledge some fifty or sixty years ago. He must be up to modern methods and ideas. If he is, he will have no more trouble operating a railway line under a joint running arrangement than is experienced by the Grand Trunk Railway and Wabash company.

I now come to the other great critic, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). I wish to deal, first, with some remarks he made regarding the 17th clause of this contract. This clause, which appears to have disturbed that hon. gentleman's peace of mind, reads as follows:—

No addition shall be made to the cost of construction or the capital of construction account in respect of customs duties in cases where there is direct importation of materials or supplies by the government.

From that section, the hon. gentleman argued that all the material which would enter into the construction of this eastern

division from Winnipeg to Moncton would come in free of duties, and he went on to say further that one result of this would be that there would not be a rail rolled in the Dominion for the next five years. I wonder how he worked that out. I would ask some hon. gentlemen opposite to tell me how it can be possible, when there is no duty on rails over 45 pounds in weight, that the importation of such rails without duty will prevent the rolling of rails in this country? Is there any one of them who can explain that?

Mr. BENNETT. That was not the argument of the hon. member for West Toronto. The First Minister said there was to be a great development in the iron and steel rail industry, and the hon. member for West Toronto pointed out—and it is a pity the hon. gentleman could not grasp it, because he made it very plain—that there was no benefit to the Canadian industry at all under that contract.

Mr. WADE. I did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. BENNETT. I said that it was not the argument of the hon. member for West Toronto that there was any customs duty on rails from the United States. But what he pointed out is this, that the right hon. the First Minister had declared, with a great flourish of trumpets, that the Canadian rail industry would be benefited owing to the fact that there was a clause in the contract—as the First Minister said, but who nobody believed—that they would have to purchase those rails in Canada. The hon. member for West Toronto pointed out that in this he was entirely incorrect, because it was entirely optional on the part of the railway company whether they purchased in the United States or not.

Mr. WADE. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for his explanation, that was not the argument of the hon. member for West Toronto at all. That had nothing to do with the contention he was making. What the hon. member for West Toronto said was that because of this clause, which permits rails to come in free of duty, there would be no rails rolled in Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. No.

Mr. WADE. I do not wonder the hon. gentleman does not believe that the hon. member for West Toronto could have said anything so ridiculous. But he did say it all the same.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman quote what the hon. member for West Toronto did say?

Mr. WADE. Well, I have not much time to hunt it up; but if you wish, I will try and find it. This is what he said, in concluding his argument:

Therefore, for fifty years all the supplies that come into Canada in connection with this road will come in free of duty.

And so on.

Mr. TAYLOR. Read on.

Mr. WADE: (reading.)

If we take twenty-five years only of this lease, and say that the capital account will be increased three and a half times during that time, we shall have a capital account at the end of twenty-five years of $280,000,000. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) drew a glowing picture of what this great railway building was going to do for the merchants, manufacturers and people of this country. Let me tell you what it will do for the merchants and manufacturers. I have jotted down a few of the ordinary supplies that are necessary for the building of a railway, and for its continuous betterment. Apparently the section to be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not to be exempt from the duties on the materials and supplies used in its construction, showing very clearly what the intention is, so far as the government road is concerned. I may say here that when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, as I recollect it, they were to bring in free of duty for the original construction of the road the steel rails and fastenings and certain supplies, but we made no steel rails in this country in those days, and that was a reasonable proposition. But under this contract, we bring in steel rails and everything to be used in the construction of the railway free; yet, the hon. member for Cumberland says that if this contract be carried out the rolling mills of this country will be so full of orders that they will treble their capacity. Let me tell him that if this contract is carried out, there will not be a steel rail rolled in Canada for fifty years.

Now I could go on and read a lot more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on, go on.

Mr. WADE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not get excited. I have something more to say to them on this point. I want to show them that when the hon. member for West Toronto spoke thus he did not know what he was talking about. In the first place, the Act which confirms this contract makes it necessary that this road should be built by a commission. The government is not building the road. It is to be built by a commission who cannot build it themselves, but will have to give contracts to parties to build the road, either as a whole or in sections. Now, is there any provision in clause 17 that when a party accepts a contract to build this road or any part of it he shall be exempt from the payment of duty? There is not a word. My hon. friends have shown in more than one instance that they have not read the contract intelligently or in a way that they understand it. Now, this clause 17 has reference to the preceding clause; you must read it with the context, with the preceding clause, section 16 of the contract is as follows:

In case, after the completion of the said eastern division and the taking possession

thereof by the company under the lease thereof, hereinafter referred to, or at any time thereafter during the continuance of the said lease, the government shall deem it necessary to expend any sums of money for the improvement of the said eastern division, the replacement of structures by others more modern, or otherwise upon capital account for betterments, and not being 'working expenditure' payable by the company, the government may expend such sums, and the amount thereof shall be added to the capital of the construction account at the end of the year in which such expenditure takes place, and shall thereafter be considered as part of the cost of construction, upon which interest, by way of rental, is to be paid by the company; provided that no such expenditure shall be entered upon without the consent and approval of the said company.

Now section 17 comes in:

No addition shall be made to the cost of construction or to the capital of construction account in respect of customs duties in cases where there is direct importation of material or supplies by the government.

That is, if the government import materials and supplies for the purpose of making betterments upon that road, and do the work themselves instead of by contractors, then they shall not charge any duties upon these materials and supplies. That is what these sections mean and I am astonished to hear any hon. gentleman attempt to argue anything else.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this exemption does not apply to the original construction?

Mr. WADE. No, it does not apply to the original construction. If the hon. gentleman reads the contract and the Act confirming it he will see that it does not; the original construction is to be by tender and contract. Suppose the government calls for tenders for the building of the section from Quebec to Winnipeg and asks contractors: For how much per mile will you build and complete that road, and I suppose a tender is put in to build the whole section for $30,000 a mile, would the hon. gentlemen opposite say that the contractor could come to the government and say: I am not going to pay duties on materials and supplies imported for use in the construction of this road? Surely they would not contend anything of that sort, and when this section 17 is read in connection with section 16, which speaks of the betterments to the road which have to be made from time to time, and provides that the cost of the betterments is to be added to the cost of construction for the purpose of charging a rental upon that amount surely they see that what I say is absolutely correct and that there can be no other interpretation of the section.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this section, which speaks of 'capital of the construction account,' and 'cost of construction,' does not apply to the original cost of construction?

Mr. WADE. Certainly I do, and if the hon. gentleman had listened to clause 16 he would have seen that my statement is correct. We have interpretation sections in this contract defining 'cost of construction,' and under section 16, which provides that the government may from time to time, if they see fit, with the consent of the company, go upon the road and expend money for betterments, then they are entitled to add their cost to the amount of the capital of the construction account and charge interest upon it, but in adding that amount it is provided by section 17 that they shall not make any charge on account of duties on articles brought in from abroad by the government.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I right in understanding that the hon. member contends that a contractor, when making an offer to build the road, would not take into account the reduction which he would be likely to receive by virtue of bringing in these articles free of duty?

Mr. WADE. Most assuredly; there could be no such reduction. How could you work it out? The commissioners are appointed and told that they must build the road, not build it themselves but build it by tender and contract. They ask for tenders for the construction of the whole or a part of that road and the contract calls for the construction of the road by the contractor whose tender is accepted.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman say that in the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, where the same principle is involved, contractors who build the road are not allowed to bring in material free of duty?

Mr. WADE. I would answer the hon. gentleman in this way: With regard to the Intercolonial, the law permits the government to import materials from abroad without paying duty.

Mr. SPROULE. So it does in this case.

Mr. WADE. Certainly, but, if a man takes a contract to do a certain work on the Intercolonial, the government does not allow him any rebate for duties.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it does.

Mr. WADE. We should speak about these things with knowledge. It is all very well for a gentleman in Toronto to look over a contract, which has passed the legal ordeals that this contract has, and to give his statement that a certain section of it means a certain thing. If the hon. gentleman would be a little more careful before making a statement of that kind, he would not put himself in such a position as he has done.

Mr. HEYD. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that section 17 does not

apply until the railway has passed into the hands of the lessees ?

Mr. WADE. That is exactly what I say. It does not apply until it has passed into the hands of the lessees, and until there has been a necessity for betterments which will be, I presume, a matter of at least fifteen years. And in this connection, be it remembered the government is not obliged to spend a dollar in betterments. And, under the terms of the contract the company has not only to maintain the road but to maintain it in accordance with the altered and advanced requirements of railway operation as time rolls on.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? I do not wish to interrupt him.

Mr. WADE. Certainly ; that is all right.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman, as a lawyer say that, in his opinion the courts, if appealed to, would not hold that under a proper construction of the contract, the estimate of the cost of construction should be reduced by the amount of the duty ?

Mr. WADE. As a lawyer—and I speak in the hearing of lawyers and my words will go on record to be read, if they desire, by the lawyers of the whole Dominion—I say that in arriving at the cost of construction of the eastern division under the provisions of this contract, the Grand Trunk Pacific will not be entitled to have any rebate given or deduction made on account of the articles which have been brought in and which have paid duty. I do not believe a lawyer can be found in the whole Dominion who would give an opinon to the contrary.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the articles do not pay duty ? Suppose the contractor takes the position that they are brought in for the government ?

Mr. WADE. There is no authority under the Customs Act, under which that can be done. The only party that can import free of duty is the government itself. Every man who has a contract under the government takes that contract under the liability to pay duty on imported articles used in this contract. It would be just as reasonable to say that a man who has a contract to build a lighthouse on the shore and who has to import material, might say : I am building this for the government and need not pay duty. I wish to assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) that I am in earnest in this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) is on record, and the future will determine whether he is right or not.

Mr. WADE. Yes, the future will show. Now, I want to refer for a moment to the matter of subsidies. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) said there should be no more subsidies granted to railways. I think that is a very unkind remark coming from him, with his province traversed in every way by railroads which have been subsidized and aided by the government and the road of which he was a director subsidized to a greater extent than any other road in Canada ever was or ever will be. Why, he comes away with his coat pockets stuffed full of subsidies, with his waist-coat pockets stuffed full of subsidies, with his trouser pockets stuffed full of subsidies, with his boot-legs stuffed full of subsidies, and when he has got all that he can carry away, he turns around and says : Stop it ; it is time to bring this thing to an end ; no more subsidies must be granted and no more railroads built.' That is not a position that the people of the other provinces will stand. We want railroads constructed whatever they are necessary for the development of the country, and we are not going to allow him to prevent us from giving proper assistance to these roads. Why what was his own project ? He is assisting in formulating a scheme by which the government would be compelled to pay over to his company $24,000,000 or $25,000,000, to take off their hands an unprofitable portion of his road and also to expend $3,000,000 in betterments of the line. This hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) said that we had no security under the contract that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company would operate the eastern division. And he told us that he had consulted one of the best lawyers in the province of Ontario. With a good deal of reluctance he gave us that gentleman's name as Mr. James K. Smith. I have looked up Mr. Smith. I must confess that I was so ignorant that I had never heard of him as a celebrated lawyer, or as a lawyer at all, until his name was brought up in this House. I find that he is a very estimable gentleman living in Toronto, who has considerable means and deals in real estate loans and so on. But I am told that he has never been in active practice and is not in active practice to-day, except in foreclosing mortgages and other things of that kind pertaining to his personal business.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) permit me to tell him that Mr. Smith is the editor of the Ontario Law Reports.

Mr. WADE. I would like to know how far that goes towards proving that he is an eminent lawyer.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Quite right. Law editors do not practise very much.

Mr. WADE. I do not think, that, if I wanted to employ a lawyer to give me an opinion on a railway contract, I would go to a Law Reports editor, but to an active practitioner who is dealing with the matters to be considered. But what does this gentle-

man tell us ? He tells us in effect, that the only way by which the government can enforce the operation of the eastern division by this company is by selling out the five million dollars worth of rolling stock. Well, I could not imagine that a lawyer would have made that statement until I heard his letter read, and until I had a copy placed in my hand. I have the letter, with the statement referred to over Mr. Smith's own signature. Now, I give my opinion against that of this gentleman, that if the Grand Trunk Pacific fails to operate that eastern division in strict accordance with the terms of the contract and lease, which is to be drawn, the government will be in a position to do one of three things : They can seize, under their mortgage, the five million dollars worth of rolling stock and sell it ; or, they can bring action against the company for the amount of loan and damages, and the measure of damages would be the cost of operation of the road by the government; or, they can, under the terms of an Act which has gone through this parliament this session, and which the learned gentleman was evidently unaware of, go to the Exchequer Court as an ordinary creditor and asked for a decree to have the whole system of the Grand Trunk Pacific put in the market and sold. This gentleman does not seem to keep posted on what is going on.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will it sell for the amount of the bonds ?

Mr. WADE. I will talk about selling for the amount of the bonds in a minute. This new law to which I refer says :

The Exchequer Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction, as regards any railway not wholly within one province, or as regards any section of a railway not wholly within one province, or as regards any railway otherwise subject to the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada,—

(a.) At the instance of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or of any creditor of any person or company owning or operating such railway or section, to order or decree in such manner as it may prescribe, the sale of such railway or section of railway, and of all the rolling stock, equipment and other accessories thereof, whenever such company has become insolvent, or has for more than ten days failed to efficiently continue the working or operating of such railway or section or any part thereof, or has become unable so to do.

First it goes on to provide for order of sale. Then, there is the provision to show when the company shall be considered insolvent. It is considered insolvent in all cases which constitute insolvency under sections 5 and 6 of the Winding Up Act. I have not the exact wording as it left the committee of this House and cannot state just how it was finally worded. But one thing is certain, that if it suffers judgment to go against it and execution to remain in the hands of the sheriff for a period of thirty or sixty days (I think) that is an act of insolvency, and, that act of insolvency having been performed, the government can, as a creditor, go to the Exchequer Court and ask for an order to sell the whole railway. If that is done what is the result ? In the first place the Grand Trunk Pacific has to lose the $20,000,000 which it has put in for rolling stock. The result is that the Grand Trunk Railway is going to lose 25 per cent which they guarantee towards the construction of the prairie and mountain sections. That is all gone. The government can step in and buy that road and they would have the road, plus the $20,000,000 of rolling stock, for the cost of the road less the rolling stock. Perhaps it may be said that the Grand Trunk Railway would bid the price of the road up so as to cover the cost of the bonds that they have guaranteed. Granting that they did that, and they had to pay the bonds, then the government would pay no more and no less than what the road actually cost and they would have $20,000,000 in rolling stock for nothing. I would ask the hon. gentleman what further security could we have than that ? Is not that ample security and does this justify him in making the statement he has made ? These are about all the criticisms of this contract that I have seen made and which I deem it necessary to reply to.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for detaining the House so long, but this subject is a vast one and one that cannot be considered in a moment. There has been a great deal of time taken up in the discussion of this measure, but I think it is time well spent. It is cerainly time well spent in the interest of the government, because every day that this matter is under discussion it is being demonstrated with more certainty that this is a marvellously good contract in the interest of the Dominion of Canada. While it is a good contract in the interest of the Dominion of Canada, I believe it will be a good contract in the interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. It would not be a good contract if they were going to run a small, picayune business, but if they are going to inaugurate the system they promise us, they will then have a contract which will be profitable and beneficial to them. One of the effects of this scheme is that the capital that is going into it is British capital, capital that is content with a moderate earning and that is a matter of very great importance. I heard one of the best railway men in Canada make the observation the other day, and mark you he is opposed to this scheme for personal reasons, that it was useless to talk in this day about operating a transcontinental railway unless you have ocean connections. What would the Canadian Pacific Railway do to-day if it had not its connections on the Pacific coast and if there is going to be no profit in the hauling of grain, if there is going to be no benefit derived by the Canadian Pacific Railway in

the running of their road out into the Northwest Territories, I would ask hon. gentlemen why did the Canadian Pacific Railway within the last two months acquire a line of steamships upon the Atlantic? They only acquired that line because they could not operate that road without it. They must have their line of steamships there just the same as they have their line of steamships on the Pacific Ocean. We cannot tell, we can only imagine the increase of the trade that is going to take place on the Pacific coast, and I believe that this Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is destined to have a brilliant future.

At all events, Mr. Speaker, I have faith in this Canada of ours. We are all working together with a common purpose, we are feeling in these days the pulsations of nationhood, we are no longer satisfied to occupy a lesser and meaner position. We have in this country determined to work together to develop our great resources which God has blessed us with, and I say it is the duty of every Canadian to put aside for the moment his party politics and to come forward and assist in carrying through this great work. Some hon. gentlemen have stated that this is the crowning act in the life of the right hon. leader of the government. I cannot agree with that. It is a crowning act, no doubt about that, it is a great accomplishment on his part, but to my mind the crowning act in his life, as I believe history will show, was when he broke down racial and religious barriers; when he united Canadians in the province of Quebec, in the province of Ontario, and in the provinces down by the sea and the west, in a common brotherhood; and when he taught them by his example to go forward and develop this country and give it the place in the galaxy of nations forming the British empire that God and nature intended it should occupy.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). Mr. Speaker, rather an unfortunate circumstance to myself in rising to reply to the speech that we have listened to for the last three hours or more is the very important fact that to reply to the lengthy speeches that we have had on both sides of the House during the last ten days would require some one with a great deal more physical strength and ability than I possess. The hon. member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Wade) has given us an exhibition of his desire to have good feeling prevailing from one end of this Dominion to the other. The first hour of his speech, and I leave it to the House to decide as to whether I am correct, was taken up in a deliberate attempt to create those very feelings which he says the right hon. the Prime Minister has attempted to allay. To work up the enthusiasm of the maritime provinces he tells us that whenever the maritime provinces made a demand for anything it was resisted by the provinces to the west, that the residents of the maritime provinces have never had anything but resistance, and that the rest of the Dominion has always opposed them. I contend that such is not the case. I contend that there is no feeling throughout the rest of Canada as against the maritime provinces. I have lived as long in this country as the hon. gentleman has. I have met as many residents of Canada as he has met, I have lived among the citizens of the province of Ontario, I have gone in and out amongst them, I have been doing active business amongst them during the last forty years, and I can assure this House and this country that the statement made by the hon. member for Annapolis is absolutely incorrect. He speaks of the crowning act of our Premier's life. Nobody will be more delighted, nobody will be more pleased than I if the right hon. Premier would crown the various good acts of his life by doing now what he promised to do a few weeks ago; that is, that he would place this whole matter in the hands of a transportation commission, which would take into consideration the wants of this country in the matter of transportation by water and by land. It was promised that they would take the whole matter into consideration, that they would receive expert evidence, that they would report the result of their investigations, that the report would be laid before the House and that we would then act upon it. I am told the right hon. the Prime Minister has made the appointments to this commission. I merely see it in the newspapers. We asked across the floor of the House yesterday as to whether these appointments had been made, but the acting leader of the House at the time stated that he would rather leave the matter to the right hon. Prime Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) refer to the transportation question?

Mr. BROCK. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry that I was not in the House this morning when the routine business was discharged; otherwise I would have informed the House that we have appointed a commission, to be composed of Mr. John Bertram of Toronto, Mr. Reford of Montreal, and Mr. Fry of Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. That is locking the stable after the horse is stolen.

Mr. BROCK. We are not, from this side of the House, going to offer one objection to the composition of the commisison. It is my pleasure to know two of the gentlemen very well. I have every confidence in them, and if the Prime Minister will now place this great matter of transportation in the hands of that commission, and let them receive evidence and report upon it, I think I can say that they will get every assistance from this side of the House, and

the Prime Minister will get every assistance from us in having the report of that commission carried out. I do not think that is an unfair proposition. These gentlemen were appointed by the government and if the matter is now referred to them they will take evidence and report upon it, and this side of the House will join with hon. gentlemen opposite in carrying out the report they make.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) who has held the attention of the House for the last three hours, endeavoured during the first hour of his speech to make it as unpleasant as he possibly could for us on this side of the House. After trying to create difficulties between the two provinces, he then attacked individuals; he attributed motives—motives that if true would be most unworthy. He made the statement that when the leader of the opposition announced this scheme of his through-connections for a transcontinental road, Mr. Osler, a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway had used his influence with the leader of the opposition to get him to relieve the Canadian Pacific Railway of an unprofitable part of their system. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) had no right to say anything of the kind. Mr. Osler is known and favourably known from one end of this Dominion to the other. No greater insult could be offered to the friends of Mr. Osler who know him well—and I believe gentlemen on the other side of the House know Mr. Osler well—than to say that he ever used his influence in any manner whatsoever for such a purpose. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) had a good case, why was it necessary for him to impute such motives to gentlemen who stand high, not only in this House, but throughout Canada. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) paid a little attention to myself. It appears that when a certain statement was made from the other side of the House, I referred to it as a humbug. Well, I am going to stand by that; I don't make statements unadvisedly.

Mr. CLARKE. It is parliamentary too.

Mr. BROCK. I suppose it is. When I used the expression the Finance Minister was reading a survey of the exploration of northern Ontario which he called a report. Now, we are discussing a great transcontinental railroad to be built from Moncton to the Pacific coast, a most important undertaking, and the Finance Minister after reading from the introduction of this report, went on to speak of this country as having been explored and having been examined, and he argued that such a road as that described by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) could be built through this country at a reasonable price; I think he said $25,000 or $30,000 a mile. I said that was humbug. Those who went into that part of northern Ontario did not do so to survey for a railroad from east to west, and they have made no report about such a project at all. In fact, if we had such a report I feel confident that the government would change the location of their railway and adopt the plan of the leader of the opposition. The hon. member for Annapolis denounced me in strong terms, but with these remarks I leave him in the hands of the House.

There has been some little talk about loyalty and some little talk about disloyalty. Well, people can be disloyal without being personally disloyal. They can be disloyal to the best interests of Canada without being personally disloyal. We have gone through strange changes in this country. I am old enough to have listened to some magnificent speeches from Liberal leaders favouring unrestricted reciprocity. But now, their cry is: We must have this road built right away, there is no time to be lost or the Americans will jump upon us and do away with the bonding privilege. But when the right hon. the Prime Minister advocated unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, what was he doing? He offered to pour the whole wealth of this country of ours over the border; he offered that the Americans should pour into this country their manufactured goods to the utter ruin of every manufacturer in Canada. That was the meaning of unrestricted reciprocity, and he advocated it with his eyes open. Don't let him talk any more about disloyalty. There never was a more disloyal scheme sprung on this country, but fortunately the people of Canada knew their own interests too well to endorse it.

The member for Annapolis said amongst other things, that this project of the government was absolutely necessary to maintain this country in its present condition; that we were two disjointed sections, separated by a hiatus of 1,000 miles. Well, Sir, the day has gone by when Lake Huron and Lake Superior can be called separating barriers. I say on the contrary that they join us together. We have the best kind of communication with that country every day over these great inland waters, and when members on the other side say that we are separated by these waters they are making a big mistake. You will excuse me, Sir, if I give my views in a somewhat disjointed way, because I have not had that legal training that would place me in a position to answer such an eminent legal light as the member for Annapolis. The hon. gentleman told us that the possibility was that the people of our Canadian west might join their fortunes with the people to the south of us. Well, I don't believe that there was ever any possibility of that. Better British subjects than those in the North-west do not exist anywhere in Canada; they are not only thoroughly loyal to Canada, but what is more, they are thoroughly loyal to their own interests. They know

that the whole Dominion is just as much bound up in their prosperity as they are themselves. They will have no cause to complain of our conduct towards them, and there is no object in gentlemen on the other side trying to raise issues of that kind to bolster up a bad case. I think I heard some call this proposition of the government an hysterical scheme, which was rushed into without proper consideration. But, Sir, when I heard the contract read, I could see that there was a guiding hand to it, and I could understand the wisdom of Mr. Hays refusing either to build the railway proposed by the government, or to pay any rent for it, for seven years at any rate. He did consent, and I do not think it required much pressure to make him consent, to build a road from Winnipeg west, and to accept from the government a guarantee of $13,000 per mile. I do not think he refused to do that. But somebody has said that the days for bonuses to railways have gone by. They have. The days for granting bonuses for railways through the wealthy and settled parts of these provinces have gone by. If you are going to grant any assistance, it should be to open up new country. Now, let us see what was the first project sprung upon this country—I think it was through the 'Globe' newspaper—by the Grand Trunk Company; the hon. Finance Minister rose upon his toes and said to the old Grand Trunk. Let us see what the old Grand Trunk were going to do for the country. They were going to connect their system via North Bay with the great west, opening up a country north of Lake Winnipeg, and thence to the Pacific. The hon. Minister of the Interior was hunting about for authorities to show who were advocating the Grand Trunk Pacific, and he read several interviews, one by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and another by myself. Mr. Clarke can take care of himself. The hon. Minister of the Interior quoted me as saying that I was delighted that the old Grand Trunk were going to continue their system through the west, north of Lake Winnipeg and on to the coast. He quoted my approval of that scheme as an approval of the present scheme of the government. True he had to take it back; but it showed his animus; it showed what he wanted to do. I may again have to quote the hon. Minister of the Interior, and I am very sorry he is not here.

Now, this matter has been before this House and before the country for a great many days. We have now two schemes before the House and the country. We have that of the hon. leader of the opposition, a scheme which somebody has said he developed in eighteen days. Well, I consider that he has done good work in that time. He has merely outlined a scheme, and that scheme will commend itself to a man of business, who honestly sits down and studies the situation, taking into consideration the conditions and the wants of Canada. One of the great needs of the day is to place ourselves in the position to bring the grain of the west as far east as we can, through Canadian waterways and over Canadian railways to Canadian ports. That is the project placed before the country by this side of the House; and, mark you, if the country spends its money upon that project, the country is going to own it. We are not going to wait for eight years before we get any return. We have not got to pay the expenses of these roads for seven or eight years; we have not to lie out of our interest for that time. From the very day the arrangement is made, and these railways are taken over, they will pay their way. There is no doubt about that. With regard to the much talked of line between North Bay and Fort William, over which one railway is running at present, it is said that that piece of road cost $60,000 a mile. The present government propose—may I say to parallel it?—to build a railway some fifty or one hundred miles north of it, which also they will find will cost them $60,000 a mile. Then there will be two railways there which will have cost $60,000 a mile each. The owners of the Canadian Northern system want to bring that railway down to the eastern part of Canada. If they do, they will have to build another railroad at a cost of $60,000 a mile; and the Grand Trunk Pacific, or the old Grand Trunk, wanting to get into that country, would also have to build a railway at the same cost. So you would have four railroads running through that country, all of them costing about the same amount of money. The proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition is to combine these four railways, giving them all an equal right to run over that road, and thus to diminish to each the expense of haulage. Do you mean to tell me that is impossible? Railroad corporations are business corporations. When the Canadian Pacific Railway Company undertook to build a railway from Toronto to Hamilton, how were they met? They were met by the Grand Trunk Company, who said: Cannot we make an arrangement and save you something and save ourselves something? And the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific Railway Companies, by a friendly arrangement, both used the tracks of the Grand Trunk from Toronto to Hamilton without any difficulty. And yet, it is said that the Canadian Pacific cannot make a satisfactory arrangement to allow these other railways to run over their line. I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway Company might not be able to do so. The plan of this country is not to let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have all the say, as the government are allowing the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to have all the say. The plan of this country is, either by expropriation or by fair terms agreed upon,

to make the proposed arrangement. It is just as much in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to have the expenses of that line divided up among the other railways as it is for the other railways to have running powers over it; and it is all in the interest of Canada that all these railways shall be controlled by the government of Canada.

There is a matter in connection with the country from Quebec to Winnipeg which I think is worthy of examining for a little while. We have heard some reports upon it quoted. I may say that some five years ago I had the honour of being appointed by the mayor and corporation of the city of Toronto as one of a commission to have an investigation made of the capabilities of that very country. Mr. Lyman Melvin Jones, the present senator, was another, along with Mr. Herbert Mason, Mr. Robert Davies and Mr. George Gooderham. We came to this House and got a charter in our own names on behalf of the city of Toronto. We sent an exploring party of surveyors up to investigate that country. Have you heard of a road being built since by the wealthy city of Toronto? Some of our friends speak of Toronto as 'Hogtown'; if it were going to be such an advantage to us to open up that country, if there was such a magnificent clay belt there, and if it was so rich in minerals and timber, why did not the city of Toronto have a railway built into it? I believe the time will come when it will be built for a certain distance; that is, a colonization road. That is the only way you can colonize that country—you have to aim at the fertile spots. It is no use to build a railway 1,800 miles long to wabble about through that country to find its fertile spots. You cannot even locate your stations in the morasses up there. I know the kind of treatment given to any one who wants to tell the simple truth about that country. One of the worst services you can render it is to deceive the people about it. Many people who went to northern Ontario to settle have returned. I do not say they have returned from the best parts of it. They may have been disappointed, and got bad land; but they came back telling sad stories about the winter they passed in northern Ontario. There is, I believe, very good land westward from Lake St. John; but this projected road does not go within 100 or 150 miles of that land. Remember that this is north of the height of land. This is not on the south side where there is any timber, but you have to go north of the height of land; and I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) speak of its being in the Artic region himself this morning. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), understands all about timber and timber limits. He knows how closely people investigate timber limits. Would the hon. gentleman put $100,000 into a timber limit in that country on information which the right hon. gentleman the First Minister deemed sufficient to warrant the building of this 1,800 mile railway? Would he, supposing there were any timber limits up there send up $100,000 to buy a timber limit, without any investigation? Would he change his mind in going from one room to the other with regard to timber limits as he did with regard to this scheme when he suddenly became converted from an opponent into a strong supporter of it?

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall be happy to answer the hon. gentleman. He asks if I would be willing to put $100,000 into a timber limit in the country though which this road is to pass without examination. I answer no. But I am satisfied, with the information I have, that this road will open up a great many timber limits worth more than $100,000; and as soon as that road is projected and well advanced in construction I shall go in there and buy timber lands.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman is perfectly willing that the country should spend $50,000,000, $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 on information on which he would not buy a timber limit. There is no doubt about that. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) also endorsed this scheme. He has travelled through that country, he has been in a great many parts of it, but not as a railway builder, not with the view of investigating whether we could get there these magnificent grades, without which the hon. member for North Norfolk told us the road would not be any good. Twenty-one feet to the mile or four-tenths of one per cent, I think, was his idea of the grade. Unless they could get that grade, unless it was a first-class road, unless it could carry 2,000 tons to the train, it would be no good. On my responsibility as a member of parliament, and as one who has obtained everything he has in this world in this Dominion and in this province, I say that a worse scheme has never been devised. It has been called a mad scheme. I have no right to impute improper motives, and have no intention of doing so, but I will say this, that if it be a good scheme, I am strongly in favour of government ownership. The government money is going in to build that road from Moncton to Winnipeg. The government are building that road through a country concerning which we have very little information. When the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) says that a grade can be got in that country such as the hon. member for North Norfolk makes compulsory, he says that a grade can be found which no engineer has ever yet discovered there. The engineers may find such a grade; but if they do, as my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has said, they will, in order to go a distance of three miles, have to cover twenty-two miles. But I have not got through with that North-west country yet.

I have here the report of a gentleman given as to the quality of that country. He says it is 400 miles in extent. That is a pretty good length to build a railway through. Then he proceeds to say :

> Then we have sections 10, 11 and 12 at the other end of the line, which do not constitute a country which we can call an agricultural country. The last 300 miles, or probably 400 miles, of the line is in a country which it cannot be successfully asserted is likely to be a country which will amount to very much as an agricultural country. There are occasional patches of good land along the water courses, but they are not large in extent.

This is not the language of an opponent of the government. It is not the opinion of a man who is looked upon as unfriendly to the government. It is a statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton). I do not think that the right hon. the Prime Minister can possibly have looked into this matter as he should have done before launching it on the public.

The government started out this year early with another proposition which the Prime Minister did not propose off his own bat, but after deliberation. They started out with a scheme to solve the great transportation problem by land and water. They were going to appoint a commission of experts who would take evidence. There was no talk then of building this road at once. There was no talk about the abrogation of the bonding privilege ; they were going to take time to deliberate and report. In what position is that commission ? In what position is the government at present ? They surely have not appointed men in whom they have no confidence. Should we not take it for granted that the men they have appointed are men in whom they have every confidence ? I know two of them, and will bank upon them myself. I believe that they will do what is right and honest. I would like to have those three men investigate this scheme from Moncton to Winnipeg and submit a report to this House, and I know that they will not bring in a favourable report unless the scheme is a good one. We should have their investigation and report before committing ourselves to this project. Let the government hasten slowly, and have confidence in its own commission. The opposition do not ask to be represented on that commission. The right hon. gentleman must show his confidence in his own commissioners, or how can he expect the country to have any confidence in them or him ? Let this project go before that commission, let the commissioners take evidence and report, and let the right hon. gentleman, if necessary, call an extra session to receive and consider that report. Let the government place plenty of money at their disposal for surveys, and let these commissioners find out whether we can build such a road through this country as the hon. member for North Norfolk says we must, or if not wipe the thing out altogether.

Mr. CHARLTON. Suppose we find out in the meantime, within the next month perhaps, that we can get just such a line as we want, with four-tenths of one per cent grade ?

Mr. BROCK. This scheme, we are told, is very intelligible ; and to show how intelligible it is, the government have placed a map on the Table. This map was brought down here to show that the scheme is feasible and practicable, but I defy anybody to make anything out of that map. All the lines run north and south. There are none running east and west to show that the country has been examined from a railway point of view. The great difficulty about the whole thing, I am afraid, is that our respected Premier has not given it the attention he should have. Internal trouble in the cabinet and quarrels in the Council Chamber have probably urged him forward. I do not mean to say he did it to get rid of any of his ministers, but that he was urged into hasty and ill-considered action by the troubles he found rising about him. And I believe he will live to seriously regret what he has done. We have had a good deal of detraction by some hon. gentlemen opposite of very important members of this House who sit on their own side, including efforts to impute motives to these gentlemen. Members of this House who, for years have applauded the ex-Minister of Railways, now get up and find fault with the members on this side because, after being silent all these years we did applaud that hon. gentleman. We did applaud him, and this country is applauding him for the position he took. But it comes with very bad grace from those whom, in many cases he has almost made, to speak of him as they have done. I cannot forbear to refer to one gentleman particularly. He came into this House with a great flourish and was spoken of as an acquisition to our membership. His scholarly attainments were praised in advance and we were led to hope great things of him. I refer to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell). This hon. gentleman sought to belittle the ex-Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman ought to know that he does his own side no good by attempting to belittle one who has acted with them all these years. Suppose that a merchant had a man in his employment, who, after twenty years of service decided to make a change, would that merchant raise himself in the estimation of others by seeking to belittle the man who had been with him so long ? After having approved him for twenty years, would he win approval by speaking of him as unfit to tie his shoes ? Nothing of this kind was required from the hon. member for Hants. We will not impute motives, but we will watch and see what the result will be.

I wish to draw attention to one matter in connection with this new commission. It is fair to do that, so that it may be known where we are. One member of this commission is strongly committed to the scheme of the Prime Minister now before the House. I do not know whether he would have been appointed if he had opposed it. If the commission will investigate and promise to report on the schemes on their merits notwithstanding all that has been said, we on this side are perfectly prepared to place ourselves and the interests of the country in the hands of this commission. I think that under the circumstances it will be an evident sign of weakness, or obstinacy, which is very often weakness, if this offer is refused. But if it is not accepted I think the duty of the Prime Minister, as soon as he can get through with the business of this House is to give us an appeal to the country. We are prepared for it. We are prepared to go before the country and let the people choose between the schemes placed before them. I know what the result will be. Efforts are made to show that public opinion has expressed approval of the government's scheme. The Minister of the Interior showed that certain resolutions had been passed by boards of trade, or rather by councils of boards of trade. I have been a member of the council of a board of trade for twenty or thirty years, and I know that most extraordinary things have got through that council. All you have to do is to have a friend or two advised to attend the meeting, and it is wonderful what you can get through. Of course, you must take good care to bring the matter up in the absence of those who are opposed to it. Somebody once said that he could get petitions signed to have the signers' grandmothers hanged. And so you can arrange to have almost anything approved by councils of boards of trade. Those who passed this resolution probably did not have these two schemes before them. And, like some other people, in the innocence of their hearts, no doubt, they placed some dependence on the statement of the Prime Minister that he had mountains of information about the country through which this road is to run. They supposed, not that he had read a few old reports, but that he had something reasonable in the way of definite information to show we could build a road through that country. It is of no use to tell us that carrots and cabbages grow at a certain point in that northern country or that oats will ripen in some portions of it. The proposition is to build a railway, and to build a railway such as was described by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who spoke with authority as to the character of the road required. You need to tell us something more than that cabbages can be grown in that country before you can convince the people of Canada that they ought to build that road.

I must draw these disjointed remarks to a close. I wish they could have been stronger; I wish they could have been strong enough to impress the minds of hon. gentlemen on the other side. I have only to do the best I can, but I think I may fairly say that in making any statements, I have not made them for political effect, or to benefit any political party or any province or section. There has been a little too much of that kind of thing in this debate from the very first. I was in the committee room when this road from Quebec to Moncton was forced on Mr. Hays and upon theh committee. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) made a most eloquent appeal and let the government know pretty plainly that this road must be made a part of the scheme. So it was that we got to Moncton. In the first place, Mr. Hays did not want even to build the line from North Bay to Quebec. The fact that Mr. Hays accepted these propositions one after another naturally arouses suspicion that he was looking to work something in by which he would be made pretty safe. And I think that when the contract comes to be carefully analyzed in this House it will be shown where Mr. Hays will be able to slip out and let the government in. Of course, I won't set up my opinion against those of the clever lawyers who have spoken. But opinions have been asked, and I believe, given, and by pretty clever lawyers too, pointing out just how this can be done. I do not wish you to think, Mr. Speaker, that I am by any means attempting to explain the scheme of the leader of the opposition. That hon. gentleman and other members who are better aware than I am how matters can be arranged in connection with the legal difficulties that may arise, will lay the matter fully before you and before this House. But it seems to me a feasible scheme. As I said, the roads are now in operation, and directly the government takes them over they become a paying proposition. We are not to keep running these roads for seven years and lie out of our money during that time before we get any return. Therefore, deliberately and with the best knowledge I have, I give my preference to the scheme which has been presented by this side of the House rather than to this most extraordinary proposal which is being pressed upon this House by the government.

Mr. A. MALOUIN (Quebec Centre). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate, I do not propose to speak at any length. I only wish to offer a few suggestions and to give my reasons for supporting the railway policy submitted by the government. This scheme for the building of a transcontinental railway, which is now before the House, has, I think, been considered with care and is worthy of our approval. In the first place, it has, from its inception, met with general commenda-

tion throughout the country. We all remember that in October and November last, when the Grand Trunk Pacific made public its intention of forming itself into a company for the building of a railway to the coast, the whole press of the country, in giving the news, stated that the undertaking was one of absolute necessity and which would be of the greatest service to Canada. However, two companies were in existence at the time requesting help from the government for the carrying out of such an undertaking. When the scheme for the building of a transcontinental railway was brought forward, all admitted that the plan was a good one and should be carried out. It was recognized by all that before long we should have another railway across the continent.

Subsequently, came the opening of this session ; and the promoters of the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company came before parliament and asked for a charter authorizing them to carry out the undertaking. So, the matter was brought up before the House, and later on before the Railway Committee.

When the scheme was first made known to the public, the starting point was to be North Bay, that is it was to run from North Bay westward to the coast. Then, it was decided to alter the location for the purpose of meeting the wishes of the people of the maritime provinces and of Quebec. In submitting the matter to the Railway Committee, the promoter of the Bill (Mr. McCarthy) thought proper to move an amendment providing that the proposed road should be extended in direct line to Quebec, and from Quebec to the maritime provinces. That amendment was carried. In accordance with that amendment, the road was to be built wholly on Canadian soil, thereby benefiting all the provinces of Canada. At the time, the scheme was received with pleasure, not only by the Liberal members, but by the Conservatives as well. We are all aware of the discussion which took place on that Bill before the committee, and which lasted for three long weeks. I remember that those who exerted themselves the most to secure the passing of the Bill, which was finally agreed to, and is now known as a Transcontinental Railway Bill, were members of the opposition, and among others, the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), who was very tenacious on behalf of the scheme. Before the committee, the hon. member for Montmorency, thinking that the motion made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) had solely for its object to deceive those who were in favour of the extension of the road eastward, urged that the various sections of the railway should be constructed simultaneously.

The hon. member for Annapolis, as we all remember, introduced a motion which has since been designated as the Wade motion. That hon. member, in common with the other representatives of the maritime provinces, believed, at the time, that the intention was to frustrate their expectations, and accordingly this famous motion was drafted. As I have just stated, the hon. member for North Simcoe had moved an amendment providing that the said transcontinental railway should start from Winnipeg and run by way of Quebec and Moncton. With a view to ensuring the construction of that part of the road, Mr. Wade moved :

> Provided, however, that the work of construction on the Quebec section and east of Quebec be commenced at or near Quebec, and carried on simultaneously east and west, and that the said sections be operated at the same time, and no such section shall be operated without the other.

So that the desire of the hon. member for Annapolis was that the Quebec section and the Moncton section should be built simultaneously.

In the course of the debate, the hon. Minister of Finance suggested that it was not customary to lay down such terms in granting charters to private companies. He added : Should the government decide to grant some help or other towards building the road, they would be careful to lay down conditions which would ensure its construction. The hon. member for Annapolis complied with the request of the Minister of Finance and agreed to withdraw his motion ; but the hon. member for Montmorency, who was posing as the champion of the interests of Quebec, took exception to the withdrawal of the motion and a vote was taken. The member for Montmorency, and the member for Laval and Nicolet voted in support of the Wade motion. By that vote they have given their assent to the principle that the railway should be built, not only to Quebec, but as far as Moncton. As for us, representatives of the province of Quebec, we voted against the motion on the ground that we did not wish to lay a heavy burden upon the company before it had received any help from the government. We said : When the government will have made up their minds to help the company, it will be time then to exact terms ; but until then the company should not be interfered with. The hon. members for Montmorency, Laval and Nicolet said : On the contrary, the company should be bound at once. These gentlemen laid down the principle that the line should be built immediately and an exceedingly heavy burden put on the shoulders of the company, a burden to which it is not customary to subject them. But the Conservative papers of the province of Quebec did all in their power to make it clear that the undertaking in question was of vital importance for the whole province ; and at the same time, they taunted the members

from the district of Quebec for not having voted in support of the Wade motion.

In the course of this debate, the views expressed by newspapers in Ontario and various other provinces have been quoted to show what public sentiment was in the various localities. Let me quote, now, from the Quebec 'Evénement' to show what was the sentiment of the press there at the time. But, before I give these extracts, let me state that the 'Evénement' is the chief organ of the Conservative party in Quebec. It holds the same position in the district of Quebec as the 'Mail' and 'Empire' in Ontario. It is the property of Senator Landry and of Mr. L. P. Pelletier, who was recently selected as organizer of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec. Let us see what views that paper expressed in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill; for it should not be forgotten that the scheme submitted to the Railway Committee is identical to that brought before this House by the government and which is now under discussion. Neither should it be forgotten that it was distinctly understood with all the members that the government was to grant help to the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. Now, Sir, what happened? The Wade motion was negatived by the committee. Immediately the 'Evénement,' on June 6, published the following article intituled: 'Where are our representatives?'

> We urgently draw the attention of our readers to the report of yesterday's meeting of the Railway Committee.
>
> Where are our representatives?
>
> Once more, where are they?
>
> Mr. Casgrain fought valiantly, but who supported him? No other name is mentioned from Quebec.
>
> It is obvious that the Grand Trunk Pacific intends to deceive us.
>
> Why should they reject amendments intended to protect Canadian ports, if they really wish to build a national line?
>
> Sir Wilfred Laurier said the other day that great corporations easily evade legislative enactments.
>
> That is a further reason for making these stronger, and requiring additional security.
>
> Quebec will be left aside once more, if the company is not bound to carry on the work simultaneously eastward and westward from the city.
>
> That is the object of the Wade amendment, and we are thankful to Mr. Casgrain for eneré getically upholding our claims. The member for Montmorency stated that should the committee reject that amendment, he would submit it once more to the House.
>
> We notice with pleasure the courageous stand taken by the representatives of the maritime provinces, who, heedless of party allegiance, insist on their rights being recognized. Their interest is the same as ours. What force would they not have altogether if the members from the Quebec district joined them. We have twenty representatives, and Mr. Casgrain is the only one to fight our battle.

Those are the words of the 'Evénement,' the chief organ of the Conservative party in the district of Quebec. As regards ourselves, we deemed it inopportune to subject the company to unusually burdensome conditions before the government had decided what measure of help they would extend. But, Sir, is it not obvious that hon. members who, like the member for Montmorency, supported the Wade motion, concurred at the same time, and without reservation, in the principle which lies at the very foundation of the scheme submitted to this House? In the same issue of that paper, its Ottawa correspondent, who was no other than the member for Montmorency himself, or Senator Landry, wrote as follows:

> Since the last meeting of the committee, the representatives of the Grand Trunk have met a certain number of members from the maritime provinces, and agreed to the line being built from Quebec to Moncton, and from that point connect with St. John and Halifax, by way of the Intercolonial.
>
> But that has not given satisfaction to the other members from the east, and Mr. Wade has moved an amendment, with a view to bind the company to build its line from Quebec to Moncton and from Quebec to Manitoba simultaneously.
>
> Mr. Casgrain has gone over the history of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and shown that the company intends to extend its line outside of Canada, and have its winter port at Portland. It was only after a great deal of agitation in Quebec that the location was changed from North Bay to Lake Nepigon and thence to Quebec. That last link passed through an impracticable country, and he did not believe the company were in earnest, even if they should start building the section east from Quebec. He has in hand information which goes to show that the people in the east will be deceived. The Dominion government should not vote one dollar before the company gives indisputable pledges of its good faith. Mr. Casgrain adds that should the committee reject Mr. Wade's amendment, he will introduce a motion on similar lines in the House, so as to have a vote on the question.

That is what the member for Montmorency or Senator Landry wrote in the 'Evenement,' as that paper's correspondent.

To carry out his promise, the hon. member for Montmorency gave notice, that same day, that, on the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill being called for its third reading, he would move as follows:—

> Provided that in the event of the company receiving from the Government of Canada any assistance, either by way of subsidies, moneys, land grants, guarantees, loans, or in any other manner whatever, the work of construction on the Quebec section be commenced simultaneously with the work on the woodland and prairie sections, and be completed and put in operation simultaneously therewith and before the Company exercise any of the powers conferred upon it by section 33 of the present Act in respect to 'lease and running powers over other railways.'

So, the hon. member for Montmorency was exceedingly anxious that this part of the road should be built. He threatened to move that the company should build the Quebec

section at the same time as the woodland or prairie section.

The campaign carried on by the 'Evenement' may, I think, be of use later, when elections are on (I know not when). In the meantime, let us look into the statements made by that paper, in the name of its party.

On June 4, the 'Evenement' stated :

THEY ARE AGAINST US.

Yesterday, we put the question : 'Where are our representatives ?' The answer came to us yesterday afternoon :

THEY ARE AGAINST US.

Mr. Casgrain did not flinch to the last. He kept his word. He insisted on the Wade amendment being put, whereby the Grand Trunk would be forced to build from Quebec eastward at the same time as elsewhere ; and three members only from Quebec district voted with him.

Here is the vote as regards the province of Quebec :

FOR THE RIGHTS OF QUEBEC

Casgrain, Pope, Morin, Talbot, Bickerdike, Fortier, McIntosh and Léonard.

Sir, all the members were at one with the 'Evenement' on thinking that the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was the only good one for Quebec and that, should it fail, the welfare of the province would be imperilled. After giving the names of those who voted against the Wade motion, among whom I was, the 'Evenement' goes on to say :—

Let us not forget these names.

We say : The rights of Quebec, and we are justified in so saying.

Who went to the pains of showing that the location running through Quebec is not the best in the general interest of Canada ? Not one. If what is required is a national route favouring Canadian ports, in winter and summer both, it will be felt by all that the Quebec route is the right one. Verbally, the Grand Trunk agrees to this location. But Mr. Laurier has warned us that great corporations easily avoid fulfilling their pledges. It was in order to prevent such an occurrence that an effort was being made to bind the Grand Trunk as tightly as possible. And our representatives have not even had the courage to safeguard our interests.

At that time we were lacking in courage because we would not vote in favour of the Wade motion ; but if these gentlemen have any courage themselves, they will support this scheme of the government, since it is practically the same as that submitted to the Railway Committee.

The 'Evenement' has a further reference to the matter on June 9. But the hon. member for Montmorency, judging that that paper was not going far enough in support of his position, wrote to the 'Journal,' of Montreal. In that article he gave himself as favourable to the scheme and severely criticised the members of the province of Quebec who had not supported the Wade motion. Some time has elapsed since, and the hon. member for Montmorency, for some months, has disappeared from the political arena.

Before proceeding further, I must say that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), always takes such an active part in the debates of this House, was on the alert when the discussion I have referred to took place before the committee. He followed the debate on the Bill and voted against the Wade motion, on the ground that it was not comprehensive enough, referring only to the Quebec and Moncton sections. After the vote had been taken, the hon. member moved the following amendment :—

The company shall build simultaneously all the sections east of Winnipeg, until they are wholly constructed.

That is to say, the hon. member for East Grey also approved of the scheme under discussion by moving that all the sections east of Winnipeg be built simultaneously. How is it that to-day he has such a poor opinion of the scheme propounded by the government, whereby they propose to build that very road referred to in the Bill in accordance with the McCarthy motion. The only difference of opinion which existed between us at the time, was that we did not think it fair to force the Grand Trunk to build simultaneously the various sections from Winnipeg to Moncton, but we did not object to these works being carried out.

Pressed from all quarters by resolutions voted by the boards of trade of all the cities in Canada, the government decided to undertake themselves the construction of that road. There were three plans to select from. First, the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme; then, that of the Trans-Canada, and also that of the Canadian Northern. After duly considering these various plans, the government, and rightly so, I believe, decided that the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was the most advantageous of the three, and that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company was the one which gave the country the best assurances as to the construction and running of the road.

But there are one or two points which came up in the course of the debate before the Railway Committee. an almost endless debate, I may say. Should the Grand Trunk Pacific build the line from Winnipeg to Moncton ? That was the question which had to be solved. The government deemed it in the public interest that this part of the road should be built at the expense of the country, so as to enable us to make of it a trunk line, 'a common highway' for all railways. I believe that move was a wise one, and rejoiced with all those who wished this undertaking success. All the friends of the scheme are happy to see that the government has taken charge of this work.

Now, how was the government's proposal received ? It was thought at first that all would be satisfied, that the Conservative party would greet this measure as a public

benefaction, and would consider it as the best thing that could be done. It was a mistake ; for in the minds of the Conservatives there is one thing that supersedes public interest, and that is partizanship, the interest of their party. Partizanship must have come out foremost and induced these gentlemen to reject the wisest scheme which has ever been submitted to parliament. These gentlemen are combatting to-day an undertaking which they themselves pronounced to be essentially of a national character, but above all and primarily in the best interest of the province of Quebec. The 'Evénement,' which I quoted a moment ago, antagonizes this scheme and approves of that submitted by the leader of the opposition. Such are the ways of these gentlemen. Nevertheless, I am convinced that in their inner conscience, they cannot approve of the plan of the leader of the opposition.

Now, Sir, the Trans-Canada has also been mentioned ; it has been stated that such a road as that would have fulfilled the expectations of the province of Quebec. I am free to admit that this road would have been of great benefit to our district ; but I think the proposed road will be of still greater benefit, for instead of stopping at Roberval, it will come right down to Quebec. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the recognized leader of the opposition in the province of Quebec, has opposed this scheme of the government on the ground that it will not be a colonization road, and that for the time being a colonization road is of greater import. Well, the reasons given by that gentleman are not very weighty. It is obvious that if we have such a transcontinental road, the northern parts of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario will thereby be opened up for settlement ; it will be an easy matter to build branch lines starting from the main road. That is exactly the answer given by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), in his speech the other day. He said : 'We are not opposed to the buildng of railways for colonization purposes. In Manitoba, for instance, as he pointed out, these roads are numerous, being ten or twelve miles apart. When you come before us, he said, with commendable proposals, the government will certainly grant help wherever necessary. I think that answer of the hon. minister is entirely to the point, and it is likely the hon. member for Jacques Cartier will have reason to regret having taken that position when he comes before the people.

A great deal has been said about the character of that road. Will it be a colonization road, or will it be used for the transportation of grain ? I think it will serve both purposes. As a colonization road it will render great success not only to Quebec, but to all the provinces through which it will pass. The North-west Territories will also profit by it, as they need railways for the carrying of their grain. The province of Quebec will be benefited, since a large tract of fertile soil will be opened up to settlement. It will thereby contribute to the greatness and prosperity of the country.

As regards the transportation of grain, it is apparently a difficult matter to settle. Some who pretend to know contend that this road will not be convenient for the haulage of grain. All that I can say is based on the reports of experts ; but I am inclined to think that on the whole there is some exaggeration in the contention of those who assert that not a bushel of grain will be carried by that roal. We are being told all the time that traffic in the west is congested ; that the means of transportation for grain are insufficient. If that is the case, new outlets should be provided, and that new road will provide an outlet for a certain quantity.

The hon. Minister of the Interior, in the course of his practical and able address delivered a few days ago, showed that railways, at the present time, carried at least one-thirteenth of the wheat crop. But we may expect further improvements from the application of science to railways. To compete with the water route, railways should be as perfect as possible, that is to say, the grades should be very low, rails very heavy, so that trains may haul loads twice or three times as heavy. Under those conditions, we may be sure that the proposed road will secure a certain part of the grain trade, and that before long it will be one of the most prosperous in the country. I think that in this respect, without being too sanguine, we may safely follow the advice of wise men, of those who believe this railway will benefit the various provinces of Canada.

The hon. gentlemen opposite have not only criticised the scheme (it was their right to do so), but one hon. member called it a hybrid scheme. Criticisms have been numerous. After listening to the numerous views expressed by his followers on the subject, the hon. leader of the opposition deemed it expedient to make a proposal, in order to relieve the situation. He thought, no doubt, that he would thereby bring all his followers into line, and offer a compact front to the enemy. Hence, the scheme which everybody knows. I shall not undertake to criticise it ; hon. members of greater ability than myself have already shown that this plan is the most laughable, preposterous one that could be devised ; that it is utterly impracticable. But the hon. leader of the opposition must have satisfied himself that it is an easier matter to find fault than to do right. With these two plans before us, we may well say that if the government plan is not perfect, that of the leader of the opposition is still less perfect.

I notice that the Conservative members from the province of Quebec (the hon. member for Dorchester, Mr. Morin, excepted),

are not in the House. They who, some months ago, posed as saviours of the nation, who pretended to be the protectors of the country, and especially of the province of Quebec have disappeared. The hon. member for Montmorency, who made such an uproar, represents a constituency in the vicinity of Quebec. At the time he assumed he was representing not only the interests of Montmorency, but those of the city of Quebec. And in the 'Journal' which I mentioned a moment ago, he devotes a special article to me, under the heading : 'Mr. Malouin's letter,' in which he states that if I had voted for the Wade motion, thousands of men would be seen at work in Quebec, and east and west of that city.

One fact must have struck the House : when the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was launched, it was to go to North Bay and from there to Winnipeg. At that time, several members from Ontario approved of it. Interviews given by them appeared in the papers at the time. Since the government has undertaken to build the sections from Winnipeg to Moncton, these gentlemen have changed their minds, and condemn the scheme. Would it be, perchance, because that road passes through the province of Quebec ? Do the Ontario members, and among others the hon. member for Toronto Centre, prefer to see Northern Ontario remain a closed country rather than let the province of Quebec have the benefit of the transcontinental railway ? I might well draw that inference from the views expressed by themselves and in their newspapers. I regret it exceedingly. As for us, in the province of Quebec, our policy is broader ; we wish to see all parts of the country have the benefit of public works. We wish to see all the provinces of the Dominion thrive and increase in number. We wish to see Ontario increase its population ; but on the other hand, we would like the province of Quebec have its share of prosperity and greatness. Let the sun shine for all of us.

It has been stated that this road would be going through unexplored parts of northern Ontario and northern Quebec. For how long a time have the hon. gentlemen opposite been satisfied that these parts are unknown ? Only since the government has taken the matter in hand. They never stated so when the Bill came up before the Railway Committee. But the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior have quoted from reports of geologists and engineers which give us concerning that country a knowledge almost equal to that we possess in respect to southern Quebec and southern Ontario. But the scheme did not suit them, because it was going to benefit Quebec.

Now, the hon. members on the other side have brought forward a certain number of arguments against the proposed scheme. lel the Intercolonial. I think the road in lows :—The country does not at present require another transcontinental railway. That contention has been shown to be entirely without foundation by hon. members on this side of the House. The hon. Minister of the Interior, among others, communicated to the House resolutions voted by the various boards of trade throughout the country, as well as the views of the press and of leading business men. But at a certain time, the leader of the opposition himself undertook to confute that argument by introducing a plan of his own making, a plan much more costly and less reasonable than the present one. That is the best evidence of the necessity of this road.

It has also been stated that the country had not expressed and does not now express a wish for a transcontinental railway; that the government were too hasty in deciding to build such a road, that they had not sufficient information as regards the character of the country through which this railway is to run ; that it will not be used for the carriage of grain as the grain will be shipped by the water route on account of the lower rate ; that the part extending from Quebec to Moncton will parallel the Intercolonial. These are some of the reasons brought forward against the government scheme. I shall refer briefly to the last argument only, as the others have been peremptorily disposed of by hon. members on this side of the House. Opinions have been quoted which cannot be contradicted. As regards the point raised in connection with the paralleling of the Intercolonial, that objection is childish, and for this reason. Because a railway starts from a certain point and reaches some other point, which two points are already connected by a railway, it does not follow that these two roads are parallel to the extent of injuring one another. The proposed road will not parallel the Intercolonial ; it will go through rich and thriving parishes, which to-day have no means of communication with large centres. I shall not enter into details, as I think my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has given on this point all the required information. But I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there has been in existence for some years past, since 1899, I believe, a charter authorizing the construction of a railway from Quebec to New Brunswick. And, if I am not mistaken, the government has granted a subsidy towards the carrying out of this scheme. Now, no exception was taken at the time to this measure ; it was not objected that this road would parallel the Intercolonial, that it would be contrary to public interest to build it ; and if the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) had no objection to subsidizing that road, I fail to see why he should have thought it unwise to approve of the present scheme on the ground that it would parallel the Intercolonial. I think the road in

question is a very desirable one and in the best interests of the country.

Before taking my seat, I wish to say a few words of the contract passed with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. After they had decided to build the road from Moncton to Winnipeg and to grant a substantial subsidy to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, towards the building of the road from Winnipeg to Port Simpson, the government entered into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, whereby the latter undertook to lease and operate the eastern section. After looking into that agreement, I believe the government could not possibly have entered into a more satisfactory agreement or one giving greater security.

The contract, Sir, starts by stating what are the obligations of the company. I shall refer to them as briefly as possible. Clause 8 of the Bill provides that the eastern section shall extend from Moncton to Winnipeg. I make this observation because it has been stated somewhere that the Grand Trunk Pacific, under the contract, are not bound to operate the part from Quebec to Moncton. I believe it was the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Osler) who made that statement, and I think he backed it up with the opinion of a lawyer (Mr. Smith). Well, the hon. member must be wrong; there cannot be any difference of opinion on that point. The section which the Grand Trunk Pacific is to operate is the eastern section, which comprises the whole of the road from Winnipeg to Moncton. There cannot be any doubt as to that.

Now, what are the obligations of the Grand Trunk Pacific? (1) The company agrees to lease the road, to keep it in repair and to make renewals when necessary; (2) To operate the road, to repair it if necessary and to make of it a first-class road; (3) To give a regular service to the satisfaction of the government; (4) To carry freight by that road to Canadian seaports, unless otherwise routed by shipper; (5) To favour that road in the largest possible measure; (6) Rates not to be higher than on United States roads; (7) To operate lines of steamers on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; (8) Lastly, the government will have the right to name a director on the board of managers.

Such are the requirements which the Grand Trunk Pacific Company has agreed to fulfil. They are those usually found in leases; they are as complete and perfect as possible. Should the company not comply with them, as stated in the deed, the latter may be cancelled.

Now, the question is raised whether the securities offered by the company are sufficient to warrant us in hoping that they will fulfil their obligations. Well, I think the securities are as good or even better than those which are attached to ordinary contracts.

As regards the rolling stock of this railway, the contract states that it should represent a sum of $20,000,000, of which $5,000,000 should be on the eastern section. These $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock are security for the payment of the rent as well as for the fulfilment of the other obligations of the company. Should the payment of the rent be withheld, or should the company fail in fulfilling their other obligations towards the government, the latter has a recourse against the company and may force them to fulfil their pledges. But, more than that, the contract contains a very wise clause in virtue of which the government may insert in the deed all provisions required to ensure the carrying out of all the obligations agreed to by the company, and that to the satisfaction of the government. The amount payable for damages may be indicated in the lease. I believe the government have taken all necessary precautions to ensure the operation of the eastern section. Besides all these pledges, we have the machinery of parliament, which may be set in motion to confer on the government all the powers required to bring the company to time. For instance, what could there be to prevent the government, in case the company refused to fulfil their pledges, from cancelling the lease and operating the road direct, or making arrangements with other companies, the Canadian Northern, for instance. What could there be to prevent parliament from stepping in and forcing the company to fulfil their pledges, or enacting a penalty that would ensure their fulfilment?

I do not think there can be any doubt as to that, as it should not be assumed beforehand that the company are in bad faith. If they are in good faith, as we have reason to believe, the contract will be carried out faithfully and the country benefited thereby.

The suggestion has been made that the company should have an interest in the building of the eastern section, so as to ensure its operation. But after duly considering the matter, I think it is preferable that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company should not have any interest in that undertaking, and for this reason: If the company were to have an interest in that way, they would be part owners, and we would not be at liberty to evict them. For that reason, I am of opinion that the scheme as submitted by the government is worthy of our approval.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MALOUIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker, when the House took recess, I was referring to the contract passed by the government with the company in connection with the operation of the eastern section. I stated, at the outset, what are the obligations of the company, and what means the government have of exacting their fulfilment. I

for one have no doubt that the clauses contained in the deed are quite sufficient to enable the government to enforce on the company the carrying out of their obligations. Of course, it should be assumed that the government of the time will endeavour to bring about the faithful carrying out of the contract. I understand perfectly well that if the government and the company are conniving in the non-fulfilment of the terms of the contract, the company may evade fulfilling them. But assuming that the government are in good faith, as I think they are, I believe the company will abide by the contract, or else the government have all the means required for exacting its carrying out. Thus, the government have, in the first place, an action for damages on account of failure to carry out the contract. They have also the power to cancel the lease, to take possession of the road, to run it themselves or to have it operated by another company. No other conclusion can be arrived at, if the contract is looked into in a spirit of fairness. Consequently, the company cannot do otherwise than carry out the terms of the contract. The government are free to run the road direct or have it operated by another company. The contract is quite clear and cannot be transgressed unless both parties are in collusion.

It has been stated (and the statement has been peremptorily confuted by the Minister of Justice) that the company instead of buying rolling stock, as required by the contract, might merely rent it. To my mind, that objection is totally unfounded for the reason that if the company borrow the rolling stock instead of buying it, they are not fulfilling their contract, and the government may step in and force them to fulfil their obligation, or confiscate the five millions which the government will have in hand as security. As already stated, the company have to supply $20,000,000 worth of rolling stock, of which $5,000,000 are applicable to the eastern section.

The Grand Trunk Pacific are in good faith; there are clauses in the lease which show this clearly. One of the clauses says that the Grand Trunk Pacific reserve their right of supervising the construction of the eastern section. Why should they reserve that right, if not in order that the said section be built in the most economical way ? And if they are anxious that the utmost economy should be exercised in the carrying out of this work, the reason is that they intend to pay the rent, as agreed. Is it reasonable to assume that the company have given such close attention to all the clauses of the contract with the intention of laying it aside after signing it ?

There is one other clause which may be looked upon as evidence of the company's good faith ; it is that in virtue of which they reserve for themselves an option in case a second fifty-year lease should be granted. In accordance with that clause the government have the right to operate the road themselves if they think fit ; but should they decide not to do so, and to pass a new lease, the Grand Trunk Pacific have reserved their right to take the lease on the terms offered by the government. Is not that an indication of the good faith of the company ?

Then the Grand Trunk is interested in seeing that the Grand Trunk Pacific should operate that part of the road, as laid down in the contract. The Grand Trunk Company guarantees the payment of one-fourth of the cost of construction in the western part. The government will have a first lien on the road on account of the guarantee on the other three-fourths of the cost of construction. The Grand Trunk will then have a second mortgage only to answer for their guarantee on the remaining fourth. Should the Grand Trunk Pacific neglect to operate the eastern section, and should the government, who are surely in earnest, apply the means at their disposal to force the company to fulfil its obligations, the Grand Trunk, having only a second charge on the road, would be the loser. Is it not a fact that the Grand Trunk would suffer loss, in case the Grand Trunk Pacific Company did not operate the eastern section, and as a consequence was sued by the government and turned over to a receiver ? For all these reasons, we are bound to come to the conclusion that the company with whom the government have been dealing are in earnest and anxious to carry out the agreement.

Now, as to the price, I shall say a few words only. The amount of money which this country will have to pay for the building of this transcontinental road is exceedingly small ; and those who are in a position to know, can hardly believe that the government of Canada has made such a good bargain. But the contract is there all the same, and the railway will be built.

There is no doubt that the mortgage secured by the government on the western section of the road will ensure the full recovery of the government's outlay, should the company be unable to pay. It is admitted by all that the western part of the road will be paying. There is a certainty, as a consequence, that the government will have absolutely nothing to pay. Now, as regards the eastern section, the amount of three per cent to be paid at the expiry of seven or ten years will represent the interest to be paid by the government. So, the government will have to pay seven years' interest on the eastern section, and seven years' interest on the Rocky Mountains' section. As stated by the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior, the whole amount will come to thirteen or fourteen million dollars. To build a transcontinental road at an expenditure of thirteen or fourteen millions, seems to me quite a feat, and I am confident the whole country will endorse such a transaction. But reference is made to

liabilities to be met at the expiry of fifty years, on the bonds guaranteed by the government. It is true that the government will have to pay for the debentures issued on the eastern section; but it should not be forgotten that in fifty years from now the population of Canada will have reached the twenty or twenty-five million mark; that the revenue will be much larger than it is to-day; that the road will be a paying one, and that instead of receiving three per cent, the government will be getting six or eight per cent, and the difference between the two rates of interest will be used as a sinking fund during the fifty years to follow. I may add that the road will remain the property of the government.

There are other clauses on which I shall not dilate, but which it will suffice to mention in order to show the advantages ensured by this scheme. Thus, the government have reserved over that part of the road which is leased running rights for themselves and for other railway companies. Nor should we lose sight of the other clause which states that the material required for the construction of the railway shall be purchased in Canada whenever the company are able to secure them on terms as advantageous as in foreign countries. Let me also recall the right which the government have reserved of controlling the rates. That is an invaluable concession, and of great benefit to the country. In conclusion, let me say this: It is the opinion of fair-minded people, of those whose views are not biassed by a spirit of partisanship, but who are rather inclined to consider the scheme on its merit, that this arrangement is an admirable one. I for one, do not hesitate to say that the government have succeeded in making a great bargain, such as is seldom concluded, especially by governments. As against the views of papers who are interested in finding fault with the policy of the government whatever it be, we have those of persons whose minds are not influenced by party spirit. The other day, I was reading the following item from the New York 'Journal,' reproduced in the 'Canada.'

A railroad is to be built in Canada parallel to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which is to be called the Grand Trunk Pacific. The new road will in no way interfere with its old competitor, but will only help in developing the country, and bringing about good results for both roads. Within the next ten years the development of the Dominion of Canada will astonish the whole world. The products of the farms, the fisheries, the forests and the mines have increased by 283 per cent, and the manufactured goods by 738 per cent, under the Liberal rule.

Let me, Sir, draw your attention, in passing to the views expressed by the 'Moniteur du Commerce,' published in Montreal. That paper frankly supports the scheme propounded by the government. Such utterances have more weight than criticisms from opponents of the cabinet.

As regards the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), urging that the government should acquire and operate the railways, and should build and run the proposed road, I believe that principle is a wrong one. It is a good plan for the government to grant help towards building railways or to take charge of such work, but I consider the operation of railways by the government a source of danger. For that reason, I shall vote against that amendment.

The proposed road, to my mind, will be a benefaction to the whole of Canada. I am satisfied, Sir, that the province of Quebec, like the other provinces, will be benefited thereby. In my opinion a transcontinental railway that would have its terminal at North Bay, would not be of much good, and we from the province of Quebec would not have supported such a proposal. The province of Quebec and the maritime provinces contribute liberally to the expenditure made to ensure the development of the North-west. We do not object to that; but when a transcontinental railway is being built, we want all the provinces to be benefited thereby. We rejoice at the government having decided to build a railway that will run through all the provinces of Canada.

Under the circumstances, I believe, Sir, that every member of this House who is anxious to help on conscientiously the interests of the country, heedless of party, should support this Bill. It is a bold undertaking, perhaps, but worthy of the progressive government which control the affairs of the country. It was conceived in a lofty spirit of public interest, and let us hope that it will be carried out in the same spirit. And if it is, we may rest assured that the whole country will greatly profit by it, and that it will be one of the most efficient means of development for the next fifty years.

Mr. A. F. MACLAREN (North Perth.) Mr. Speaker, I have one great regret, and that is that I cannot answer in the French language the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. His speech will not be criticised very much by me because I do not understand a single word he has said.

Mr. MALOUIN. I am very sorry for you.

Mr. MACLAREN (North Perth). I do not think I would have said a word on the proposition which is now before the House had it not been for the fact that last session I spoke at some length upon the transportation question, and I feel it incumbent upon me to make a few remarks now upon the Grand Trunk Pacific project, which has formed the subject of this debate. Before proceeding further, I wish to present to the House resolutions passed by the board of trade of the city of Stratford and other parties. This is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Stratford board of trade at a meeting held on the 3rd of April, 1903:

Moved by Mr. Wm. Preston, seconded by Mr. W. J. Mooney—

Whereas the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have made application to the Dominion parliament for power to build a transcontinental line of railway from Quebec city to a point at or near North Bay, and thence to the Pacific coast, and

Whereas the said company have expressed their intention to ask for a cash subsidy to enable them to carry out the proposed work, and

Whereas the new railway will open up a very large and important section of Canada not at present available for settlement, or served by any railway, thus contributing largely to the growth, development, and general welfare of Canada, and

Whereas it is desirable that these lands should be opened up and settled as soon as possible, therefore

Be it resolved, that in the opinion of this board, while not expressing any views on the general principle or railway subsidies, we believe it to be in the interests of the Dominion of Canada considering the magnitude of the new railway, and to insure its rapid completion, and the early settlement of our unoccupied lands, that a reasonable subsidy be granted to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

That a copy of this resolution be presented to the House of Commons, through our representative, A. F. MacLaren, M.P.

J. STEELE,
Secretary.

That is the first resolution which I wish to present to the House. Then, I have another from the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, which is as follows :

Stratford, May 6, 1903.

Dear Sir,—I beg to forward you in behalf of the membership of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Fireman, resident in Canada, east of St. Clair river, the following resolution.

Whereas, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has made application to the Dominion parliament for power to build a transcontinental line of railway from Quebec city to a point at or near North Bay and thence to the Pacific coast

Whereas, the said company expresses their intention to ask for a subsidy to enable them to carry out the proposed work.

Whereas, the new railway will open up a very large and important section of Canada not at present available for settlement or served by any other railway which if built, will thus contribute largely to the growth, development and general welfare of Canada.

Whereas, it is desirable that these lands should be opened up and settled as soon as possible.

Therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of the membership of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Fireman, resident in Canada, while not wishing to express any views on the principle of railway subsidies, we believe it to be in the interests of Canada, considering the magnitude of the new railway and to insure its rapid completion and the early settlement of our unoccupied lands, that a reasonable subsidy be granted to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

In conclusion, we sincerely invite you to accept this resolution because we earnestly believe the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will open up a section of new country that will develop so rapidly that many deserving young men and women will find homes and employment in that portion of undeveloped Canada.

I remain,

Yours respectfully,
H. M. PATON,
Secretary.

I have another resolution signed by Mr. M. D. Hunter, from the joint general committee of adjustment of conductors and brakemen of the Grand Trunk system east of the St. Clair river, which is in the same terms as those which I have already presented, and I shall not, therefore, trouble the House by reading it. Now, the House will see by these resolutions that they were dated away back in April and May, at a time when the bodies from which these resolutions come had no thought whatever of such a tremendous project being brought before parliament as that which has been presented by the right hon. leader of the government. At that time they thought it was simply a case of connecting the present ends of the Grand Trunk Railway with the two oceans, and they had no thought, as I have said, of such a tremendous undertaking as that which has been proposed. As far as I am personally concerned, I would have supported the granting of any reasonable assistance to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and particularly assistance in extending the road west of Lake Superior into the great wheat fields and ranches in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and to the mines, the fisheries and the forests of British Columbia. I certainly would have been willing to grant any reasonable assistance to the company for this purpose, and as far as I am concerned, I would be inclined to support the building of all the railways that are necessary to open up and develop the country west of Lake Superior. I spoke last year at some length on the developing of the waterways from the head of Lake Superior down to points along the Georgian bay and Lake Huron, such as Collingwood, Owen Sound, Midland, Sarnia, Goderich and Windsor, and I still hold the views which I expressed then. I have not changed my mind as to that. I think these waterways should be improved, and I think, as many hon. members on this side of the House have said during the last few days, that the ports on our inland waters should be built up, that we should have first-class elevators constructed on modern principles, that we should have properly equipped warehouses and in some parts cold storage where perishable goods could be unloaded, stored and then shipped by rail. As I said last year, I think it would be well if some assistance were granted to the parties who hold charters for the construction of a road from Collingwood to Toronto. If such assistance were granted it would enable shippers to utilize the waters from the head of Lake Ontario, because, if there was a sufficient

freight supply from the west we would have steamers running from the head of Lake Ontario to the seaboard. If some of the traffic from the North-west could be secured for such a route we could have a magnificent fleet of steamers sailing from Toronto to the sea. I think the sooner the government go to work and improve the waterways, while at the same time lowering the rates, the better it will be for the people. I may say here, Mr. Speaker, that I have not changed the views which I expressed here last year, and I still think that the government should do something for the manufacturer and for the horny-handed sons of toil, who have hewed down the forests of this country and who have spent their lives in building up this country. They are the men to whom this government should first look and for whose benefit they should spend some of their money before opening up too much new country at such a tremendous outlay as that which is proposed in this measure. My idea is that if the government spent one-tenth of the amount of money in improving our waterways, more good would be accomplished than if they expended the $150,000,000 or $200,000,000 involved in this project. I do not think the country is ripe for such an expenditure or that it is prepared to assume liability for so many millions of dollars. I certainly think, as a business man, that the people who have built up the different provinces should receive some consideration. I do not say Ontario particularly, because I take a broad view of these questions. I would like to see every province prosper and I want to see every province derive its share of benefits from the expenditure of public money. I do not want to take a narrow view or to say that one province is jealous of the other. I never had any feeling against any province in the Dominion of Canada. On the contrary, I have the most kindly feeling towards all the provinces, and I would be sorry to see any hon. member of this House attempting to stir up any feeling between the different provinces. We are all one. As far as the maritime provinces are concerned, I am very glad to know that we have a magnificent market in that part of the country for many of our manufactured goods and agricultural products, and I think the maritime provinces have a kindly feeling towards the province of Ontario. I am glad to know that the province of Ontario reciprocates any such feeling and I think hon. members on both sides of the House will agree with me when I say that such a feeling should exist all along the line.

Now, a great many people talk about making Winnipeg a great centre, and they say that Winnipeg is going to become a great manufacturing centre. It certainly is a great city to-day, but I think that Port Arthur and Fort William will become very important distributing points in the near future. At the present time when the steamers arrive there, they unload their goods through the freight sheds into the cars, the goods are hauled by rail to Winnipeg, unloaded there, carted up town, warehoused; the goods are sold by the wholesale men, then carted to the station again and shipped to different points all over Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I think it would be a wise step on the part of the government to assist in the building of warehouses at Port Arthur and Fort William and making these places the great forwarding points for the west. It would be a great saving in time and labour. It would save extra handling, extra haul and extra labour generally. I think that would be an important question for the people of the west to work out and I do not think it would do the city of Winnipeg much harm.

Now, in regard to the proposed road from Collingwood to Toronto, there are people who express the view that it would not pay, but as Collingwood is 300 feet higher than Toronto the grain could be shipped across very cheaply and if the most modern type of elevator were used it could be handled in the most economical way. There are only about six or seven miles upon which a serious grade would be encountered, but two engines could be employed at this place to haul the trains and a good speed could be maintained.

Since the government has so much money, I would like to see some of it expended in utilizing the water-powers and in building electric roads through that part of the province of Ontario lying west of Toronto, where, I believe, there are already twenty-one charters for electric roads. On these roads cheese, butter, grain, cattle, hogs, anything at all produced or manufactured in that district could be brought to Toronto. They could be stored in Toronto and shipped by boat in the summer time, or if they were not shipped by water, a lower rail rate could be obtained. In this way freight rates could be materially reduced. We all know that the rates are very high in the Ontario peninsula and in the west, and I would like to see warehouses, cold storage plants and elevators of the largest and most improved style, such as are to be found in Duluth, Chicago, Boston and Philadelphia, erected for the storage of produce. If the Americans can do this kind of work, there is no reason why we should be behind them and why we should not, by these means, get as low a rate of freight as do the people to the south of us. I think that it is much more important that relief should be given to those who are doing all this great and good work for the development of the country now than to spend money to open up an unknown and uninhabited country, which, as one hon. gentleman said the other day, is now known only by the birds.

If these great waterways were utilized, we could not only ship our produce clean down to the sea, but we could bring back as return cargoes, coal and iron and also secure for Canadian lines that great foreign trade which now comes into New York and Boston and is brought west via Niagara, whence it is sometimes sent right through to Winnipeg and to all points in western Ontario. These goods we could haul up through our own country and we could have them distributed from Toronto, Owen Sound, and different points in the North-west. This, I think, is another strong argument in favour of utilizing our own waterways. Why wait one moment to relieve the people who have done all this good work? Talk about waiting to open up this new country! A year ago I asked the government to do something to reduce these high rates of freight throughout the western country. At that time we were promised a commission; we have been promised that commission for many years, and I understand it has now been appointed. The first thing that this commisison should do is to look into the possibility of lowering the rates of freight charged the people who are doing business now, not wait for those people who may be doing business in that new land when this railway is built, but to secure lower rates for our present producers, so that they will be able to compete with the rest of the world. The Prime Minister says: We cannot wait, we cannot wait. There is no one in this new land to wait. But the great manufacturers of our older and thickly settled portions of this great Dominion can wait. These can wait, and then when this great road is built through an uninhabited land, it will not relieve the people or lower the rates on freight one cent as far as such commodities as butter, cheese, lumber, furniture, coal, &c., are concerned. I believe in giving now. If you have anything to give give it to the people who have done so much for the development of Canada, and do not wait to bring in new people and then help them. Give it, as I have said, to the people who have developed this country.

We have heard a good deal about an all-Canadian route and about shipping our goods through Canadian ports. I fully agree with every bit of that, and would like to ship everything that I buy in Canada and ship to the old country through Canadian ports. I hope the day will come when it will be possible to ship it all in that way. But is is useless to talk about that when the Americans give better rates. For instance, when I buy cheese in the west, the first thing I do is to wire to Montreal, Boston, New York and other ports asking the lowest rate for the goods to London, Liverpool, Bristol, Glasgow, or whatever point I want to ship to, and I, of course, ship all things by the route which gives the cheapest rate of freight, and the lower the rate I obtain the higher price I can pay to the farmer for what I buy from him. Let us make our Canadian railways and waterways right and then we can get cheaper and lower rates by a Canadian route. Then, and not till then, will goods be shipped by an all-Canadian route. Such a route could be secured, an all-Canadian route, cheaper than any American route, for one-sixth the money it is proposed to spend upon this great Canadian transcontinental railway.

The hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) talked a great deal about the cheap railway haul from Chicago to New York. I would ask permission to submit to the House a statement from the record of the Chicago board of trade of the shipments of wheat and corn at that port for the season of 1901, of the average freight charges per bushel between Chicago and New York by lake and rail, and all-rail routes, and a statement of the summer traffic between Chicago and ocean ports. That statement is as follows:

From the records of the Chicago Board of Trade, the shipments of wheat and corn at that port for the season 1901, were:

Receipts from all sources. Bushels.	Shipments by lake. Bushels.
Wheat, 51,197,000	31,521,000
Corn, 84,136,000	34,000,000
Wheat entered into consumption	9,000,000
Corn entered into consumption	18,000,000

The balance of the receipts of these two cereals not here accounted for were distributed eastward by the railways, some for export, but mostly internal domestic consumption.

Average freight charges per bushel, season 1901, Chicago to New York.

	By Lake and Canal. Cents.	By Lake and Rail. Cents.	By all Rail. Cents.
Corn	4·61	5·16	9·21
Wheat	5·11	5·54	9·88

Season, 1901.

Grain for export, all-rail from Chicago to following points:—

The summer tariff from June 1st to October 21st, as follows:—

	Per Bushel.
Boston, 16 cents per 100 pounds, i.e.	9·60
Portland, 16 cents per 100 pounds, i.e	9·60
Montreal, 16 cents per 100 pounds, i.e.	9·60

Thus, you see by these figures that a great deal of freight is shipped from Chicago to New York, some by water and rail and some all-rail, but in every case, the water transportation is very much cheaper. I would also like to read to the House the rate of freight from Buffalo to Liverpool in 1901. That rate was 11½ cents from Buffalo, while from western Ontario it was 21 cents per 100 lbs. What I am trying to explain to the House and to the country is that by cheapening transportation a great deal of money may

be made for the farmers, the producers and the manufacturers of this country, if we were to improve these waterways so that we could get the same freight rate enjoyed by the people to the south of us. Last year it was stated that if the Americans had had to pay as high a rate of freight on goods shipped in the United States as we had to pay in Canada, they would have to pay on the amount of freight they shipped over $200,000,000 more than they did pay. That, Sir, would build the Grand Trunk Pacific in one year if we had as much freight to ship as they have. May I call attention to the comparative rate on cattle from American and Canadian points to the seaboard. From Toronto to Portland the rate on cattle is 28 cents; from Chicago to Portland, 800 miles greater distance, the rate is the same, 28 cents; from Chicago to Montreal the rate is 25 cents; and from points in the county of Perth, Bruce or Huron to Montreal it is 33 cents, or 8 cents more than it is from Chicago to Montreal. You can see for yourself, Mr. Speaker, that is a very important, a very serious matter, not for the people who are going to come in and inhabit this new country seven or eight years hence, but to the people who are now here, and that is why I am so anxious to see a reduction in freight rates. To give a concrete case, Sir, the rate on cattle from the town of Listowel, in the constituency which I represent, is $1.25 per head higher to Montreal than from Chicago to Montreal, although from Chicago the haul is 400 miles longer than from Listowel.

In 1901 the United States shipped 500,000 head of cattle to England. If they had paid the same rate of freight that we pay in Canada, it would have cost them $500,000 more.

I might talk for hours along these lines, illustrating the need of reform in this direction, but I do not intend to take up much more of the time of this House. There is one thing, however, that I wish to speak about. Hon. gentlemen talk about running freight by train through to the Atlantic coast from Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Indian Head, and all the great grain-producing centres of the North-west. But when a car leaves any of these points in the fall it does not return to the west for a month and that is one reason why I say it is necessary to have proper elevators built at the head of Lake Superior. You can run a car many times between Brandon and the head of Lake Superior while it is making one run through to the coast and return.

It would require an immense amount of rolling stock to handle that trade in that way. I hope the time is not far distant when the government will build these elevators. There are immense elevators in Minneapolis and St. Paul. I saw one a few days ago in Minneapolis built entirely of cement, and this material could be utilized by the government in building elevators at the head of Lake Superior. The farmers could ship their grain to these elevators, and receive in return warehouse receipts, upon which they could obtain money from the banks. If the government would do something of this kind, and drop this expensive scheme, involving an expenditure of $150,000,000, they would better serve the real interests of the country.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a long speech, which I think would be out of place at this stage of the debate. A great many members have been trespassing upon your kindness and upon the kindness of the House by taking advantage of this debate to introduce all sorts of subjects which are not relevant to the question before the House. I am going to follow the example of the hon. gentleman who has preceded me, and make my remarks very short. I think by this time the members of the House have made up their minds which way they are going to vote. There are sufficient facts and figures before the House to enable any man who takes the trouble to look into them, to form a judgment, and a sound judgment on the question. Therefore, I have agreed with the whip on the other side of the House not to speak more than ten minutes, and if the hon. members who follow me will do the same, we shall get through this debate all the sooner, for your good, Mr. Speaker, for the good of the members and for the good of the country.

The principle of having a transcontinental railway line is admitted, so much so that the hon. leader of the opposition himself announces that the policy of the Conservative party is to have a transcontinental line. The discussion then, comes down to the method to be adopted for the building of that line. We have a proposition submitted by the government and a kind of proposition submitted by the opposition. As I do not want to give a silent vote, I desire to state in a few minutes why I favour the one scheme rather than the other.

This question of a transcontinental railway involves a question of transportation, a question of colonization, and, as the right hon. leader of the government has said, also a patriotic question—a question of transportation by attempting to relieve the congestion in the western plains, to regulate the rates, and to give the farmers the benefit of low rates; a question of colonization, by opening new fields, and bringing in settlers to develop the natural resources of the northern country: and a patriotic question by having an all-Canadian line to carry Canadian products over Canadian territory to Canadian ports, and that, Sir, not only for six months in the year, as the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition proposes, but for twelve months in the year.

In dealing with this question of transportation, some hon. members seemed to think that the only thing we have to transport from the western fields to the Atlantic seaboard is wheat. They do not take into consideration that there are ranchers on our western plains who raise cattle. They do not take into consideration the fact that though during the last few years we have had good crops in the North-west, there are other years when the crops are not so good. I remember, when I was in the North-west in the late eighties and the early nineties, and when the crops failed, the general advice given to the farmers was to go into mixed farming. What does that involve? It involves the raising of cattle, and that the dairying industry will develop. It has been admitted by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), who professes to have made a special study of the transportation question, that cattle cannot be properly transported by being carried by train to Port Arthur, and there put on vessels and carried down the lakes and the St. Lawrence, but that they must be shipped by railway.

Now, what is the scheme proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition? He proposes to buy from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a portion of their line which is most unprofitable, a line which is mostly curves and grades, and which runs through a country where you can see, in place of vegetation, only burnt trees sticking out of rocks. He proposes to buy that line and pay millions of dollars for it. How is that going to relieve the congestion in the North-west and help to bring the trade of the west to our Atlantic seaports? The hon. gentleman proposes to make that line a common highway, over which the Grand Trunk Railway will obtain an entrance into the North-west. He also proposes the purchase of the Canada Atlantic Railway, and by that means run the Intercolonial over this common highway. What would be the result? The result would be that all these lines would be able to carry traffic to Port Arthur and Fort William during the summer months, where the traffic would be transshipped to barges and sent down the lakes and the St. Lawrence to the Atlantic ocean. But what would be done in the winter? The Grand Trunk Railway would take part of the traffic, and, instead of carrying it to Canadian ports, when it reached Montreal, it will go on to Portland. Consequently the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition involves this result, that for six months in the year the Grand Trunk Railway would carry Canadian produce through Canadian territory down to American ports. The proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition adds absolutely nothing to the transportation facilities of the country, but it involves handing so many millions of dollars over to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to put into their pockets, and so many millions to the Canada Atlantic Company.

The scheme evolved by the government, on the other hand, proposes to open up a new territory, to develop the natural resources of the country, to induce immigration to come in. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) the other day answered this argument by saying that he had from a reliable source the information that the territory now opened up in the west and covered by railways could accommodate 5,000,000 people. Well, Sir, it may accommodate 5,000,000 people, but it will not do so except on one condition. If a settler goes into a country that is already pretty well settled and where he has railway facilities, he must have a certain amount of capital to establish himself. He has to pay higher for the land, perhaps from $5 to $8 an acre; he won't live in a sod house when he sees his neighbour occupying a substantial residence, and he must have better stock and better surroundings generally, than he would think of procuring were he settling in a new country. Now, when a pioneer settles in these newly opened up regions, the first year he can cut cord-wood, and haul logs, and make a little money, and gradually he finds that he has his farm cleared and ready for cultivation. These are some advantages of settling in a new country, which favour the poorer settler, and they are not to be despised. I was also surprised to hear the leader of the Quebec Conservatives (Mr. Monk) speaking in the name of his province, say, that the line proposed by the government would run through sub-Arctic regions and through a barren and desolate country. Let me tell him that north of the St. Lawrence in the province of Quebec, in the counties of Portneuf, St. Maurice, Maskinonge, Berthier, Joliette and Montcalm through which this railway will run, the hon. member (Mr. Monk) makes a big mistake when he refers to them as sub-Arctic regions or barren lands. There is no richer region in the Dominion of Canada than is this particular region I have spoken of. We have there vast water-powers, which are to-day neglected. Members of this House remember that when they visited Shawinigan Falls a couple of years ago, they saw for themselves some of the enormous water-powers of the St. Maurice river and the further you go north the more abundant these water-powers become. I am told by experts who have gone into that country for the Quebec government, that the La Tuque Falls which are 60 miles north east of Grand-Mère can develop unlimited power. Our friends opposite are talking about high tariff, and about the bringing in of manufactured products from the United States; but let me tell them that manufacturing will go where it gets sufficient and cheap power to operate it. South of the

St. Lawrence river, where the leader of the opposition wants to run a railroad, you hardly have a water-power at all, but on the north, on the Gatineau river, the Lièvre river, the River St. Maurice, and the Mattawin, there is sufficient water-power to drive the wheels of industry of every manufacturing concern that can possibly settle in Canada. If you open up that country to the north, then instead of sending your trade to the United States as the scheme of the leader of the opposition would do, you will see settlers going in there, you will see manufacturing industries being developed there, and you will see that country the home of a numerous and a contented people. Five years ago the Shawinigan Falls and Grand-Mère were in a wilderness —to-day Grand-Mère has a population of 5,000 and Shawinigan Falls, after four years, a population of 3,000. I have no doubt that six years ago the member for Jacques Cartier would describe both Shawinigan and Grand-Mère as being in a sub-Arctic and barren country. Let me say that there have been $5,000,000 invested in these two great water-powers on the St. Maurice river within the last four years. I felt somewhat ashamed to hear an hon. gentleman of the position and standing of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) belittle the northern part of the province of Quebec, in order to try and justify himself for opposing a scheme which he knows to be in the best interest of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, my ten minutes are nearly up and as I will not break my word to you I have but a few sentences to add. By building this transcontinental line we will open up fertile regions through new Ontario. We have 16,000,000 acres there and we will develop them and bring them under cultivation. In Quebec a splendid territory will be developed by this railway which will be the home of manufacturing for Canada, just as New England is for the United States. We have in that country cheap water-powers sufficient to drive the wheels of industry and manufacture, and we will have availing of these water-powers thriving industries which will produce for the western farmers all the manufactured goods they are able to consume. I need not refer to the fertility of the Peace River district, for we are all agreed as to that. I am in favour of this scheme proposed by the government because it is a patriotic scheme. I am in favour of this scheme because it will carry Canadian trade through Canadian territory twelve months in the year, I am in favour of this scheme because it will develop the resources of our own country and attract settlers to us, I am in favour of the scheme because it is a grand national scheme promulgated by a wise government headed by a great statesman.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I congratulate my hon. friend (Mr. Bureau) upon the brevity with which he has stated all that can be said in support of this scheme, and I do so all the more heartily because he has done in ten minutes which it took the Finance Minister and the Minister of the Interior each five hours to accomplish. Hon. gentleman on both sides must realize that the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) has been a very useful contribution to the debate, when we remember the lengthy speeches we were forced to listen to from members on the Liberal side, who knew no more about the question than the hon. member for Three Rivers does. I must, however, say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) has made the same argument as that used by all of the government supporters, including the ministers of the Crown who have spoken on this question. He told us that this scheme is a patriotic scheme, and that it is needed for transportation purposes, but he did not refer at all to the resolution now before the House; which as most hon. gentlemen seem to have forgotten, I shall read. This is it:

> That it is expedient, in connection with the Bill now before this House, respecting the construction of a national transcontinental railway, to ratify the agreement set forth in the schedule to the said Bill, entered into on the 28th of July, 1903, between the government and certain persons on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by parliament at the present session thereof, and to authorize the government to do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said Bill and agreement.

Now, Sir, I have not heard from the government or their supporters one word to prove that it is expedient to ratify this agreement. They seem to assume that because they allege it is a patriotic scheme and that we need transportation facilities, that therefore no matter what the price, the money shall be taken out of the pockets of the people to provide these facilities, and that it follows as a consequence that it is expedient to do so. I should consider that this expediency was similar to the expediency which the executor of an estate would adopt if he had in mind the conserving of that estate in the best interest of those to whom it belongs. I would consider expediency, that care which would dictate to the trustee that he should see that the bargain he is making is a good one, and that he is paying no more for what he gets than he ought to pay. I have listened attentively to this debate and I have heard little indeed as to why this scheme is expedient in the sense in which I understand the proper meaning of the term. It is my duty to draw the attention of gentlemen opposite to the fact that if this bargain is not a good bargain for the people of Canada, the patriotic side of it is not one which we should consider very seriously. We Conservatives do not need any lesson in patriotism from gentlemen on the other side. There was a time when we did not hear so much from

these gentlemen about a scheme being a Canadian scheme, or about a scheme freeing us from the bondage of the United States. There are gentlemen on the Liberal benches to-night who occupied seats here when blue ruin was the talk of the Liberal party, and when they contended that Canadian affairs would better be regulated from Washington. Things of that kind were said by the Liberals until the people of Canada became disgusted, and while we may congratulate these politicians that at last they have come to recognize that national questions must be dealt with from a Canadian standpoint, yet we must remember that the people sent us here to make the best bargain we can in their interests, and in the interest of the country. In every speech made on that side of the House we have had this menace of the abrogation of the bonding privilege repeated over and over again. This, if it were not an insult to Canadian manhood, I would call a red-herring drawn across the trail in order to conceal from us the fact that the bargain is a mighty bad one.

On this resolution itself we did not hear from the right hon. the First Minister. He was probably within his rights when he nodded his head as you, Mr. Speaker, put the resolution to the House; and we have therefore to hark back to what he said on the Bill itself in order to find out the reasons he gave why this agreement should be ratified. Naturally, before deciding whether this was a wise and prudent bargain or not, the first thing we would ask of the right hon. gentleman is, where is your evidence of its acceptability? What have you got to show that this is a good bargain for the people? Well, after the right hon. gentleman had stated his case, we found a former colleague of his—one under whose particular administration this project would have naturally fallen, but who preferred to resign his seat in the cabinet rather than give it his endorsation—rising in his place and, in an argument which covered the whole ground, and which lasted some two hours and a half, putting the right hon. gentleman out of court. We found his former colleague proving that it was a most dangerous, improper, unsafe and absolutely foolish bargain. So convincingly did he state the case against the government, that the government have found it necessary to prolong this debate, in order to give every one of their supporters, on whom they could possibly count to make any kind of a plea in support of this scheme, an opportunity to reply to the strictures of the hon. the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. The ex-minister was the first witness to prove that this was a most expensive bargain. He told us, and his figures have not been controverted, that this projected road was going to cost us in the neighbourhood of $120,000,000 or $130,000,000. It is true that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who was put up by the government to reply, undertook to show that an expenditure of $70,000,000 would cover the cost, but he did not go into the details, and he did not cover the whole of the project at all when he gave those figures. Contrast these estimates. We have first the estimate of the right hon. the First Minister, made upon the introduction of the Bill connected with this resolution, that the road was going to cost $13,000,000 and not a cent more. It is rather a striking commentary on the administrative ability of the First Minister, that the first witness against him was his former colleague, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, a gentleman who was high in his counsels and respect until he disagreed with him upon this question. And we had the ex-minister—whose experience and knowledge in railway matters would entitle his opinion as an expert to much greater value than that of the right hon. gentleman—declaring that the cost, instead of being $13,000,000, would be $120,000,000 or $130,000,000. This was rather hard testimony for the right hon. gentleman to refute; and it is evident how hard pressed he was when he had to solicit the aid, in order to bolster up the case of the government, of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who, as this House well knows, is prepared to argue convincingly on either side of any question, just as his interests of the moment dictate. Well, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) estimated the cost at $68,000,000 or $70,000,000—considerably less than that of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, but considerably greater than that of the First Minister. Then we had the hon. the Finance Minister brought to the rescue, and that hon. gentleman went the Premier one better, and reduced the cost from $13,000,000 to $8,000,000. Could we require any better proof than these contradictory estimates, furnished by the principal supporters of this bargain, by the promoters of it, to show that the government are really rushing into this vast undertaking without having the faintest idea of what it is really going to cost the people. Following the Finance Minister, we have had any number of gentlemen on the government side giving us estimates varying from $120,000,000 down to $8,000,000. Of the lot, the hon. the Finance Minister is the most penurious, the most anxious to make the figures as small as possible, and we are expected to find our way out of all this maze and come to a decision on which we can rely with any degree of certainty. All we have to go by is what evidence and information we can glean from the present debate; and if this discussion were to last three months instead of three weeks—aye if it were to last three years instead of three weeks—the people would be better satisfied than to let the contract go through with no other than the meagre information submitted to us. The opposition, Sir, would be false to their

duty if they did not keep up this debate, if for no other reason than to obtain every possible scrap of information we can possibly secure before committing the country to this extravagant project. In the course of three weeks which this debate has lasted, we have been given no reliable information as to what this project is going to cost. We are still completely in the dark as to the amount of liability we are about to impose on the country. For that reason alone my constituents—those who voted against me as well as those who voted for me—would consider that I had done wrong if I did not make every effort to obtain for the country more information before allowing this resolution to go through. Even those who voted against me at my election would be justified in saying: 'Although we did vote against you, we expected, when you did go to Ottawa, that you would find out what you are called upon to vote for, before giving your vote, and if you cannot do that we will get somebody who will. And they would be quite right. For my part I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman can take the position taken by the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Bureau), of declaring that as this resolution was proposed by the government he was supporting, he was going to vote for it without any regard for its merits or the consequences. That is not the position we on this side take. We want to find out all about a question before casting our votes either for or against any proposition submitted to us.

The right hon. the First Minister gave us four reasons why this scheme should go through. First, he said, he wanted it to carry grain. It seems to me, however, that my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) rather gave the real reason when he said that it was not to carry grain the Premier wanted the road but to carry the elections. But for my part, I am confident that the elections will not be carried, as the hon. the First Minister intends they shall, and the people will once more put the Conservative party back into office, because that is the party which is willing to do what is right. I do not believe that the few millionaires, which the right hon. gentleman hopes to construct out of this scheme at the expense of the people, will be powerful enough to carry the elections. I have too much faith in the integrity and independence of the people to believe that all the millions which can be raised out of this scheme by the half a dozen millionaires it is going to create will be able to carry the election. It is an insult to the intelligence of the people to suppose that they will not see through a scheme of this kind and that they will be carried away by such corrupt and clumsy devices in this year of grace, 1903.

The second reason which the First Minister gave for asking this House to pass this resolution was that the scheme would only cost the people $13,000,000. I have shown how he has been put out of court by his own witness on that point and will not trouble the House by further discussing it. And he gave a third reason, that with regard to the bonding privilege. I feel like apologizing for even mentioning that matter in this House. It was a trashy argument to be put forward by anybody, and it has been exploded by every speaker on this side who has dealt with it, and has been dropped by hon. gentlemen opposite like a hot iron or—well, I hardly know what comparison to offer, because it has been a quicker and more impulsive letting go than anything I can think of in ordinary life. I notice hon. gentlemen opposite have not referred to the bonding privilege question since the address of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell). That hon. gentleman has courage far greater than his stature. I must say this for the hon. gentleman—he can speak for four or five hours, and in ten minutes he can use more words than most of the rest of us can use in twice the time. But that hon. gentleman did so thoroughly explode the arguments of those on his own side with regard to the bonding privilege that I feel sure that none of the others will deal with it. I do not think, for instance, that the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), who is the only member of the government present and the only one who seems to think it necessary to pay any more attention to this debate—on which I congratulate him—will try to revamp this bonding privilege argument. If he is to speak in this debate, I should be glad indeed if he, as a man of business experience, and one who must know a great deal about the shipping and handling of freights on railways, steamboats and in every other way that goods are transhipped, would corroborate, if he can, some of the arguments of the hon. member for Hants when speaking on this question. I think the country also would be very glad to receive his views upon it. No doubt, the hon. gentleman will say that the bonding privilege has nothing to do with the question. The right hon. Prime Minister quoted a statement made by the President of the United States—he did not say when, but I think it was fourteen or fifteen years ago—a statement evidently made for election purposes. It was just like any one of the many efforts in the United States to twist the British lion's tail made just before the election, in order to please a certain element and win its votes. In the same way, President Cleveland, seeking to be re-elected, made his threat as to what he was going to do to us poor Canucks with regard to the bonding privilege, I thought the fact of the Prime Minister referring to this utterance was very suggestive. For, just after talking this kind of nonsense, Mr. Cleveland went to the country and was overwhelmingly defeated. I think that when the Prime Minister appeals to the people and they see that this bonding

privilege talk is all that he knows about the expediency of the contract he asks them to confirm, they will tell him he had better accept the same verdict that Mr. Cleveland got, as he seems to know just as much about the bonding privilege and the transportation business as Mr. Cleveland did. As to the speech of the hon. member for Hants, I think that those who heard it—though I could hardly blame any hon. gentleman who did not hear it at all, because it took up half of one day and pretty nearly the whole of the next until evening—will agree with me that if that speech is printed and circulated it will convince the people that they ought to vote for the party who oppose this legislation, and not for the party on whose behalf the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) was speaking. He gave some very strange arguments in support of the resolution. He acknowledged the fact—as will be found on referring to page 9235 of the current 'Hansard'—that the building of this line from Quebec to Moncton would probably have the effect of turning the Intercolonial Railway over to the scrap iron heap. Referring to that point, he said that a new invention or appliance took the place of the old, and the change is beneficial to the community at large. He instanced certain manufactures, and said that one manufacture took the place of another, and so, as one railway became inefficient another would have to be constructed; and if the construction of the new road—and there he was referring to the Quebec and Moncton line—had the effect of reducing the Intercolonial to the scrap iron heap, it did not make any difference, because we should have a better road. There was a distinct admission that the seventy millions of dollars spent on the Intercolonial are of no account.

I know—and I have been aware of it, perhaps, longer than some hon. gentlemen on the other side—that, taking them as a whole, the people of Canada are not a stingy people. The people of Canada are ready to pay and pay pretty well, for anything they require in the interest of the country. But when an hon. gentleman representing a constituency in this House tosses aside seventy million dollars of their money as of no account, says that it may be thrown in the scrap heap, and calls the institution on which the money has been spent a mere 'raft in the shipwreck'—those were his words when he said that the Intercolonial as compared with the whole transportation question was a mere 'raft in the shipwreck'—I think the people of Canada will say to him that it seems to be a pretty dear raft, that it is made of the most expensive kind of timber, and that the pieces, instead of being fastened together with iron bars, are fastened together with gold plate. On this road we are asked this session to vote $3,000,000, for what? The other day the Governor General consented to a Supply Bill covering one-fifth of the estimates for the current year, these having been passed by arrangement between the leaders in this House. The remaining four-fifths of these various items still remain for discussion. And this total of $3,000,000 to be spent on the Intercolonial is for what? It is for betterments. The government propose to spend this amount of money to put the road in more perfect condition than it is in to-day. The right hon. Premier gave the key note for the chorus of his followers with regard to the Intercolonial when, in introducing this Bill, he said that the Intercolonial was built for military purposes and not for purposes of transportation. The hon. member for Hants took courage from that, and went on to call the Intercolonial a 'raft in a shipwreck.' Yet this is the road upon which this government in its seven years of office has spent $20,000,000. And now, we are told the weeds should be allowed to grow up on the Intercolonial, and the rails, perhaps, be sold as scrap iron, and the whole institution allowed to go to waste. Yet, while this is looked to as the result of that policy they propose to spend $3,000,000 to still further improve the Intercolonial.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) when he considered the improvidence and outrageousness of the scheme used very mild language when he talked about hysterical frenzy or temporary madness as having surely had something to do in dictating this policy. How could any hon. gentleman who had the least respect for himself, who valued the good opinion of those whom he met day by day, and joined with the Minister of Finance and other hon. gentlemen supporting the government in voting these millions every year, including the part of this $3,000,000 already voted this session, thus declaring that the Intercolonial should be kept with the top notches railways—how could he at the same time support a scheme which involved the idea that the Intercolonial was not fit for the purposes of a railway and was so regarded by the government.

What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? Does any one doubt that the Intercolonial is fit for the purpose? Is it not doing all the business that it can do or that can be done by any railway? Is it not reasonable that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) should urge that the Intercolonial should be used as far as it goes and that it should be extended, as he suggests, up to the great lakes in order to afford the transportation facilities that are there required. Is it not reasonable that we should avoid the absolute waste of paralleling the road which we already own, paralleling it and paralysing it by building a commercial enemy. That is the proposition of the government, and it is one that should be condemned, while I submit that the alternative proposi-

tion of the leader of the opposition, so far as the Intercolonial is concerned, is one that must commend itself to this country.

The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), one of the principal supporters of the government, also distinctly said that it did not matter to him whether the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), in leaving the government, was actuated by high conviction or by resentment. Let us look at the state of political morality which this indicates. It mattered not to him whether it was from honest conviction that a matter was wrong and ought not to be forced upon the country, that the hon. ex-minister abandoned his office, gave up its emoluments, and left the cabinet councils of the country, or whether he did it in a pet, angry at some imaginary rebuff he had received. What conditions are we coming to in this House? Are we going to vote things simply because the right hon. the Prime Minister says we are to do so? Because he bows to you, Mr. Speaker, as much as to say: Enough said; that is my resolution; I desire it to pass; what right has the country to know what my evidence is in support of it? I am Premier, I bow to you as a token that I want that to pass; that settles it—it must be passed, and the people of this country and the opposition are not entitled to know any more than I choose to tell them as to whether it is expedient or not.

As representing a somewhat prominent constituency, one with over 30,000 people, I protest. I want some evidence in justification of the expenditure of this money before I can bring my conscience to consent or before I believe the consciences of the people I represent would consent to this deal—for it is nothing but a deal—going through.

The fourth reason, and the Premier touched a good many times on it—and with all respect, I wish to say I was astonished at his hardihood—that this railway must be built was because the Conservative party once made a pledge that they would do something of the same kind, and that he thought he should redeem the pledge of the Conservative party. Charity begins at home, and if there is any charity in a Reform government, it should begin there too. We do not ask the Premier to pay our debts; we have had no claims filed against the Conservative party and proved in the ordinary way, to show that there are any debts of this kind against the Conservative party. We know, however, that there are a good many claims to be satisfied by the Reform party, who in 1896 turned out of office better men than they are, by making pledges they did not intend to carry out. To show how callous this government are in the matter of broken pledges, I would remind the House that in the speech from the Throne, placed in the mouth of His Excellency by this government, a pledge was made that this question would be dealt with in a very different way, and we have heard no apology as to why that pledge was not carried out. I would advise the right hon. gentleman to pay his debts, so recent and so fresh in the minds of the people, before he talks such nonsense as he has talked about the debts of the Conservative party. I tell him, without fear of contradiction, that the Conservative party does not owe a single debt on account of broken pledges and does not want any advice from any Premier of any so-called Reform government.

To do the hon. Prime Minister credit he said that it was for patriotic reasons that it was essential that this railway should be built. If I understand my constituency and the province of Ontario, and in fact all the constituencies of the Dominion of Canada—for I do not understand that one Canadian is different from another in his knowledge of patriotism and of his business duty—I believe thoroughly that the people of Canada want the business which we are sent here with a solemn trust to conduct, dealt with on its merits and without any such nonsense as patriotism being used as a reason for a bad Bill going through. What patriotism is there in making five or six millionaires at the expense of the people? Have we to constitute Morgans and Vanderbilts and Rockfellers, five or six of them, before we can call ourselves a nation, before we can wake up and find ourselves a nation? Has the Premier to go to sleep again and have another dream and find that we are not a nation because we have no multi-millionaires? We are sent here as the representatives of the people to look after their interests, and it is not fair to take from every family of five what this scheme will take. It will cost in round numbers $150,000,000, with no interest and no return, and it is not fair to thus assess every poor man's family $150 in order to make five or six millionaires.

No case has been made out in support of this scheme. The Conservative party does not stop short at criticism. They would be justified in saying: Because you have not proved to this House that this measure is expedient, therefore we must assume it is not expedient. The Conservative party have investigated the facts; they have said to themselves and to the people, If the government will not ascertain the facts and take the trouble to have surveys and plans made and to see what they are doing, we will do it, although we have not such facilities as the government have, although the expenses we make will come out of our pockets and not out of the public exchequer, although every telegram we send and every engineer and every explorer we employ, must be paid out of our own pockets—although all this is so, still, in the interest of the country, we will ascertain what this is going to be. And so at considerable expense, and at the cost of a great deal of

time and energy, we have shown to you and to the House and to this government—if they will be good enough to open their ears wide enough to take it in—what this is going to amount to.

What does it amount to? It is going to cost $150,000,000, and the canals of the country are going to be rendered useless if the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite is good. I do not think their arguments are good in that respect. I think the canals will still do business, but I do not think this railway will do the business that hon. gentlemen opposite pretend it will do. If their arguments are good this road ought to be able to handle all the traffic and the canals are to be put out of business. The scores of millions of dollars which have been spent in the building of our canals are to be wasted the moneys spent on the Georgian bay are to be wasted, the moneys spent on the St. Lawrence canal system are to be wasted, if their arguments are good, because according to these hon. gentlemen this railway is going to do more than any other railway can do. It is pretended by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that this railway will be able to carry the grain from the west and that another railway cannot do it. It is a strange thing that this railway should possess a supernatural power to do that which these hon. gentlemen say other railways cannot do. If these hon. gentlemen are correct in what they say, then the canals and the existing railways are all bad, and if they are not, this particular railway will be no good. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not able to carry, according to their argument, any such quantities of grain from the west as this railway is going to carry under similar conditions, though the trains are hauled by the same kind of engines and through the same kind of country. The argument of these hon. gentlemen is that unless this particular railway is constructed the grain cannot be carried out of the country, because hon. gentlemen say that this railway can do what other railways cannot do. The proposal of the hon. leader of the opposition has all the advantages that the government scheme assumes to possess and at one-third of the expense. There is no question but that all the grain can be brought out and that the fruit from the eastern provinces can be sent up to the west. I was amused to hear the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) talk about shipping his apples and other fruits to Great Britain. Does he not know that we cannot send our apples and other fruit from the Niagara district to Winnipeg because the freights are too high to allow us to do it ? The miller in the North-west Territories gets his barrel of flour carried to St. Catharines for less than one-half the freight that the fruit-grower has to pay to get his barrel of apples carried up to Winnipeg. Do the people in the hon. gentleman's county want to send their fruit to Great Britain or to the west ? If they want to be national in their ideas let them start to build up a trade at home. Does the hon. gentleman not think that hon. gentlemen who sit in this House, that the friends and relations of hon. gentlemen who sit in this House, and that the people of Canada should be considered a little in this question as well as himself and those he speaks for ? I am not going to say that because the farmers of Ontario had to build granaries in the pioneer days, that because they had to take care of their grain until the railways were built, that because they had to hold it for months and months ; that because in the early days of Ontario the farmers did not have the advantages that are now afforded to the people of the west, we should not give these advantages to the western people. The section of the country which I have the honour to represent is not stingy and it does not object to any proper bargain that is entered into in regard to railways, but if the country is going to build railways, build them on a sensible plan ; do not build them and then hand them over to a corporation at the expense of the people who get no benefit from them.

I want to say one word in regard to the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). The right hon. gentleman made a speech upon this question the other day. Of course, if the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) does not agree with the scheme, the next best man to appeal to is the hon. Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), because it is a money question. The hon. gentleman said that the whole cost would be for the interest, which amounts to $8,000,000, but he did not tell us what it would cost for the payment of the prinicpal. The next hon. gentleman that we would be apt to call upon to give us some information in regard to this project is the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. The right hon. gentleman addressed a long speech on this question to this House, or rather to the other side of the House. During the course of this debate I have noticed that when cabinet ministers undertake to address the House on the subject they turn their backs upon you, Mr. Speaker, and upon the people of the country as represented by the opposition, and they devote their attention to trying to convince their own followers that they had better vote for this scheme. It is quite evident that the cabinet ministers from the right hon. Premier down are afraid to trust the fidelity of hon. gentlemen sitting behind them, and therefore, whilst endeavouring to convince their own supporters, they turn their backs upon you, Mr. Speaker, and upon us, because they think it does not make any difference about us if they can only hold the fifty majority which they have had since 1900. The right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce tried to convince the hon.

gentlemen behind him. He told us nothing whatever about the present project, but he said that if the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie's scheme had gone on the country would have been more prosperous in 1885 than it is now. I do not know. I may be stupid, but if that is the case I do not know why it is that we have not 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 people here now, although I am sure this country has enjoyed a large measure of prosperity since 1878, when Mr. Mackenzie was put out of power because he was considered by the people not to be able to carry on the affairs of the country in such a way as to promote its prosperity. I am sure it has prospered since and if the same proportion was to be given effect to we would get ourselves into that same maze that the hon. gentlemen on the other side have got themselves into when trying to show us that this is a good scheme. He did tell us he was afraid that in the face of our record we would not be able to make it go down with the people that this was not a good thing for the country. I recall the time three years ago next November when the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce came over to St. Catharines to defeat me and to endeavour to have the present Senator Gibson elected by a good majority. He made a speech in the Opera House in St. Catharines and he undertook to speak in regard to the fiscal policy. His speech on that question was about as applicable to the fiscal policy as his speech in this House the other day was applicable to this railway project. He made about the same kind of a speech in comparison as he made here the other day, and the result was that a majority in 1896 of 119 was converted into a majority in 1900 of 396. I can assure the hon. minister that if he comes over at the next election he will save me a lot of trouble and a lot of election expenses. If he will come over to the Opera House in St. Catharines and deliver the same kind of a speech upon the railway policy that he delivered in regard to the fiscal policy on the occasion to which I have referred, I think he will increase my majority from 369 to probably 1,069.

I was going to speak for a moment in regard to the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), who addressed the House upon this question yesterday. He said that he had listened very carefully to the speeches delivered during this debate, that he had read 'Hansard' containing what he had not listened to, and that he had not heard one word uttered by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House taking any exception to the paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway. Here is an hon. gentleman speaking in this House trying to belittle the arguments of the opposition and stating that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House has found fault with this road because it is paralleling the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell), who spoke a little while before him, had taken up an hour or more with his argument in respect to the bonding privilege and he had devoted another hour and a half in trying to convince the House that the paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway was not in reality a paralleling of the Intercolonial Railway, but a paralleling of the Grand Trunk Pacific by the Intercolonial Railway. That is about the way he left the matter when he got through with it, and then he said that the effect of it was that if the Intercolonial Railway were turned into scrap iron it would not make any difference.

I would advise the hon. member for (Welland) Mr. German to consult the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) as an eye and ear specialist, so that when he reads 'Hansard' again and listens to the debates in this House, he will understand better what has been said. The hon. gentleman (Mr. German) could not give any reason to the people of Ontario as to why $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 should be wasted in paralleling the Intercolonial Railway, towards the construction of which the ratepayers of that province have contributed largely. He knew that if the new line paralleled the Intercolonial Railway it should not be built, and then he resorted to the device of saying that he heard no one on this side of the House making objection to the paralleling. Well, if he listened he would have heard it. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) comes from the Niagara district—although not as good a part of it as I come from—it might be thought that if I did not refute what he said I had acquiesced in it. I am bound in the interests of the honest reformers and the Conservatives of that district to refute his statements at the first opportunity. He told us that he understood in the Railway Committee that no substantial assistance was to be given to the Grand Trunk Railway. I was in the committee when the Grand Trunk Railway Bill was being discussed, and I know that we had all we could do to keep gentlemen opposite from pledging the government that there would be no financial aid given to the company, if a charter were passed. They were afraid that the government would give financial assistance, and on the very preamble of the Bill, and all through its clauses they endeavoured to provide that there would be no financial assistance given to that company. We have heard from the Minister of the Interior, and we have heard from other gentlemen from the west, that the great cry in the North-west is that they cannot get trains enough to take the products of that country to the seaboard. If that be true, and I suppose it is, it would seem that a railway should give a bonus to the country for granting permission to enter that region. When a railway builds there, it is not a case of taking chances. Subsidies are paid to railways when they un-

dertake a venture which looks doubtful, but which if successful may add to the prosperity of the country. Subsidies are paid to railways to open up countries so that crops may be grown and hauled out. But here is a country in which the trouble is that the existing railways cannot handle all the freight that is offered to them. Is that not a good reason why this railway in the prairie section, should not be subsidized, but on the contrary that it should be thankful to get permission to enter that country and to do the business which is waiting for it. The hon. gentleman from Welland (Mr. German) also told us that there was nothing in the contention that this new road would parallel the Intercolonial Railway, because if the government did not parallel the Intercolonial the Grand Trunk Railway would step in and do it itself. Well, I would point out to him that the Grand Trunk Railway could not build one foot of road to parallel the Intercolonial Railway unless parliament gave them a charter to do so. What idleness it is for the member for Welland to say that unless the government built this section of the road, the Grand Trunk Railway Company would build it and themselves parallel the Intercolonial Railway. Why, the Grand Trunk Railway cannot do any such thing unless they get a charter. They cannot build a foot of road unless they get a Dominion charter where it is to the general advantage of Canada or a provincial charter with respect to a portion of the road which affects only a particular province. The member for Welland says that we are at the mercy of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in this matter, when as a matter of fact the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway must and should be at the mercy of parliament for any favours which they may get, or for any permission to build roads which they may obtain. Sir, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals was absolutely correct when he talked about the hysterical frenzy of the government. You would imagine that they believed that the Grand Trunk Railway could take the people of Canada by the throat and say: Unless you build this railway from Quebec to Moncton, we will build it, and we will put your Intercolonial Railway out of business. That is the sort of argument that comes from the hon. member for Welland. Then the hon. gentleman told us that we had the advantage of government ownership in the road from Moncton to Winnipeg, because we will build the road ourselves. What is ownership in a railroad or in a House, or in a barn, or in anything else if it is not the right to use it; and has not the government of this country handed over the right to use that road and the practical ownership for fifty years? What good is the title if we have not the user? If the scheme of the leader of the opposition were adopted we would have the right to use the roads acquired, and therefore we would have all the attributes of ownership; but in this case you build the road and for half a century you hand over what is practically its ownership to the Grand Trunk Pacific. It is not my habit to say what any man's constituency will stand from him, but if I know the people of Welland, I doubt very much if they will not resent the action of the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) in underestimating their intelligence to such an extent as to suppose that the arguments he has advanced to this House would appeal to any reasonable man.

The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German does not care what will happen fifty years hence and the member for Hants (Mr. Russell) told us that he was tired of hearing people talk of fifty years hence when he would be in his grave. Well, I should have thought that the Prime Minister would have given a little attention to this matter before he entered into this scheme. You cannot convince any business man in this country, nay, you cannot convince any schoolboy, that in a matter of national concern you must not look forward for fifty years. Why, Sir, this road will have made millionaires of its promoters or it will be found to be an utter failure in the next fifteen or twenty years. We know that railways which were constructed fifty years ago are not doing business in the same way to-day as when they were first operated. How does any gentleman know in this age of scientific research and invention what the conditions will be fifty years hence? I notice that charters which this government have passed speak about steam and electricity as being possibly set aside and their place taken by an atmospheric pressure or other discoveries as motor power. It may be that in handing this railway over to the Grand Trunk Pacific for fifty years we are handing it over for the time that it will be of any profit whatever. That can be obviated by owning the whole line now, and by controlling it now, or, it can be obviated by adopting the scheme of the leader of the opposition which will cost one-third the money that the government project will cost, and be more advantageous to the country.

The hon. member for Welland also claimed that this road should be built because it would bring freight to the Intercolonial Railway from the North-west. The Intercolonial Railway is not in the hands of a receiver; it is owned by the people; it is doing business at the old stand, and carrying a great deal of freight. Is it not getting freight from the North-west now? If the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition is carried out and the Intercolonial Railway is extended to the North-west by the amalgamation he proposes, will not the freight come down over the Intercolonial Railway as well as over others? Is it going to be turned away or sent to the North Pole or to Chicago or anywhere else?

Does not the scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition give us all the benefits of the scheme of the government itself, and at one-third of the expense, while at the same time the people have the whole control ?

I want to mention another matter. The government, by the solid vote of their party two or three months ago, voted down the proposition made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and seconded by myself, to bring the Intercolonial under the terms of the Railway Commission Bill. They gave as a reason for voting down that proposition that the Intercolonial Railway should have a little more power than the other railways. If that is the case, why do they want now, to throttle the Intercolonial and go back on their vote of two or three months ago ? Why do they not protect their own business ? Why do they give to strangers, or at any rate to people doing business in opposition to the people they represent, the advantages which they claimed for the Intercolonial Railway three months ago ? The question was whether the Intercolonial Railway should not be allowed more control over freights, so that it could relieve the situation, even if the railway commission did not succeed in doing so, it being understood that the railway commission must prevent discrimination, and give the same chance to all railways carrying to the same points and under the same conditions. It was thought that the Intercolonial Railway might be treated as an exception. If there was any merit in the opposition of the government to the proposition made on this side of the House, it was that the government, being actuated by proper motives, not by political motives, but only anxious to relieve an improper and hazardous situation, would in some special case create a disposition of freight and transportation for the benefit of the people. The Intercolonial would perhaps carry freight cheaper and in a less formal way than the other railways. If hon. gentlemen opposite voted against that proposition on the ground that the Intercolonial Railway should be strengthened, being the people's road, if they were sincere in that position, and if there is any consistency about them, why not apply the same view to the present case, and carry out the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition, which is to strengthen and increase the powers of the Intercolonial Railway ? And if there is any benefit to be conferred on the people by the Intercolonial Railway not being under the railway commission, then, so far as you increase the powers of the Intercolonial, so far you increase that benefit.

I must pay the compliment to the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) of saying that I was very glad the other night to hear him say that he had fished and trapped and hunted over that part of New Brunswick through which the supposed railway is to run, and that, although he would not dare to compare it with the fertile lands of the Niagara district or other parts of the province of Ontario, it was not bad land, and that he thought the railway might be built through that country. I suppose as soon as the railway is built the bad land will be turned into good land, the muskegs will be filled up, and joy and happiness will reign. I was very much pleased, however, to hear the hon. gentleman, because it was the first speech I have heard him make into which he did not drag the religious question. The hon. gentleman spoke with more evident anxiety about the result than he usually does, probably because he thought the proposition before the House was fraught with a good deal of anger to the government which since 1896 he so ardently supported. I was also glad to hear him say, that though the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals had left the government on this question and was not going to be so strong, yet his friends were not going to leave him. I agree with the hon. gentleman's conclusion, but not with his preamble. I do not think that because the hon. ex-minister left the government on this question that his friends are going to leave him, nor do I think that the fact that he left the government was any sign that he was weak. Almost every man who spoke on this question in support of the proposition of the Premier, made three-fourths of his argument in abusing the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals; but if that hon. gentleman has not their support, he has strengthened a code of morality in this country which says that if you do not think a thing is right you should not vote for it. I think the people of this country will want a better argument than abuse of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to convince them that the government are right and that he is wrong. Let the hon. gentlemen on the government side who are putting this scheme through tell us where the hon. ex-minister is wrong. Please do not call him names ; he is a Canadian as well as the rest of you. The row has cost him, and not you. So far as we know, he has been actuated by proper motives. When the people come to vote on this scheme at the polls, I think they will vote disapproval of the government and not of him, or else they will require more substantial arguments than have been addressed to this House in support of the government scheme. They will not, I think, conclude that because a man has voted against the government in power and because he has voted against the extravagant project now submitted to us, he is therefore everything that is vile, and worthy of the severest censures.

I want for a moment, before concluding, to refer to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan). That hon. gentleman waxed quite eloquent and patriotic. In fact every time this government proposes to do something, their followers become patriotic and

indulge in windy screeds about Canada being a large country and about our being all Canadians, and so forth. He even became prophetic, and predicted what was going to happen to the two political parties in the coming election. He was not so indiscreet as the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who told us that we were going to have general elections this fall. He was more careful—probably he had been cautioned not to be too explicit—and he said that whether the general elections came off this fall or two years hence—and they must, under the constitution, be held inside of two years—the banners of the Liberal party would wave triumphantly at the head of the poll. On these banners, he told us, would be inscribed the words 'Laurier, Progress and Victory,' and on the banners of the opposition would be found the motto 'Borden, Blue Ruin and Gamey.' I wondered what in the world was the matter with the hon. gentleman; I wondered who had been talking blue ruin to him; and on trying to find some cause for his language, I noticed that his arms were stretched out exultingly towards that seat on this side which used to be occupied by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when in opposition, and when he was wont to preach the gospel of blue ruin. The hon. gentleman imagined for the moment that he was addressing the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and was really confounding with that hon. gentleman the leader of the opposition. But I can assure the hon. member for Cumberland that he is mistaken about the banners of the two parties. Although I am not in possession of the secrets of the Liberal caucus, or in the confidence of the leaders of the government, I think I can venture the assertion that on the Liberal banners we will find emblazoned these words: 'Laurier Millionaires at the Expense of the People,' and on the Conservative banners 'Borden and the People's Rights'; and as soon as the people are given the opportunity, they will vote for the Conservative candidates and the Conservative leader, who has done more for the people's rights in the three years he has been leading his party in this House than any Reform leader has done in the past forty years.

Mr. W. ROSS (South Ontario). I feel somewhat diffident, Mr. Speaker, in occupying the time of the House at this late hour of the session, especially as we shall by next week have had the longest discussion on record in the history of this confederation. But on this occasion I feel impelled to speak, for two reasons. First, that I do not care to give a silent vote upon this great question, one of the greatest that has ever occupied the attention of parliament. And, secondly, because, from a careful attention to this debate, I find that the more the proposition before the House is discussed, the better it commends itself to my support.

And although I am the sixty-first speaker to address the House on this resolution, and although it has been fully debated in all its details, I am sure that its merits will still bear further discussion, and that therefore I may be pardoned if I give what little aid I can to the promotion of this project, which I consider will be of immense advantage to the people of Canada.

Notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) who has just sat down, I am confident that the people will show by their votes at the next election, whenever that may be, that they heartily approve of this measure and are convinced that it is in the interest of the country at large. The hon. gentleman stated that this measure would simply create millionaires and ruin the country. That is not how I understand it. I have studied the Bill very thoroughly, and even at the risk of wearying the House, I wish to give some of my reasons why I think the scheme a good one. So much has been said by those who have preceded me that it is almost impossible to introduce any new matter into this discussion; but this is one of the many good things which will stand repetition. Let me read the resolution which the right hon. the Prime Minister moved when he brought down this Bill:

> Resolved, that it is expedient, in connection with the Bill now before this House, respecting the construction of a national transcontinental railway, to ratify the agreement set forth in the schedule to the said Bill, entered into on the 28th of July, 1903, between the government and certain persons on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company to be incorporated by parliament at the present session thereof, and to authorize the government to do whatever is necessary to give full effect to the said Bill and agreement.

We have also an amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) in favour of government ownership.

Let me say briefly that I can well understand the earlier movements in connection with the introduction of this Bill. During the earlier part of the session the Grand Trunk Railway asked for a charter to extend their road from North Bay westward, and they wanted a subsidy of $6,400 and 5,000 acres per mile. The Canadian Northern Railway were also asking for bonuses. These matters were all engaging the attention of the government. Indeed, this parliament itself, in the interest of the Mackenzie & Mann syndicate, who are the head of the Canadian Northern Railway, voted a very substantial bonus for the prairie part of the road. All these matters were pressing upon the government, and the government scarcely knew what to do with the tremendous demand upon them for subsidies, which would take millions and millions out of the people of the country. And, apparently, they did not see their way clear to satisfy all these demands, but they brought down this Bill which they present

to the House. Let me read the title and preamble of the Bill :

BILL No. 235.

An Act respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.

Whereas, by reason of the growth in population and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada and especially of the western part thereof, and with a view to the opening up of new territory available for settlement, both in the eastern provinces and in the west, and the affording of transportation facilities for such territory and for other reasons, the necessity has arisen for the construction of a national transcontinental railway to be operated, as a common railway highway across the Dominion of Canada, from ocean to ocean and wholly within Canadian territory; and whereas an agreement has been entered into bearing date the 29th day of July, 1903, between His Majesty the King of the first part, and Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, C.B., G.C.M.G., and others, representing therein and acting on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, a company incorporated by an Act of parliament of Canada passed at the present session thereof, of the second part, making provision for the construction and operation of such a railway, a copy of which agreement forms the schedule to this Act ; and whereas it is expedient that parliament should ratify and confirm the said agreement, and should grant authority for the construction in manner hereinafter provided of the eastern division of the said railway between the city of Moncton in the province of New Brunswick, and the city of Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba.

Now therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows :—

There we have the matter before us. We have had the subject dealt with by sixty members of the House, including the Prime Minister, who presented all the points in connection with the Bill so well and forcibly. It will be noticed that the preamble begins : 'Whereas by reason of the growth in population.' We are quite sure that in the early eighties and up through the early nineties the growth of population in this country was very slow. It was very slow for various reasons. We, as Liberals thought that the fiscal policy of the Conservatives, then in office, had a tendency to retard the growth of the country. We saw that the industries which had been promised did not spring up, and we attributed this fact to the fiscal policy which had been adopted. We saw that our young men had gone to the other side of the line, that a large population from French Canada had gone into the eastern States, that everywhere our people were leaving us and that our growth in population was not at all satisfactory. But I am glad to assure you, Sir, that since the advent of the Liberal party to power the growth has been rapidly increasing. We have had a natural growth of the country and have also had an immigration into Canada which has been a surprise to everybody. We have talked about the matter in the House and the records show that the immigration into the country has been far and above anything ever known here, and that it is likely to increase. Indeed, the immigration into this country during the last fiscal year was about 125,000 people. That is very significant, when you remember that for many years the immigration did not exceed 5,000 or 6,000 per annum. That immigration is likely to increase. Why ? Because we have the country to attract them; because the country is well governed and has a policy which is suitable to immigrants making life pleasant and easy for them. Under these circumstances, we are sure the immigrants will come into this country and will come in very fast. The second portion of the preamble says : 'And the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada and especially of the western part thereof.' Let us consider, for a moment or two, the growth of trade which is the second reason why we are asked to vote for the Bill. When the Premier puts forward this resolution he does not say to us : You are my servile followers; vote for this. He gives us reasons. And the second of these reasons is the rapid development of our trade. We find that in 1882, when the first transcontinental road was built, our total trade amounted to $221,356,703; and in 1902, twenty years later—just two decades, the lifetime of one individual—it had increased to $467,000,000. That is, it has doubled in the last twenty years and most of that increase, I am assured, has come in the last seven years. The total revenue of the country in 1882 was $33,383,455, and the revenue for 1902 was $66,500,000. We find a great increase in the bank assets also. The government are not by any means the only people to whom the increased business of the country is to be credited. There are the business people besides. The banks have a hand in practically all the business of the country, and they get a rake-off for the work they do. The total bank assets in 1882 were $227,426,835. In 1902, the total bank assets had grown to $641,985,372, more than keeping pace with the growth of the trade of the country. And if hon. gentlemen say that the government did not do it all, we quite agree with them; we say that the country grew independently of the government. The money in the savings banks including the post office savings banks in 1882 amounted to $21,786,661. This has grown until in 1902 it amounted to $59,147,226. These figures show the growth and expansion of our trade generally. But we know, independently of the figures that all our industries have been growing. In my own riding we have a smart little town. The industries of my own riding have grown rapidly. We can see them grow. New additions are being put upon factory buildings, more men are being hired, and new stuff being turned out. We have enormous factories in our town now, and what we see there is only indicative of what is going on

all over the country. In my travels I meet with gentlemen engaged in the manufacturing industries. They tell me that business was never better; their trade in many cases, is overdone; they cannot get the hands to do the business that offers. Our mines have been very productive. We have heard the hon. members for British Columbia telling us of the productiveness of their mines. The coal mines and other mines operated in the east have been operated largely, as also have the coal mines in the west on this side of the Rocky mountains. The price of lumber has advanced, the enormous cut of logs has produced a great quantity of lumber and not only has the home trade in lumber been good, owing to the activity in the building trade, but the export lumber trade has also been highly satisfactory.

The agricultural and live stock industries have felt this prosperity, and the farmers in the county of Ontario, which I have the honour to represent, are doing well to-day. They receive high prices for their live stock, good average prices for their grain, and they have large crops. Only the other day I had a letter from one of my constituents who said he had been farming for thirty-five years and that this was the best crop that he had ever had; he had oats running as high as 100 bushels to the acre.

These are the things that tell the growth in trade. This government have observed this growth all over the country. We see an enormous development of trade in the North-west. A few years ago they grew ten million or fifteen million bushels of No. 1 hard wheat; to-day they grow sixty to seventy-five million bushels and some of us who are here will live to see them grow hundreds of millions of bushels. These things show that the trade of the country is growing.

The next reason we are asked to vote for this is that it will open up a new territory which is available for settlement. We are not asked to vote blindly; reasons are given why we should vote for it. Is this country peopled as it should be, this enormous country with three and a half million square miles of territory? We have opened up simply a fringe of our country along the United States border, but it is now proposed to go farther in and open up the country and say to the people: Come and take the resources that lie here.

This railway will pass in its progress of 3,500 miles across the continent through one territory and five provinces. It passes through the province of New Brunswick with 28,200 square miles of territory, through Quebec with 298,900 square miles, through Ontario with 222,000 square miles, through Manitoba with 73,956 square miles, through British Columbia with 383,300 square miles, and through the North-west Territories, through a very rich and fertile part of them, with 906,000 square miles of territory. This is a vast area of country to be opened up. There is not much more to be opened up except Nova Soctia and Cape Breton and the unorganized districts which are estimated at about one and a half million square miles of territory.

As you think of the vast extent of this country you wonder why the attention of the world has not been turned to Canada before this, Canada with its enormous territories of valuable arable land. Are they productive these territories and provinces? What have the members who represent them said? What did the hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison) tell us of the enormous development and riches of his territory in British Columbia? What did the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) say with regard to the wealth of the district from which he comes? These two members have spoken for British Columbia; they have said that there is a practically inexhaustible supply of minerals in that country; that the forests of that country, which some of us have seen and know to be of immense wealth and size, will be sources of wealth for many years to come; that they have great fisheries, while the valleys although small, lying between the enormous hills that reach into the skies, are wonderfully productive. Then there are the territories. In previous sessions we have heard more than one member tell of the boundless resources and vast wealth of their districts and we know the productiveness of the fertile prairies. The member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has spoken of that during this debate; he has told us of the resources and the needs of that country—and its greatest need is a new railway.

The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) who is a practical lumberman and has gone through a great part of northern Ontario, told us the other day, and I have it from his own lips, that it is not by any means all water and rock; that there is a great deal of arable land there and that it is not impossible to run a railway across the route projected. The hon. gentleman I may say as a lumberman keeps a man employed constantly to bring him reports of that country so that the information which he gives to the House is of additional value. We know too from the result of the explorations made by the Ontario government that north of the height of land, between that and James' bay, there is a large section of arable land, estimated at anywhere from sixteen to twenty million acres, which is very favourably situated and through which this railway will run. Besides that, does not New Ontario contain a vast amount of minerals? Gold, which is one of the most valuable minerals in the world, is found there. Iron of all kinds is found in great abundance on the north shore particularly in the section of the country which was stated by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and again by one of the members to-day, to be practically not a farming

country. This then will be a mineral country. We had a report in the newspapers the other day that the explorers who are working in that country have found a vein of lignite coal. This would be a wonderful boon to the great manufacturing province of Ontario.

We have heard also from the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) have told about the wonderful resources of Quebec and we know that the northern sections of that province are very similar to the northern sections of Ontario. This northern part of Quebec must indeed be very rich, not only in farming lands, but in timber. There is a crop there now all ready to cut, a crop of fir, spruce, pine, birch and the various woods ready to be manufactured into lumber and into pulp.

The hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Hon. Mr. Costigan) said in this House a few nights ago that this railway will pass through his county, the county of Victoria, N.B., and he has told us about the wealth of the section of the country through which it will pass in that province. He tells us it will not be by any means through a mountainous country, that it will be through a rolling country and that it will have streams and rivers; that it will be rich when it is opened up and that the reason it has not been settled before is simply because it is inaccessible. To secure settlement you must have a railway; that is the thing to attract people and if you put a railway in there, he is sure that the country will be filled up in good time. He says that this is a feasible route for a railway and that there is timber there. It is true that this has been cut over but there is still a great deal of it left besides the new crop. He also stated that there are minerals there and a little further down large quantities of coal. But of these we have heard from the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). Then we have here an important reason. He tells us about the wonderful riches of that country and he tells us that in his capacity of commissioner of roads he had to travel over a large part of the country and that he knows its wealth. If time would permit I would be prepared to present to this House any quantity of information that I have had from books which I have read upon the various sections of this country, the reports of botanists, reports of geologists, reports of engineers, reports of exploring parties, reports of hunters and reports of travellers who have travelled over the route which this railway proposes to traverse and they say it is a good country.

Mr. WILSON. Give us the reports.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I do not have them here. I have been in the library reading them.

Mr. WILSON. I did not mean to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I understand him to say that he would give us these reports if we wanted them, but that he did not want to take up the time of the House in reading them. It would be very interesting if we could have them.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I will not give them to you just now. I would rather do something else. I prefer to take the statements of men who represent these constituencies, of men who know something of the country of their own personal knowledge and when they upon their honour and standing in their places as members of this House report these things to me, I am in honour bound to believe that they are so. That satisfies me of the productiveness of the country through which this railway is to pass. The next reason why I am going to vote for this measure is that it will afford necessary transportation facilities. Have hon. members asked for this? Has the country asked for this? Yes, the members of this House have demanded it. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) has had a motion on the Order Paper for two years to say that he believes that it is in the interest of this country that more transportation facilities should be given the people of the west, and other western members have voiced that need time and time again. We have listened to them very patiently as they have told of the needs of the country as they exist to-day. Now, you will find that settlement has gone in advance of the railway in many cases. The railway should go in some respects in advance of settlement, but in this case settlement has gone in advance of the railway. Of the 125,000 settlers who have gone into that western country this year as immigrants, some thirty odd thousand are Americans. These people have come from a country where they know what railways are, they have come from a country that has been served by railways, and to ask them to go into the North-west without railway facilities is not a wise thing to do. If they do not have railway facilities they will become discontented, and if they become discontented they will look again to their homes in the south, and if they do get railways from that country connecting with the sections of the country where they are now located they will exchange their trade with the people of the south, while, on the other hand, if this railway is built the trade of these people will naturally be drawn down towards eastern Canada. They will be able to ship their grain down over this line. I need not state here the advisability of encouraging the development of such a trade as that. The point has been already ably argued in this House. With this railway these settlers will be able to trade with the great industrial provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Their national sentiment would draw them

to the south, but if they can make use of this road then we shall overcome that great difficulty of the settlement of New Ontario and bring these people into touch with the industries of Ontario and Quebec. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are in the best position to handle this scheme because they already have their feeders in eastern Ontario, they already have their trunk line and I believe these people can handle this scheme better than any one else. We have by our vote in parliament given large sums to different parts of the country to remove the congestion in trade. We have done wonderful things in connection with providing facilities for the people. We have built the Intercolonial railway at a cost of $75,000,000, which does not practically pay its way, according to the records which have been given to this House by different hon. members. In the construction and deepening of the canals and waterways we have expended $80,000,000 in round numbers and we do not collect a dollar from them. They do not bring us any revenue, but it costs us $450,000 a year to keep them up. This is what has been spent in the interests of the country. We have spent $150,000,000 or $160,000,000 to aid and assist in the development of this eastern section of the country, and besides that there has been the large expenditure of the Dominion upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, to which I shall not advert at the present time. This being the case, it shows that the necessity is very great for the construction of a national transcontinental railway. This government took the first step and resolved to help Canada. That was its resolve. I believe it to be an honest resolve notwithstanding what others may say to the effect that it is an election dodge, or that it is in the interest of certain senators, or that it is in the interest of a certain clique. I cannot bring myself to believe that fourteen or fifteen men in the cabinet council would consent to support a scheme such as that and practically take their lives in their hands in order to present it to this parliament. Hon. gentlemen may say that I am simple, that I am gullible, but I ask them to bring on the evidence before I shall believe it. I have confidence in the government of this country. Hon. gentlemen may say what they like regarding it, but until they bring the evidence to the contrary I for one shall not believe it. What manner of agreement have they made ? They have set forth the various reasons why they think we should build this railway. They have stated that they think the railway is necessary. They say to us : If you think with us, kindly consent to this agreement. Here is the agreement which is given to us attached to this Bill. Suppose we examine this agreement. Whom are they dealing with ? Are they dealing with promoters, are they dealing with men of straw ? Who is the president of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company ? Is Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson a man of straw ? I looked up his record the other day in the library. I found that in 1856, the year I was born, he was appointed as a clerk in the treasury. He was private secretary to two secretaries of the treasury, he was private secretary to the Earl of Beaconsfield when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was afterwards appointed controller of Great Britain and he held that position for many years. During this time he was appointed on the International Coinage Commission in the interest of Great Britain. When the British government had important matters to be attended to in Egypt they chose Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson, controller of the national debt, to go to Egypt. He went to Egypt and took the position of finance minister, being associated with a French gentleman from Paris, who, in the interests of the French government, acted as minister of public works. Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson held that position for three years. He then returned to England and took his position again as controller of the national debt. He afterwards went back to Egypt, and if any hon. members have read the history of the recovery of Egypt from its financial distress under the guidance of the British government, they will know that this was in a great measure due to the financial genius of Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson. This gentleman has also been on one of the Royal Commissions to make a treaty between England and France. You would not call a man like that an adventurer, you would call him a distinguished financier and a gentleman to whom it would be safe to entrust a scheme of this kind. Sir Rivers-Wilson, I need hardly say, is now the president of the Grand Trunk Railway. I am not acquainted with all the members of the board, but we all know the name of Chas. M. Hays as one of the greatest railway men in the world to-day. We have railway men in Canada of whom we are proud. We have Sir Wm. Van Horne, and we have Sir Thomas Saughnessy who have done wonderful things for the Canadian Pacific Railway, but perhaps a greater accomplishment than any they achieved, was when Mr. Hays succeeded in bringing the Grand Trunk Railway to the high position it occupies to-day. We who live upon the line of the Grand Trunk Railway knew its condition when Mr. Hays took hold of it. He has completely reorganized its forces, and its credit which was then very low has to-day been established on such a firm basis that the securities of the Grand Trunk Railway have been enhanced in value on the market to the tune of $75,000,000. That is the kind of man whom the government presents to us as an associate in the carrying out of this national project. Then connected with the Grand Trunk Railway we also have Mr. Wainright. Mr. Wainright occupies a position of responsibility in connection with this

railway company and he has in the past done excellent service. Mr. Wainwright is known to every one in this House, and I am safe in saying that we all have confidence in his opinion on any railway question. He is not heard of a great deal, but his judgment is good and his counsel will be valuable. The government did not submit to us a lot of adventurers as their associates, but they gave us a contract signed by men of ability and responsibility. For my part, I think all the more of the contract that it bears such names. I desire to keep my remarks within reasonable limit, Mr. Speaker. If I entered into all the details which a study of the subject has placed at my disposal I might speak for hours as some other gentlemen have done, but I shall be brief. With another member of this House I went through the contract the first day it was issued, and we both came to the conclusion that no better contract under the circumstances, could be offered for the approval of the Canadian people. For myself, I do not see how the government could make a better contract without tying up the hands of the other party altogether. Let me run briefly over the provisions of this contract which parliament is asked to approve of. The government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway will build a standard road from Moncton to the Pacific coast which shall be upon Canadian territory. Does that not appeal to the sentiment of every Canadian. The company shall deposit $5,000,000 in cash or bonds as security for the faithful fulfilment of their contract. The western section shall be commenced forthwith and built in five years. The government will build the eastern section and lease it to the company. The company will maintain and operate the whole road. The government will guarantee the bonds of the company's western division, the prairie section to the amount of three-quarters of $13,000 per mile and the mountain section to the extent of three-quarters of $30,000 per mile. The company shall have $45,000,000 capital, and shall equip the whole road, and under sections 14 and 15 the cost of construction and the working expenditure on the eastern division are defined so that there shall be no friction at all between the two parties to the contract. Should the company default in interest, the government alone pays it and that is important, because as it is to be an all-Canadian road, if the company defaults in paying its interest coupons, the government steps into their place. The Grand Trunk Railway of Canada shall guarantee the extra cost of the western section, and the company shall give the government a mortgage on all its interest in the property. The company shall buy all their materials and supplies in Canada where possible and shall see that all just claims against them are paid. The company shall operate the road to the satisfaction of the government and all rates and tolls shall be subject to government control. That is a most important thing in connection with this great transcontinental road. Ever since I have been in this House I have heard the members from the west complain that in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway there is no government control over the rates which they charge. In the present instance this government has taken precaution that the rates of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway shall be under their control. Then the company contracts to do their best to keep Canadian trade in Canadian channels, and encourage shipment through Canadian ports. The company shall provide terminal facilities on both the Atlantic and the Pacific oceans, and provide vessels for the transport of the traffic. Then again the company shall allow a director on their board to be appointed by the government. That is the practice in all great financial institutions. You find that where an industry has borrowed money from a bank the bank puts a representative on the directorate, and that is what the government is doing in this case. The company shall in all cases of dispute submit to arbitration. Now, Sir, I think that every public interest is guarded in this contract. I am not a lawyer, I am only an ordinary layman, but I know what a contract means. I believe that there are many laymen in this House who can read a contract sometimes just as well or perhaps a little better than a lawyer, not denying lawyers all the credit that is due them. The contract I maintain is a good one. Its provisions are all properly hedged and surrounded with safeguards in the public interest. It is a wise provision in this Bill that no member of either House shall have a contract on this railway. Now, amongst other things, it has been urged against this project that we do not know the country through which the railway is going to run. For myself I am satisfied that we have a general idea of the country, sufficient at all events for our purposes until we actually commence the work of construction. It is said that we have no information on record, but any one who wishes to go to the library may find any amount of information there. At any rate, hon. gentleman opposite say there is no necessity for haste ; in fact, it is all wrong, and there is nothing good in it at all. That is about the size of their argument. I have not heard anybody say outright that this is not a good scheme. I have listened to nearly all the sixty speeches which have been delivered in this debate, I have heard the arguments pro and con, I have tried to take them in, and I have heard absolutely no serious objection to the scheme of the government. True, the hon. leader of the opposition has put up an alternative scheme ; but he does not father it. He does not present it to this House in the shape of a motion. I do not wish to impute motives to any man in this House. I have tried to find a motive, however, for

that proposition. It seems to me that if that alternative scheme were so good a scheme as it is heralded by hon. gentlemen opposite, the leader of the opposition should put it in the form of a motion. But we have no motion from the opposition at the present time. We have the motion moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee). This motion is :

> That all the words after 'that' be struck out and the following substituted :—
> By reason of growth in population and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada, and especially the western part thereof, the time is opportune for the adoption of a definite policy of government construction and operation of railways, under a properly safeguarded civil service system, put entirely beyond the influence of partisan politics.

The hon. member for Winnipeg in this motion speaks of the growth and development of the country. Western men never forget that the west is growing. Talk to a western man, and he will give you fifty reasons in five minutes why you should go and live in the west. Some of our eastern people think that the western people are a little too free. We have a good country in the east. I do not give up old Ontario for any other province ; I was born there, and I love it. But we have many good provinces, and I like to hear western people talk well of their own country. Then, the hon. member for Winnipeg says in his motion that the time is opportune. I think it is opportune that this railway should be built as proposed by the government, and the motion does not express any serious objection to it. But I do not know how it is possible in this country to carry on a government railroad or anything else entirely beyond the influence of partisan politics. You cannot eliminate politics from the business of this country. Some party must do that business, and there will be another party opposed to their policy. The question of operating railroads by commission is not yet settled. Indeed, there are many people who are opposed to that policy, and I am one of them. I could not vote for that resolution, because I do not think the country is ready at the present time for the government ownership of railways. I may change my views on that question, because I have advanced views. My conviction for some time has been that the government had better get ready to own the telegraphs and telephones. These have become a pressing need in this country, as much so, especially the telephone, as the post office. But I cannot favour the government ownership of railways at the present time.

The scheme of the hon. leader of the opposition was discussed so fully by the hon. Postmaster General last night that it would be useless for me to spend much time in showing that it is not as good a scheme as that proposed by the government. I do not think it is, mainly for this reason, that it will not open up or develop any new country. That is, I believe, the strong feature of this new government railway, that it will open up a new section of country for settlement, which will be of very great advantage to the people of Canada. The hon. leader of the opposition is not afraid to spend money, and he said that the people of this country were not. I am glad he said that, because I sometimes think that hon. members of this House are afraid of spending money. I am not. I think the money of this country, as rapidly as it comes in, should be spent in the interest of the people of Canada.

It has been said that the scheme of the government is a gigantic and monstrous scheme which will plunge this country in debt and ultimately in ruin. I do not think so. Since I have been in this House I have followed with a great deal of confidence the hon. leader of this government, and only once have I been compelled to vote opposite to him—I will not say against him. I am not sorry that I have followed him, because I believe that on every occasion I was right. He comes down with this scheme and practically fathers it. He says : I commend this scheme to the House as a good one, for the reasons I have advanced ; and I have no reason to go back on his judgment on this occasion, though I also use my own judgment.

There is another member of the government in whom I have always felt and placed a good deal of confidence, as he has never been mistaken in his statements regarding the financial affairs of the country. I refer to the hon. Minister of Finance. He has told us what the cost of this railway will be—that the surplus of this government for one year would pay the total cost of this railway to the people of this country. I am not denying the fact that the national debt will be increased ; but if you increase the national debt, you will have a national asset to set off against that increase ; and is it not reasonable to suppose that if the Canadian Pacific Railway has almost doubled in value in twenty years, this other transcontinental railway, including that part of it which belongs to the government, will also double in value in twenty or twenty-five years ? If it does, our asset will be worth, not one hundred cents on the dollar, but one hundred and fifty or two hundred cents on the dollar. Under these circumstances, I am satisfied that the money will be properly spent, and that the amount stated by the Finance Minister is the proper one.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. member pretend to say that the amount stated by the Minister of Finance, $13,000,000, is to be actually the cost of this railway ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Yes, that is all the outlay. I am prepared to back my reputation on the Finance Minister. That has no

reference to the maturity of the bonds ; but when you take up the bonds you own the railroad.

Mr. SPROULE. But if you buy something, don't you pay some consideration for it ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Certainly, you pay some consideration for it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not the consideration which you have to pay for it standing against you ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). If I buy a farm and mortgage it for all it is worth, I do not own the farm until I pay off the mortgage; but when I pay off the mortgage, do I not own the farm ?

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman borrows $2,000 to buy a farm, does he not owe the $2,000.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). But when I pay the $2,000, do I not own the farm ?

Mr. BENNETT. But if the farm is no good ?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). Well, I think that we know something about finances on this side as well as members of the opposition. I am prepared to take the statements made by the right hon. leader of this House and many members on this side, who have spoken in connection with this matter. I think, Sir, that I have gone as rapidly as I could over the main features of the subject before the House, but of course I did not expect to convince hon. gentlemen opposite, who have already made up their minds against it. I have simply given the reasons and the facts as they have presented themselves to my mind, and what I have said to-night has been the subject of mature consideration and the outcome of my honest conscientious convictions, and under these circumstances I am prepared to support this resolution.

Nations, as well as individuals, should have the courage to grapple with great problems. In this connection, I am reminded of a quotation from Lord Macauley, which appeared on the outside of the transportation building at the World's Fair : 'Of all inventions, the alphabet alone excepted, those that have bridged distance have done the most for mankind.' That truth is particularly applicable to transcontinental railways. Look around and see what the world has been doing in that connection. Look at Russia, which for twenty-five years has been building a railway 3,600 miles long, across a country exactly similar to this country, which hon. gentlemen opposite term a sub-arctic region. Russia has built this railway through the region of Siberia. It was an undertaking which practically staggered the empire at first, but it has been successfully accomplished, and Russia has now her sea-ports on the Indian ocean. She accomplished it many years before it was absolutely necessary, but her policy is to-day justified. People are flocking into that country, rich in hard woods, farm lands, water powers and all these things, and they have practically reduced the distance from London to Shanghi, so that when they put on fast trains they expect to shorten the time of travel between these two cities by ten days, which is half the time taken by the fastest vessels. I am told that railway magnates on this continent are looking particularly into that question and are fearing the competition they will have to meet in that direction. Look at South Australia, offering 75,000 acres per mile to build a road 1,200 miles long, so that they will be giving 90,000,000 acres for the construction of 1,200 miles of railway over a country which is not the equal of this country, which is noted perhaps more for its minerals than anything else, but more particularly for its drought. What are they doing on the continent of Africa ? The British government are building a railway practically from Egypt to Cape Town, all the way down through dense forests of jungle. They are doing this to help the country and the individuals that are going to it. Shall we be behind in the race ? I say no. I am a Canadian, I feel the national blood tingling in my veins, I feel that this country shall not remain a nation of five million people, I look to see the day when this will be a nation of twenty-five million, yes, fifty million people. We have the country, we have the resources, we have our vast prairies, we have our mountains filled with minerals, our rivers, our water powers, our lakes, which this great transcontinental railway which we are about to build will open up to commerce, and give this country that greatness and prominence which are its manifest destiny; and when this great enterprise is brought to a successful completion, I shall be glad that I was one of those who had some share in its inauguration and promotion.

Mr. D. HENDERSON (Halton). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Ontario opened his speech with the well known remark that the trade of Canada is growing. I wonder did it occur to him that the trade of China is growing perhaps in larger proportions than even the trade of Canada ? But what that had to do with the subject before us is something I am utterly at a loss to understand. The hon. gentleman told us that the revenues of the country were increasing. I can see the connection between the Bill before us and the growth of our revenue, because, from the very nature of the question with which we are dealing, very large revenues indeed will be required. But when under the fiscal policy of this government, we have a system of hign taxation and low protection, how can we expect that the revenues of the country will do otherwise than increase. The people of

Canada to-day, notwithstanding anything which the hon. gentleman has told us, are paying higher taxes than were paid during the last six or seven years of Conservative regime, comparing the term of seven years of Liberal rule with the previous five or six or seven years of Conservative rule. The hon. gentleman attempted to congratulate himself that the exodus was decreasing and that immigration was increasing. He was glad that a large number of agriculturists were coming into this country to engage in farming. I should rather think that he would have regretted that the artisans, the workingmen, those who are consumers and not producers, were leaving the country, because, had he taken five minutes to investigate, he would have found in the Trade and Navigation Returns a very large amount of settlers effects going out of this country to the United States, proving conclusively that the people were going along with them.

It is not my intention to follow the hon. gentleman through the somewhat interesting speech—interesting to himself no doubt from his own standpoint—which he made, and I congratulate him on having made a very nice speech but a harmless one I am sure. There was not much in it to encourage the government in the course it is taking. He did not put forward any very strong reasons why this railway should be constructed through what has been called an unknown country.

Mr. Speaker, when we came to this House on the 12th day of March last, we were delighted to learn from the government, through the speech from the Throne, that they had determined upon a policy of better transportation facilities for this country. His Excellency informed us, through the speech from the Throne, that a commission of experienced men would be appointed for the purpose of looking into this whole matter. Special reasons were given why that was necessary, and I propose to read to you from the speech from the Throne what these special reasons were. For I shall endeavour to keep close to the subject that we are dealing with. I want to state these reasons in order that I may build an argument upon them. His Excellency said :

> The great influx of population into our North-western territories and the very large additional areas of fertile land which are being brought under cultivation combine to further press upon us the need for increased transportation facilities for the forwarding of our grain and other products to the markets of the world, through Canadian channels. The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

When this House was asked to concur in the resolution, it was urged upon us that the most important question was to afford railway facilities for the new settlers, and for the old setlers, for that matter. We were told by the hon. gentleman who moved the address in reply to the speech from the Throne that this was the great question before the House. He said:

> To what end the raising of 200 million bushels of wheat in the west unless the farmers there can get that wheat to market in reasonable time and at a reasonable expense to them.

Note the words, 'in reasonable time and at reasonable expense.' And, as I proceed, I wish you to apply these words and see whether the scheme propounded by the government will serve to take the products of the west to the markets 'in reasonable time' or 'at reasonable expense.' If not, then this great scheme would fail to meet the purpose that His Excellency had in view when he presented us with the speech from the Throne. The mover of the address also told us :

> And the very same remarks apply to the mixed farmers of older Canada. These men must get their varied products to the seaboard quickly and inexpensively, or forfeit the markets of Britain and Europe. Therefore it is with great pleasure indeed that we heard the announcement in the speech from the Throne, that the government of His Excellency will immediately appoint a transportation commission to deal with this very intricate question, for the purpose of its betterment.

For a considerable time, however, this important matter was lost sight of, as we all remember. It was not until the 19th of May last that we heard any more about this commission which was to investigate the question of better transportation facilities. Then an announcement was made that the commission was appointed, to be composed of Sir William Van Horne, John Bertram and Harold Kennedy, to report on questions affecting the transportation of Canadian products to the markets of the world through and by Canadian ports, &c. In this announcement it was also stated—and I read now from the Order in Council which has been placed on record in 'Hansard' more than once, but some portions of which, I think, well deserve further attention :

> That the development of North-western Canada has manifested the inability of existing Canadian transportation agencies to take care of Canadian products.
>
> That our agricultural exports can only command the prices over seas to which their natural excellence entitles them when they cease to be confounded and confused with the inferior and often adulterated articles produced elsewhere ; and to preserve their separate identity they must go through Canadian channels.

Further, the Order in Council says :

> That the questions to be considered are complicated and involved, including among the objects to be sought the transportation of western products from place of production to the markets of the world involving the consideration of their transportation :—
>
> From place of production to Canadian seaports.

From place of production to the western ports of Lake Superior.

From the western ports of Lake Superior to Canadian seaports.

This Order in Council especially declares—

That in making such investigation attention should not be confided to routes and facilities which are at present utilized, but, if necessary, new surveys should be made to determine whether any more economical and satisfactory channels of transportation by land or water can be opened up.

I would ask if the new surveys have been made? If so, where are the maps and reports? Or, is the government simply taking a leap in the dark, regardless of the interests of the people of Canada, either in the east or in the west? We have been told that there are 'mountains of information.' Where are these mountains of information? I have failed in my efforts to put my hands upon anything at all that would give me the particular information that I would require before being able to decide the question as to the feasibility of the project that is before us. True, we have been told that some two hundred years ago Champlain crossed this country. I think La Salle, another celebrated explorer, was referred to by the Prime Minister, and Alexander Mackenzie also—not he whose monument we see on the grounds to the west of this building, but a man who died a hundred years ago, long before railways were thought of, and whose explorations were made at a time when it could hardly be said the question of whether a railway from Moncton to Winnipeg would carry the products of the west cheaply to market had been taken up for consideration. These are parts of the 'mountains of information' to which we are referred. Then, we are told by this Order in Council:

That in these circumstances it devolves upon the Dominion government to consider and adopt the best possible means of promoting such measures as may enable Canada to control the transportation of its own products, and it is thought that the most efficient method of conducting such an inquiry and obtaining the required information is by means of a commission of competent and experienced experts.

Very true. Then, as if to complete the solemn farce—for this commission had never met (it was not completed until to-day), and I cannot call it anything but a farce—the minister recommends the appointment of a commission composed of Sir William Van Horne, Mr. John Bertram and Mr. Harold Kennedy, of whom Sir William Van Horne is to be chairman and convener, for the purpose of making any such inquiries, obtaining such information and making such reports and recommendations as, in their opinion the exigencies of the case may require.

My object in reading these extracts from this Order in Council is to show where the government have been derelict in their duty towards this House and towards the people of this country. Here we have an emphatic declaration by the government of their own absolute want of information. They were in search of information; they knew nothing more about the country, according to their own declaration than did hon members of this House outside of the government. They were in absolute want of information concerning the country and its needs, the best means of affording relief, whether by a new railroad, an all-rail route or by improving existing routes by rail and lake and river or by other means. The mind of the government was a blank on this question and they were in search of information according to their own declaration. They were in fact utterly helpless. A government of business men confessed their absolute inability to cope with the whole situation. Very early in July the House was informed that Sir William Van Horne, an able and competent man, was not able to act upon the commission, and I may here say that we on this side of the House join with the government in expressing regret that so able a man was unable to give attention to such an important question. Notwithstanding the lack of information, no new appointment was made by the government and on the 19th of May as I said, we find the government with their minds still an absolute blank, without hope as it were—hope was abandoned—and they did not appear to be able to secure another man to act upon the commission. On the 30th of July, notwithstanding the declaration they had made that information was necessary, that they could not proceed without it and that they were in search of it, they launched at once this gigantic scheme. The scheme was launched by the Prime Minister who made a solemn declaration that there was no time for deliberation, and this was done in the face of the solemn protest of the minister of the Crown whose duty it was to take charge of every matter pertaining to railways. He was the member of the government above all others who was best able to judge as to what was right and proper. He entered his protest, he declared against the mad haste with which the First Minister was proceeding to waste public money. I shall read his own words:

I am not in favour of impetuously rushing into the construction of a transcontinental line from Quebec, through an unknown country to Winnipeg and the west, until we know something about it—until we have the fullest information about it. The project is one of very great magnitude, and should be dealt with only after the maturest deliberation.

The hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) sealed his protest by placing his resignation in the hands of his leader, surrendering office, surrendering emoluments, surrendering social position, surrendering as I believe promotion, because I have regarded the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals as one of the

ablest men, if not the ablest man, in that government, and a man who was destined, had he remainel in the government to play an important part in the future of this country. But since his resignation, members sitting on your right, Sir, have one after the other had nothing but ridicule and condemnation to offer to the ex-minister who dared to act on his own conviction and to do what he considered right. Why, they say, should he have been consulted. Only a few days ago the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in a lofty voice, said: Why should the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals have been consulted any more than any other member of the government? What right had he to be taken into the confidence of the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister did not think it beneath his dignity to take into his confidence certain senators and railway projectors who are not responsible to the people of this country for their actions. And yet, Sir, hon. gentlemen tell us that the Prime Minister was justified in refusing to accept the advice of the minister, who was better able than he was himself or than any other of the colleagues who surrounded him, to decide this matter. I say this is an important matter, when we consider that we are dealing with a project which might launch this country into an expense of anywhere from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000. The hon. gentleman approved of the fact that this man was ignored, that he was kept in blissful ignorance and I say it was unfair to that hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) and we on this side of the House and hon. gentlemen on that side of the House need not be surprised at all that a man of the feelings of the ex-minister of Railways and Canals should under such circumstances consider it his duty to withdraw from the government of which he had so long been a member. The hon. ex-minister said:

> I think I might justly complain that so important a matter of policy, arising within the sphere of my own department, should have been adopted and continued in this way behind my back and without my knowledge.

And such, Mr. Speaker, is liberalism, the boasted policy of hon. gentlemen to your right.

Well no report from the commission had been obtained; in fact the commission had not met as I said before. The opinion of Sir William Van Horne had been obtained notwithstanding the fact that he had declined to accept a position on the commission. We find that on August 5th he made known to a 'News' reporter in Toronto his views on this question and although these views have been cited here time and again, I think it is a proper thing for me, even at this late hour, to occupy a few extra minutes to again cite these views, because they have had weight, and will have weight, not only with the members of the opposition but with supporters of the government. Sir William Van Horne when interviewed in Toronto, said:

> The Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or any other all-Canadian route will never voluntarily carry a carload of wheat by the all-railway route around the great lakes to an eastern Candian port for shipment abroad, for the simple reason that it will never pay any road to do so. Nor will the transportation problems in the west ever be solved by the construction of an all-Canadian route from coast to coast.

Now, this is the advice of the very gentleman whom the government sought to place at the head of their commission. Notwithstanding the fact that he did not find it convenient to accept that position, why should they refuse to accept the information, to accept the advice which he has tendered even though not a member of the commission?

> Sir William Van Horne stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway shipped every carload of wheat that it was possible to ship by their steamship line on the great lakes from Fort William to Owen Sound, and thence east by rail or else by way of Buffalo and the Erie canal. The long haul around the great lakes was dreaded, because it was unprofitable, and the bulk of the grain brought by that route was carried during the winter months, and used by the millers of Ontario to keep their mills in operation during the cold season. There was altogether too much talk of an all-Canadian route by people who were entirely ignorant of the situation.

And he added:

> I state this emphatically that no all-Canadian line, I care not by whom it is built or run, will voluntarily draw a single carload of wheat east of Port Arthur over its tracks. We occasionally take one when the traffic by boat is congested, in the winter, when any special need arises.

Had the government accepted the advice of Sir William Van Horne, I fancy that today we would not be sitting here in the sixth month of a long session considering a project which Sir William Van Horne says can never profitably carry a bushel of wheat from the North-west Territories to a seaport. Of course, we will be told that Sir William Van Horne is an interested party, but his standing in this country is such that notwithstanding his close alliance with the Canadian Pacific Railway, his advice would be accepted, his counsel would be accepted, his opinion would be accepted by the people of this country. Well, we are told this is not a time for deliberation. The right hon. Prime Minister was emphatic upon this point. Why not? We are spending $100,000,000 or $150,000,000. Why not deliberate? An hon. gentleman on my left says more than that. I am inclined to agree with him. Why not deliberate? Are the government afraid of public opinion? Do they want to rush this mad scheme through the House and crystallize it into law before the people become seized of its enormity, when for ever it will be impossible to re-

voke it? Is this why the government are not anxious to deliberate? I fail to find practically any other good reason for this extraordinary desire to rush the Bill through the House at the present time. In fact, the right hon. gentleman, in his address, grows frantic over his desire for immediate action, and invokes the aid of heaven to avoid disaster and delay. Let me read his prayer:

It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; heaven grant that, by reason of delay, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels, and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land.

Only last week I took up a reliable Montreal paper and I found this report. It showed me how quickly the answer to the right hon. Prime Minister's prayer had been given. The report is this:

Chicago, Ill., August 21.—Lake shipments of corn for the port of Montreal have aggregated 1,000,000 bushels during the past few days. The gain of the Montreal ports is due entirely to the action of the government in making the Canadian canals free.

In making the Canadian canals free. Why then should we stop at the canals? Why not make the port of Montreal free, and increase the business of that port? I visited the port of Montreal a short time ago in company with many hon. members of this House. I went on board the vessel and after going over this port and viewing its surroundings, if there was one single thing that I became convinced of more than another during my visit there it was the fact that the port of Montread should be a free port.

Grain can now be shipped from Chicago to Montreal for export to Liverpool three cents a bushel cheaper than it can be routed by part-rail, part-lake, through Boston. When it is known that a fraction of a cent a bushel will divert all the grain that can possibly go through a port, the advantage that Montreal has over American ports will be readily seen.

Then comes an important announcement as to trade.

During the first seven months of the present year over 9,000,000 bushels of wheat, and almost 4,000,000 bushels of corn have passed through the port of Montreal, as against a trifle over 1,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 4,000,000 bushels of corn through the port of Boston.

What are we to be alarmed about? If we utilize our water-ways, if we utilize our ports and run them properly we can command the trade of the country, and we need not be alarmed about the Americans taking it from us. Lake Superior is the key to the whole situation. What was Lake Superior put there for? Was there no object? Why was it not a rocky promintory or why was it not an agricultural country? Lake Superior is there for a purpose. It is the key to the whole situation between the great west and the east, and it will be the means of regulating transport for all time to come and of levelling the rates charged from the west to the east.

Has the government a mandate from the people to construct this road, and this is an important question? We know now that those who criticised most severely at that time, now acknowledge the wisdom of the men who constructed the Canadian Pacific Railway. I only wish we could hope, that twenty-five years hence the same commendation will be given to the men who will construct this new transcontinental road, if ever it should be constructed. Is there any immediate demand for another transcontinental road? Is there an immediate demand for it, and will the proposed road fulfil the requirements of increased transportation facilities? These are grave questions. Let us hear from those who are interested and those who have knowledge on that point. We have not been able to hear from the transportation commission, but we have heard from others who have studied the question and who are able to speak from practical knowledge. The ex-Minister of Railways has spoken with no uncertain sound in condemnation of this scheme. He says it will not meet the requirements of the case and that therefore the country should not be plunged into a huge expenditure in order to secure this road. Sir William Van Horne has voiced his opinion that the road will be no good for the purpose for which it is designed. It is not sufficient that that road shall carry pulpwood from Lake Abitibi to Shawinigan Falls and Grand-Mère, and carry pulpwood from Grand-Mère and Shawinigan Falls back again to Lake Abitibi. I submit that is about all that those gentlemen tell us is the local trade that will be found in that country. They are simply proposing to carry coal to Newcastle and then carry it back again. Premier Roblin, a man now of railway fame; a man who has made railway transportation a successful study, because he has done more for the people of the North-west in railway legislation than all the governments that preceded him in Manitoba; he is not backward in pronouncing his opinion, and he says:

The people of Manitoba and the west are strongly opposed to the Canadian government granting one dollar of public money or an acre of land to the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway as an all-Canadian route from coast to coast because they do not see any material advantage in its construction to the people of western Canada.

Later on he says:

Where is the demand for the construction of this road? I fail to find it anywhere. Manitoba to-day needed no more railways, for the average distance from the farmer to the railway in Manitoba was but five miles. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian

Northern Railway would be quite able for the next twenty years to supply all the railway necessities, whereas what was wanted was an increased equipment especially in rolling stock.

These opinions are worth their weight in gold at this juncture. Men who have made this question a study, men who are able to give an opinion to those who only two months ago, or just before launching this scheme on this country acknowledged that their minds were a blank upon the whole question; they condemn the scheme. We were told that the government could not wait a day, nor even an hour, nor even a minute. But it is the government alone that insists upon hasty action. The Prime Minister told us that Canada is commercially dependent on the United States, and that to secure our independence we must have a new transcontinental railway. I confess it was news to me to hear that we were not commercially independent of the United States. I admit that had the Liberals led by the First Minister to-day, had their way in 1891, we would not be commercially independent of the United States to-day. But thanks to the loyalty of the Canadian people, we maintained our commercial and political independence and we will maintain that independence to the end. I will read an extract from the speech of the Prime Minister, because I think it is proper that the minds of the members in this House should be refreshed from time to time on what leading members of the administration have said. The right hon. gentleman said this :

What are your minds running to when you have facts staring you in the face which show you that at this moment Canada is not commercially independent of the United States. What is our position to-day ? From the early days of railway development in this country we have been dependent on American good-will for the transportation of our goods across American territory. From the early days of Canadian railway development we have been allowed to make use of American territory and harbours ; the American government granted us the bonding privilege, they granted us the privilege of using their harbours for our imports and exports without paying them tolls and customs duties.

Again he said :

We cannot take steps to better our position, to improve our trade, but we are told from the American side that we had better look out because forsooth the bonding privilege will be taken from us.

Then he quotes Andrew Carnegie, and the President of the United States and the New York 'Sun,' to show that these threats were held out to us dating from the year 1888. Let me say to the Prime Minister of this country, that there is an old adage which says : barking dogs never bite, and that is as true to-day as it was a hundred years ago. The Prime Minister need not be afraid of the barking of the United States with reference to the bonding privilege, because they have no intention of biting. The Prime Minister knows well that we too can abrogate the bonding privilege. We have just as much power in that matter as the United States has, because for many years we have had an all-Canadian railway on Canadian soil. You can to-day get on board the Canadian Pacific Railway at Vancouver, transfer to the Intercolonial Railway at Montreal, and you are landed in Halifax without touching anything but purely Canadian soil. When this Grand Trunk Pacific transcontinental railway is constructed what better off will we be ? Why, you will be landed at Moncton, but still you would have to transfer to reach the seaboard. To-day we are just as independent of the United States as we can possibly be when this new railway is built. If we are interfered with at any time, then, to paraphrase the words of the Prime Minister, we can say :

Take off your bonding privilege whenever it suits you, we are commercially independent.

Here is another statement which was made by the Prime Minister :

We consider it the duty of those who sit within those walls by the will of the people to provide immediate means whereby the products of these new settlers may find an exodus to the ocean at the least possible cost.

To move the products of the west to the east seems to be the primary object of this new government railway, according to the Prime Minister.

The smallest cost and the immediate necessity—these are two points which I desire hon. members to keep in mind. An immediate and cheap grain route is what we are seeking to bring about. Will the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Moncton be immediate ? Will it be cheap ? Will this all-rail route be as cheap as rail and water ? There is one thing certain—it cannot be immediate ; because five years is the shortest time which the government have given us any assurance of that it will take to construct that road. Consequently the right hon. First Minister is defeated in his first proposition ; it cannot give immediate relief to the congestion of the west. It will not be as cheap as rail and water, which I shall show you very conclusively before I sit down, and which has been demonstrated time and again by hon. members on this side of the House. This is the crux of the whole matter. If this road will not at once give us relief, and give it to us cheaper than it can be obtained at the present time, it will accomplish the purpose which we have in view. Why not, then, extend and improve the existing system if by so doing we can furnish a route that will accomplish the purpose that we have in view ? Let us proceed to extend our existing system of railways in the east, to improve our water-ways, and to extend all our great existing railway systems into the west with as convenient speed as possible.

That, associated with our water-ways, will to my mind accomplish the purpose. It will be the means of providing us with an immediate outlet for the crops of the west and a cheaper route than can be provided in any other way. In this way we shall be able to utilize the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway. Let us utilize to the fullest extent all the railway systems which we have at the present time, by bringing them into connection with each other and into connection with the great water-ways of this country, and we will solve the problem of transportation, concerning which this commission was founded to give us the fullest information. We have now plenty of railway lines from the west to the east; I am convinced of that. What is wanted is more complete equipment. There is no question in my mind, and I think in the mind of any hon. member of this House, that the two railways running at the present time between Winnipeg and Port Arthur, will carry all the products of that western country for the next ten, fifteen, or twenty-five years. But these railways require to be more fully equipped. They must be provided with more haulage power; they must be provided with more cars; elevator accommodation must be increased. If all this is done it will provide a means of taking all the grain of the western country from the hopper that was spoken of by Sir William Van Horne through the spout, which I understand to be the country lying between Winnipeg and Port Arthur. Enlarge the spout, and you accomplish your purpose, and in the easiest possible way.

The hon. leader of the opposition has outlined a scheme which to my mind will meet what is desired at the present time very much better than the proposition made by the government. I desire to refer to that scheme, because I think it has not been discussed by hon. members at your right in a fair spirit; and, in order that I may make no mistake, I propose to read the language of the hon. leader of the opposition, so that it may again go on record and be read to the people of this country. The hon. leader of the opposition, referring to his plan, and contrasting it with that of the government, says:

1. It combines prompt action with deliberation and caution.

2. It developes and does not throttle the Intercolonial.

3. It takes account of the expenditure upon the Intercolonial and upon the inland waterways, and brings those great national highways in harmony with our project. The lake route, the St. Lawrence and other canals are joined by the policy I propose in one harmonious whole, whereas the policy of the government, which cuts off the water-ways, which cuts off the lake communication—cuts off the very Intercolonial Railway on which this country has spent $70,000,000—and on which this government have spent $15,000,000 for the purpose of doing the very thing which I am advocating in this House.

4. It develops transportation along the lines of least resistance, that is to say, by water and by water and rail.

5. While connecting at the same time all the great railway systems in Canada, it controls in the only effective way the carriage of Canadian products through Canadian channels, by enabling the people's railway to compete for this traffic.

6. It affords immediate relief to the congestion of the west by bringing the Grand Trunk Railway into Winnipeg without delay. And

7. It insists that further railway development in the west shall not only give necessary competition in settled districts, but shall open and develop new country.

I do not desire to enlarge upon that scheme. The language is clean-cut and speaks for itself. I leave it to the House to judge as to the plan which he has propounded. It refers to the immediate action that is called for at the present time. The cry comes from the west for better equipment, more haulage power, more cars, more elevators, more rapid transit from the place of production. I believe this scheme will furnish all these requirements. But another important factor must be combined with it, that is, the factor of cheapness. I care not what route you may construct or devise, unless it includes the element of cheapness, you will find it impossible to force grain or any other product over it. Now, can an all-rail route combine all these qualities that I have mentioned—cheapness and immediate results.

Let us look elsewhere to see how the traffic rates compare. From Chicago to New York by rail is 900 miles. By lake and rail it is 1,400 miles. Rail competition is keen from Chicago to New York, because there are fully half a dozen railways running between these two points, provided with extra good haulage power, running through a well settled country and able to pick up freight along the way—just the very kind of railway that would be able to produce the best results, so far as cheapness of rates is concerned. But let us compare the two. I take my figures from the Chicago Board of Trade reports. In 1890 the lake and rail rate from Chicago to New York per bushel was 8·52 and the all-rail rate was 14·30 on wheat, or an increase of 70 per cent. In 1895 the lake and rail rate was 6·96 against an all-rail rate of 11·89, or an increase in the latter of 70 per cent. In 1901, the last year of which I am able to find any report, the lake and rail rate was 5·54 and the all-rail rate 9·88, showing an increase in the latter over the former of 78 per cent. The average increase of all-rail over lake and rail rates, during the periods I have mentioned, was from 70 to 78 per cent, although the rail and water route is much longer than the all-rail route. I propose to take some actual rates, because we can find actual charges to guide

us. From Winnipeg to Fort William, on the 1st day of September next, the rate on the Canadian Northern will be 6 cents per bushel. From Fort William to Montreal, by way of Depot Harbour, we are informed—and the statement has not been contradicted—that wheat was carried for 3¾ cents, making the rail and lake rate from Winnipeg to Montreal 9¾ cents per bushel for wheat. From Winnipeg to Fort William the rate is 6 cents per bushel ; and we are told that with proper elevators at Port Colborne and other ports grain could be carried from Fort William to Montreal by rail, lake and canal at 3 cents per bushel, or at a total cost of 9 cents per bushel. The average rate for the past five years, I am informed, by rail from Fort William to Montreal is 12 cents and from Winnipeg to Fort William it is proposed to make it 6 cents, so that the all-rail rate route from Winnipeg to Montreal, per bushel of wheat, will be 18 cents. If we take the evidence of Mr. Wainwright, to whom the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) referred to-night, given before a committee of this House in 1898, we will find that he then said that one-half of one per cent per ton per mile was a satisfactory rate on long distances, such as 500, or 600, or 1,000 miles. If you make the calculation, you will find that the rate on a bushel of wheat from Winnipeg to Montreal or Quebec on this new transcontinental railway will be 21 cents. We are told that there is a company which will carry wheat at present, or has been carrying it, from Duluth to Montreal for 3½ cents. Taking the rate from Winnipeg to Fort William as 6 cents, and taking the comparative distance, the rate from Winnipeg to Montreal or Quebec by the transcontinental line would be 20 cents. To my mind that is conclusive evidence of the absolute impossibility of discovering an all-rail route which will convey the products of the west to the ports in the east anything like as cheaply as they can be carried by lake and rail route or rail, lake, river and canal route, or any route that combines water and rail. In the face of these facts, can we conclude that the congestion in the west can be relieved by the proposition submitted to us by the government. The hon. the Minister of the Interior, in order to demonstrate the possibility of carrying grain from Winnipeg to Montreal for about 11½ cents, gave a case where grain had been carried from Kansas city to Chicago, a distance of about 500 miles, for 5 cents per 100 pounds. I draw attention to this fact, because I think it is unfair for the hon. minister to build up an argument on what the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) so well designated as a bargain-day rate, a rate that might never be repeated, and which to-day is not in force, but instead of which there is a rate in force of about 14 cents per 100 pounds. I say it was not fair on the part of the hon. minister to base an argument on such a frivolous and unsatisfactory foundation in order to convince the people that we are doing right in voting $100,000,000 or $130,000,000 for this scheme.

With reference to the character of the country through which this road is to pass, I propose to say a word. I have nothing of my own to say that will discredit the country. Should I say anything that does not present the country through which this road is to pass in such a favourable light as we would like, I shall not use my own, but the language of others. I hope that we have a fine country to the north of us. It is a large country but is not yet required for the purpose of colonization, and I say now—and I say in all good feeling towards the government and in perfect good faith—that the government are making a fatal mistake. I say it is a shame to induce young men to go from Ontario and Quebec to settle in northern Ontario or northern Quebec, so long as we have the prairies in the west waiting simply for the plough to be put in and the crop to be reaped the following year.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it would simply be consigning a man to prison as compared with going to the North-west. If a man undertakes to hew out a home in northern Ontario or Quebec, be the country ever so good, he would not find himself so well off in twenty years as the man who goes to the prairies of the west will find himself in from three to five years. And I say that the government will make a sad mistake if they induce the young men of this country to settle in the northern regions of these older provinces. Retain that country for the future, it will be time enough to colonize it when it is wanted. Why should our sons go into the forests while the immigrants from the old land come in and reap of our very best ? If a man wants to move from Ontario or Quebec and build up a new home, let him go to Manitoba or the North-west Territories. But do not advise him to go, do not spend a dollar for the purpose of inducing a man to go into New Ontario or New Quebec at the present time. We have heard glowing accounts of that country and I would be only too glad if they were all absolutely true. I am referring now to the country through which this road is to pass from Moncton to Winnipeg. We are told of the vast stretches of agricultural land in these two provinces, rich in spruce and poplar and with fine, arable soil. The report of the exploration and survey of northern Ontario in 1900 has been profusely read from. I am going to read something from it too. What I do regret is that hon. gentlemen opposite, yes, and even Ministers of the Crown read part and left out part. I propose to supplement their selections with something which they did not feel at liberty to read to this House. I think we ought to be perfectly honest and fair in this matter. I do not say they were dishonest

I would not attribute that to them. Perhaps their attention was not drawn to it by the president or manager of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, or perhaps this scheme might not have gone through. I will take this little extract and the hon. gentleman will find it in exactly the same volume from which they were reading. This is where it makes reference to a tract of 6,000 square miles, 'sixty per cent of which would cut five cords of spruce wood to the acre.' I need not ask you, Mr. Speaker, what kind of land it is that would produce five cords of spruce to the acre. Would you like to live on it? Or induce your son to go and settle on it? There is only one conclusion we can arrive at as to the character of land that grows five cords of spruce wood to the acre. I do not think that this fact indicates a high degree of fertility. We were told the other day that the government has mountains of information with regard to this country, and the Prime Minister said that from 1872 to 1880, twenty-eight exploration parties had been sent into that country. This was about the time the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be built and he told us that $5,000,000 had been spent at that time in exploring this country. Surely all that ought to make some mountains of information, even if only small ones. I am going to give you the opinion of a gentleman who had access to these reports, a gentleman who had the honour of a seat in this House and took part in the discussion when a charter was granted for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the gentleman who now occupies the high and honourable position of Prime Minister of Ontario. And I am going to ask you what you think of his opinion of that country after he had investigated these mountains of information. He spoke in this House on the 10th of January, 1881, and he not only spoke with reference to Ontario, but also with reference to Quebec, New Brunswick, and, I believe, Prince Edward Island, and if I am not mistaken, Nova Scotia as well—a large portion of the country through which this road is to pass. The 'clay belt' of 15,000,000 acres of land existed there as it exists now. It should be worth more now than it was then, but perhaps the difference would not be very much. Let us see what Hon. G. W. Ross thought of this country after he had perused this $5,000,000 worth of information about it. He said:

> Sir, I look upon the North-west as the right arm of this Dominion. The other portions of this country are tolerably well occupied now. We have a very small portion of land in Ontario for sale. There is a small area of good land in Quebec for sale, and with regard to the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island there is very little cultivable land for sale. Now, the increase of our population requires that so far as agricultural pursuits are concerned, room should be found for our surplus population. Where are these homes to be found? Not in Ontario, because in order to provide homes for young farmers, somebody else must be bought out.

This is his opinion as to whether it would be better to send our young men to the northern regions of our older provinces or send them to our North-west. He said further:

> I say this contract involves the immediate construction of that length of road, which is not required in the interest of colonization or settlement. We certainly are not building the Lake Superior end of the road, what is called the eastern section, for the purpose of colonization. We have no evidence that the land is of great value; we know the climate is unfavourable, we know the soil is somewhat barren. True, there may be some valuable timber in that country, but we do not require to build a railway into it for the sake of timber.

He was lumberman enough to know that we bring timber by way of the river. That is the country of which we have heard so much. I have not said a word to discredit it; I am simply telling hon. gentlemen opposite what their friends say about it. And I hope that, even at this late date, the question may be reconsidered whether the country is worth the immense expenditure of $100,000,000 to $150,000,000 to colonize it. I think we are driven to the conclusion that the Grand Trunk Pacific will not be a grain route. Then if it is not to be a colonization railway, what, under heaven, are we spending the money for?

But there is one other phase of this question that I would like to refer to, and I shall do so as briefly as I can. It is not at all the most unimportant part of the whole matter—the cost of the road to the country. The Prime Minister told us it would cost exactly $13,000,000 and no more. The Minister of Finance was a little more extravagant, and he raised that sum to $13,725,703—just see how exact he was to the dollar. That was to be the entire cost that this country would have to meet for the road from the Pacific Ocean to Moncton. The Winnipeg to Moncton section I understood from the hon. gentleman is to cost this country only $8,853,502. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), no doubt desirous of pleasing the First Minister, exactly coincided with him, there was not a whit of difference between the two gentlemen. That is not always the case, but they generally come together.

An hon. MEMBER. Pre-arranged.

Mr. HENDERSON. Pre-arranged, I dare say. And then, Sir, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the man who was expected to be the custodian of Ontario's interests, who was to watch the public chest when he came down here and to see that no harm was done to it, did not seem so confident as the First Minister, but he was perfectly satisfied that $14,000,000, and not one dollar more, would be all the country would be

required to pay. The Postmaster General sticks to the $13,000,000; you see how closely he keeps to the First Minister. He does not want to deviate one-eighth of an inch. Does he hope that after this road is built and after this monument is erected to the present Prime Minister, he is going to occupy that position? At any rate, he feels it safest for him to stand by the Prime Minister at $13,000,000 and nothing more.

I wonder if hon. members of the government think the country is going to take these statements seriously. I do not think for one moment that the members of the government are serious. The veriest school boy on a back concession of any county could tell any of these gentlemen that they cannot accomplish any such thing, I do not care if they do it by an actuary or by capitalization or what system they employ. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals made an estimate and said it would cost $138,850,000. I would rather accept the wisdom of the man of experience in railway construction and railway matters than the opinion of the Postmaster General or the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who never had anything to do with the construction of a railway. Others have made estimates ranging from $65,000,000 to $150,000,000. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has made an estimate, and, to my mind, he has made the most careful estimate of any that I have seen. He says that from Winnipeg to Moncton will cost $112,350,000. But the Minister of Finance is not going to make these payments himself; he has evolved another scheme—and I am sorry indeed he left the chamber, because I was going to make a suggestion to him by which, I think, he would be able to reduce the amount very much below the $8,500,000. I think the hon. gentleman must be taking lessons from the Hon. G. W. Ross, of Toronto, who is an adept at deceiving the people in matters of Finance. Why, Sir, for ten or fifteen years Mr. Ross declared from one end of the province of Ontario to the other that the money that he borrowed on forty-year annuities to pay railway subsidies, was not a debt of the province, because these annuities were not presently payable. You would be surprised how many of the people of Ontario believed that this was the case until, a year or two ago, the people became educated along these lines. They saw through the whole matter and through sheer force of public opinion Mr. Ross was compelled to issue a different statement the next year and to acknowledge that he had been wrong for ten years before, and that the debt created by borrowing on forty-year annuities to pay railway subsidies was a debt which had to be deducted from the surplus. The point to which I wish to draw attention is this: The Minister of Finance tells us, and I do not wish to be unfair, that this road can be constructed for $13,000,000, and so does the Postmaster General. They all drop into the same line. I think the hon. member for South Ontario made the same statement to-night, I hope he will never do it again. They all forget one thing, that the $13,000,000 only pays the interest for the time while the road is under construction and until it is handed over, and that the whole cost of construction has to be paid outside of that. If it costs $150,000,000 to construct this road, the government will have to borrow $150,000,000 and every dollar of that has to be paid by the people of this country. They may say it is not presently payable when they are borrowing it for fifty years. That makes no difference. If we do not pay it our children or our children's children will have to pay it. Why should we leave such a legacy unless the whole scheme is a sound one? Do not let it go down to our children and our children's children that we imposed on them a scheme of this kind, claiming it was not a debt of the country simply because we were throwing it on a future generation. The Minister of Finance speaking on this question the other day, was drawn out by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd). The hon. member for South Brant even became a doubting Thomas; he was not sure that the minister could build this road for $13,000,000, and he asked: 'Will that include the bonds at the end of the fifty years? The minister was compelled to give him an answer and he said: No, at the end of the fifty years we, of course, pay the bonds. That is his own language, it is not mine, the minister has admitted it. He said: What I am dealing with is the interest. If he was dealing only with the interest, why under heaven would they, one man after the other, get up and tell us that $13,000,000 and not a dollar more will construct this line. Why not be honest enough to tell us that it would take $13,000,000 and the whole cost of construction besides. That is what they should have told us and have told the people of this country, because that is the actual fact. As the Minister of Finance has left the House for a moment I do not intend to deal with the system of annuities. Yesterday, in answer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), the Minister of Trade and Commerce rather declined to be responsible for handing over $13,000,000 to any actuary or insurance company for the purpose of providing means to pay the interest.

One word with reference to the plan which has been proposed to this House by the hon. the leader of the opposition. I desire briefly to place it on record so that it may be read from 'Hansard.' Already we have the Intercolonial Railway from Atlantic ports to Montreal and consequently we want nothing further in that matter at present, but from Montreal to Coteau Junction the hon. leader of the opposition proposes to build 30 miles of road, costing $40,000 per mile, or $1,200,000 in all. Then from Cot-

eau Junction to Depot Harbour, 342 miles, he proposes to acquire either by purchase or in some other way, but by purchasing if necessary (or by construction of another road) the road known as the Canada Atlantic Railway with all its equipment, which he believes can be bought for $12,000,000. Then from Scotia Junction he proposes to construct a railway 104 miles in length to Sudbury at a cost of $40,000 per mile, which with interest on the investment during the course of construction, would cost about $4,360,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Is that not 120 miles ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I believe that the distance is given by actual survey.

Mr. CLANCY. And the plans are made.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is no unexplored part of the country. This has been explored and is well known. I am informed by the hon. gentleman who made that statement here yesterday that 104 miles is the correct distance from Scotia Junction to Sudbury.

Mr. SCOTT. I think 120 miles was the distance named by the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) thinks. I will take the positive statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) a hundred times before I will take what any hon. member thinks.

Mr. SCOTT. I am quoting the words of the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman said 'I think.' My hon. friend from Bothwell assures me that he knows what the figures are. However, it is not a matter to quarrel over. It is a matter of detail but I feel assured in giving these figures to the House that I am giving the correct figures. Then from Sudbury to Fort William, 555 miles, the hon. leader of the opposition said that that portion of the road could be acquired for the sum of $25,000,000. He proposes that $3,000,000 shall be expended upon the betterment of the road so as to bring it up to a proper grade and to make it a grain carrying road of the best quality. He then proposes to acquire by purchase if necessary—it is possible that it may not be necessary—the Canadian Pacific Railway from Fort William to Winnipeg, 426 miles in length, at $30,000 per mile, or $12,780,000 in all and for betterments to make it a more complete railway for the purpose of carrying large trains he proposes to expend $2,100,000, making a total of $60,440,000 as the entire cost of providing this railway system over which all the existing railway systems of this country at the present time can move and over which they can all carry traffic and which, by permitting the use of this road by all the railway systems, would enable the government, if they adopt this plan, to find a means of relieving the country of the congestion that is complained of at the present time and providing a means for years and years to come and not only that but of providing an immediate means of bringing out of that country the vast crops that are produced there. The benefit of this will be in the fact that the effect will be immediate, not five years hence, not ten years hence, but within six months from now, and practically I see no reason why it should not be accomplished this year if necessary to relieve the congestion in the west.

Now, the government plan gives us an all-rail route from Winnipeg to Moncton for $112,352,000. The plan of the hon. leader of the opposition provides, first, an all-rail route, but it provides also from Winnipeg to Montreal the means of making the most complete rail-route and water-route to ocean ports. The government plan takes wheat from Winnipeg to ocean ports for 20 cents per bushel. The alternative plan proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition will accomplish the same thing, for from 9 to 9¾ cents per bushel. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), whom I am pleased to see in his place at the present time, told us the other day that in the course of a few years, not many years, five years, or ten years at the outside, this road would not be required so much for the purpose of carrying wheat as it would be for the purpose of carrying cattle and other products of that country. Well, I am glad to assure the hon. Minister of Agriculture that he will be provided with a better route for carrying cattle from that western country to ocean ports if he adopts the plan suggested by the hon. leader of the opposition than he would be if he sent them through this back country over a longer route possibly at a time of the year in the winter season when the road would be blockaded and transportation would be stopped. The hon. minister shakes his head. I do not know why he should do so. He must be a little more dull of comprehension than I take him to be. I think this a very simple problem. Will he tell us any reason in the world, why, if he can ship a carload of cattle from Winnipeg over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway running hundreds and hundreds of miles north of civilization through the province of Ontario and Quebec and away down to an ocean port, the same train of cattle cannot be shipped the other way from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, from Port Arthur to Sudbury, from Sudbury to Scotia Junction, and from there over the Canada Atlantic to Coteau Junction and to Montreal ? I can assure him without going into any very complex calculation that his carload of cattle will be on board the ship in Montreal long before it would reach its destination over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. SCOTT. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, the hon. gentleman may do so, although, whilst I am occupying the floor, I do not know that any hon. gentleman has a right to, but I shall grant him the privilege. I desire to close my remarks, but before doing so I desire to say that my honest conviction is that if the government pursue their scheme and construct this railway they will find out to their sorrow that after the whole road has been completed from Winnipeg to Moncton and the resources of this country have been exhausted for the purpose of constructing the road, the demand from the people of the western country will be as strong as ever for the removal of the congested state of the traffic there. I do not believe the road is going to accomplish that purpose. It certainly will not do so immediately. I believe it will not do so effectively. There is another advantage in the plan that the leader of the opposition has suggested. It will at once put the railway system of the western country in direct communication with all our large commercial centres. It will connect it with Halifax, St. John, Moncton, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Peterborough and all other manufacturing centres throughout the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. How could you connect the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway with all these commercial centres ? I hope and trust that the government may yet see their way to withdraw this proposal, and to adopt the wiser and speedier and better plan that has been suggested by the leader of the opposition, under which the wheat fields of the west will be brought in direct connection with the Atlantic seaboard within six months or a year at most.

Mr. GEORGE STEPHENS (Kent, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, the hour is so late that I shall not occupy the time of the House for more than a few minutes. The member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said, that the scheme proposed by the government was a mad scheme, and, of course, he claimed great merit for the scheme propounded by the leader of the opposition. However, he will have considerable difficulty in making the House and the country believe that the proposition of the leader of the opposition is a better one than that submitted to us by the Prime Minister. The hon. gentleman has quoted Sir William Van Horne as an authority, but we must remember that Sir William Van Horne has some prejudices, because he is interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to say, as he does, that a bushel of wheat will never be carried over this road, is simply nonsense. Against the statement of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that there are sufficient railways at the present time in the North-west, we have the statement of the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that last year the farmers of the North-west lost $6,000,000 for lack of better transportation facilities, and as it is needless to say that the hon. member (Mr. McCreary) who lives in the North-west knows more about that country than does the hon. member for Halton, the House will I am sure be disposed to accept the word of the former hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Halton also told us that the road proposed by the government will cost the country from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000, but the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) told us that this road would cost $560,000,000, and I leave these two gentlemen to reconcile their differences between themselves. I regret that the member for Halton has such a poor opinion of this Canada of ours. I am optimistic of the future of this country, and I believe that there are vast areas yet untilled in the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick, which when this railway is completed will be brought under cultivation by a happy and prosperous population. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) contends that this will not be a colonization road, but all the evidence goes to show that not only will it be a colonization road, but that it will be as well a great transcontinental highway through Canadian territory. Starting at Moncton the line passes through valuable agricultural lands which are well timbered, and which the young men of that province will remain at home to cultivate rather than go to the United States, as they are doing to-day. This railway opens up a tract of country nearly 300 miles long in New Brunswick, and if that country is settled for ten miles on each side of the line over 3,000,000 acres will be brought into cultivation. Here is a statement which recently appeared in the newspapers :

St. John, N.B., August 21.—The rush of harvest excursionists from the maritime provinces to the North-west is unprecedented. The Canadian Pacific Railway announce to-night that they have ticketed 2,400. Then there are 1,600 more along the line of the Intercolonial Railway in the maritime provinces, who will pass through here to-night or to-morrow. The Canadian Pacific Railway has been unable to get enough cars and this is causing delay.

This would tend to show that the young men of New Brunswick need employment, and are moving to the west or to the United States to find it. Would it not be better that they should remain at home to settle along this new line, take out the timber, and develop the resources of their own province ? The hon. gentleman from Halton stated that this would not be a transcontinental road, but as it shortens the distance from Quebec to Moncton 125 miles, there is no doubt that it will secure the through traffic and take the products of the west to the seaports of the maritime provinces. I believe that if this road never carried a bushel of wheat, it will be worth every dollar of its cost as a colonization railway. As to the contention of hon. gentlemen op-

posite, that this railway will parallel the Intercolonial Railway, I cannot see how that can be, when it is from 30 to 70 miles distant from the Intercolonial Railway throughout its entire length. I might mention that in the county of Kent, which I have the honour to represent, we have four lines of railways paralleling each other, and from Lake St. Clair to Lake Erie the distance is not more than twenty miles. Nevertheless all these roads seem to be doing well and paying dividends. This new road traverses the province of Quebec for about 450 miles and in that province it will create a new Quebec, opening up to settlement about 6,000,000 acres of land, which is well timbered, and as the report shows, fit for agriculture. For 1,000 miles the road will pass through the clay belt of Ontario, and if it is settled along its course for fifteen miles on each side, then we will have 15,000,000 acres of land brought within the reach of those who wish to occupy it. I am informed that this land in Ontario is good agricultural land, that it is heavily timbered, and in some places rich in minerals. Here is a report of Mr. Robert Bell, Civil Engineer, which will give some idea of the possibilities of the country :

Farming and gardening have been successfully carried on by the officers of the Hudson Bay Co., at their posts on Lakes Mattagami and Missinibi. At the latter, Mr. John McIntyre, now of Fort William, has informed me : That he found spring wheat to ripen well. At Moose Factory, although the soil is a cold wet clay with a level undrained surface, farm and garden produce, in considerable variety, are raised every year. Among other crops harvested in 1874, were 1,700 bushels of good potatoes. Oats, barley, beans, peas, turnips, beets, carrots, cabbages, onions, tomatoes, &c., are grown without any more care than is required in other parts of Canada, and I was informed that some wheat which had got accidentally sown one year was found to ripen, but no experiments so far as I could learn, have ever been made to ascertain whether this cereal might be regularly cultivated or not. Upwards of 80 head of cattle are kept at Moose Factory, besides horses, sheep and pigs.

The climate in going northward from the height of land towards James' bay does not appear to get worse, but rather better. This may be due to the constant diminution in the elevation more than counterbalancing for the increasing latitude since in the these northern regions, a change in altitude affects the climate much more than the same amount of change would affect it in places farther south. The water of James bay may also exert a favourable influence, the bulk of it being made up, in the summer time of warm river water, which accumulates in the head of the bay and pushes the cold sea water farther north. The greater proportion of day to night during the summer months may be another cause of the comparative warmth of this region. I have referred to some of these points in previous reports, careful notes were kept in regard to the timber of the districts passed through, but the details would be unsuited to the present report, I may however, mention that the species of the most importance, namely, the red and white pine, were common all the way from Lake Huron to Mattagami lake.

This goes to show that there are large tracts of land in that country fit for cultivation, and large areas of timber.

This road from Winnipeg to Quebec, I am told, will be about as short as the Canadian Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Montreal. If that be the case, that is another argument in its favour as a transcontinental railway. I believe there are large tracts of timber in Northern Ontario. In the year 1902 we exported $4,383,182 worth of pulp and pulpwood. This was shipped mostly to Great Britain. Then we only supplied eight and a half per cent of the amount used. In 1902 we also exported $35,000,000 worth of wood and manufactures of wood. This is a large item, and it brings a great deal of money into our country. If the proposed railway is built through New Ontario, it will keep our population in Ontario. There will be farming, lumbering, pulp mills, elevators, saw mills, flour mills, oat mills, and ranching in operation along the line of that railway. There will be railways built from old Ontario intersecting this road, and they will be busy taking up machinery for the mills and the elevators and other supplies. The farmers of Ontario and Quebec will supply the requirements of the people who build the road. They will take up horses, beef, butter, eggs, tools of all kinds, steel manufactures to supply structural work, cars, locomotives, rails, telegraph and telephone supplies; and they will bring back lumber and other natural products. Wages all over this country will be enhanced, and men will be kept busy.

Then, we pass on from Winnipeg to Fort Simpson, through a long stretch of prairie, where the railway will open up millions of acres of wheat lands and grazing lands. Then we pass through a fine mineral district of British Columbia, where thousands of miners will go, and where thousands of miners would have been to-day if they could have got in the machinery and the supplies required in their business. This road will be busy in taking in their supplies and bringing out minerals, lumber, and so forth. In the year 1902 this country exported $33,948,708 worth of coal and other minerals. Mr. Selwyn, in a report made in the year 1875 says, that the climate of the Peace River district, compares favourably with that of the Saskatchewan or Montreal. He says, to give some idea of the value of a tract of generally fertile country such as that now described, let us assume, as above, that the area of actually cultivatable land is 23,500 square miles or 15,140,000 acres. Let us suppose for simplicity of calculation that the whole area were sown in wheat, the yield at the rate of twenty bushels to the acre would be 300,800,000 bushels This road will provide a home market for the farmer. The farmers of old Ontario, the province of Manitoba and the province of Quebec, will ship their produce over it. It will take lumber into the prairies and farmers' products to the mines. Then, the

shipping facilities which the company have contracted to supply at Port Simpson will make it a short route to the markets of Japan, China and Australia. The company will have to pay out a great deal of money for running expenses.

Canada has 18,868 miles of railway, on which the running expenses last year amounted to $57,000,000. Taking that as a criterion, this company will pay out annually about $10,000,000 for the running expenses of the road. The road will advertise Canada as much as a great many thousand of dollars would do. It will cause immigration to come into the country. Branches will have to be built. Revenues will flow into the treasury. We get all these advantages, and what do they cost us ? I take the figures of the hon. Finance Minister, and I believe there is no one on whom we can more safely rely. He has never yet, to my knowledge, deceived us in any way. He says that if $13,725,706 were set aside at the present time, it would pay the interest on the government's investment in this railway for the seven years. He does not pretend to say that $13,000,000 is going to build the road ; but what he does say is that it will pay the interest which the government will have to pay. At the end of the fifty years, he concludes that the road will be worth fully as much, if not more, than it will be when completed. If there is any truth in the statement of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), it surely will be worth more. He says : It will take fifteen years to bring up the best road you can build to the Grand Trunk standard of to-day. He also says that the Intercolonial Railway cost to build $21,500,000, and that after twenty-six years it is worth $71,000,000 or $72,000,000, or nearly three and a half times the original cost. If the Grand Trunk Pacific Company are going to spend any such amount of money on this road, it will certainly be worth more at the end of fifty years than it will be at the date of its completion; and when the fifty years will have expired, the road will revert back to the government, and they can then either sell or re-lease it. If they sold the road, and they got as much as it cost originally, then the figure of the hon. Minister of Finance would be right.

Now, as to the proposition which the hon. leader of the opposition brings down to the House. I would like every voter in the riding I represent to examine carefully into the bargain which the leader of the opposition proposed and that which the government have made, and also to compare carefully the bargain made with the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1881 with that which the government have concluded with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Such a comparison would not fail to convince any one who is open to conviction that the proposition submitted to the House is, in every respect, deserving of support. By it the government do not tie up 25,000,000 acres of the best land, as the late government did in its contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, nor does it put our farmers to the expense of keeping up the roads in the school section and the alternate sections, which has been so great a drawback to the North-west, and which is one of the pernicious clauses in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I shall not take up the time of the House by going into the legal aspects of this contract. Having every faith in the men who made this bargain and who drew up this agreement, I am confident that the interests of Canada are safeguarded on every hand. In my opinion, this road cannot be built too quickly ; and when built, the development of this country will be such that in four or five years after its construction the railway facilities then provided will be scarcely sufficient to carry expeditiously the grain of the west to our seaports. While supporting this great transcontinental project, I am also in favour of our water-ways being improved, for I believe that there will be ample traffic for all our water-ways as well as all the railways we can build into that country. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to vote for this resolution. In the course I have taken, I am confident that many members of the opposition sympathize in their hearts, and would vote as I intend to do did not party exigencies compel them to do otherwise. Many of them, I am convinced, believe in their hearts that this scheme proposed by the government is very much better in the interest of the country than the one suggested by the leader of the opposition, and would vote for it if they could. At this late hour, Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up further time of the House, and I must apologize to hon. members for having delayed them so long and thank them for the kind attention they have given my remarks.

On motion of Mr. Ingram the debate was adjourned.

On motion of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, August 28, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

SALMON INDUSTRY ON FRASER RIVER, B.C.

Mr. THOMAS EARLE (Victoria, B.C.). Before the Orders of the Day are called, there is a matter which very seriously

affects the salmon canning industry of British Columbia to which I would wish to direct the attention of the government. Of course, as we know, the canning industry of my province is one of the most important industries on the Pacific coast. I express my regret incidentally that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) is not in his seat this morning. However, I would ask the Minister of Finance, who is now leading the House, to call the attention of the Fisheries Department to the matter which I am about to mention, and to urge upon the minister immediate action in the line which is indicated by the following telegram, which I received from the Canners' Association of British Columbia :

Vancouver, B.C., 26th.

Thos. Earle, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Following message sent to-day to Hon. R. Préfontaine. The Fraser River Canners' Association, in view of the lamentable short run of sockeyes on the Fraser river and the entire absence of salmon from the spawning grounds, respectfully pray that your department will prohibit all fishing on the Fraser river from August 29 to September 12 inclusive, in order that the balance of sockeyes remaining outside may be enabled to reach the spawning grounds, and the hatcheries get some supply of spawn. If close season not ordered future of industry seriously threatened. Immediate consideration and favourable reply by wire is earnestly requested in the interests of the canners and fishermen. Your energetic support most earnestly requested.

When we find that last year the output of salmon was not much over one-half what it was the previous year, and that this year it is scarcely one-third of last year, it is evident that there is reason for the canners becoming very greatly alarmed that the Fraser river may be depleted of its fish. The canners make the request contained in the telegram in the hope that if their prayer is granted the fish will have an opportunity of getting up to the spawning grounds, and thus the supply of fish maintained by increased opportunities for breeding. This is becoming a necessity to the existence of the industry. I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Finance Minister, who now leads the House, to the matter, and I ask him to bring it before the proper department with a recommendation that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should see his way clear to grant this request for a close season, which I believe to be in the interest of the salmon industry of British Columbia. If there is anything in the idea these gentlemen have in regard to the breeding of the salmon, it certainly will be in the interest of the industry to grant this protection, and it can, at all events, do no harm, because it will inflict no injury upon any class of the community.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I be permitted to say a word in connection with the same matter. A telegram of the same purport as that read by my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) has been placed in my hands, and I have been asked to draw the attention of the government to the matter. This telegram is very much on the same lines as the telegram received by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle), and it reads as follows :

Vancouver, B.C., August 27, 1903.

Fraser River Canners' Association have petitioned department for close season from 29th instant to September 12 inclusive. Situation here extremely critical, as I can certify. Future of industry absolutely threatened, as no salmon have yet reached spawning ground and the run is practically over. Act with British Columbia members and senators, urging upon the department imperative necessity of prompt action. A few days now may save the industry.

This telegram was handed to me by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter) to-day, as he was obliged to leave to catch a train, and it is at his request that I bring it to the attention of the government. If the situation is as disclosed in the telegram, then the Minister of Finance, who is leading the House will no doubt admit that it should demand the immediate and earnest consideration of the government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I shall call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the matter. I assume, from the terms of the telegram, that the subject has already been communicated to the department, and I have no doubt that it is engaging the attention of the minister.

Mr. AULAY MORRISON (New Westminster, B.C.). I think it is very reprehensible indeed that hon. gentlemen should, as it were, get hysterical over a matter of this kind. My hon. friend from Victoria has read one telegram, as has also the leader of the opposition, from the same parties.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would appear as if there were going to be a discussion on this question, and there is no motion before the House.

Mr. MORRISON. I shall conclude my remarks, Sir, with the usual motion to adjourn. The hon. member for Victoria has read one telegram which only gives one side of the case. It is only from one concern interested in this vast and important industry in the province of British Columbia, and it asks that all fishing operations shall cease because, in their opinion, there are no fish getting to the spawning ground. That is a matter which is almost impossible to determine, because the fish, in any event, cannot and do not get to the spawning ground until some time in the fall.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) has stated that these telegrams are from the same person. They are not from the same person.

Mr. MORRISON. I understood they contained almost precisely the same wording.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are not from the same person. I said that the telegram which I had in my hand was along the same lines as the one read by the hon. member (Mr. Earle), but they are not from the same person at all.

Mr. MORRISON. From whom did the telegrams come ?

Mr. EARLE. Mine is from the secretary of the Canners' Association, Mr. Burdis.

Mr. MORRISON. May I ask from whom the other telegram comes ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is not the slightest objection ; it is from Mr. Charles Corby.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know who Mr. Corby is, and from my knowledge of that industry in British Columbia, I do not know any one of the name engaged in it. We have all received these telegrams from the British Columbia Canners' Association asking that the fishing be prohibited, which means that there shall be a total suspension of this vast and important industry for a month or so, on the assumption that the fish are not getting to the spawning grounds. Nobody can possibly determine that, because the fish never get to the spawning grounds till the fall, or in a month or two hence ; and although according to these despatches the salmon are not at the present time running in such large quantities as usual, at the same time I have despatches from very reputable people which go to show that the fish are running. For instance, on the 26th of August, the day before these other telegrams were sent, Mr. James Anderson, of the St. Mungo Cannery, on the Fraser river, wires that the salmon are running decidedly good, and that it would be unfair if the department should stop the fishing on the Fraser river. We have not heard yet from the fishermen, men who are also affected largely by this. As a representative of the constituency in which the fishing industry is engaged, I have great concern for that industry, but at the same time I think it would be very reprehensible indeed on the part of the department to take cognizance of a despatch which comes from one source alone, however reputable that may be. I may say that there are despatches the other way showing that the fish are running, and that is the statement of the fishermen, who are the people most interested in this matter. I think myself that the department should hesitate. In fact, so far as I am personally concerned, I would urge upon the department not to take any step until they had absolute confirmation of the statement contained in the telegram, and even then I think it would not be a proper policy to suspend fishing. Why should they do so ? In my opinion, the department should lend a deaf ear to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Victoria, as well as the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition. There is no material before the minister to warrant him in taking any such step at all. If there is any doubt ; if there is a conflict of evidence as to whether the fish are running or not, then the proper course for the department to take is to let the matter alone, and it will adjust itself. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). When I was in British Columbia a short time ago, I made some inquiries into the important salmon fishing industry of the Fraser river. I notice that these telegrams state that there is a very marked diminution in the quantity of salmon caught ; that the catch last year was very much less than that of the preceding year, and that the catch this year is very much less than last year. My hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Morrison) takes objection to the statement placed before the House, and says that it emanates only from the canners. Well, I suppose that the canners, having a large investment there, are more deeply interested than any other class of persons engaged in the business. It seems to me, from a knowledge of the way that nets are placed on the Fraser river, that it would be utterly impossible for salmon to get up the stream.

Mr. MORRISON. That is nonsense.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Nonsense.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps it is nonsense, but at all events the river is completely set with nets for a long distance up and down, and whether it is impossible for salmon to get up or down as it is alleged, it is evident from the results of the canning of salmon that the run of fish is very greatly impeded thereby. This is a very important industry, and while the government should avoid taking any steps that would be unjust to any of the parties interested, it would be well to preserve this industry for future years. The recklessness of American fishermen on the Columbia river has nearly destroyed a salmon industry on that river, which at one time was one of the finest salmon streams in the world. That has been the result of lavish fishing and the wanton destruction of the fish. The run of salmon is so reduced that I understand the industry is practically paralyzed. The same process is in operation on the Fraser river, beyond question. The catch is largely reduced from year to year——

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. It cannot be otherwise ; and the leaving of that river open for a few days for a free run of salmon in my judgment would be in the highest degree

advisable. I do not think that it is proper to jeopardize that industry in the interest of those who want for the time being to make a larger catch. I do not think any suffering will be entailed upon any one by following the course I suggest. It strikes me, from what I know of the matter, from investigation on the ground, that the mode of fishing in that river is certain to destroy the industry in a short time unless some course of this kind is taken.

Mr. EARLE. In reference to my bringing this telegram to the attention of the government, I do not think I was doing anything reprehensible at all. The telegram is from the secretary of the Canners' Association, which represents forty-five or fifty canners ; and they should understand, I think, what is in the interest of the industry as well as either myself or the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). They certainly are of opinion that the Fraser river is being depleted owing to the extensive manner in which it is fished, and that unless something is done, and done immediately, their industry will be destroyed. The fact is there—they are not putting up the fish this year. Although there is an apparent sign of a run of fish coming up the straits, it is a mixed run, which indicates that the good run of fish is gone—the run of sockeye, which is the fish they can for the English market, and which also brings the highest price in the Canadian market. I cannot see what injury it can do to any one to give them a close season such as they have always had until the last two or three years. The conditions formerly were different. The catches were coming up, and they thought there was no danger ; but now the catches are going down, and they realize that there is danger ; and, in order to avoid it, they ask for this concession. As the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has stated, it is in the interests of those who are more largely interested in that industry than any other people. They have an immense capital invested in it, and they surely would not suggest anything being done that would not be in the interest of that industry. I hope that the minister will yet see his way clear to agree to the suggestion made in this telegram. In regard to the truthfulness of what I have said, or any one else, the minister is able in an hour or two to get reliable information from his fishery commissioner on the ground, and I would be willing to abide by any representation he made on the subject, knowing him to be a man of good character, strictly honourable and honest, and knowing that he would not recommend anything that would not be in the interest of the industry, being on the spot and knowing the conditions that exist. If the minister has not already that information, I suggest that he immediately apply to that officer for information as to whether the statements made here are correct, and, if he finds that they are, that he act upon the suggestion that has been made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. Raymond Préfontaine). The department has not neglected this matter at all. As sooon as the first telegram came, addressed to the deputy minister or to myself, I began inquiry about the matter. It stands to reason that the department is not going to decide on such a matter on the representations of one side only, and without inquiry from the proper officers in British Columbia as to whether the demands made are just and fair and reasonable. That is what I have done. As soon as the first telegram came, I began inquiring, and the information which I have, not only from the officials, is very contradictory indeed. If the department had come to a conclusion without getting a complete report from our officers in British Columbia, that is to say, from the fishery agent there, Mr. Sword, we would have run the risk of doing a great deal of harm to the industry and the fishermen. The fishermen are the most numerous class of people, and their rights must be protected. If I am well informed, there is something extraordinary about this matter. I just give the information as I have received it indirectly.

Mr. EARLE. Have you a report from Mr. Sword ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not yet.

Mr. CLARKE. From whom did you receive this information ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not in a position to state. But the information which I have received is this, that the canners were under the impression at the beginning of the season that the run of salmon would not be very great. Under the circumstances they made contracts with the fishermen at a very high price, and the fishermen got very little, because the run was very small. But since the run has begun to be good, the fishermen are now getting a lot of money, and are making up for the time they have lost. The canners are not satisfied with that state of affairs, and if they could stop the fishing, they would break their contracts with the fishermen. So there are two interests to be considered.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Does that mean they would stop their own business in order to get lower prices from the fishermen ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They would buy the fish on the other side from American fishermen, who use traps.

Mr. EARLE. On the other side they are in the same condition—they have not fish enough to keep the canners going.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not my information. My information is that the canners would get all their supply of fish on the other side from Americans, who are using traps, while traps are not allowed to be used in Canadian waters. Whatever may be the contentions on both sides, the department certainly would not do justice to itself if it were to come to a decision upon such an important matter as this without having a report from the proper officers in charge, who are responsible to the department for the carrying out of the law and the administration of the fishery regulations in British Columbia.

Mr. EARLE. In regard to the statement made by the minister that the canners are buying their fish on the American side, I may say that the American canners were coming over to the Fraser river and buying fish and putting up the price; and the canners had come to an understanding with them to cease doing so, or they would go over and buy fish from the traps on the American side. So there is nothing in that. Referring to what I said——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has already spoken twice.

Mr. EARLE. With the permission of the House, I would like to say that this is a very important matter to the province of British Columbia. It is a matter which I have pressed on the attention of the department year after year, in the time of the previous government as well as the present. I have pointed out that the trouble with the whole Department of Fisheries in British Columbia is that instead of being run departmentally, it is run politically.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Not now.

Mr. EARLE. The hon. gentleman may say what he likes. I had reports to that effect from the late representative of Burrard, who said to the late Minister of Fisheries that no man should get the right to fish unless he got his consent. That was stated to the late minister by one of the largest canners in British Columbia, and a Liberal of the city of Vancouver. I have no objection to mention his name——Mr. Bell Irving.

Mr. MACPHERSON. When did he become a Liberal?

Mr. EARLE. He was always a Liberal. He may not have supported the school of Liberals to which my hon. friend belongs, but he is a Liberal of the old school, and always has been. Aside from that, if the Department of Marine and Fisheries is to to be run on these lines, the minister might as well throw it up and leave it to be run by the members representing the district. The way it is run now is simply a farce. No time should be lost by the hon. minister, but he should act at once in this matter. He can get official information on which he can rely.

Mr. MACPHERSON. In view of the fact that I am pretty well interested in this matter myself, I would like to say a word or two in contradiction of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. When he makes the statement that the salmon business is run on the Fraser river by politicians, he makes a statement which I cannot qualify as being other than ridiculous. What the politics of Mr. Bell Irving are I do not know. The hon. gentleman says he is a strong Liberal, but he is reputed to have put up a good deal of money to defeat the Liberal candidate in the last general election, and a man who would do that cannot be a very sincere Liberal. I have had several telegrams in connection with this matter, which show that the canners are not at all unanimous. Here is one which I have received:

> Canners not unanimous. If season closed will injure small canners and fishermen. Memorial not based on facts. Scheme to affect English market. Have written fully. Get Minister wait until properly posted.
>
> FRANK BRUNETT.

Mr. EARLE. He is one of the gentlemen referred to by Mr. McCraney.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I can assure my hon. friend that he who steals my purse steals trash, but he who filches me of my good name robs me of that which not enriches him and makes me poor indeed. It is easy enough to sling mud, but the hon. gentleman should be the last man to get up and throw mud at anybody else. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. When the man is not here to defend himself, the hon. gentleman ought, in common decency to reserve what he has to say against him for a future occasion, when he can say it to his face. The minister has acted perfectly right, and should not, under the circumstances, follow the advice of the hon. member for Victoria. It is well known that the people of Centre Victoria have been doing all they could to get the canning industry down there during the last five years. In the city of Vancouver there are some hundreds of fishermen, not one of whom is in favour of having the season closed. The hon. minister should not do anything until he knows all the facts. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that the nets were so closely placed in the Fraser river that they would not allow the fish to go up, but I know as a fact—and my statement can be proved by the papers—that the fishing industry in British Columbia has increased by leaps and bounds. This year is an off season, but I see by the Montreal 'Star' that there are this year 170,000 cases packed in the river, and there are 300,000 in the

Columbia river. The Skeena river has been a failure, also the Naas, Rivers Inlet, and the Alaskan pack. If the canners get a good pack of sockeyes from now out, they will make money, because the pack is small in other places and will be next year as well, next year being an off year. It is always small every four years. When Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was Minister of Marine, a howl was made to get him to extend the season, and the thing was done at the request of the canners. It satisfied everybody, the canners, the fishermen and the public generally. We found no request then to close down the season, but the reverse. I do not think it would be advisable for the minister to take the stand which the hon. member for Victoria has taken. I am prepared to stand or fall by the position I take. I do not think that this thing should be considered until the other side of the question is heard from—the fishermen as well as the small canneries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) must have misunderstood what I said when he desired that the government should turn a deaf ear to any remarks I made on the subject. If he had paid attention to what I did say, he would have observed that I asked the government to give consideration to the subject. I do not know that there is any particular reason why the government should turn a deaf ear to a suggestion of that kind. If this is a matter which really involves the preservation of the fishery industry of British Columbia, the Minister of Marine should act promptly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely not without information ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend had waited a moment he would have understood that I agree entirely in that suggestion. He should get all the information from his officers, and that as speedily as possible. But if he should dilly dally many days longer, and if there be any truth in these telegrams, the time to act will have expired. I entirely agree with the minister that if there is really an attempt to coerce the fishermen or small canners, the government should not listen to it for a moment. But he should carefully consider whether there is any foundation for that statement. It may be a difficult situation, but an administrative officer in his position has to deal with difficult situations and deal with them very quickly. I would suggest to him that there is the greatest possible need to urge expedition upon his officers in British Columbia, so that he may have the requisite information to deal with what is alleged to be a very serious situation. It is in the interests of the small canners and the fishermen themselves that this industry should be preserved.

Mr. MORRISON. What I meant to characterize as reprehensible is the giving of serious consideration to telegrams sent to individual members on either side of the House. We have an inspector of fisheries out there, Mr. Sword, a very reputable officer, who is right on the ground, and readily accessible to these people who are sending those telegrams. They could very easily consult Mr. Sword and have him communicate with the government. The hon. member for Victoria gets a telegram from somebody, I get a telegram from another and the hon. member for Vancouver gets a telegram from a third, and they are conflicting, and we come here and bother the minister, and there is not a word from Mr. Sword. Mr. Sword is keeping away from these squabbles. The very fact that the inspector of fisheries has not sent in any communication, warrants the minister in not taking any notice of telegrams read from either side of the House. That is what I meant when I said that it was reprehensible for members on either side, in a matter of such importance, to ask that action should be taken on telegrams sent by interested parties.

Mr. CLARKE. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that, in view of the conflicting telegrams received by hon. gentlemen on both sides, the Minister of Marine should do nothing ?

Mr. MORRISON. He has done something.

Mr. CLARKE. He has not advised us yet what he has done. I rose for the purpose of asking the hon. gentleman what he has really done. I understand that the fishery commissioner is on the ground. Has the minister communicated with that gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said I had. As soon as I got the first telegram I made inquiry of Mr. Sword, I telegraphed him again yesterday to make a report to me by wire. I thought he might suppose that I wanted a report by mail, so I telegraphed him to send a report by wire.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. minister had enlightened the House in the first place——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He made that statement.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) made no such statement.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course I did.

Mr. CLARKE. I am not deaf, nor was I inattentive. I listened carefully to everything the hon. minister said ; and I am in the judgment of the House when I say the hon. minister made no such admission.

Mr. MORRISON. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) will not say that the

hon. minister did not tell the House that he had communicated with Mr. Sword by wire. I certainly understood him to say so.

Mr. CLARKE. I listened attentively to the discussion that has taken place, and, in my hearing, the minister did not advise us that he had wired to Mr. Sword and had asked Mr. Sword to wire his report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will have to say it in French next time, so that I may be understood.

Mr. CLARKE. I shall be glad to stand corrected if the hon. gentleman made that statement. I did not hear it, though I was paying close attention to every thing that was said.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Préfontaine) says he said it, and we here certainly so understood him.

Mr. CLARKE. I rose only to express my astonishment that, in the face of the information that had been furnished and of the urgency of the case, the propriety of calling the matter to the attention of the minister should be questioned by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison). I hope that, if the hon. minister receives a reply to his telegram he will lay it before the House.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I have just one word to say in connection with the contention of the hon. member for New Westminster that it is improper for any individual to wire a member of parliament with regard to a grievance and ask it to be brought to the attention of the House.

Mr. MORRISON. Under the circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. I enter my protest against it. Every citizen has a right to appeal to parliament for the redress of grievances in matter under the control of parliament, and he has the right to appeal to his own member or any member known to him; and a member of parliament is doing the proper thing in bringing such a grievance to the attention of the government. That is their right, and their undoubted right.

TREADGOLD COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask whether the government has any information to give with respect to the telegram which I read the day before yesterday on the adjournment of the House, with regard to the alleged action of the commissioners who were appointed to investigate the Treadgold concessions. I read the telegram, which I will repeat for the benefit of the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) who is leading the House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to bring this matter forward when the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in his place. He will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who was leading the House when I first called attention to the matter, said he would make inquiry and would give me any information the government might have at a later date, I bring the matter forward now to remind the government that the information was asked for.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AN DCOMMERCE. I will call the attention of the Prime Minister to it as soon as he comes in.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee on a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway, and the motion of Mr. Puttee in amendment thereto.

Mr. ROBERT D. WILMOT (Sunbury and Queen's). Mr. Speaker, we are confronted with one of the most important questions that have ever come before the Dominon parliament. Certainly, in my experience here, covering some fourteen sessions, nothing has been brought before us comparable in importance with the great question we have now to consider. And, with my inability to deal with important subjects, I feel the very greatest embarrassment in attempting to address you to-day. I approach this question with feelings of awe at the enormous amount involved, the unknown millions that we are liable to be called upon to spend on this enterprise. I am also amazed, considering the small amount of information that is before us, that we are called upon to decide finally as to the merits of this question. Had we been experts in the professions of civil engineering, we might have given our opinion with some confidence. We are practically at sea. We have fragmentary information concerning one section of the country that this road is supposed to follow, and fragmentary information concerning another section. Yet, in the face of the insufficiency of information, we are called upon to say whether this country shall burden itself with liabilities for the great expenditure that will be necessary in order to carry out the proposed work. It is urged on the part of the government in forwarding this scheme that it is a matter of, I was going to say, urgency. I suppose that between urgency and emergency there is a distinction without any very great difference. I do not think, in

view of the past history of our friends who are in power, that they are exactly well fitted to deal with emergencies. It is well within rememberance of every one who hears me that a critical time in the affairs of our empire occurred, when the government was faced with a duty that devolved on them, a duty near to the heart of the whole empire, at all events to the heart of Canada—the duty of acting in defence of the empire. That was an emergency, and how did the government meet it ? The Prime Minister went off on an entertainment tour to attend some banquet, I understand in Chicago. But public opinion was so strong that the government felt that they were in an emergency, and, after some time had elapsed they repaired the mistake they had made. They acted, I may say, in response to the demand of the leader of the Conservative party. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, so far as we are concerned, I think there was something said about emergency rations during that campaign. They did not come out of that controversy with any great credit to themselves. Now we are face to face with a great emergency and from appearances I do not think they are going to come out of it with any great credit to themselves or to the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if a man goes to build a house he adopts the scriptural plan of sitting down and counting the cost before he begins. No such proceeding of that kind appears to have been undertaken by our friends on the other side of the House. We know that is done by business men—and there are business men in the Liberal party, as good as any that can be found in Canada, shrewd business men who would not make any mistake in their private affairs, and how they can bring themselves to act as the government wish them to act on this occasion is more than I can comprehend. It must be an emergency. Where is the emergency ? It is not apparent on the surface. We are told that that great country of which we are all proud, that great country north of Quebec and north of Ontario, is the country which the government are going to open up by their railroad policy as propounded by the right hon. the Premier. Well, Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to deny the facts of history. No one can charge the Conservative party wth having endeavoured by word or deed to prevent the developments of this great country. In the lives of every one of us, a great many duties will sometimes present themselves to us at the same time, and it is the part of wisdom to endeavour to perform those which press upon us the most strongly at the time. Now, when we look at our great west, the extraordinary conditions that prevail there, the almost inexhaustible quantity of arable lands that are singularly fitted for producing all that man requires, lands that the world is beginning to recognize as the most fruitful for producing all the necessaries of life, is it not to our advantage, is it not our first duty, to turn our attention to them ? Immigration is coming into that country in a manner that every Canadian is proud to see. That country is becoming settled up. We are all proud of it, and we give our friends, the government, credit for doing their best in the direction of inducing immigration. Large sums of money have been spent and are being spent for the purpose of filling up that great North-west, and I give the Liberal party the credit that is due them in that respect. Of course, we all recognize, we cannot be blind to the fact, that our friends on the other side who are governing this country have enjoyed an extraordinary run of good luck. The commerce of the world was never in so prosperous a condition, money never was so plentiful. The crowded contres of Europe are turning their attention our way as never before. The agricultural lands of the United States similar to our own are all being taken up, and the consequences is that immigration is now coming our way. Let not our friends of the Liberal party take to themselves all the credit for these fortunate circumstances. There are some things for which they can take credit, but they are in no wise responsible for the good times that prevail generally all over the world. They are only a small body of men controlling a comparatively small portion of the world, so far as population is concerned. Their influence is not so extended as that they have been able to bring prosperity to the neighbouring republic, they have had no part in enriching the commerce of Europe. But all the same, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to give those gentlemen the credit that they deserve.

Now, Sir, we must all acknowledge that that great country in our North-west would no more than be known at the present time were it not for the policy pursued in the past by the Conservative party. The history of the past points plainly to the fact that not only does the Conservative party deserve credit for having opened up that country, but it also points to the past that our friends of the Liberal party placed every impediment that they could devise in the way of the Conservative party in carrying out their policy. We all know—I was not a member of this House at the time, but I know well, when that great scheme of building the Canadian Pacific Railway was presented to the House and to the country, how great a strain was laid upon the country in carrying out that policy, and how arduous were the efforts made in pushing that great enterprise to a conclusion. The difficulties of nature were great, but not greater than the difficulties that were placed in their way by the Liberal party. Those difficulties brought the enterprise almost to the breaking point when the company called for further assistance, and at that time where did we find the Liberal party ? We

found them, as it were, step by step fighting against the advancement of this country, endeavouring to prevent the passage of that great measure which proved to be so beneficial to the Dominion of Canada. Who did we find allied with them at that time? We found the Grand Trunk Railway, a powerful factor aiding and abetting the Liberal party. When I say 'powerful factor,' I mean that they made representations in the money centres of the world, particularly in London, decrying the credit of the men who were working for the success of the enterprise that has proved to be of such vast benefit to this country. Happily, Sir, the combination of the Liberal party with the Grand Trunk Railway Company failed. When the difficulties appeared to be almost insurmountable, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were also in extremes, and were obliged to come to this parliament and ask for a loan of $30,000,000, that proved to be almost the breaking point in the enterprise, but the men who governed the country at that time had faith in the future, and proved to be equal to the situation.

We all know as a matter of history that the money was advanced, credit was given to them at that time and that that great enterprise was carried to success. We all know the rest, and in spite of the influences then brought to bear that country was opened up and now I hope that the Liberal party do not take to themselves the whole credit for the success that has attended it. The same Grand Trunk Railway Company, whose action at that time was most ungrateful, are very much in evidence in this case. They were indebted to this country for aid in the construction of their own system to the extent of many millions of dollars, and they should have had a more kindly feeling for the welfare of Canada than to take the action they did at that time. Now they are again allied with the Liberal party, and I think that in view of past events we have strong grounds to look, if not with suspicion, with precaution, at the progress of events. I know that in the lower provinces, when it was rumoured that the Grand Trunk Railway Company were behind this scheme and were going to extend their railroad to the North-west that rumour was received with grave suspicion. It is well known that their eastern terminus is at Portland and that the distance to Portland, as compared with the Canadian Pacific Railway line to the port of St. John, is nearly 170 miles in favour of Portland. Our people in the maritime provinces also knew that the affiliations of the Grand Trunk Railway are very largely with the United States, and this knowledge created a feeling of further uneasiness when we learned later that they were the support of the strength and power of the government of this country. It then became a serious matter.

As I said before, I must protest against the onus being cast upon the Conservative party of opposing the development of this country.

I wish for a few moments to attract attention to the proposed road so far as it concerns the province that I know better than any other, and which plays an important part in this scheme—the province of New Brunswick. Now, it is proposed by the scheme as outlined by the right hon. Prime Minister to carry the line through the centre of the province. We have, I will not say a great deal of information, but we have sufficient information, to understand what sort of a country that is. As an example, I shall read an extract from the report of Sir Sandford Fleming, submitted to the Canadian Legislature in 1865, in which the obstacles of the central route were concisely stated as follows:

> In seeking to avoid the great military objection to any line in close proximity to the American boundary, Sir Sandford stated, 'we unfortunately increase the engineering difficulties; as, in looking for a line sufficiently distant from the frontier, unless we at once go to the other side of the province, and thus considerably increasing the length, we are driven into a section of the country characterized by great irregularities of surface and difficult to penetrate.'

The difficult country from Rivière du Loup to Edmundston is described in the report. Next, the peculiarities of the Restigouche river headwaters, not far from Edmundston, are noted.

As early as 1849 the country was reported upon by Major Robinson. His estimate was equally unfavourable. He wrote:

> The fourth obstacle is the broad and extensive range of highlands which occupies nearly the whole space in the centre of New Brunswick, from the Miramichi river north to the Restigouche. Some of these mountains rise to an altitude exceeding 2,000 feet.

Further he states that:

> The Tobique river runs through them, forming a deep valley or trough, which must be crossed by the direct line, and increases greatly the difficulty of passing by them. The lowest point of the ridge overlooking the Tobique river, at which any line of railway must pass, is 1,216 feet above the sea. Then follows a descent to the river of 796 feet in eighteen miles, and the summit level on the opposite ridge or crest between the Tobique and Restigouche waters 920 feet above the sea, or a rise of 500 feet above the point of crossing at the Tobique water.

The line down the St. John river valley does not present these formidable difficulties. In 1860, Mr. T. S. Rubidge reported on the route along the river above Woodstock. He wrote:

> From Edmundston the line will continue down the valley of the St. John, at very favourable grades, passing through a comparatively well-settled, fertile and level part of the country. And long straight lines and curves of large radius may also be obtained here.

He further noted that:

The streams to be crossed are unimportant, but their valleys are sometimes very broad, necessitating heavy embankments

I do not want to weary the House by reading extracts because I suppose there is a limit to our powers of endurance, and that limit must have been pretty nearly reached during this debate. However, if I read a short extract I can easily find a precedent, because I believe extracts have been read before. Although this article which I am about to read is the opinion of a Winnipeg paper, yet it is very appropriate to the country through which the line will pass in New Brunswick. There do not seem to be any politics in the article; it seems to rise above the level of mere party politics, and it says:

One of the chief reasons, and, under the circumstances, one of the most absurd that could possibly be given for the construction by the Dominion government of a line from Quebec to Moncton, paralleling the Intercolonial, is that it will effect a saving between the two cities of about one hundred miles, as compared with the Intercolonial route. In the first place there is nothing to show that any such saving will be effected. The Hon. Mr. Haggart, formerly Minister of Railways, has said that the saving will be only about fifty miles.

Granting, however, that the distance by rail between Quebec and Moncton is to be reduced one hundred miles by the building of this line, does this saving justify the condemnation to unproductiveness of the Intercolonial for all time, so far as interest on its cost, $68,000,000, is concerned. The interest at 3 per cent, on this sum is $2,040,000, to which must be added the rental of the Intercolonial's terminals at Montreal, amounting to $140,000 per year, making a total of $2,180,000, which the government is willing to pay annually to effect a saving of one hundred miles between Quebec and Moncton for the Grand Trunk Pacific. Surely such a saving does not warrant such an expenditure.

But there is another phase to this question. If the saving of one hundred miles to the Grand Trunk Pacific is worth $2,180,000 annually to the government, then Halifax is completely out of the race with St. John as a freight port, for it is one hundred miles farther from Moncton to Halifax than from Moncton to St. John, and this difference cannot be in any way lessened. That being the case, what is the object of building across New Brunswick from Edmundston to Moncton in order to secure a point from which lines run both to St. John and Halifax. Why not proceed direct from Edmundston to St. John, instead of running across the province from the extreme west to Moncton, which is almost in the extreme east, and then having to run back westward nearly ninety miles to reach St. John. St. John is some miles nearer to Edmundston than is Moncton, so that at least a hundred miles would be saved by building direct from Edmundston to St. John. If the saving of one hundred miles between Quebec and Moncton is worth $2,180,000 per year, surely a similar saving between Edmundston and St. John is worth an equal amount.

If to put St. John and Halifax on an equal footing for the securing of traffic, as will have to be done, the through rates to the two ports are the same although the haul to Halifax is one hundred miles longer than to St. John; why cannot the freight to these ports be hauled an additional hundred miles over the Intercolonial at the same price as will be charged over the shorter line that the government is talking of building. It will be as short by the old Intercolonial to St. John as by the new Grand Trunk Pacific to Halifax. If a one hundred mile haul makes no difference in the one instance, why should it in the other? The traffic which would thus be secured for the Intercolonial would put that line on its feet and enable it to pay interest on its cost, instead of being as it is now, operated at an annual loss.

The government will have to find a better excuse than the saving of one hundred miles in order to justify the building of the line from Quebec to Moncton for the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in advocating and endorsing the opinions that have been very clearly and convincingly expressed by members on this side of the House, I must repeat that I believe the proper way and the most direct way to get to the seaboard is down through the valley of the St. John river. The figures were quoted by my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and I may be pardoned for giving them to the House again. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway scheme from Lévis to Edmundston via Connors is 166 miles, from Connors to Chipman 135 miles, and from Chipman to St. John 76 miles, making a total of 377 miles.

Mr. KAULBACH. What is the distance between Chipman and Moncton?

Mr. WILMOT. In the neighbourhood of 60 miles in a straight line, and it is an easy country through which to build a railway. Now, from Quebec, via the St. John valley the distances are as follows: Lévis to Edmundston via Connors, 166 miles; Edmundston to Fredericton, 180 miles; Fredericton to St. John, 65 miles, making the total from Lévis to St. John via the St. John valley, 411 miles. I shall take the distances as mentioned by the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister. From Edmundston to Moncton, following an air line, it would be somewhere in the vicinity of 200 miles, but in going to St. John I recognize that we stop at Chipman, and from Edmundston to Chipman it is 135 miles; from Chipman to St. John is 76 miles—that is, going from Edmundston to St. John partly by the government route and the Chipman route to the Intercolonial Railway, and it is 135 miles, making a total of 377 miles.

Now, while the distance down the valley of St. John is 411 miles as compared with 377 miles, we must recollect that the northern part of the road as proposed by the government runs through a country such as has been described by Sir Sandford Fleming, and which is a most difficult country for railway construction. If we take into consideration the grades that will be encountered, and the detours that will have to be taken by the government road, it will,

I believe, be a longer line of railway in the end than if it were built through the valley of the St. John. The route by the valley of the St. John is nature's route. It is through a level and fertile country, it is traversed by a railroad the entire distance, and its grades are all well known. The grades are not particularly heavy, although for a transcontinental road, no doubt, they could be improved at a very moderate cost. I strongly advise the government, if they persist in this policy of extending the transcontinental railway from Quebec to Moncton, that they take that course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in calling Moncton a terminus, it seems to me that we are asked to stultify ourselves. It is not a terminus. It is a point on the Intercolonial Railway overlooking a small tidal river, which is practically muddy ground when the tide is out. It is altogether insufficient for the purpose of shipping produce of any kind in large quantities that might come from the western country or elsewhere. It is, in fact, altogether out of the question as a point of shipment. As this paper says, why go off there? It is a mere sentiment. To use a common expression, there is nothing in it—nothing of a practical nature. It does not help Halifax, while it injures St. John. Why go off there, for the sake of suiting the political sentiments of the representatives of a certain portion of the province of Nova Scotia? They must have a strong influence with the government when they can induce them to adopt that line. It is a mistake. If the object of this transcontinental railway is to pass from ocean to ocean by the shortest route, why take the long route? Why divert the line for any purpose, except to avoid some natural difficulty? Why not go to the seaport nearest at hand? The proposal which I make to our Nova Scotia friends is this, to bring the line down by nature's route, the valley of the St. John, which is the most thickly settled portion of our province, to a common point at Fredericton, and from Fredericton branch off to Chipman and Moncton.

Mr. KAULBACH. What distance would it be from Fredericton to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. WILMOT. Twenty-three miles. The distance from Fredericton to Moncton could be shortened by having a short branch from the Canadian Pacific Railway to Fredericton. That would avoid the necessity of going down to Fredericton Junction, where the Fredericton branch meets the Canadian Pacific Railway. The adoption of this route would overcome the difference of opinion that exists, would do away with the proposed compromise, and would meet the requirements of the most direct and shortest line through the province of New Brunswick to the sea.

With regard to the central route, through the heart of New Brunswick, I am ready and willing to acknowledge that while great natural difficulties present themselves to the carrying of the line through that section of country, such as the height of the mountains and the fact that the rivers have to be crossed at right angles, yet as a farming section it is one of the best in the province of New Brunswick. Aroostook county, in Maine, adjoining New Brunswick, is celebrated throughout the United States for its fertility. The large cities between Boston and the province line are to a great extent supplied by the products of that Aroostook country. I mention that to show that the same fine quality of land extends easterly, well across the province of New Brunswick to the Restigouche river. No man in that province knows better than does the hon. gentleman who has represented the county of Victoria in this House ever since confederation, the correctness of what I say as to the fertility of the soil of that country.

It is almost useless for me to advocate the claims of the valley of the St. John river as the shortest route to the sea, because those claims are amply justified. But I consider it my duty to advocate them, because at present we are like people beating the air—we do not know whether the proposal of the government is going to be carried out or not. The air is thick with rumours that strong influences are being brought to bear upon the government, even within the last few hours, to abandon the whole project. Whether there is any truth in those rumours or not, I am not prepared to say. I will, however, quote from a journal which stands very close to those who support the government's proposal. I cannot define the politics of this paper, which is called the Toronto 'News'; but I will quote from an article in yesterday's issue:

> The most doubtful feature of the government's transcontinental railway policy is the projected extension of the air line from Quebec to Moncton. There is no doubt that construction over this route will be costly. It is not at all clear that satisfactory grades can be obtained. It is possible that the new road will hardly excel the Intercolonial in carrying efficiency and that years will elapse before it develops any considerable local traffic. In the meantime we impair the revenues of the Intercolonial, discredit public ownership, and obtain in return neither local nor national advantages at all commensurate with the expenditure which must be shouldered.

It goes on to say:

> It seems, therefore, to be clear that the government's policy would be improved, although at some additional cost to the country, if the Moncton extension were abandoned, and the Intercolonial carried to Parry Sound. The fact that Mr. Borden has suggested Intercolonial extension should not cause the government to reject the proposal without consideration. The object of debate in parliament, and of discussion in the newspapers, is to find the strong and weak points in such propositions as are submitted and finally to evolve the plan which best serves the national interest. The government's policy

is bold and progressive, and thoroughly meritorious in many of its features, and we are satisfied that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier would now so far revise his bargain with the Grand Trunk as to abandon the Moncton section, and declare for Intercolonial extension to the lakes, his action would be taken as an evidence of strength, rather than as a confession of weakness, and he would then present to the country a transportation policy which could not be successfully opposed.

In conjunction with that article, I was very much impressed with the speech delivered by the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte). He evidently has carefully studied the question, and is without doubt the most interesting figure in parliament on either side of politics. I was particularly impressed by the very temperate manner in which he appealed to the First Minister regarding the extending of this proposed line of railway from Quebec to Moncton. It was difficult for the right hon. gentleman not to be impressed with the very temperate yet strong manner in which the ex-Minster of Public Works urged him not to incur this great liability but to use the money on pressing public works where it would be much better spent than on this extension from Quebec to Moncton. That money, the ex-Minister pointed out, could be much more profitably spent in opening up and equipping our lakes, ports, and seaports and our water routes. He also pointed out that by extending the Intercolonial Railway up to our lake ports and further on to Winnipeg, the maritime provinces would profit as well as the others. They would profit much more largely by the development of our great western country and the transport of the product of that country to the sea coast than by the present scheme. While not decrying the opening up of our great northern country, it would be better for us to put our hands to what is best in our interest for the time being, and then we will be in a better position to go and develop that northern country. I believe that the day is nearer at hand than many realize when that great Asiatic trade between Asia and Europe will be largely developed. Possessing, as we do, geographical advantages over every other portion of the world, for sending the products of the orient across our Dominion to European ports, that time will soon arrive, and then will be the time when the road now projected will be required. How long will it be with our present prospects before a second transcontinental road will be required ? No man can say that at this moment it is required. What we require to do is to develop our most available resources to the fullest extent, and then we will be in a position to develop other portions of our country. In the maritime provinces there is very naturally considerable jealousy and suspicion regarding the affiliations of the Grand Trunk Railway with our neighbours to the south. We who are interested in the welfare of the port of St. John have good ground to be jealous of our rival American ports, and that feeling is warranted by statements from Portland and other American newspapers declaring that the people of Portland feel very confident that they will get the traffic of this new Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. When the leader of the Conservative party made his speech on this question, he referred to some quotations from a Portland newspaper declaring that a prominent official of the Grand Trunk Railway had stated that that port was going to be the outlet of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question ? With regard to the Portland extract, could he gives us the date?

Mr. WILMOT. Unfortunately, I have lost it.

Mr. HOLMES. Is the hon. gentleman aware that it was back in July last, before the present scheme was before the House ?

Mr. WILMOT. That does not alter the fact that the Grand Trunk will use every energy to maintain their interest in Portland. The Portland, Maine 'Advertiser'—I have not the date—has an interview with a prominent Grand Trunk official. This gentleman appears to have a view of the situation from the point of view of his company, and his view will therefore be of some interest :

All this talk about Montreal and St. John being able to handle the Grand Trunk terminal business all the year round is wearisome. St. John has not the harbour facilities to do it, and the expenditure of $5,000,000 would not make the harbour equal to Portland's. Montreal is nothing but a summer port anyway. Portland has no need to worry, for the Grand Trunk people are going to stay where they can get adequate accommodation.

Just notice that President Charles Rivers-Wilson and General Manager Hays, in their replies to the queries of the legislators in Montreal (Ottawa) did not for a moment admit that they had any intention of leaving Portland. Sir Charles put it point blank when he said that the port of Montreal had proven inadequate to handle the business, and Mr. Hays did the square thing when he said that the port of Montreal had proven inadequate to handle the business, and Mr. Hays did the square thing when he said that the Grand Trunk had not expended all the money at Portland, but that the people of Portland had provided the most of it.

The fact is that Portland is really going to be the great terminus of the new transcontinental railway line that will equal in importance any in the world. Portland has the natural facilities to do the business and St. John has not.

That is a foul slander on St. John. I deny the accuracy of this statement most emphatically.

St. John may get a small share of the traffic, but, mark me, Portland is destined to be the

place where the great bulk of the business will be transacted.

That was subsequent to the time when Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and Mr. Hays met the Railway Committee of this House. That reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of my experience as I sat there, a silent witness of what went on when Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson and the other magnates of the Grand Trunk came before the committee. We saw a map extending nearly the whole width of that big room on which a red line indicated the route as they intended it should be. Those members who sat in the back seats could not understand the course of the lines of railway indicated there without the use of binoculars. There was nothing of an instructive nature in that map with regard to the lines of railway. The young gentleman, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was the promoter of this great scheme. And it struck me that he was almost breathless in his anxiety that the committee should adopt his proposals right off. It was a sort of——

Open your mouth and shut your eyes,
And I'll give you something to make you wise.

It is a scene I shall never forget. Here was this great committee of this great House assembled to consider that scheme, yet there was practically no information brought before it. The hon. members of the committee looked from one to the other, hardly understanding what was required of them. 'What,' they said, 'endorse such a great scheme with only that map and the proposals of the promoters before us?' I sincerely hope that when next a measure of like importance is brought before this House, it will not be submitted in this most unsatisfactory form. I feel sure that members of this House who are supporting the government, away down in the bottom of their hearts are not satisfied. I know they are built as I am; I know they are reasonable men, as we all are. Only to very few of us is genius given, but we all have about an average bit of common sense. And I know that no man dealing with a proposition in his own business relatively as important as this is to the public affairs with which we are entrusted would do such an unreasonable thing as to adopt the proposition with so little information to support it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have done. Before resuming my seat, I have only two words to say. One of them is that I have been deeply interested and much entertained by this debate. I have been astonished and delighted at the ability that has been displayed on both sides of the House in discussing this question. I have been pleased also by the urbanity displayed and the lack of rancour which has characterized the debate. The great measure before us has been discussed in a temperate manner, and ably discussed by those who have spoken. I think it but fair to say that the happy state of affairs that has existed, the decorous, pleasant intercourse between party and party, and between member and member, is mainly attributable, I believe, to the conduct and deportment of the leaders on either side, the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the worthy leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I think their manner is such as would grace any deliberative body, and I think that the debate we have had on the question before us would be creditable to the highest parliament of any land. I will not make any exception. I was going to, but I will refrain. There was a prominent gentleman who pursued a course different from that of the other hon. members, but let that pass. My second word is that it is not too late, and I hope the government will consider well the step which they are taking. Our honoured leader, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) has laid down a policy that has evidently been acceptable to the great majority of this House. I hope that the government, in reconsidering any part of their scheme will adopt, if only in part, the scheme laid down by our leader. If they do so, we shall all rejoice, for I feel sure that it will be a benefit to the country at large if they do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will draw my remarks to a close. I have not gone into the financial bearings of the case, as that part of the question has been sufficiently well dealt with by others more able to do so than myself. I will say this in conclusion, that if the government decide to make any modification in their proposals if not in their policy, in the direction indicated by the leader of the opposition, it will not be the first time that they have taken a leaf out of our book.

Mr. JOSEPH GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, while realizing how precious is the time of the House at this late period of the session, I deem it my duty to explain—and I shall do so as briefly as possible—my position on this very important question which is submitted to our consideration. I shall take advantage of the British fair-play to address the House in my native tongue, counting that my English speaking colleagues will soon find my remarks translated in the revised edition of 'Hansard.'

As the various aspects of the government's policy have already been dealt with in the numerous and able speeches previously delivered, I shall confine myself, in order to avoid repetition, to making some observations of a general character.

For eleven years past I have taken an active part in politics, I have followed closely public affairs, and it struck me that we were confronted with a great problem. For three years back, I have had the honour of attending the debates of this House,

and here also I noticed that this same problem, which is that of our means of transportation throughout the country, was being frequently discussed by the leading men and by the great papers of Canada, in connection with the enormous increase in our production, in our trade in general and in the needs of colonization. Everywhere, public opinion was awaiting impatiently the solution of this ever increasing difficulty.

Various plans were being discussed, the most important of which, to my mind, were the improvement of our inland water routes, the building of our canals, the proposed extension of the Intercolonial to the great lakes with a view to constructing a new transcontinental road, and the scheme for the building of a second Canadian Pacific Railway, all undertakings of a costly nature, requiring millions of dollars to be carried out. I followed closely the discussion which took place on that subject, both by listening to the speeches and by reading 'Hansard,' as I was anxious to obtain a full grasp of the question. Speakers on both sides of the House have taken great pains, and I think I am in a position to decide knowingly, intelligently and conscientiously on that great issue now before us.

In 1901, the charter of the Trans-Canada was revised by the House, with some amendments and subsidies granted for the first sixty miles west of Roberval.

The hon. member for Saskatchewan, during the session of 1902, expressed himself as follows as regards the difficulties in the way of transportation of western products eastward :—

> What we want is a continuous line of railway, which can be operated twelve months in the year, and double track if necessary. Last year four hundred thousand people in the west produced 100,000,000 bushels of grain. We are going to get people in there at the rate of 100,000 per year, and in eight or ten years the production of that country will be increased to 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 bushels. Wheat will have to be carried to the seaboard, and that cannot be done over our canals when they are frozen up six months in the year. What we want is to be able to put our wheat on the car and run it through to the seaboard. There has been too much money spent trying to create an artificial port—trying to make an ocean port out of something that was never intended to be so by nature. If half that money had been spent on the port of Quebec in providing proper facilities there—where we have a port that can float the largest ship that will be built in the next twenty years—and if we had a railway running from the centre of the territories right into the port of Quebec, from where our produce could be shipped twelve months in the year, you would not hear anything about the car shortage we hear so much about at present.
>
> What we want is a continuous line of railway from the west to some ocean port, and Quebec is the proper place.

A prophecy which events are carrying out to-day. In the course of last year, the promoters of the Trans-Canada railway decided to form a company and laid before the country the question of the expediency of building in the northern part of the Dominion a new road from Port Simpson, on the Pacific coast to Quebec, Ha Ha bay and Chicoutimi, in the east, as summer ports, and the maritime province ports as winter terminals, by means of the Intercolonial. Quebec and St. Catharine's bay, near Tadoussac were also contemplated as winter ports at some future date. Once the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence has been made practicable, which, I hope, will be pretty soon.

The road as projected, ran from one end to the other, through entirely new districts of the west, Ontario and Quebec districts abounding in wealth of various sorts. By means of branch line to Winnipeg, it gave the whole country the benefit of the shortest route, of the lowest gradients, and besides an all-Canadian route both as regards its location and its terminals. We were thus made entirely independent of our good neighbours to the south, who, under present conditions in Canada, profit immensely by the improvements we carry out, without ever showing us any gratitude.

Important meetings were held at Quebec attended by the leading men of both parties for the purpose of considering the scheme, which was unanimously pronounced to be superior to all others heretofore laid before the public. It was decided to start a movement in Canada to spread the idea and have it accepted if possible.

Then it was that a further scheme for the building of another transcontinental railway was launched before the people. It was to be undertaken by the Grand Trunk Railway, to have its starting point in Ontario and to reach the west by way of Winnipeg. In the eastern part of the province the present system of the Grand Trunk was to be utilized.

I had the honour of being one of a delegation of the Trans-Canada sent to the maritime provinces to discuss both schemes with business men there. We met the boards of trade of St. John, Moncton, Truro and Halifax ; also members of this House and men of high financial standing.

The discussion which took place was a business-like one ; the feeling seemed to be general in favour of building at once, a new transcontinental railway, farther north, along an all-Canadian route both as regards its terminals and its location. Some boards of trade, particularly that of Halifax, passed very strong resolutions in that sense. At these meetings the expediency was discussed of building another line from Quebec to the maritime provinces, the Intercolonial being too long to enable the ports in those provinces to compete successfully against Portland. That idea appeared to be accepted generally.

About the same time, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) visited the west, meeting a great number of business men in

various cities ; and from newspaper reports and other sources, the idea was gathered that there also public opinion was unanimous as to the necessity of a second transcontinental, provided it was all-Canadian.

Such was the state of public opinion at the opening of this session, and I arrived here firmly convinced of the immediate necessity of a new transcontinental further north. The Trans-Canada scheme was, to my mind and to that of many others, the most practical. While public opinion was thus concerning itself with this important question, and while some were favouring the construction of a Canadian transcontinental railway, and others favouring the improvement of inland navigable routes and the building of new canals ; and others still favouring the extension of the Intercolonial, the government were discussing the same question in their secret councils. From time to time utterances of some prominent men would give us an inkling of what was going on. On certain days reference was made to the extension of the Intercolonial westward, while on other days, the question under discussion was that of a common trunk line for all the railways from Quebec to Winnipeg : hints thrown out to the public as to what the government were doing. The request for a charter on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific for the construction of a transcontinental was the first step towards feeling the pulse of the House. The Trans-Canada stepped in ; the struggle between the various interests was often a hot one ; but the north and east gained ground, and the original scheme was amended to meet their views. The plan of building a transcontinental railway through the northern country was accepted, and both the public and the House were awaiting anxiously the action of the government.

Finally, the government have come to a decision, and having satisfied themselves as to the necessity of a second railway throughout Canada, they requset the House to sanction the decision they have come to as a result of their investigation ; that is to say the building of a new all-Canadian route, as demanded by public opinion, part of which to be built by the government and to be free of access to trade generally, and the remainder to be built by a company, with the idea of utilizing it both as a colonization road and a trade route.

The question is put.

At one o'clock House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I would have been glad to get through with my remarks before the House took recess ; however, at the risk of wearying hon. members, I wish to lay before them a few more facts in connection with this matter.

In the first part of my address, I was endeavouring to show that the idea of building another transcontinental through unsettled territories was not a new one ; that it had been discussed for some time past, and that if the government propounded such a scheme it was in response to the urgent demands of the people. The cabinet is charged with undue haste, for entering into this agreement without sufficient information on hand. But, if I am not mistaken, the location of the road is not yet settled, and the government will have to order surveys for which they will be wholly responsible. After considering the data supplied by these various surveys, they will be in a position to select the most suitable location as regards colonization and trade, which it is the object of this road to promote.

As for the section from Winnipeg to Quebec, the most direct line between the two points passes north of Lake Abitibi, whose waters empty into Hudson bay. By following exactly the height of land, the chances are that you would meet the poorest farming lands, and those that are the least favourable for lumbering operations, as in the vicinity of the sources of streams, these cannot be utilized either for the floating of the timber or the generating of power. Besides, the steepest grades would likely be found along that route, and the object it is proposed to attain would be lost. On the other hand, by locating the road further north, all these drawbacks are avoided.

As regards the section from Quebec to Moncton, the great objection is that the government is to parallel the Intercolonial. If my information is correct, there are at present two or three charters granted to private companies to do exactly the same thing, presumably with the assistance of the country. Moreover, as I stated a moment ago, at the time the Trans-Canada was being advocated in the maritime provinces, I got the endorsation and unanimous support of the business men down there in favour of the building of that line. I fail to see what difference it makes for the Intercolonial that it should be paralleled by a government-owned line, or by a company line subsidized by the country. The reduction of the mileage is the all-dominating principle in the matter. Besides, such a road will open up for settlement new districts, well adapted to agricultural pursuits, and which, otherwise, in Quebec, at least, will never be cleared.

It has been stated that the wiser course to follow would be to improve our inland waterways, as they afford the cheapest means of transportation. I followed the discussion on that point with the utmost interest. The arguments brought forward were based mainly on the experience of the United States, and to my mind, the results are not conclusive, but rather contradictory. Certain advocates of that idea laid before the House series of figures going to show that in some parts of the United States the bulk of the traffic goes by way of the water route and not by rail. Other hon. members

have given figures showing that in other parts of the United States with access to the water routes the bulk of the traffic is carried by rail. So that the contention set forth in the first place, although sound apparently, is only partially true as regards the movement of trade in the United States. In order to arrive at a true estimate of the comparative values of the water and all-rail routes, it will be well to observe what is going on in our own country. I refer hon. members to 'Hansard' as evidence of the truth of my statements.

Advocates of the water route contend that railways cannot possibly compete with it. At the same time they tell us that the Canada Atlantic, a road which parallels the St. Lawrence river, and the bulk of whose traffic will, we are told, consist this year of 20,000,000 bushels of United States grain, is a paying concern, so much so that the suggestion is made that the government should acquire it and utilize it for extending the Intercolonial. Surely, these two propositions cannot be made to agree. If the Canada Atlantic is in a position to haul grain so profitably at the rate of two cents a bushel, despite the competition of the famous water route, the proposed route from Winnipeg to Quebec, taking into account their comparative mileage, could carry the same traffic at the rate of nine cents a bushel. Well then, what does the alleged superiority of the water route amount to ? Wherefore I say, let us consider what is going on in our own country ; we will learn more thereby than from any information gathered from the experience of the United States, which may be applicable to their conditions but not at all to ours.

Things have been so managed in the past that the hundreds of million dollars applied to the development of the country's trade have been expended for the especial benefit of southern Quebec, Ontario and the west. The city of Quebec, with its natural advantages, its ideal port, its three railways converging into it, has not received the attention which it should. She is waiting patiently that her children cease to consider her as a stranger, and that common sense be allowed to prevail.

Nobody complains ; the whole country rejoices ; the western country is growing by leaps and bounds ; everything is done that can be done towards its development. In this connection, one remark I heard seemed to me most regrettable. An hon. gentleman on the other side, discussing the scheme under discussion, exclaimed : What is the province of Ontario going to get out of this government scheme ? In answer to that question let me put another : What did the province of Quebec get out of our past policy ? I could hardly believe that a representative of Ontario would take such a narrow view of the question. For it should not be forgotten that the future of the whole country is now at stake, and local interests should not be in the way of the general progress of the Dominion. As a result of the old policy, Ontario has been riddled with railways and improvements of all kinds, and the province of Quebec left, so to speak, to go barefooted. The people of Ontario should in the future show as much patriotism as the people of Quebec have shown heretofore. The prosperity of the country as a whole will ensure that of every province.

The results of the last census are now before us. Ontario and the maritime provinces will lose ten representatives, who will be replaced by ten new members from the west ; and yet for only five or six years past have emigrants begun to pour into that country. Where has the missing population of the older provinces gone to ? The west has received a goodly number. However, Ontario praises its northern country, its 'New Ontario' as a paradise on earth. Quebec speaks in the same strain of the Lake St. John, Gaspé and north of Montreal regions. Are we not face to face with a most entrancing problem to solve ? Should we not urgently adopt a broad policy which, while not interfering with the present system, will enable the older provinces to keep abreast with the increase of population in the west, and to retain in the administration of the public affairs of the country the position to which they are entitled. The government answers : Yes. I believe they are right. The piecemeal policy of colonizing followed in the provinces is not satisfactory. We have the proof before us ; it is necessary that the Dominion government should step in to give a new impetus to the settlement of the country ; a great artery of commerce is required at the right place, to supply all parts of the body with proper nourishment, in order that they may form a well balanced whole. That is apparently the aim of the government scheme.

Information is sought, doubts are raised, as to the character of the land in our northern country. At all events, it is contended that they cannot compete with the lands of the west. The inference would be, I presume, that we shall have to wait until the west is filled up before we think of colonizing the northern parts of Ontario and of Quebec. To my mind, Sir, if I may be permitted to say so, that principle is false and almost unpatriotic.

What information is required to convince people in good faith that our lands in the north, are good, equal to those in the west ? Have not accounts of them been given for two hundred years past by missionaries who roamed over this whole area ? Have not official reports been published by direction of the governments of Ontario and Quebec? Is it assumed that explorers like the Bells, the Sullivans, the Dumais, the Bignells, and others, like McKenzie, of Montreal (who has just returned after discovering there rich deposits of asbestos) is it assumed that all those men have written jokingly, without

leaving their desk, works of imagination as it were ? Have we not the oral testimony of our trappers and hunters, and even of Indians, handed down from generation to generation and preserved in our homes ? All that is sufficient information to me ; it is good evidence of the fertility of the soil, of the wealth of the forests, of the suitability of the climate, not to speak of the mineral resources of the country, of the fisheries of Hudson bay, which our neighbours to the south seem to appreciate better than we do.

Now, when the scheme for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway was brought forward, was there laid on the Table of the House information as complete as what is required to-day from the government ? So that, to my mind, these data are sufficient to satisfy the government that the construction of a railway through that region is quite feasible, and practicable. I extend to all skeptically inclined an invitation to visit the country I have the honour to represent. We are there, due north of Quebec, on the brink of the great north-western table-land, with the Laurentian range to the south and east of us, and the limits of the province to the north and west. You will find there lands that give wealth and happiness to the settler within a period of a few years. You will find that the crop returns for that district are greatly in advance of those for the rest of the province, equalling at times those for the west, and last year surpassing them. You will find there a small farming community—grouped around the towns of Chicoutimi and Roberval, two new stars of the north—whose numbers have increased fifty per cent within the last decade, a result observed in no other part of the province. That is due to the construction of the short line of railway built from Quebec to Lake St. John and which has been fully operated since 1893 only. But at the time, despite the natural advantages of the country, and on account of the distance, the want of means of communication, the people were losing heart. In some localities the parish census has not even shown the average increment. In 1901, eight years later, the Dominion census shows, in that same district, the increase I have just stated. That small community of settlers exported last year six million pounds of cheese, five hundred thousand pounds of meat, two hundred thousand bushels of grain, besides what quantity of those products was consumed on the spot. If a short line of railway from Quebec to Lake St. John has, in the space of eight years, accomplished so much, what may we not expect from a great government railway opening up all at once this whole region ? We are only a few people down there yet ; we have only a few acres under cultivation ; and there are still 70,000,000 acres of that land, covered with virgin forest, drained by large rivers, whose roaring water-falls of incalculable power await impatiently to be turned to advantage by the hand of man. As regards education, the seminary of Chicoutimi, the convents, the school of domestic economy, of Roberval—the only one of its kind in the country—and the numerous parochial schools will show that in no respect are we lagging behind the times.

To return to the great water powers, let us see what is going on on the rivers of Chicoutimi, Jonquières, Ouiatchouan and Peribonka. The four pulp mills built on those streams have a capacity of 520,000 tons of manufactured pulp, present output ; and the quantity of barked pulp wood shipped out is just as large, making a total of 1,040,000 tons.

The lumber trade is just as large, though the population is only 30,000, and there only four small rivers operated. What enormous business will be developed when the rivers Ashuapmachouan, Peribonka, Mistassini and others will be put to use with the great forests they drain. Not only will these products of the forests be available for export, they may be shipped to supply the needs of the western country, and by themselves would provide enough freight to sustain the railway. Official data confirming what I have just stated concerning this district were received on the day before yesterday at the Department of the Interior.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, let me say one word in reference to some unfavourable comments made on our lands as compared with those of the west. My contention is that our lands are just as valuable, provided they are not beforehand despoiled of their natural wealth. Of course, if in this district which is to be opened up, the present provincial laws were to be enforced, the settler would go west, and rightly so, as he would have a better chance there. But let the Dominion government and the governments of Ontario and Quebec have a conference before taking any action ; and let them study together the best means of putting to advantage this projected railway, and all will come out right.

If, in accordance with the present practice, the timber and the water powers are turned over to outsiders, who despoil the land of all the settler needs to make a living for himself at the outset ; if, moreover, the mineral resources are also reserved, then we may expect the same failure there as the returns for the last decade show to have been the lot of the older provinces. But if pains are taken to find out the adaptibility of the various districts to farming or to lumbering operations, if agricultural belts and forest belts are located along the line, and if the farming lands are sold to the settlers in their natural state, with all the riches they may bear or contain, then our lands will be as valuable as those in the west. The settler will take them up with the assurance that he will not at the outset suffer from want, for he will have at his

door the raw material of a great industry which he can put on the market at any time to supply his needs.

Put up the selling price of these lands, if you wish, retain the fees, that will not interfere in any way; you will not have lost anything, and you will see the settlers come in great numbers as in the west, each township having its period of lumbering at the outset, while farther on, in the parts not suited or not reserved to farming, the lumbermen will carry on their business on a larger scale, but all together working hand in hand for the general welfare of the community. You will see no more of those disputes between the settler and the lumberer, disputes of which we hear so much and which are so harmful; and the danger of forest fires breaking out will be minimized, as the settler will be just as interested as the merchant in protecting the forest, as well as his buildings, both equally precious to him.

But under present conditions, the settler, especially in those parts where the pulp industry has been carried on, having on his farm only stumps and wood of no value, is anxious to get rid of them as soon as practicable, and his best means of doing so is fire.

Now, if, in the west, the government before selling them to the settler, leased the lands to companies or individuals who robbed them of their original wealth and left them to the settler minus seventy-five per cent of their value, do you think that the tide of immigration towards the west would be as strong? Why not deal with our wooded lands in the same manner as we deal with our prairie lands? The time is no longer when the settler meekly believed his lot was to suffer. We shall have to look to him, Mr. Speaker, in our northern country, to render us absolutely independent, commercially speaking, from the neighbouring states. Sir, I lay that suggestion before those in authority; it is worthy, I believe, of their serious consideration.

Now, on going over the data supplied for the Trans-Canada, as did my hon. friends the members for Gaspé and Bellechasse, and others, I am led to believe that it is in that direction that the grades are the easiest for heavy traffic. The greatest difference of level between Roberval and the western boundary of Quebec is 1,200 feet, spread over a perfectly smooth table land, where there is not a single mountain in sight, not even towards lake Abitibi,—and that according to surveys made especially to ascertain differences of level. With that in view, the promoters of the Trans-Canada had offered to carry all the grain from the west, whatever the loading point (even along the Winnipeg branch) to the port of Quebec or to Ha Ha bay, at the rate of nine cents per bushel. They could afford to do that, as their route would be a direct one, without transhipment, without the use of elevators and the delays they involve. Besides, the offer was made to carry the settlers free of charge. Under those conditions, there was to be a net profit of $1,416 per train of 30 cars, or 52 per cent. Is it necessary that a railway should bring such large profits to be a paying concern. I do not think so. And those figures were obtained by a capable engineer, Mr. Doucet, and verified by men of weight, such as Messrs. Wm. Price, J. G. Scott, Tanguay and others.

The hon. Minister of the Interior has given as possible a rate of 11 cents per bushel along the road which they propose to follow across the country. These two estimates are of a nature to convince us that, in the absence of a transcontinental water route, inland navigation is not and will not be in a position to compete with the all-rail route, especially when we take into account the reduction in mileage and greater speed secured by following the latter route. Now, since the government have the same object in view as the promoters of the Trans-Canada, and will run their railway through the same country, will they not be in a position to offer as low a rate? Let them follow the same route, and that will settle it.

I give herewith the distances from Winnipeg to various ports by the proposed line:

Summer ports: (by proposed line).	Miles.
From Winnipeg to Ha Ha bay	1,319
" " Quebec	1,385
" " Portland, via Quebec.	1,735
" " Saint John	1,785
" " Halifax	1,951

A difference in favour of Ha Ha bay:

	Miles.
Over Quebec	66
" Portland	416
" Saint John	462
" Halifax	632

Now, from Ha Ha bay to Liverpool, the distance is, 2,642 miles.

	Miles.
From Quebec to Liverpool	2,686
" Saint John to Liverpool	2,700
" Halifax to Liverpool	2,300
" Portland to Liverpool	2,789

And if you figure the total distance from Winnipeg through to Liverpool, you get the following results:

	Miles.
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Ha Ha bay (Trans-Canada)	3,961
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Quebec (gov. route)	4,065
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via St. John	4,481
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Halifax	4,251
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Portland	4,524

Consequently, Ha Ha bay and Quebec have the enormous advantage over the other ports of four hundred or five hundred miles.

Now, if you wish to compare these distances with those obtained by the famous water route, here they are:

	Miles.
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via St. John, C.P.R.	4,689
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Halifax, C.P.R.	4,548
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via St. John, I.C.R.	4,948
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Halifax, I.C.R.	4,654
From Winnipeg to Liverpool, via Portland, G.T.R.	4,594

A difference of six or seven hundred miles in favour of Quebec and Ha Ha bay.

If the Grand Trunk Pacific is in a position to haul grain to Quebec at the rate of nine cents a bushel, it should have a goodly share of the grain crop to carry, besides other freight supplied by the cattle trade, the cheese and butter industries, the lumber industry, and other traffic special to it and which does not pass through the elevators. My conclusion is, therefore, that, on business basis, that undertaking rests on a solid foundation. So much for the summer traffic. But the winter traffic has its exigencies, and what will become of the navigable routes? As soon as the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence has been proven to be practicable, Quebec will retain the year round the position it now possesses as a summer port. St. Catharine's bay, at the mouth of river Saguenay, facing Tadousac, will also be benefited in that way. That port, which is never closed, is already provided with wharfs to a depth of thirty feet at low tide. They were constructed by that energetic Wm. Price, at his own expense, for his present requirements and in view of future developments. That seaport, open the year round, would save the risk of one hundred miles of river navigation. Sixty-two miles of railway would connect it with the Quebec and lake St. John at Ha Ha bay, whereto the company owning that road is soon to extend it, thus taking advantage of the subsidies which are at its disposal and fulfilling its pledges to the Quebec government and the people of that district.

The advocates of the river route, with all their calculations, seem to lose sight altogether of the winter trade. The advocates of the Intercolonial are just as forgetful. Allow me, Sir, to lay before you the following statement which seems to me very instructive. After the close of navigation, here is the position of Canada as regards transportation.

Via Canadian Pacific Railway:	Miles.
Winnipeg to St. John, N.B.	1,989
" Halifax, N.S.	2,264
Via Intercolonial Railway:	
Winnipeg to Saint John, N.B.	2,248
" Halifax, N.S.	2,346
Via Grand Trunk Railway:	
Winnipeg to Portland	1,805

A difference in favour of Portland, varying from two hundred to five hundred miles. Under present conditions the winter export traffic divides at Montreal: it may go to a Canadian port by way of the Intercolonial or the Canadian Pacific Railway, or it may go, by the shorter route, to Portland. Portland has the advantage. Just at this juncture, the proposed new line will relieve the situation by bringing St. John as near to us as is Portland. That is where the action of the government is felt and shows its patriotism.

In spite of all that has been said, I fail to conceive how the longest and slowest route can be the easiest and cheapest. I stick to the belief that the most direct route is the shortest and the cheapest. Moreover, I am of opinion, that nations, as well as individuals, should, under all circumstances, unless radically prevented from doing so, control their affairs the year round, independently of their neighbours. Hence the necessity of our taking at once the proper means to overcome the difficulties in our way towards attaining that end.

As regards winter navigation, the observations of residents on the northern coast, which I visited, last year, seem to point out clearly to the fact that the river St. Lawrence is easily navigated the year through from Tadousac to Blanc Sablon. If I may be allowed, I would suggest to the government that, in order to complete their present scheme, they should see to the settlement of that much controverted point: the winter navigability of the St. Lawrence to Quebec. It would be a good plan to establish at once observation stations along the north shore and at Belle Isle, to ascertain from day to day the condition of the river in winter time. That question should be taken up at once by the government. The practicability of the scheme is being denied. I contend, with a great many others, that it is quite feasible. But the point should be settled at once, and I trust the government will not delay doing its share towards settling it. The experiments carried on between Murray bay and River Ouelle, and between St. Catharine's bay and Tadousac, on a small scale, are a beginning; but there is need for more.

I think I have shown by statistics that the future of the country is dependent on the northern country; in that country lies our hope.

In that way, Sir, do I appreciate in a general way the scheme which the government has just laid before this House. I would have preferred the Trans-Canada. I did all my power to gain my point with the government; they deemed it their duty, in the interest of the country at large, to propose something else. I must give them full credit for acting in good faith; I am satisfied that they were moved under the circumstances by very serious reasons. At any rate it is much better to accept the present proposal than to bring the Trans-Canada scheme before the House, with chances of having it rejected. The Trans-Canada may fairly claim the credit of having helped on the passing of the present

scheme to a great extent. Their prospectuses have several times been quoted from before this House. The country reaps the benefit of the work effected and money expended by the promoters of that scheme. It is a satisfaction to those who devoted their time and energy to ensure its success. That scheme is not dead ; it is only postponed. If it was necessary that twenty years should elapse before the Canadian Pacific Railway be paralleled, at the rate things are going, within ten years from now, the Trans-Canada will have to be built.

My district may have benefited in a greater measure from the Trans-Canada scheme than from the one under discussion; but the government are aware of what is going on there. They know that within two years, the stream of settlers which is pouring into that district, and which they have helped to such an extent for the last seven years, will come to a standstill if railway is not extended from Roberval westward. Already we have settlers 70 miles away from the railways. The government are aware that an important company is awaiting a decision in the matter to begin utilizing the enormous water power of St. Félicien. They know that it is necessary the railway should be pushed on from Chicoutimi to St. Alphonse to open up for general trade the magnificent seaport of Ha Ha bay to which I have referred. They are satisfied that the river Saguenay should be deepened as far up as Chicoutimi, or even Shipshan, in order to promote the great industries of Chicoutimi and those in course of creation at the point I have just named, and at the Grande Décharge. The government know that it is proper to provide a winter steamboat service on the Saguenay, from St. Catharine's to Tadousac. They are aware that the extension of the Roberval road to James bay, in connection with the present line, would almost be equivalent to the Trans-Canada. They realize all that, when undertaking the construction of the proposed line. They assume the whole responsibility. We are awaiting their action with confidence. On the other hand, I recognize,—and I wish to say so now,—considering all the government have done for my district in the last three years that I have been here co-operating with them for the promotion of colonization, agriculture and dairying, I recognize that they are favourably disposed towards my constituents and that they are not lacking in the means to forward their interests.

In a quiet way, millions of dolllars are at stake just now between Seven Islands and Peribonka. With men, such as our millionaire, Wm, Price, generous and able successor of Price Brothers & Co., who were the founders of my district in conjunction with the first settlers ; with the Chicoutimi pulp works, those of the Ouiatchouan and Peribonka ; with Mr. Wilson, a son of Ontario, who has such a faith in the future of our district that he has gone thither to lay the foundation of a great carbide, iron and pulp industry ; with Mr. B. A. Scott, lumberman of Roberval, and the Seven Islands, Portneuf and Escoumains companies, who together control millions of British, United States and Canadian capital; the government will find it an easy matter to build a road that will meet the requirements of that country to the north of Quebec and ensure its prosperity and wealth.

So, I thrust that this policy will give satisfactory results. At any rate, I see that the leader of the opposition has also declared in favour of building a line of railway from Winnipeg to Quebec, on the same plan as the government, with this difference that he would use it rather as a colonization road, while the government have in view both a colonization road and a trade route. Both agree in ignoring the proposal of the Trans-Canada. The leader of the opposition did not even find fault with the government for having discarded it. The inference is that he approves of the government having done so, and that he would have acted similarly under the circumstances.

The hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) referring to the Trans-Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific on the 26th of May last, said :

> It is a road from Quebec, I gather—for we get pamphlets about it every day—and it is to run through to Manitoba and the Northwest. I do not know who the promoters are or anything about it. But, if the Grand Trunk Railway propose to build a road into that section of the country that is another matter. The Grand Trunk Railway has done a great deal towards the development of this country, and the stockholders of that concern have had but meagre return on the money they have invested. Anything the Canadian people can do in return for the great benefits that that company has yielded to this country ought to be done, other things being equal. If they propose to build a road which will open up a new territory in the North-west, and make a connecting line with Quebec, I would rather see it assisted than any other scheme I hear proposed. (3446 of Debates.)
>
> As I said before, we have a choice of deciding between two companies for the building of this road. My opinion is that if the government should decide to give any assistance for that purpose, the company which is entitled to the preference is the Grand Trunk Railway Company. That company has done a great deal to open up this country, they have spent a great deal of money, and have received very littlte return for it. (3448 of Debates.)

Should that hon. member, an ex-Minister of Railways, were in power to-day, would he think otherwise ? In the Senate, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, leader of the Conservative party seconded the motion to grant the charter of the Grand Trunk Pacific. All that goes to show that that company has powerful supporters on all sides.

I am satisfied that the time has come for northern Quebec to have its equitable share. I am convinced that the northern country

is the corner stone of our country's commercial independence, and that the plan of the government is the most practical means of maintaining the present political balance in the country and increasing our prospects of trade in the future. I consider that the scheme laid before us is a good one, and on the whole is deserving of the country's approval. One of the promoters of the Trans-Canada, a Conservative of Quebec, wrote to me, last week: 'From the national standpoint, there is no doubt in my mind that the policy of the government for the building of a road from Quebec to Winnipeg is a good one and will greatly benefit the province as well as the whole of Canada.'

Mr. J. G. Scott, the leading promoter of the Trans-Canada, in the 'Morning Chronicle,' of Quebec, expresses the same views. Mr. Doucet, engineer of the Trans-Canada, stated to me a few days ago that the government scheme, as regards Quebec, was on the same lines as that of the Trans-Canada, according to which the railway was to run direct to Quebec from the north of Lake Winnipeg, with one branch line to Winnipeg city, and another from James bay to Ha Ha bay and St. Catharines. So, I am not alone of that opinion: the engineer of the Trans-Canada scheme believes that the government scheme is an equivalent one as regards Quebec.

It has been stated that the projected line will not have any traffic and that its usefulness will be nil. I have heard it said, especially this year, as a cardinal principle, that trade, like water, has its natural channels. If that be so, in accordance with the figures I have quoted, the western and the general traffic, once the projected line is built from Winnipeg to Quebec, will naturally take its course that way. So that apart from the local trade which will be considerable, traffic will not be wanting, provided the line is rightly located.

Some express fear at the heavy expenditure entailed by this undertaking: $100,000,000 and more, it is alleged. The government put down the expenliture at $13,000,000. There must be a mistake somewhere; the discrepancy cannot be so great. I understand the government to mean, that the only amount expended that will not bring in a return, is the interest during the first few years, as the road will remain ultimately the property of Canada, the company, in the meantime, paying interest on the capital invested. In fact, our public debt will be increased by those $13,000,000 or so, and no more.

Now, in projecting to build the Trans-Canada, we were prepared to expend $100,000,000, and that, to build a road through an entirely desert country, where everything had to be provided. What would these same people have thought of such an undertaking when they fret at the thought of engaging into the building of a road which can expect for its first train as much traffic as it can haul?

What would be the cost of the alternative scheme proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition? The same amount. He stated that the people of Canada are not afraid to spend their money for useful improvements. What would it cost to improve our waterways, as proposed? Millions and millions of dollars.

So, we are confronted with various proposals, all of which entail, let us say, to avoid quarelling, all the same expenditure. I think the proposal of the government is the best because it benefits all the provinces in a more equitable way than does the proposal of the leader of the opposition, which would strengthen still more the present system of providing for the requirements of one part only of the country, and besides would leave us at the mercy of the United States.

Praise has been bestowed on the system of local or branch colonization railways. Sir, we have had enough of that system to know what it is worth. It took twenty-five years to build 170 miles of railway from Quebec to Lake St. John; and for eleven years past, the company has not found the means of building the remaining ten miles to connect Chicoutimi with Ha Ha bay, in accordance with its charter and its most solemn pledges to the government and the public. They cannot be prevailed upon to extend their road west of Roberval, although warranted by the requirements of the settlers and the prospective establishments of large industries at St. Felicien.

And see the Gaspé peninsula which has remained stationary, notwithstanding its natural advantages, awaiting those vaunted colonization roads. See the country to the north of Montreal, the Nominingue, the St. Maurice valley. Why not admit it at once, that system is too slow, surrounded by two many difficulties.

Times have changed; we have no more that old-time settler who believed himself destined by Providence to a life of privation and suffering, his sole reward to be the honour of having founded a new colony. The struggle for life has changed: the poor as well as the rich strive now only for comfort. Hence that unfortunate desertion of the country, that aversion of the settler for our forest lands, in recent times, and that wild rush towards the western prairies to the detriment of the older provinces. Since, therefore, it is necessary to build railways in advance to ensure the success of colonization, and since the provinces heretofore have been unable to do better with their railways than follow at a distance in the footsteps of the backwoods settler. I consider it our duty to accept and to further the proposal that is made of providing a great central railway through the finest forest territory remaining to us. I speak from experience. I have partaken of the settler's life in the backwoods; I know

its difficulties. I know what are the views in this respect of the community I represent; and I think I am the faithful interpreter of every settler in the province of Quebec when I say they rejoice in finding a government providing for them through the forest a royal road which will do away with the misery of old.

Not very many years ago, a man who is no longer with us, laid on the Table of this House the Bill for the first transcontinental road through Canada. What a surprise. What dark forebodings. What conflict of opinions. Millions to be spent, insufficent data, and what not. None, Sir, are better acquainted with that phase of our history than those of my colleagues who were then members of this House. Sir John A Macdonald and his supporters persisted; the Bill was passed as being a good measure on the whole, nothwithstanding imperfections of detail. Twenty years have since gone by. That scheme has been found so beneficial, that even his political opponents are prone to say that Sir John A. Macdonald was a great statesman; and following in his footsteps, request to be authorized to build a second transcontinental. The new scheme is criticised in the same way as the former; but the parts are interverted.

History repeats itself and I trust it will do so in this case. Some day Laurier will disappear. Ontario will pride itself in having given birth to Sir John Macdonald and in having his remains; Quebec will pride itself as to-day in having given birth to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and the country will honour the graves of these two eminent men each with its brazen crown; the one bearing the letters, C.P.R., the other G.T.R. Around these two graves two great races who have founded Canada will feel themselves more tightly bound one to the other by a common sentiment of national pride.

Sir, I realize that the vote I am about to give will be the most important act of my political life. I represent here enormous interests; I was elected by an intelligent community to whom I honestly promised to support the government whenever possible. I am favourable to the principle involved in the measure, and I believe it to be superior to all others which have been discussed in this House, as it decentralizes the commerce of the country, and is more equitable to all its parts. At the same time, the rejection of the Trans-Canada scheme, whereby my best and most devoted personal friends felt greatly aggrieved, might have induced me to oppose this Bill. But, after closely following the debate I am satisfied that the Conservative party would have dealt with the Trans-Canada in the same mood as the cabinet. Besides, I recognize the substantial assistance which this government has given to my county on all occasions, as well as the courteous treatment I received at the hands of its members. I am confident that the Prime Minister is taking an ever increasing interest in the welfare of my district, and I would, for all those reasons, deem myself greatly failing in faithfulness and in honour, should I in such a solemn circumstance of his life, refuse to uphold his views. In so doing, I believe I am fulfilling my duty conscientiously towards my country, my province, the constituency I represent, and towards my friends, and I entertain the hope that all will be benefited in a large measure by this policy.

Mr. H. A. WARD (East Durham). I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that I am not sufficiently well versed in the French language to have understood the arguments of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Girard) who has just taken his seat, which I have no doubt have been very able and interesting. It may be quite true that nearly all the arguments that can be advanced, either for or against this scheme now propounded by the government, have been brought forward; at the same time there are people in every constituency who have a right to know where their representative stands on an important measure of this kind, and therefore it is that I shall address the House on this occasion. I realize that hon. members on both sides are becoming impatient at the prolonged nature of this debate, and I can assure them that it is my purpose to make my remarks brief. I am strongly in favour of the development by railway of those parts of this Canada of ours that have not yet been opened up, but I desire to see measures for such development undertaken by the government only after serious inquiry, and on the basis of the very best information that can possibly be obtained, and in a manner which shall be found in the best interests of the country. I am willing that money should be freely spent by the administration of the day on any railway that will have the effect of improving our transportation facilities, in opening up unsettled districts, and generally in drawing the provinces of this confederation more closely together. But I believe that this scheme propounded by the present administration, coming as it does without that information that we on this side of the House consider necessary to have been obtained by the government, has been conceived in reckless haste, and is not one that should appeal to the country. Since this debate commenced, arguments have been brought forward on this side of the House which ought to lead the government seriously to reflect before deciding to embark in an expenditure of such an immense sum of money without the necessary information which would justify them in doing so. I believe that the Grand Trunk Pacific should be afforded every facility for getting into the North-west, and should be granted liberal assistance for that purpose, under reasonable and safe conditions.

I consider the proposal that has been brought forward by the government to be

defective in many ways. I desire to call attention to a few arguments that have no doubt been previously given in this House, but which I think can bear a little repetition. In the first place, I would call the attention of the government to this fact, that now for the first time in the history of the country a great railway corporation is to be bound to the government, and the government is to be bound to that corporation for the period of fifty years. Fifty years, Mr. Speaker, is a long time, and the results may be very serious to the country. I desire to call attention to some points in clauses 7 and 16 of the contract entered into by the government with the Grand Trunk Pacific. In clause 7 it is provided:

> In order to insure for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such a manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, &c.

As I desire to shorten my remarks as much as possible, I will only read the portion of the clause I wish to refer to. Clause 16 provides that the government are bound to consult the Grand Trunk Pacific as to the amount of money that shall be put into the eastern division, and that it shall be economically constructed. Then clause 16 provides for betterments. Now it is well known in railway construction in this and other countries that the first construction is not usually intended to be a durable one. I contend therefore that the clause leaves it open to the Grand Trunk Pacific to secure the construction of that eastern division in such a way, in so economical a manner, that every year thereafter betterments will be called for and the government will have to provide them. Now, this is clearly shown by these two sections, that in each year a large sum will probably have to be spent for betterments, and I have no doubt, in my own mind, that the amount that must be spent in this way will come to even more that the interest that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will have to pay on the cost of this road.

A good deal has been said about the security that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are giving to the government for the payment of the 3 per cent interest upon the cost of construction of the eastern division. I was rather amused not very long ago by hearing a gentleman who came from a western Ontario constituency, represented by an hon. gentleman on the government side of the House, state that the government had a perfect 'cinch,' as he elegantly expressed it, in the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; that they were secured for the payment of all they would expend in building that portion of the line by a mortgage on all the rolling stock on the whole line. I asked him if he was quite sure about that, as it was not the manner in which I had read the contract. He said: Oh, yes, the member for my county told me so. I should think that hon. members should be careful about what they say to their constituents in reference to this contract, and should really stick to the truth when they undertake to instruct them upon this very important question.

I shall deal very briefly with the cost of construction of the eastern division. So many different estimates of this have been made, that really any hon. member could be excused if he had not a very lucid or clear idea as to what that division is really going to cost; but there can be no doubt in my mind that it must cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $75,000,000 to $100,000. If that is so, as the security given is only a second mortgage upon the $5,000,000 worth of rolling stock which are ear-marked, I believe, for that division, what security can there possibly be after the rolling stock on that division has commenced to depreciate? The hon member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) brought forward what I thought was one of the most conclusive arguments as to the danger this country is incurring in constructing that eastern division. The argument which he brought so clearly before the House has not been answered by any hon. gentleman opposite who has followed him. He argued that as the earnings of the Grand Trunk Railway itself, on its roads in the thickly settled portions of this country, only amounted, after paying working expenses, to $800 per mile, that in this sparsely portion of the country through which the eastern division of the Grand Trunk Pacific will run, they would have to earn even a larger amount per mile in order to pay the interest on the cost of construction, even taking this as the amount which the government admit it will cost. It seems to me that this contract which has been entered into by the government was stamped as unbusinesslike at the very outset; if we are to believe what we have heard in connection with the negotiations with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway people, they absolutely and entirely refuse to undertake the construction of that portion of the work. That being so, it seems to me that the project is stamped at once as being an unbusinesslike one for the government to enter into.

The right hon. gentleman who brought down this scheme, and he did so in very eloquent language, used that expression which I suppose has now become historic: 'We cannot wait.' It seems to me, with all due respect to the right hon. gentleman, that the reasons he gave to the House and to the country for the undue haste with which this project is being carried out were not of a very serious character—in fact, I might almost say that they were flimsy. The right hon. Prime Minister, in excusing the haste with which this contract was entered into, expressed great fear that the bonding privileges would be taken away from us; and in connection with this excuse,

I will read a short extract from the Minneapolis 'Journal.' It is as follows:

> The Grand Trunk Pacific scheme has caused a strange twist in the attitude of the Canadian parties toward the United States. The Liberals have generally been supposed to be the party of those who had no ill-will for or special fear of the republic, but Sir Wilfrid Laurier is advocating a Grand Trunk Pacific on the ground that there must be an all-Canadian route which cannot be affected by the withdrawal of the American bonding privilege. The Conservatives are now answering that there is no danger that the United States will ever withdraw that privilege. And they are right. Uncle Sam is not prone to cut off his nose to spite his face, and with the growing sentiment in the United States in favour of freer trade with Canada, there will be no tendency to get rid of such encouragement to trade as we now have.

This is an expression of opinion from the Minneapolis 'Journal,' and it seems to me that from what we know of the American people, that there is not the slightest danger of this bonding privilege being withdrawn. It is not at all likely that the American people, and the American government, entered into this arrangement with Canada years and years ago, unless they were going to reap from it at least as much advantage as the Canadians would. It has been a general feature of our dealings with the Americans that they generally get a little the best of the bargain; that they derive the greater advantage, and I am quite sure that we have nothing to apprehend in the danger of this bonding privilege being removed.

Several hon. gentlemen have spoken of the congestion of freight that has taken place in the North-west in the last two years. That congestion, I believe, has existed with the two last crops grown in the North-west, but such arrangements have since been made by the railways already in existence in the west as to enable them to cope with the difficulties in a much better manner than in the past. Now, I wish to call attention to the estimate of the crop yield for the last two or three years:

Year.	Estimated Yield.
1898	31,450,000
1899	34,830,000
1900	17,055,000
1901	63,300,000
1902	67,000,000
1903 (highest estimate)	58,000,000

Thus, the estimated crop for this year is nearly 10,000,000 less than that of last year. Of course, that is a matter to be regretted, but it shows that there is not the necessity for haste, so far as the moving the crops in the North-west is concerned, as the right hon. gentleman would lead us to suppose. The project might, in my opinion, very well have waited for another year, and the country would not have suffered in consequence. The commission which has just been appointed by the right hon. gentleman's government was, as I supposed, a commission to take into consideration the very points which have led the government to introduce this scheme to the House.

Now as the government have decided upon this great transportation scheme, that commission seems only of use to register the decree of the government already issued. We always imagined that the commission was appointed for the purpose of trying to solve the transportation problem, and it seems unfortunate that the government should have rushed this matter before parliament with unseemly haste before the commission had an opportunity to tender its advice upon it. Let me read an extract or two from a speech of the Prime Minister delivered some years ago, to show what a change of heart has come over him. On the 21st December, 1880, Mr. Laurier, as he was then, had this to say with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract then before parliament:

> The policy of the Liberals was that it should be built gradually as the wants of the country require and its resources permit.

The policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to-day is not to build his railway gradually and as the resources of the country require, but to rush into it without knowing what he is doing. Again the Mr. Laurier of that date said:

> Honourable gentlemen opposite will remember that they received ample warning not to create that state of things which would bind this country to the immediate completion of the road. They were reminded that if they did so they would be putting a burden on this country too heavy for its strength to bear; but they did not heed these warnings, they forced their followers to vote for this policy, and now, as a crowning consequence of that policy, their followers are asked to consent to enormous sacrifices involved in this contract. . . . In my humble judgment it was a crime, though I might say without severity it was a political crime—at all events it was a fault to bind this country to the immediate construction of the road.

I read that to show that the right hon. gentleman at that time believed in making haste slowly, and did not believe in rushing wildly to construct a railway as he is doing in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

The Liberal party in Canada seem to have realized lately that the Conservative government made no mistake when they built the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, as they built it. The hon. the Finance Minister told us the other night that he did not refer to the Canadian Pacific Railway contract with the intention of casting any reproach whatever upon the men who framed it and who constructed that railway. That was a considerable admission for the Finance Minister, a leader of the Liberals, to make, and I commend him for it. We of the Liberal-Conservative party have always contended that the proper system to adopt was to build the Canadian Pacific Railway as a harmonious whole, and not a thing of shreds and

patches, as the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie proposed ; and, Sir, subsequent events have abundantly shown that the Conservative government was right. The policy of Mr. Mackenzie was to build the road in four sections, and after giving the contractors $10,000 a mile and 20,000 acres per mile, to hand each section over to them to be thereafter owned by these contractors. That would have given us four different sections of railway running between Lake Nipissing and British Columbia, while the Conservative administration by sticking to the original scheme, have given to Canada a national highway of which every Canadian is proud.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce when speaking to this motion, told us that the remarks of the Finance Minister met with his entire approval, and so he did not devote much of his time to the consideration of the question, but applied himself to one of his old time speeches in condemnation of the railway and fiscal policies of the Conservative party. I am glad the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) has come into the House at this opportune moment. Here are his words :

> However good the record of the Canadian Pacific Railway may be looked at as a commercial undertaking and I think the future historian of Canada would largely bear me out when I say that no possible combination of blunders could be conceived or could be more injurious to Canada than those which marked the initiation of that enterprise. I say in the first place that the bargain which they made in 1871 with the people of British Columbia by which, without knowing the smallest circumstances or the smallest fact that they ought to have known, they bound themselves within ten years by a treaty with that state, unasked for by them, to construct that railway was a fatal mistake, a mistake which resulted in very great injury and very great loss to the people of Canada and which seriously affected the permanent usefulness of the road.

But the right hon. gentleman did not tell us in what way the interests of the country had suffered, nor did he in any manner show how the permanent usefulness of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been impaired by the policy followed by the Conservative administration. I desire to call the attention of the House to his word, 'unasked for by them," which I would take to mean that the province of British Columbia did not ask for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The right hon. gentleman must have forgotten the history of the time, or, he would not have made such a statement. I quote from the memoirs of Sir John A. Macdonald, by Joseph Pope, an extract which I take to be correct :

> In June, the death of Governor Seymour gave to the imperial government an opportunity of showing their appreciation of Sir John Macdonald's judgment. Mr. Musgrave was immediately transferred from Newfoundland to British Columbia. Through his influence, aided by the efforts of the Hon. (now Sir) Joseph Trutch, and other friends of the union, an agreement was entered into, the principal condition of it being the construction by Canada of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In the autumn of 1870, the people of British Columbia approved this arrangement, at a general election. On the 20th of the following January it was ratified by the legislature, and on the 20th of July the waters of the Pacific ocean marked the western limit of the Dominion.
>
> The government of the Dominion undertake to secure the commencement simultaneously within two years from the date of the union, of the construction of a railway from the Pacific towards Rocky mountains, and from such point as may be selected, east of the Rocky mountains, towards the Pacific, to connect the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada ; and, further, to secure the completion of such railway within ten years from the date of the union.

That, I apprehend, conclusively answers the hon. gentleman when he says that the Canadian Pacific Railway was not asked for by British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Does my hon. friend want to know the facts ?

Mr. WARD. I only know the fact that the hon. gentleman has stated what is not correct.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman is very much misinformed.

Mr. WARD. In addition to that, I wish to show that the Liberal party of that time were distinctly against the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, more especially the British Columbia section. On the 16th of April, 1880, the Hon. Edward Blake moved the following amendment to a motion of Sir Charles Tupper in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway :

> To leave out all the words after 'that' in the said motion, and to insert the following instead thereof : 'The public interests require that the work of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia should be postponed.'

The Hon. Edward Blake, in concluding his very able speech on that occasion, made use of these words :

> Complete the railway to Red river, go on with the prairie section as far as settlement demands. For that risk something, since the die is cast. But in order to succeed in that, in order that you may have a chance later to do more, deal with that alone now. Bend to that great effort your undivided energies, your whole available resources. Postpone meanwhile the western work, and do not by your present action, based on airy dreams and vain imaginings, risk the ruin of your country.

That was the position of the Liberal party at that time. Their policy was simply to build the railway as the necessities of the country required it ; to drop off settlers, I supposed at the western end of the road, and only build into the prairies towards British Columbia as in their opinion the

necessities of the country required. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if that policy had been carried out the Canadian Pacific Railway would not have been completed to this day. It seems to me that with the lack of energy which characterized the administration at that time, they would have simply gone on building small portions of the railway, and Canada would not have been in the position she is in to-day, to enable these hon. gentlemen to pose as the administrators par excellence of this country. That is one of the colossal blunders which my hon. friend referred to as having characterized the policy of the Conservative administration of that day. The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman also referred to the arrangement which the government of that day entered into with British Columbia as a colossal blunder. I leave it to the good sense of the House to say whether or not the hon. gentleman's charge is correct. He went on to state that he had an interview or correspondence with Sir Stafford Northcote, the chancellor of the exchequer. This is what the hon. gentleman said :

I very well recollect that when I came to lay my proposition before Sir Stafford Northcote, while he admitted the substantial truth of my suggestion that the road was of imperial concern, that its construction would be a great benefit to the whole British empire ; he told me nevertheless in so many words ; that although he believed that my request would have been acceded to at once at the time that the union of British Columbia was affected, yet, that as we had chosen to bind ourselves by treaty to the people of British Columbia to build that road within a certain period of time, it was out of his power under the circumstances to propose to the British parliament to grant us any further assistance.

The hon. gentleman evidently had no confidence in the resources of the country at the time the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie's administration was in power. He was afraid to launch out into the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway without assistance, and therefore he made this frantic appeal to the British government to help him over the difficulties which he seemed unable to overcome himself. It seems to me that that was rather a humiliating position for the hon. gentleman to take, after the courageous policy that had been enunciated and partly carried out by the Conservative administration.

The hon. gentleman also had his usual fling at the Conservative administration for the small number of immigrants that came to the country during the eighteen years that Sir John Macdonald's government was in power. That argument of the hon. gentleman's is so old that it hardly needs any answer. But I would call his attention to this fact, that while the government of which he was the Finance Minister was in power, the exodus to the United States went on just the same. It is a matter of congratulation to all the people of this country, on both sides of politics, that we are now getting large numbers of immigrants from the United States, instead of our young men leaving our shores and going to that country. But surely the hon. gentleman can not claim that as a result of the present government being in power. Surely he understands, or he ought to understand, that the United States, being a very much older country than Canada, has been attracting immigrants for many years ; and that the stream of immigration, having once set in, in any particular direction, it is a most difficult thing, I imagine, to stem the tide, and divert it in other directions. That has been, in my opinion what we have had to contend with. Every immigrant who went to the United States was an immigration agent for that country, and used his influence to bring his friends there. I am very glad to say that the tide is turning in our direction, and I am sure that no one rejoices over that more than the Conservative party.

The Hon. Mr. Tarte, in the speech which he delivered to the House the other day, remarked that he regarded the debate which has been in progress for the last three weeks, as a peculiar one, in this respect. He said :

One thing is cheering ; we have not heard anybody during this long and interesting debate talking blue ruin or talking about the absence of the credit of this country. On both sides hon. members of the House have expressed the fullest confidence in the future of Canada and in its ability to grapple with the biggest problems.

That is in strong contrast with the conduct of the present government when in opposition. As everybody knows, who has studied the proceedings of parliament at that time, especially when the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built and the National Policy was being introduced, a great many blue ruin speeches were delivered by these hon. gentlemen. But no similar accusation can be established against this side. No hon. gentleman on the government benches can prove that the present opposition have ever adopted any such course as was followed in the days I referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite. Judging by the criticisms, Mr. Speaker, indulged in by the supporters of the measure before the House, it would seem that they either do not understand, or wilfully misunderstand the policy enunciated by the hon. the leader of the opposition. In my opinion that policy is a broad and courageous one. It is, I believe, becoming every day more popular with the people, and I should not be surprised if the government, before this resolution is voted, were to adopt some of the suggestions made by my hon. leader. Were they to do so, they would be acting in the interests of the country. The policy enunciated by the leader of the opposition offers an attractive alternative to the vicious

policy enunciated by the government. In every line it suggests that we should not blindly rush into any scheme without counting the cost, and if the leader of the opposition should be returned to power at the next general elections—which we are told are very close—it would not even then be too late to modify this contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, so as to make it more acceptable in the interests of the country. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway themselves, I believe, are not altogether in love with the scheme, so far as the eastern division is concerned, and would be quite willing to modify it; and if that were done, it would save millions of money to the country.

Hon. members on this side have been charged by hon. gentlemen opposite with unpatriotic conduct, because they are opposing the measure before the House, but no accusation of preaching blue ruin has been or could be possibly made against us. The Conservative party rejoice in the fact that, in spite of the infliction of having its affairs conducted by a Liberal government, the country is prosperous. We take pride in the thought that, by reason of the foundation of prosperity having been so firmly laid by the much abused administration of the late Sir John Macdonald, the country is able to stand even the reckless expenditure of the present administration. We look forward to the time when hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches will be relegated to that political obscurity they are so well qualified to adorn. The day is not far distant when the hon. leader of the opposition will be called on to put into force the policy to which he so ably drew the attention of the House. We have an abiding faith in the future of this great Dominion, and notwithstanding the strictures of hon. gentlemen opposite, we will always be found, in power or out of power, doing our utmost to assist in the up-building of this young nation.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I had not the pleasure of listening to all of the speech with which we have just been favoured, but as no doubt it was on pretty much the same line as the other speeches already delivered on that side, I am probably not very much the loser, so far as concerns replying to the strictures of speakers on the opposite side, who preceded the hon. gentleman, and who went over the same ground. In dealing with this question, I intend, Sir, to be very brief. I do not intend to thresh over again the old straw which has been so well threshed by hon. gentlemen opposite, but to confine myself as much as possible to that portion of the Bill which interests the people I represent.

This discussion has now lasted some weeks. When the proposition of the government was first submitted to the House by its right hon. leader, in an eloquent speech, we had no reply for some time from the hon. leader of the opposition. But that hon. gentleman, after brooding in silence a long time, came down with an alternative proposition. Previous to that his supporters, who had been attacking this project, attacked it on the ground that the proposed railway was not wanted, that there was nobody asking for it, that the country which it was to go through was not fit for settlement, and that the operating of the line between Moncton and Winnipeg by different railway companies, with joint running powers, was impracticable. But as soon as the leader of the opposition, after his long period of silent incubation, brought down his alternative proposition, his supporters began to change their tune; and that alternative proposition, I must say, bears very strongly the stamp of an hon. gentleman who made a trip here from Manitoba some time ago. I refer to Premier Roblin. That he had something to do with formulating the policy of the leader of the opposition is shown by the fact that that policy comprises the buying or establishing of barns and warehouses for the people of the west. Then again, I am under the impression that a red headed boy has something to do with it. We have heard of one red headed boy, but apparently there is another, because a considerable portion of the policy proposed by the leader of the opposition would certainly tend to benefit a certain corporation with which this red headed boy has a good deal to do. That policy is before the House now, and I intend to discuss it as briefly as possible. But I wish first to give some attention to a few of the statements made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), and I do not know that I would have trespassed on the good nature of the House at all had it not been for those statements. It is well known that the people of the west are anxious to have this road constructed. We hear hon. gentlemen opposite say that there is no demand for it, but we know, as a matter of fact, that the question of building this line has been brought up in this House during the last seven years, in season and out of season, by supporters of the government. Then again we have pointed out the disabilities under which our settlers are labouring on account of not being able to get their produce to market in an expeditious manner, and also on account of the exorbitant freight charges which they have to pay to the railway corporations which is practically in control of the transportation in that part of the country. Not longer ago than last year, this question was brought up, and I remember that on that occasion many members opposite took part in the debate, amongst others the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Marquette. This is what the hon. member for Marquette said, as will be found on page 917 of the 'Hansard' of 1902 :

We are bound to require additional facilities, because our crop will be increased each year. To-day we find this condition of affairs—not only are the terminal elevators at the head of navigation full, but so is every elevator in Manitoba and the North-west. Every elevator and flat warehouse, every place where grain can be stored is full to overflowing. And not only that, but we find that at each little station, not only along the main line, but on the branch railways, are piles of grain in bags standing out exposed to the weather for two months past.

It is over a year ago that that statement was made by the hon. member for Marquette, who now tells us that we do not need further transportation facilities in that country. On the same occasion the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock)—page 942 of 'Hansard' of 1902—said:

The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Hon. Mr. Ross), with the distant voice of the past, remembering old things, forgetting that this country is moving, cannot possibly have listened to the voice we heard this evening from our great North-west. No government can disregard that voice and continue in office.

Further on, at page 944, the hon. gentleman was discussing the question of canals, as to whether the water route was sufficient to meet the requirements, and he came to this conclusion:

This is an all-the-year-round country. We cannot bring our grain that is grown in the North-west, if we work only in the summer time. We must hold out inducements to the railway companies and great transportation companies to move the grain all the year round—and it will take the whole year to move it. In the interest not only of the farmers of the North-west, but of the great financial institutions that are putting their money into moving the grain crop, it must be kept moving continually, and not only for the few months of canal navigation.

But notwithstanding this statement made by the hon. member for Centre Toronto, when the government, following his advice and that of other hon. gentlemen on that side, brings down a proposition that nobody can say anything against, we find the hon. member for Centre Toronto, because he wishes to assist his political friends, saying that the proposition should not be accepted, but that we should use the waterways. On the same occasion the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) said:

And when the hon. gentleman brings down any reasonable scheme for increasing the means of Canadian transportation—any scheme by means of which the grain grown in the Canadian North-west shall be assuredly carried over Canadian lines to Canadian ports and shipped thence to Europe—he will have my support and I believe the support of every other man on this side of the House.

Yet, when this proposition was brought down, we were told that there was no demand for it. I see the leader of the opposition smiling. He need not smile, for if he will read the speeches of his followers he will find that time after time they demanded to be told who was asking for this new road. Why, the demand for it came from the leader of the opposition and his followers, as well as from the people of the country generally.

Now, the hon. member for Marquette made a few remarks the other evening discussing the subject now before the Chair, to which I would like to refer for a few moments. He referred us to the railway policy of the Manitoba government. He said that this Dominion government was giving $13,000 a mile by way of guaranteeing the bonds to subsidize the prairie section of this road, but the Manitoba government got a road built through a large portion of the province of Manitoba for a guarantee of $8,000 a mile. He said, it is true, that a little later on they increased that to $10,000 a mile, but it was with the understanding that the extra $2,000 a mile was to be used for the purpose of buying rolling stock. But he forgot to tell the House and the country that that same road had been granted a subsidy of 6,400 acres per mile by the late Conservative government of the Dominion, and also that it had been given, by way of subsidy for the carrying of mail, something like $80,000 a year. So that, before the $2,000 a mile was given by the government of Manitoba, that company had received no less than about $30,000 a mile, allowing a fair valuation on the grants and mail subsidy. It must not be forgotten, too, that the road to which this extra $2,000 a mile was given had been in operation for years and years. The hon. gentleman seeks to justify this additional subsidy by saying that it was for the purpose of increasing the rolling stock of the road. The people of the western country know what 'increasing the rolling stock' means. That stock rolled around the constituencies, in the shape of dollars and cents, in the last election, and a portion of it to-day, no doubt, has found its way into the form of carriages to be used by the Minister of Public Works for the province of Manitoba. The less hon. members on the other side representing Manitoba say about that bargain the better. The hon. gentleman went on to say that the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) had quoted some statements made by the Grain-Growers' Association of the North-west Territories, and he went on to read a resolution passed at some meeting of the grain-growers of Manitoba, at which they condemned this proposition. But what did they condemn? They condemned the granting of assistance to any railroads at all, even the guaranteeing the bonds. After the Manitoba government had guaranteed the bonds on this railway to the extent of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000, no doubt the members of this grain-growers' association went to the polls and voted for Roblin's candidates. But when his government was returned to power and this gov-

ernment comes down with the proposition to guarantee bonds, these gentlemen get up and resolute, actuated, no doubt, by a desire to assist the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. The grain-growers of Manitoba appear to be under the control of Roblin and Rogers. They seem to have resolutions on tap. Whenever resolutions are wanted they are turned on.

Discussing the bonding privilege, the hon. member for Marquette raked the leader of the House over the coals for having introduced that question at all. He said there was nothing in it. It is easy to say: 'There's nothing in it'; but what argument did he give to sustain his statement? Why, he said, and I have it here in his speech, that a man could get on the train at Halifax and could travel through to the Pacific. I wonder if he thought that what was wanted was to send passengers through in bond. As a matter of fact, we have a lot of cattle to send out of the country, and they must come through in bond. If we had not a railway built into the west over Canadian territory we would have to send the cattle through in bond or keep them. Only last autumn the Canadian Pacific road was unable to take out all the stock we had in that country. Our ranchers had to drive the cattle three hundred miles into the United States and there take advantage of the bonding powers to send the cattle through to an ocean port. And after they had driven them three hundred miles over the prairie they saved $3 a head on the cattle by doing that. This is another thing that demonstrates the need of a railway in that country.

The hon. gentleman went on to make a statement with reference to the Intercolonial. He said the system is not paying, notwithstanding that this is a prosperous time. Yet the government propose to construct another railway to compete with it, and, if not render the expenditure on the Intercolonial nugatory, yet to depreciate it to a very considerable extent. Has the hon. gentleman read the proposition brought down by his own leader? The leader of the opposition proposes to parallel the Intercolonial. He proposes to build another road through that country. If this road that the government proposes to build, and that the Grand Trunk proposes to operate, is going to injure the Intercolonial in the way of diverting traffic, I am of the opinion that the road the leader of the opposition proposes to build would have the same effect. That is the kind of argument the hon. member for Marquette used in this House.

Now, as to the necessity of this road, as I said before, I do not not think it needs any argument whatever. The people of that country have farmed on shares, so to speak, with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for twenty-three years. Those hon. gentlemen who make speeches in this House on this question allude to the grand scheme that was put through by the Conservative party, and the hon. member for Marquette alluded to it as the pioneer of progress in that country. Pioneer progress! Why, Sir, that scheme has had the effect of keeping that country back for twenty-three years, and I say here without fear of contradiction that if the advice of the Liberal party, when that scheme was put through this House, had been taken, and the road had been laid out as proposed by the Liberal party through the northern portion of that country, and built where this road is going at the present time, in place of the 300,000 people in that country, we would now have two or three millions; I say that without fear of contradiction. When this bargain was going through that these gentlemen talk so much about, the Liberal party then, as they are to-day, were well seized of the people's needs; and if their advice had been followed we would have seen a different state of things in the North-west, and there would not have been such a crying necessity for this road as there is at the present time. The Liberal party foresaw all that took place, and they placed themselves on record by resolutions. I am going to read some of those resolutions, and I challenge hon. gentlemen on the other side to get up and say that these resolutions were not what the country needed at that time, and that they should not have been accepted at that time. Here is one of the Liberal resolutions concerning the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, providing that the Governor in Council should have the same control over the Canadian Pacific Railway rates and over the rates of other railways. Will any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House say that that resolution was not right? Will any of them say it was not right for us to have control over the rates on that railway? In the light of history, will they get up now and say that this country would not have been benefited, that the people of the North-west Territories would not have been benefited, if this parliament had taken control of the rates? I do not think they will say that. I do not think you will find any hon. gentleman from the west, at least, who will get up and say that. Here is a resolution moved by Mr. Guthrie, I believe the father of the hon. gentleman of that name now having a seat in this House:

That by the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, it is provided that every by-law fixing and regulating the tolls to be taken by a railway company shall be subject to revision by the Governor in Council from time to time after approval thereof;

That the exercise by the Governor in Council of the power of reducing tolls under the said Act is by the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway limited as regards said company to such extent that the tolls when reduced shall not produce less than ten per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway, and that the net income of the company from all sources shall not be less than ten per cent on the capital so expended.

That the said contract thus limits in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the powers given to the Governor in Council in the case of other railway companies and gives to the company whose road is to be built so largely at the public cost an extraordinary privilege, and withdraws from the public the protection provided for them in the case of other railways which may be built solely out of private resources.

That the Governor in Council should have in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the same unrestricted power which is possessed in the case of such other railways of revising from time to time as the public interest may require any tariff of tolls and that the contract is in this particular objectionable.

Will any hon. gentleman opposite tell me that resolution was not right, and that it should not have been accepted at that time? Is there any person in this country who thinks now that it was a good thing to exempt the Canadian Pacific Railway from the provisions of the Railway Act, and to allow them to build up a monopoly in that country to allow that great corporation to suck the blood out of the settlers without the settlers being able to come to the government for any relief? I do not think you will find any hon. gentleman opposite who will get up and say that that resolution was not on the right lines, and that if the government of that day had had the sense to accept it, it would not have been in the interests of the whole country and particularly of the people of the North-west Territories. Now here is another resolution re the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, attacking the provision authorizing the monopoly. I wonder if any hon. gentleman on the other side will get up and say that that monopoly provision was a good provision, giving the Canadian Pacific Railway a monopoly for twenty years of the whole country also an exemption from taxation. Why, we have seen the leader of the opposition standing up in this House one or two sessions ago, and advocating the buying off of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He understood and he felt that the settlers were being oppressed by this exemption from taxation provision, and he advocated buying them off. Well, if the resolutions moved by the Liberal party had been accepted by his predecessors, if they had had sense enough to have done so, it would not have been necessary for the government to buy them off, and the settlers in the North-west would not have suffered for the last twenty years. This is the resolution moved by Mr. Mills with reference to the monopoly clause:

That the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway while it gives to the company the absolute and perpetual right to build branch lines of railway from any point or points along their line to any point or points within the territories of the Dominion and cedes to the company free all government lands required in connection with such branches provides that for twenty years no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion parliament——

I am not going to read the whole of the resolution, but I say that that is a resolution which I think would commend itself at the present time to any hon. gentleman on either side of this House, for he must feel that it was a resolution on the right lines. Here is another resolution protesting against the exemption of the land from taxation. Now, when that measure was put through this House it was supposed by the government in power, and by the opposition at that time, that the clause in that agreement provided for exemption from taxation of those lands for only twenty years. But what do we find to-day? We find that there is no possibility of the people getting any relief for years to come; we find the Canadian Pacific Railway Company maintaining that the word 'grant' in that contract means the issue of patents, and the government had not issued any patents. These hon. gentlemen sat in their seats for eighteen years and they never issued patents, and it is a question in my mind whether they did not know at the time that by not issuing patents they were extending that exemption, for it has had that effect, and I believe we will have to suffer for another twenty years unless the land in the meantime passes into the hands of other parties. This is the resolution moved by Mr. Trow:

That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway exempts twenty-five millions of acres of choice lands of the company from Dominion, provincial and municipal taxation——

Just think, exempting them from Dominion, provincial and municipal taxation.

—until such lands are either sold or occupied for twenty years——

Now it is forty years. We find now that, either by their stupidity or for some other reason, it is forty years in place of twenty years.

—after the grant thereof from the Crown; that such exemption is unjust and will impose undue burdens on the settlers on the alternate sections who will be obliged to make improvements and incur expenses enhancing the value of the company's lands without receiving their fair share of the cost of such improvements and expenses; that such exemptions by freeing the company from the burdens of taxation will reduce the inducements to the company to sell their lands early and will enable the company free of expense to hold their lands till their value has been greatly enhanced by the labours of the adjoining settlers and that the said contract is in this respect objectionable.

Will any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House tell me that that was not a good resolution, that it was a resolution that should not have been adopted, that it was not on the right lines, that it was not in accordance with the modern policy of to-day, although moved over twenty years ago? I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite will get up and say that that reso-

lution should not have been accepted at the time, inasmuch as it sought to relieve the settlers from this liability, for it is a liability on the settlers of that country for forty years. To force them by their labours to increase the value of the adjoining lands, and to allow the company to hold these lands until they can get $6 or $7 or $8 an acre, I think that is an injustice, and that nobody on the other side who has heard that resolution read would like to get up and say that it was not on the right lines, and should not have been accepted by the late government. Here is another resolution protesting against the exemption in regard to the government control of rates until a ten per cent dividend is earned. I do not think anybody will say that that is a resolution that should not have been accepted, that it was not on the right lines. The resolution was moved by Mr. Ross of Middlesex :

That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway provides that parliament shall not have power to interfere with the toll charged by the company unless the same produce, first the working expenses of the whole line, including the British Columbia and Lake Superior sections which working expenses comprise all expenses of maintenance of the railway and of the stations, buildings, workshops and appurtenances belonging thereto, and the rolling stock and other stock and movable plant used in the working thereof, and also hire of engines, rents, charges, and interest on lands not paid for, and all expenses incidental to working the railway and the traffic thereon, including stores and all consumable articles and also all rates, taxes, insurance and compensation for accidents or losses, also all salaries and wages of persons employed in connection with the railway or traffic

Now, just listen to that. By the wording of that contract perpetual exemption is granted. Owing to the great number of these charges you can never interfere with the rates because it is only after all the expenses that are mentioned in that contract are met that the rates can be reduced by a commission.

All office management and expenses, including directors fees——

There is another thing.

—agency, legal and other like expenses, and thereafter a profit at least of ten per cent on the capital expended on the construction of the railway which includes the public money and the proceeds of the public lands.

When are you ever going to get rid of that ten per cent clause ? The only way to get rid of it is to build another railway, a railway on which the rates are controlled by the government and by means of which the Canadian Pacific Railway can be forced to bring down their rates. That is another resolution which I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite will say was not on the lines of public policy at that time and should not have been accepted by their predecessors. Here is a resolution protesting against the omission of running rights. Twenty years ago, the Liberal party foreseeing that running rights would be a good thing to have so as to enable other railways to use the tracks which were built with the public money of this country, introduced this resolution in the House. Had it been adopted, the necessity for the construction of this railway at the present time would not be as great as it is. There is not an hon. gentleman on the other side now who would not say that it was a good and proper resolution to adopt, for, while some of the lieutenants of the leader of the opposition objected to the running rights as not being practicable, the opposition leader himself acknowledges that they are practicable, and can be used.

Here is another resolution which I would like to hear any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, at least any member representing a western constituency, say, would not have been a proper resolution and a good thing had it been accepted at the time it was proposed. This is a resolution protesting against the perpetual exemption from taxation of that railway and all station and station grounds, workshops, building yards and other property, &c. Is there any hon. gentleman opposite who today would not support a resolution of that kind ? The Liberal party twenty-three years ago could see far enough ahead to know that this exemption was not a proper thing and moved a resolution against it, but the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite lined up under the party lash and every one of them voted practically to put shackles on the people of the west. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who made the first Liberal speech on this proposition moved this resolution which showed that he, over twenty years ago, had a grasp of public affairs not possessed at the present time by hon. gentlemen opposite. The resolution was as follows :

That the contract respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway exempts perpetually the railway and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required for the construction and working thereof and the capital stock of the company from taxation by the Dominion or by any province to be hereafter established or by any municipal corporation therein ;

That the property of the corporation will be in substance a gift from the public ; and its exemption from taxes is unjust, creates an unfair incidence of taxation and gives an undue advantage to the company over other railway companies, calculated to prevent the construction of competing lines and the contract is in this respect objectionable.

Or, in other words, we gave them the station grounds, we gave them the road and the rolling stock, and then by this stupid legislation we exempted them from taxation for ever. That is what the Liberal party protested against twenty-three years ago, and I would like any hon. gentleman opposite to say that they were not right in

doing so. Not a western man could do it and go back to his constituency and be elected. I think every one will agree that that resolution was on proper lines and was a resolution that should have been accepted by the gentlemen who occupied the treasury benches at that time. This country from the Atlantic to the Pacific has suffered in consequence of their stupidity in not accepting that and the other resolutions and therefore I say, in the light of history, that any one reading these resolutions must conclude that the Liberal party to-day are better judges of what is required by this country than hon. gentlemen opposite and can be better trusted with the affairs of the people. Over twenty years ago the Conservatives refused to accept this proposition; their action has put shackles on the people of the west, and for the last seven years we have been demanding, in this House, that these shackles be struck off. The only way to strike them off is to build another railway, an all-rail route from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I have pointed out that we pay freight rates twice or three times as high as the freight rates that are paid in the east. Now we are getting people into that country and hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to to take credit for it; they say that thanks to the policy of the Conservative party immigration is coming into the country. Think of it. For eighteen years, until 1896, the people there were on the verge of starvation and when we brought a few people into the country by one railway they dodged out by another until the leaders of the Conservative party who were then in power went to the west to find out what was the matter. Hon. Mr. Foster, who was then Minister of Finance, surveyed the ground and advised the people to go in for mixed farming. Hon. Mr. Angers, who was then Minister of Public Works, went to the province of British Columbia and, forgetting that the miners in British Columbia did not farm at all, did not raise potatoes and cucumbers and carrots, advised them to go into mixed farming as a panacea for all the evils of the west. And to-day they will tell you that they brought about prosperity that now prevails there. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), for instance, in an eloquent peroration referred to the buffalo and the red men that once roamed on the western plains. If these gentlemen had been kept in power another seven years we would have had the red men back on the plains—the buffalo are extinct practically and could not be got on the plains but the red men would have possession. The other settlers would have been starved out. The idea of these gentlemen talking about their having assisted to bring about the prosperity we enjoy at the present time in western Canada. They had as much to do with it as they had in creating the universe. I said before that we have been farming on shares with the Canadian Pacific Railway and I shall point out how that is. I have here a statement in which I have made a comparison of what the people in older Canada and the people west of Lake Superior are paying in local rates. I have gone further, because we are getting a large stream of immigration from the United States, most of it from the state of Iowa, and I have looked up the freight rates in Iowa, because people coming from there will know what they have been paying on that side and will feel the injustice of having to pay twice as high rates on this side of the line. The statement is as follows :

Freight rates charged in the state of Iowa, fixed by commission, compared with rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway, western division, showing increase of Canadian rate over United States rate.

Iowa. 1st class rate.		C.P.R., western division.		
Miles.	Rate.	Miles.	Rate.	Increase.
30	16	30	27	11
50	20	50	35	15
100	24	100	54	30
200	40	200	80	40
450	.63	400	1.33	70

Do you mean to tell me that we can get immigrants to go into the country and stay in it while such a difference in freight rates exists? I take this as one example, but I could fill pages with such. These people come from a country where there are commissions controlling railway rates, and when they come to Canada, where owing to the policy of the wiseacres who were in power 20 years ago, there is no control, they say : If something is not done to help us out of the grip of the railways we will not stay here. The leader of the opposition wants to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway. I don't think the people of Canada have anything to complain of with regard to the Canada Atlantic Railway. That line is doing good work for the country and if the government purchased it to-morrow it could not do much better work, or give lower rates. The money you would pay to buy the Canada Atlantic Railway you might as well throw into the Ottawa river. Here are the Canada Atlantic Railway first-class freight rates : 56 miles, 26 cents; 102 miles, 34 cents ; 200 miles, 46 cents ; 363 miles, 46 cents. Let us compare these with the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway western division. The first-class rate on the Canadian Pacific Railway (western division) for 30 miles is 27 cents; and you will notice that the Canada Atlantic Railway carry freight 56 miles for 26 cents. The Canadian Pacific Railway charge, for 50 miles 35 cents, whereas the Canada Atlantic Railway carry freight 102 miles for 34 cents. The Canadian Pacific Railway charges 92 cents for 250 miles, while the Canada Atlantic Railway carries it 363 miles for 46 cents, and for 451 miles the Canadian Pacific Railway charge $1.33. The first-class rate on the Canadian Pacific Railway to-

day is $3.85 a hundred for about 2,000 miles, and if you take the long haul into consideration that is equal to $2 a hundred for 1,000 miles. Now, the Intercolonial Railway, as I am informed by the Department of Railways and Canals, carries first-class freight 1,000 miles for 80 cents, and from Chicago to New York, which is about 1,000 miles, the rate is 75 cents per hundred, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that we are not suffering in the west. Now, the grain rate on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, which is 431 miles, is 7¾ cents per bushel. It was over 8 cents a bushel, but they reduced it. On the New York Central Railway from Buffalo to New York, which is 440 miles, the average rate is 4½ cents a bushel, or about one-half what the Canadian Pacific Railway charge us. From Prince Albert, my home, to Fort William, which is about 1,000 miles, we pay 20 cents a bushel, but still these gentlemen will tell you that we cannot haul grain to the seaboard on this new line for less than 17 cents a bushel. Well, if that line can haul it for 17 cents a bushel, it would be a great boon to the people of the west. They would sit up all night making bonfires so glad would they be. Let me tell these gentlemen opposite that we do not want this new road simply as a grain road; we want it as a general highway connecting the older provinces of the east with the western country. The Grand Trunk Railway has a network of railways covering the whole of Quebec and Ontario, and when the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is constructed, it will bring every little manufacturing and commercial centre, in fact, every man, woman and child in old Canada, into touch with the people of the west. Suppose you bought the Canada Atlantic Railway tomorrow and carried out the scheme of the leader of the opposition, what would be the result? You would have the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway picking up the traffic along their own lines in the older provinces and carrying it on their own lines and the Grand Trunk having no connections at all with the west. That would leave Mr. Borden's road without feeders, it would be like a tree without roots, where would it get its traffic. The only people that can build this road into the west and make it pay are the Grand Trunk Railway people. They are in touch with all the industries of the older provinces, and they will bring the people of the west and the people of the east together. If we did not build this line and build it at once, the result would be that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or some other road would build from Chicago to the plains, and all our western trade would go through United States channels, and we would not get a dollar out of it. The revenue of the people of the west last year was $50,000,000, and the most of that $50,000,000 was spent in your industries down here, and went to pay your artisans, and Canada and Canadians got the benefit of it. Would any sane man advocate that all this western trade should go south of the boundary line. Well, if that should happen, you would have empty workshops in the east, and you would have blue ruin indeed. Now, is the time to build this transcontinental line, and if any blame is attached to the government at all, it is that they did not build it long ago. I myself have suffered in connection with freight rates. I have been in business in the west, and know whereof I speak. I have paid thousands and thousands of dollars to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at least half of which should be at the banks to my credit at the present time, if things were honestly done, and if it were taken into consideration that the people of Canada built the Canadian Pacific Railway and furnished the rolling stock, and made a lot of millionaires, who are trotting around giving money to institutions at the present time. Let me give you an instance of how we suffer in the matter of freight rates out there. It is an old story, but it is worth repeating. I purchased a car-load of apples, 190 barrels, in Seaforth, Ont., and I sent them home. In the innocence of my heart, I thought I would have to pay $150 freight, and I was figuring my profits on that basis. But lo and behold you, when I asked the Canadian Pacific Railway station agent at Prince Albert what the freight was, he blushed, because he had a little more modesty than the managers of the road, and he told me the freight was $518. My profits vanished into thin air, and went into the pockets of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to help them to pay 6 per cent dividend on a lot of water. And yet we are told that we have no grievance in the North-west. I could understand such a statement made for political effect by some one in the east, but coming from a member who represents a western constituency, I fail to understand it. Why, Sir, the government that are to-day in power in Manitoba would never have got into power in the world had it not been for the feeling that exists there against the Canadian Pacific Railway. Four years ago the idea got abroad that Mr. Greenway had made some kind of an arrangement to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway to build branch lines, and had refused to assist the Northern Pacific. That settled Mr. Greenway, and out he went. The Roblin government came into power in Manitoba because of that feeling, and they promised to give relief from the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but the people asked for bread and they got a stone. Because they are carrying a lot of bonds, they say they have control. They have no more control than I have. These railways will all be under the control of the railway commission. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) says, You are gauranteeing $13,000 a mile, and you have no control, whereas we have

given our guarantees, and we have control. What control have they? The same control as will exist over this railway when it is built, and the same control as exists on the Canadian Northern—the control of rates by the government through the railway commission when it is appointed. That is what is going to control the rates, and no flimsy thing in the shape of an order in council passed two days before an election. The Manitoba government said they were going to take two cents a bushel off the rate on wheat. They said that just before the election, but I do not think they have got it off yet. Even if they do take off two cents a bushel, the people will have to pay for it. It will be taking two cents out of one pocket and putting it into another.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the Canadian Northern as a competing through line. It is a good railway; it is going to open up a first-class section of country, and serve a good purpose. But it is only a competitor for six months in the year. It will only run to Lake Superior. It has no connections, and it cannot collect traffic anywhere except on its own line. It is just a road fit to carry wheat to the head of the lakes for six months in the year, and perhaps to carry back a little merchandise to Winnipeg, if any one sends it up to the head of the lakes. If the Canadian Northern ever does any more than that, it must make its connections and build feeders in the east like the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway in the eastern provinces, in order to get freight.

Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is complained that there is not half enough traffic for that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway which runs north of Lake Superior, and which the hon. leader of the opposition wants to purchase. If that is the case, how is it that the company operate that and other portions of their railway, and pay 6 per cent dividends on stock which is half water? At least 50 per cent of the railroads in the United States do not pay anything on their ordinary stock. Here is a piece of road which we are told does not pay, and still the company pays 6 per cent dividend. There is a nigger in the fence somewhere. The people of the west know where it is; they are the ones who pay the piper. The only way we can get relief from the monopoly which was imposed on that country by the party of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were running the affairs of this Dominion, is to get another railroad constructed right through from the Atlantic to the Pacific, so that we shall have a road under government control on which the government can fix the rates. You cannot force the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by law, but you can force them by competition, to bring down their rates. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us there is no such thing as railway competition. The hon. leader of the opposition, referring to the speech of the Minister of the Interior, tried to make out that there was no competition between railways and quoted as proof the high rate between Kansas City and Chicago. Now, I want to show you, from the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, wherein the hon. leader of the opposition was mistaken. The annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission for 1901 says:

> During the past summer the open tariff from Kansas city to Chicago has been 12 cents per 100 pounds, but the actual rate at which wheat was moved has been as low as five cents.

That goes to show that while the rate was fixed and published at 12 cents per 100 pounds, and that rate was quoted, the actual rate paid by the people shipping wheat was 5 cents per 100 pounds, which was brought about by competition.

Now, I want to deal with something that the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) has been hammering at in and out of season, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite, with reference to canals. They say that canals regulate the traffic. I want to read from the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission for 1900, which goes to show that the Erie canal between Buffalo and New York does not regulate the traffic, but that it is competition between railways that does so. That report says:

> It has generally been understood that the canal from Buffalo to New York city, while it carried a comparatively small amount of the grain traffic, determined the rate at which the railroads should carry the balance, but Mr. Harriott testified that this was not true; that the canal was not now a factor, either in the carrying of the traffic or the making of the rate; that if the railway lines advanced their rates, the canal promptly followed; that the controlling factor was competition between these railroad lines, and that if this competition could be eliminated, advances in rate would only be limited by market conditions at home and abroad.

There is the statement made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, composed of gentlemen who ought to know, that the Erie canal at the present time is not a factor in regulating rates, but that the railroads are. With reference to rates in the west, we expect that this new railway, when built, will regulate them. We are looking forward to that.

We expect that this road will be built through a good country for colonization purposes, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite say. They state that the country is only a lot of rocks and water. What have they given to back up this statement? The government have answered them by producing reports of qualified surveyors and engineers and clergymen who have travelled over that country, and who had nothing to gain by making rosy reports about it. Against these reports what have hon. gentlemen opposite put? Their own statements. Well, Mr. Speaker, what are their state-

ments worth ? Imagine these people going to meet the electors. They say that country is no good, that it is all rock and water. The electors say : But the government have quoted from reports of surveyors and engineers that it is a good country. These gentlemen answer : But we say it is not, it is all rock. The electors say to them : You are not infallible ; we have heard your statements before. When Mr. Fielding brought down his first budget, you said that the country was going to ruin, that the factories would be closed, and that the people were going to starve. That was six or seven years ago, and the factories are not closed and the people are all right. Your statements must therefore be taken with a grain of salt. But, they say, our statements are all right now. The electors will answer : What about the Teslin and Yukon Railway ? You said that the land the government were going to give for the construction of that railway was worth a hundred million dollars ; but to-day no man will give a thousand dollars for it. Therefore, we cannot accept your statement; you must give us proof. The idea of supposing that the electors will take the unsupported statements of these gentlemen after their record ! When they go before the electors, they will be asked for proof, and they have no proof to offer. They expect that the people will take their word without proof, but they will be very much mistaken.

Now, I want to say a word about the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition. If he had brought down that proposition earlier in this debate, what a lot of wind, what a lot of trouble, it would have saved. These gentlemen got up and talked hour after hour about running rights being of no use. They said we were going to waste a hundred million dollars. By and by the hon. the leader of the opposition, after having consulted the redheaded boy and the gentleman from Manitoba, came down with the scheme involving an expenditure of over $300,000,000. And in outlining that scheme, he declared emphatically, we are not afraid to spend money, return us to office and see what we shall do. Had he only brought down that proposition a little earlier, what a relief it would have been to some of his friends; what a flood of talk it would have saved. There is one thing that strikes me in connection with the two propositions, and that is this : When the right hon. the First Minister submitted his scheme, we had it explained by himself and his colleagues. We had the financial part of it gone into thoroughly by the hon. the Minister of Finance. We had every point made by hon. gentlemen opposite, during the two weeks they had been attacking the proposition, replied to. Well, when the hon. the leader of the opposition brought down his alternative scheme, we naturally expected to have it explained in all its details by hon. gentlemen opposite. But no, they all steered clear of it. They would not touch it. We did not hear any of them telling us what a fine proposition it was. But have we not a right to approach this alternative scheme of the leader of the opposition with an open mind just as well as hon. gentlemen opposite ? If they would only explain the merits of their scheme, they might convert us. Let them explain how much it is going to cost, what benefits will accrue from it to the country, and in what particlars it is better than the scheme of the government. But none of them will do that, they steer clear of its details, and they keep whacking away at the same old straw about the country back there not being fit for settlement, and about all the money we are going to spend. Their own scheme, however, they avoid as they would the plague. But just consider what a beautiful proposition it is. It will stand as a monument to the leader of the opposition who propounded it, and the redheaded boy and some others. They are going to build another line through New Brunswick, which will parallel the Intercolonial Railway and which will cost something like $10,000,000. Then they will build a piece of road from Montreal to Coteau, which will cost $1,200,000; after that they will buy the Canada Atlantic Railway. But I would ask : What do we want with the Canada Atlantic Railway ? Is that road not doing good work for the people now ? Is it not doing everything it can to relieve the congestion ? Is it not bringing to Canadian ports, not only traffic of our own country, but the traffic of the United States. Do these hon. gentlemen say, judging by our experience in the past, that the government could operate that road and haul freights over it at less rates than the Canada Atlantic Railway is charging ? I say no. Would the purchase of that road open up any new territory ? No. Why then should we throw away some $18,000,000 in purchasing the Canada Atlantic Railway ? The scheme is a beautiful one. I have here a map of it which was published in the Montreal 'Star,' and I wish it could be cut out and shown to every elector as a monument of constructive statesmanship. I would want no more convincing argument against the folly of this proposal. They are going to build from Depot Harbour to Sudbury. But what do they know about that country ? Yet they are prepared to go on and build that road. Then here is where the redheaded boy comes in, and that is the road along the north shore of Lake Superior. It is about as crooked as a dog's hind leg, it runs in and out, this way and that, in one place you start at a certain point and after you go seven miles you find yourself back within 200 yards of your starting point. That is the kind of road they want to buy. I do not blame the Canadian Pacific Railway for having constructed it

that way. I do not blame the engineers for having laid it out that way, because they had to use the water transportation in order to get supplies to build the road. It runs along the shores of the lake, with tortuous curves and heavy grades, and is of no use as a commercial road, and the redheaded boy would be glad to unload it on somebody. We built the road and paid for it and handed it over to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and now they want to sell it back to us just as they sold us back the lands that we gave them. If that road is such a good one, let them keep it. I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen, who are always professing loyalty, if that road is to be the only connection we are to have during the next twenty-five years between our eastern and western countries. What would happen, should unfortunately any trouble arise between us and our neighbours ? How long would it take them to send a steamer across and tear that road up, and where would we be then ? Our western country would fall like a pear into the mouth of the United States and we could not help ourselves.

Any one who will take the trouble to compare the government policy with that propounded by the leader of the opposition will find that ours is vastly superior and will have the effect of building up and populating the great plains in the west in a way we never anticipated up to the present. Talk about a hundred thousand people, why we have room there for millions. Here is the little province of Manitoba, about 65,000 square miles. That province is producing at present, although only one-sixth of it is under cultivation, something like 100,000,000 bushels of grain. Take the two provinces of Alberta, Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, where you have close upon 300,000 square miles of territory. What can they produce ? Their lands are equally fertile and the climate just as good as in Manitoba. What will they produce in the near future if you give the people proper railway facilities. But they will never be properly developed so long as we have to submit to a monopoly such as has controlled that country the last few years. I pointed out at one time that position of the stock raiser. If a stockman has a hundred steers that he had raised about three years old, he could drive them into a pen and divide them. He could put fifty to one side for the transportation company and the other fifty for himself. When he got the other fifty to market he would have to divide again and give twenty-five more to the company to bring back the commodities he has to purchase, so that out of his hundred steers, he only got twenty-five. We must have relief from that condition of affairs. As was pointed out in this House a short time ago, a great part of that trade will, in the near future, go down to the Pacific coast. The Chinese are awakening up and will eat flour after a while, the Japanese also will consume our flour, and in the course of a few years you will find that the railways will carry the products of the west as far as the third meridian, near Regina, and at that point that traffic will go both ways—to the Pacific coast and to the Atlantic seaboards, and every section of this railway will have all the freight it can handle. See how the cattle trade of that country is increasing, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture showed us a few days ago. It is only a drop in the bucket now compared to what it will be in the near future, if we get a proper system of transportation ? The government are acting wisely in bringing down this proposition, and will be supported by the people of the west. It is what the people have been looking to for years; and when the people of the east come to understand it, they will conclude that it is a good thing for them too.

The ex-Minister of Railways said in a jeering tone that Cox could not wait. The ex-Minister of Railways told us in a jeering way, 'Senator Cox cannot wait.' Why, Mr. Speaker, Senator Cox and the ex-Minister of Railways, too, are only flies on the wheel of this proposition. The people of the west say they cannot wait. They have said that for years. They cannot wait and they are not going to wait any longer. And the people of older Canada cannot wait. In the interests of this part of the country, it is absolutely necessary to have communication with the people of the west. And it is absolutely necessary, if they are going to hold their place in confederation, that they shall open up new fields of settlement, so that they may have a place to send their sons and also attract immigration as we are doing. That applies to Quebec, and, no doubt to New Brunswick and other parts of eastern Canada. This is a great national undertaking, an undertaking which will stand for ever as an evidence of the sagacity of the Liberal party. 'Senator Cox can't wait'—why, this whole country can't wait. The wheels of progress are moving on by leaps and bounds. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not think to stop them. And if they do not get out of the way, so much the worse for them. They will be like the cow that George Stephenson told about. When Stephenson built his first locomotive he was called upon to explain it to the committee of the House of Lords. And one old gentleman, putting on his spectacles, said : 'Mr. Stephenson, if your locomotive was going along its track and a cow stood in the way, what would happen ?' Stephenson's reply was : 'It would be bad for the coo.' It will be bad for hon. gentlemen opposite if they do not get out of the way. The hon. leader of the opposition was sagacious enough to see that. He knows that the public demand that something should be done. And so he comes forward with his own scheme. The scheme of the government has been called a hybrid

scheme. If that is so, this scheme of the opposition is a mongrel, piebald scheme. It is simply a thing of patches. There is a piece of government ownership here, a piece of private ownership there, and so on, all the way through. The fact is, the hon. gentleman went out fishing, and he arranged his bait for the fish he hoped to get. Something for the Canada Atlantic on one hook—he hoped to catch them ; another bait, a fat one, the finest of all, for the Canadian Pacific Railway—he hoped to catch them ; another for the Canadian Northern—he hoped to catch them ; another for the people of Montreal—he would give them a free port ; then the farmers of the west. Ah, he baited the hook with barns and warehouses—that, he thought, would catch them. But he will find that none of the fish will come to his hook. The people of the west understood this question. They want to use the water-ways, and will do so as long as the water-ways are open. But I have pointed out on a previous occasion in this House that something must be done in view of the fact that the water-ways are closed a great part of the year, and the further fact that our production is increasing very rapidly. If we are dependent upon the water-ways we shall have to store a great portion of our products at the head of the lakes during the winter, to await the opening of navigation, for harvesting and threshing are late with us, and the winter comes before the crop is out. I pointed out that it would cost about five cents a bushel to store grain for the winter, pay storage and insurance, allow for loss of interest, and so on. And when the grain is there, it must stay until navigation opens. Wheat may go to $2 a bushel but the farmer with his grain stored at the head of the lakes cannot take advantage of the improvement of the market. We are going to produce hundreds and hundreds of millions of bushels of grain. We cannot possibly store 200,000,000 bushels of wheat at the head of navigation. For, if we were to put that quantity on the markets of the world in the spring, the certain effect would be to depress the market and so the farmer would lose not only the five cents a bushel for storage, but, perhaps ten cents per bushel on the value of the product. If you add to the freight rate what it costs to store the grain all winter, you can make a rate that will successfully carry it to the seaboard by rail. When this is done, you will not needs the barns that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition proposes to build. I was amused when he mentioned barns. I wondered why he did not suggest furnishing the farmers with threshing mills. Then he might as well go on and furnish them with steam ploughs and wind-mills—he could furnish the wind-mills from his own side ; he would not need to buy them. I can tell the hon. gentleman the farmers are not looking for government assistance to build their barns. What the farmers and the settlers of the west are asking for is what they have a right to—fair and reasonable means of reaching the market with their products, and freedom from monopoly. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot catch the people with the baits they offer. The numbers of hon. gentlemen opposite are few now, but I am afraid that after the next election their numbers will be beautifully less. If they keep up this amusement in which they are now engaged, the people will not send so many of them here.

I support the government's proposal for the reasons I have given. I did not want to give a silent vote, nor do I want to occupy too much of the time of the House. In closing I have only to say that I believe this project is one of the greatest things ever done for this Dominion. It is not only for the western part, for we are all Canadians, and we are all looking for the benefit of the whole country. Are we to remain for ever a mere fringe of settlement along the rivers and lakes ? That is what the policy of the leader of the opposition would condemn us to. I say, No. We are beginning to have some idea of the greatest wealth in the country to the north of us, wealth in forest, mines and fertile lands. The policy that will develop that country is the policy that will make a nation of Canada, will make this country the greatest colony of the British empire.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, in attempting to address the House on the theme which has been the subject of debate for three weeks past, I do not suppose I shall be able to add either argument or information to what has been already said in the many speeches which have been delivered on both sides. Neither shall I attempt to follow the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in the rambling and discursive address he has given the House. In speaking to-day, he has dwelt upon his favourite theme, one that, I suppose affords him some satisfaction in addressing his constituents in the North-west. Abuse of the Canadian Pacific Railway seems a favourite form of discourse on the part of the hon. gentleman. I suppose it gives him the same satisfaction that that form of oratorical exercise so often practiced in the United States and known as 'twisting the lion's tail' gives to some politicians over there. And I suppose they are both intended to have the same effect in the elections. Whatever I might have to offer on this occasion, if there be no other merit in my address it will at least have the merit of brevity. Even if I had information and argument of great value to bring to the House, I feel that I have not on this occasion, sufficient command of my voice to address the House at any length.

I had the privilege and pleasure of listening to the very able, interesting and elo-

quent address made by the right hon. the Premier, in laying this scheme before the House. For, Mr. Speaker, I am ready to admit that however I may differ from the right hon. gentleman in some of his opinions, however I may differ from him in the reasons which he gave for his policy, I am not insensible to the charms of oratory, and I will concede that his speech had at any rate the charm of oratory. It had all the polish of diction, all the beauty of rhetoric which could be brought to bear upon a subject of that kind, and the right hon. gentleman certainly acquitted himself in a very pleasing manner so far as the form of his address was concerned. He dwelt for two hours in the realms of romance. But we are not able to endure long flights of oratory, we cannot soar at such great heights for any length of time, we have to come down at last to terra firma; and when we get down to solid facts and examine closely into the proposition laid before us, we find that after all the speech of the right hon. gentleman was of a decidedly romantic and imaginative character. When he was about finishing that speech and came to his peroration, after drawing a vivid picture of all the glory of the great North-west, of the bright fields of waving grain, of the immense population that would flow into that country as a consequence of the construction of this railway, and when he said: Gentlemen, all this you can have for the small sum of $13,000,000—well, it did appear to be cheap, I acknowledge that it did appear to be what you might call a bargain. We have heard addresses of that kind before. It recalled to my mind the experience of my boyhood when I saw flaming posters announcing the coming of some great circus. When the day came and I beheld all the outward splendour of the decorations, and heard the orator outside the tent telling us of all the wonders that had been gathered together from the four corners of the globe, and after I had parted with all the pennies that I had saved up, to go inside and see these wonders, I remember how great was my disappointment when I found that the reality was almost a blank. There was about as much relation between the outside show and the inside reality as there was between the grand and beautiful picture which the right hon. gentleman presented to us as his scheme, and the reality that we found when we came to examine it in detail.

The right hon. gentleman told us that there was a feeling throughout this country, that it was universal in every Canadian heart, that the time had come when Canada must have another transcontinental railway. Now that was a big thing. I do not know, however, that I have been sensible to that feeling. I do not know that the people generally whom I meet throughout the country have been conscious of any such want. I know there is a feeling throughout the country which has been expressed time and again, which I think is a universal sentiment, that the time for bonusing great corporations in this country has gone by, that the time for giving away great land grants or money grants for the construction of railways, is pretty well past in this country. There might have been a time, I think there was a time, when necessity did exist for assisting railway enterprises that were designed to open up new territory. There may be even at the present day occasions and circumstances that would justify parliament in granting such assistance, but no reason has been given to show that the present occasion is one of that kind.

Now, certain reasons were given by the right hon. the Premier why this scheme should be presented to the people. It was a surprise, I believe, to a great many members of this House. When we met here in the month of March there was no intimation that a transcontinental railway from ocean to ocean was in contemplation. We did know that there was talk of the Grand Trunk Company wanting to get access to the grain fields of the great west, and we were not surprised at it. It would indeed have been surprising if that company had not desired to enter into competition with other railway companies which were exploiting the great North-west. We were not surprised at that, and we were quite ready to believe that they would ask for some assistance, because we know that railways without exception are always ready to ask, and to take anything they can get out of the government, whether in land or money. But many members on both sides of the House thought that if the Grand Trunk Railway wished to get access to the grain fields of the North-west there was sufficient inducement for them to build a railway into that country with their own capital, with their own means, without seeking any substantial aid from the government.

Now, when we make a comparison between this enterprise, as a means of opening up that country, and the old Canadian Pacific Railway enterprise, we find that the conditions are altogether different. We remember that even after that company was formed, even after the country had to some extent been opened up, capital was still very charry about taking any risks in it. We remember that the stock of the company was sold at as low a figure as twenty-five cents on the dollar; and that it was a long time before it rose to anything like the ordinary market price of railway stocks, showing that it was regarded as a risky enterprise. Therefore it was an enteprise which required and deserved the support of the government, and I think this country has no reason to regret having given that support. Occasionally we find men like the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), who, perhaps, owes all the material prosperity that he enjoys to the privi-

leges that have been provided for him by the Canadian Pacific Railway, who will still condemn the government of that day for having made liberal grants of land and money to that railway corporation. But I believe that there is, deep down in the hearts of all the people of this country, a conviction that the government did what was necessary under the circumstances, and that the consequences have fully justified its action.

Well, Sir, there is another very widespread feeling in this country, and that is against subsidizing railways. There are other cries also that are coming up to parliament from the people of this country. One of them comes from the manufacturers, who are asking for more protection, from the workingmen in the shops, in the factories, in the mine, in the fields, asking from this paternal government protection of some character. The government have turned a deaf ear to these requests, but when approached by a great moneyed interest like the Grand Trunk, they are quite ready to listen to it. Now we know that when any great project is launched in this country the first question asked is: Is there any money in it? Well, I say there is money in this enterprise: there are millions in it. But for whom? Not for the farmers of this country, not for the miners of this country, not for the fishermen of this country; but there are millions for the exploiters, for the grafters, for the speculators. These are the men who are coming to this government to see what they can get out of it.

Now, let me ask where did this idea originate? What was the genesis of the idea of another transcontinental railway? Not with the masses of the people of this country, not with the farmers of Manitoba or the Northwest Territories. They do not call for another transcontinental railway from ocean to ocean. It is true, we are told there was a congestion, and I believe there was in some parts of the country, and the people were asking for relief. But it has been pointed out over and over again that the congestion was caused, not so much by want of new railways, as by want of sufficient rolling stock, by want of better equipment on the lines that are already in existence in that section of the country. I believe that there is a very faint idea in Canada of the extent to which railway building is being carried on at present throughout our north-western country. There is now a great mileage of railway under construction; a great mileage already in operation is newly constructed with the ballast scarcely settled on it, and now we are projecting another great railway enterprise that will come into competition with them all. The congestion of which so much has been said, has already been provided for to a very great extent, although perhaps not entirely, because there were causes for it over which the railway companies, the Canadian Pacific Railway and others, had no control. They had difficulty, for instance, in getting all the rolling stock which they required; industrial centres are sometimes hampered in their operation, and there was a difficulty in obtaining the rolling stock which they had ordered, and for which they were ready to pay. But, I understand, and believe, that this year there will be a very great improvement in that regard.

I say that the demand for the building of this railway did not originate with the farming class of the country; it did not originate with the mercantile class; it originated first with the Grand Trunk Railway—but their proposal was not for a scheme of this kind. It was undertaken by the government after coming into contact with some large moneyed men who thought: Here is an opportunity to add to our millions. The suggestion no doubt was given to the government in that way, and has been taken by them. It is a very taking suggestion, and came at an opportune time, for it was necessary perhaps to divert the attention of the country from some other matters that should press upon it. I do not say that this session has been barren of legislation; some very important measures have been put through. But still the government were ready to seize hold of this for all it promised them, for all there was in it to them. It is not a commercial enterprise; it has far more of a political character than any great enterprise ever before projected in this country.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. RICHARDSON. When the House took recess at six o'clock, I was speaking of the reasons adduced by the government to excuse their great haste in pushing through this measure. The Prime Minister told us that a great crisis was upon the country, and that we could not wait, but he kept the House in the dark as to the nature and origin of that crisis. It certainly is not to be found in the alleged congestion of traffic in Manitoba or the Northwest Territories. It certainly is not to be found in anything which a man of ordinary information can discover, and therefore we have a right to ask: Why this mad haste on the part of the government; why this haste in absolute disregard of the statement put in the mouth of the Governor General at the opening of the session, that a transportation commission would be appointed to get light on the subject? We have been told in an off-hand way that there are mountains of information bearing on this government scheme, but nevertheless nothing tangible has been laid before parliament. Another excuse given for building this road

in such a hurry was that the bonding privilege might be abrogated, but that has been so exploded that no government supporter now attempts to resurrect such a bugaboo. It could only have been stated to the House by the Prime Minister in the hope that a lame reason and a poor pretense was better than no reason at all. Then, again, we had it stated from the treasury benches that if the scheme were not gone on with now, the Grand Trunk Railway might not be open at a future date to accept such a deal as the government is giving them at the present time. Well, Sir, it is not at all credible that the Grand Trunk Railway would at any date be simple enough to refuse the benefits which they are getting under this scheme. They are not going out of business in Canada ; they are likely to stay in the country, and they will be just as ready for a good deal with the government next year or the year after as they are to-day. As to this government road relieving the congestion of freight traffic in the west, that is an absurd proposition, because a scheme that will take at least seven years to carry into operation is not going to relieve the congestion of traffic in the near future. It is said also that it is necessary to have this railroad to open up new areas for settlement. Well, Sir, it must be evident to all that it is the greatest folly to open up larger territories for settlement than we already have, seeing that millions of acres already opened up are crying out for settlers. We have railways sufficient to accommodate 10,000,000 more people, if those railways were properly equipped and properly supplied with all the accessories that are needed to the successful operation of modern railways. When you have settlements at great distances apart you have to encounter great disadvantages, socially, municipally and educationally. Man does not live by bread alone ; he needs a larger life than the merely animal ; he needs social intercourse and all that it implies in culture, refinement and development. Isolation tends to barbarism, and one of the greatest difficulties we have to overcome in the settlement of our great North-west is that people coming from the larger social life of the closely settled districts of Europe become disheartened in a sparsely settled country. We need regular settlement to build up the country methodically, wisely and regularly. We need it for the culture, refinement and development of our settlers ; all of which are brought about by education, by religion, and by all those things that elevate the mind. We need regular settlement to furnish traffic to roads already built, to establish communities and to attract the best class of settlers to that country. It is a bad policy to build railways into new areas of territory that will not and cannot be settled for many, many years to come. It would be far better that we should have regular, consecutive settlement in our country. Again, I hold that it is not necessary to have another transcontinental railway as a means of communication with our great North-west. Nature has given to us lakes and rivers which afford an easy and a cheap means of transportation, and nothing that is known to science, nothing that is known to civilization up to the present day, can equal our noble waterways as a means of transportation. The facilities for transportation by these natural water routes are developing wonderfully. It seems but yesterday since the traffic was carried in comparatively small boats, but now these modern whale-backs take such immense quantities of grain that no system of railway yet devised can compete with them in cheapness of transportation. We are not opposed, as a party, to any necessary expenditure for the development of Canada, if it be carried out on proper and in methodical lines. The history of the Conservative party in the past in regard to transportation, and to commerce, and to manufacturing, is a record of the development and the extension of this country. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a monument to the transportation policy of the Conservative party. To-day we hear Liberals acknowledge that they were mistaken when they decried the Canadian Pacific Railway in days gone by, and that they are now willing to cheerfully admit that this great enterprise has brought honour on its promoters and upon the country. It would appear as if the Reform party, looking back on the history of the past and regretting their want of foresight, were now anxious to make a history for themselves ; were anxious to build themselves a monument to show that they have lived and worked for something. And so, Sir, they conceived this mistaken idea that another transcontinental railway was necessary. We on this side of the House are opposed to all hasty, ill-considered measures. We believe that the sentiment of government ownership is growing in this country, and so far as railway construction is concerned, this scheme of the government will retard the realization of that idea for at least fifty years. The experience in government ownership of railways and telegraphs and telephones in other countries seems to point in favour of government ownership in this country. We cannot attempt, and it would not be wise for us to attempt, to bring it about at once in Canada, but we should aim at it. We have the beginning of government ownership in the Intercolonial Railway, and it would be a wise policy for us to experiment on it further, and to see if we cannot make the Intercolonial Railway a success in a larger measure, and thus fully test the principle. The best value that the people of Canada get for their money comes to them through the postal service, and although it may have its faults as administered, it is the very best and the very cheapest service that is given to the people of this country, and it is managed by government. Not only in various coun-

tries in Europe, but in India, we have an object lesson of what government ownership is doing. Railways which have probably been built in that country for military purposes are now operated successfully and so as to pay reasonably well; and all over India there is a railway service, with fair accommodation, at the rate of half a cent a mile for passenger traffic, though, of course, there is a higher rate for some of the higher classes of people. The government of India holds the telegraph service, the telephone service and the postal service, all operated satisfactorily and all very cheap.

Now, I will touch for a short time upon the supposed cost of the government's project, and the absurd statement about $13,000,000 being the total amount which this enterprise will cost this country. In what sense do we own what we have not paid anything for? $13,000,000 would appear to be the amount that is to be thrown away, absolutely wasted, in the initiation of this scheme—something for which there will not be any asset in the way of service or property; nothing to show for it at any time from the beginning to the end. I know that the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Ross) asserted that he believed that that is all it would cost. He believed it, he said, because the Premier had said so.

Mr. CLARKE. What about the Finance Minister?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I fear that there may be other people who may be willing to take it on the ipse dixit of the ministers. It was a mischievous statement, I think, and one which will bear a little looking into. The hon. member for South Oxford (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) used an illustration to explain it. He said that if in buying a farm he mortgaged it for all he had to pay for it, it was not costing him anything; he had borrowed the money which he was going to pay for it. But if he got no service from it, or was renting it for nothing for fifty years, I think he would feel that he was making a very bad bargain. I would put a question to the hon. member: Suppose he said to his son: John, I have an opportunity of buying a farm for $5,000, and I can borrow the money to pay for it at 3 per cent, so that all the farm will cost us will be the interest that we will have to pay on that money; that is everything the farm will cost us. The proposition seems very fine to begin with; but it is a different thing when he adds: John, I am renting that farm for ten years for nothing, and you must work hard to earn the money to pay the interest on it, and perhaps in fifty years it may come into our possession when we pay the full price for it. It is evident, I think, to the most shallow thinker in this country that to construct that road from Winnipeg to Moncton we shall have to pay the cost of the construction, whether we pay it out of the supposed surplus or borrow the money to do so. We have to pay for it, or we do not own it. But the first cost of $13,000,000 is that which is absolutely lost—for which there is no pretense that there is anything had in the shape of service or possession.

But this is only like some of the other hollow pretensions made for this contract. The Prime Minister, when speaking of another part of the contract, said: 'There is something in this which I think will commend itself to the hon. member for Stormont and Cornwall (Mr. Pringle)'; and he read this provision:

> The company shall purchase all material and supplies required for the construction of the western division and the equipment of the whole of the said line of railway from Canadian producers, when the same are produced in Canada, and when such material and supplies can be purchased in the desired quantities and of equal quality suitable for the purpose required, and for prices and upon terms equally advantageous with those procurable elsewhere.

Is not that something magnanimous? It is equivalent to saying to the producers of Canada: In connection with this great and costly enterprise you shall have the privilege of tendering and competing with the producers of other countries for the furnishing of supplies. And yet this is held up as a great preference given to the manufacturers and producers of Canada in connection with this great public work. I say these are hollow pretensions, unworthy of a great government. The cost is enormous, a tax upon the efforts of the workers of this country, which will be felt for a lifetime. We paid cheerfully for the costs incidental to confederation. The farmers of this country were quite willing, in order that the great North-west should be developed and the terms of confederation carried out, to create a great competition with their own products, and to pay for that competition in the form of taxes. There has not been much grumbling about that. There has been a magnificent national spirit displayed. But there is no necessity for imposing such burdens upon them to-day. Will there be no let-up to this enormous taxation for the opening up of new territories? The confederation has been satisfactorily completed; the terms of confederation have been grandly and loyally carried out. By no parity of reasoning is there the same claim on the taxpayers of this country for this enterprise that there was for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It may be said, what matters to us what the result will be fifty years hence? We will not be called on to pay more than the first ten years' interest; let future generations look after themselves. I think the framers of the Ashburton treaty on the British side may have felt an indifference something like this. They may have said: It is possible that this patch of Maine run-

ning up into Canada, and which ought to belong to Canada, may make a difference to the country in the future; but it will make no difference in our lifetime. Men who are nation builders do not act like this. This is not the method of the great men who build for the future welfare of their country. The pioneers of the older provinces built for the future; they bore burdens and hardships such as we have not to experience. Men in the west, with overflowing plenty to-day, not knowing anything of the struggles of the pioneers of other days, or realizing what they owe to them, are impatient of results. We do not begrudge them having all the facilities possible. I believe the counter proposition made by the hon. leader of the opposition is one that will work far better for the well-being, prosperity and immediate relief of the settlers in the great North-west than the proposition of the government. It works in harmony with the natural resources of the country and with our great lake and river transportation system; it points to the extension of the principle of government ownership; it means the saving of fully $50,000,000 to this country. This is a wise and statesmanlike proposition, whereas the proposition of the government is one which bears the imprint of haste, rashness and extravagance, and which suggests the warning contained in the old Latin proverb: Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.

Mr. R. HOLMES (West Huron). I do not expect, Mr. Speaker, that I shall be able to say much that is new in connection with this very much discussed subject, but I shall endeavour to express, as briefly as I can, my views upon it. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson), who has just taken his seat, was exceedingly complimentary to the leader of the government. In his opening remarks he admitted that he had listened with considerable interest and a certain amount of pleasure to the charming oratory of the right hon. gentleman. He admitted that he himself was almost convinced by the right hon. gentleman's persuasive eloquence of the propriety and wisdom of this policy; and I wish to pay my hon. friend from South Grey this compliment, that I think he is the only one on that side who has spoken in complimentary terms of the leader of this government, or of any hon. gentleman on this side who has addressed the House on the subject before us. But let me here say that it is not by the charm of oratory alone, for which the right hon. gentleman is noted, that he, as leader of this government, has won his way to the hearts and sympathies and affections of the people of Canada; it is not alone by his sunny ways that he has won their esteem, but by his sterling integrity of character, and the fact that he has given this country the best administration it has ever had. And let me add, that whenever he goes before the people, be that time near at hand or distant, the people will express their confidence in himself and his administration, and in the proposition which he has submitted to this House.

The hon. member for South Grey told us that although delegations had come here asking for protection for various interests, although representatives of the labouring classes had come asking for more protection, this government had turned a deaf ear to their appeals. Representatives of the farming and other interests, he said, had come to the government seeking for the protection they desired, but the government had paid no heed to their complaints. But when politicians had come down with a large scheme on hand, for which they wanted government assistance, the government were quite willing to accede to their demands. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that the best and the only protection that can be given the labouring classes is to give them a market where there is a good demand for their labour at remunerative prices; and that is what this government is giving them to-day to a greater extent than ever before under any previous administration. And to our farmers, who are raising crops, not alone for the home market, but for foreign markets as well, who are producing a great deal more than the people of Canada can possibly consume, the best protection which the government can give is to provide them with abundant means of transportation by which they can send their products to the markets of the world with the least possible delay, and at the least possible cost. I would remind the House further that it is not true that our farmers and labourers have been calling on the government for protection in connection with their interests. I have no desire to take up the time of the House at any length in discussing the trade question, because it is not directly relevant to the matter before the House, but I wish merely to refer to it incidentally, in order to meet points which have been raised by my hon. friend and others in that connection. And in reply to my hon. friend, I wish to point out that not only did our farmers and labourers not send delegations to this government asking for protection to their interests, but, on the contrary, they sent delegations protesting against any increased protection being given in certain directions, and insisting that the government should look after the interests of the farming and labouring classes as well as those of the manufacturers by not generally raising our taxation any higher.

My hon. friend said that there were millions in this project. Well, one can hardly expect a transcontinental railway to be constructed from end to end of this Dominion without there being millions in it. But evidently what prompted this remark was

the idea in his mind, conveying the insinuation that there were millions in this scheme for somebody who would not give any return to the country. That suspicion has prevailed to a certain extent in the remarks of a number of the speakers on the other side, but has no foundation in fact. Where did this idea of a transcontinental railway originate, the hon. gentleman went on to ask. There was no demand, he said, for a transcontinental line. Let me inform the hon. gentleman, for his benefit, that, as far as the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) is concerned, the idea of a transcontinental railway originated in his mind when in Vancouver. It had already been spoken about, but at Vancouver the ex-Minister of Railways expressed his thorough approval of the policy of building such a line, and of doing so with the shortest possible delay. The hon. gentleman went on to argue that the congestion in the west has been provided for, that there is now no special urgency for the construction of this road, that there was a time when there was urgency and special need for this road, but that that time had gone, and there is no longer any pressing necessity for its construction. Well, assuming that the position he takes is a good one, it is in direct condemnation of the proposal of his own leader, who desires that we should accept the scheme he has put before the House.

I shall not endeavour to touch on all the different points which have been raised in connection with this subject, but shall merely take up two or three as they present themselves to my mind. My hon. friend then alluded to what he termed the bugaboo of the bonding privilege. Evidently hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the cue from their leader, to ridicule the argument advanced in connection with this privilege by the government. But any one who is at all familiar with the history of this country knows well that the Americans have on several occasions alluded to the bonding privilege as only enjoyed by the Canadian people at the good will of our American friends. If he will look at 'Harper's Weekly' of one or two weeks ago—which can be had in our library—he will find in that journal an article dealing with this question. The writer of that article asks: What is the menace to the good-will now existing between the United States and Great Britain? And he replies to his own question by saying that the menace which exists to the continued good-will between the American and English nations is the presence of Canada on the North American continent, and until Canada is brought into the American Union by annexation, there will be no assurance of continued friendship and good-will on the part of the American republic towards Great Britain. Or, in other words, the abrogation of the bonding privilege is the weapon which the Americans are prepared to use against Canada. So long as Canada remains a British colony and a competitor with our American neighbours in trade and commerce, so long will it be a menace to the good-will that should prevail between Great Britain and the United States.

My hon. friend also alluded to the disadvantage of scattered settlement. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is rather late in the day for our hon. friends opposite to bring forward an argument of that kind. If they will look up the political history of this country and the records of this House, they will find that during the regime of the late Mr. Mackenzie, one of the very principles he advocated was that we should in those days build the transcontinental line then contemplated, according as settlement and development required. But our Conservative friends pooh-poohed that argument as a ridiculous one. They did not believe in the utilization of the water stretches; they did not believe in building the railways as the development of the country might call for it; but they did believe, and subsequently put in practice that belief, that the transcontinental line should be built through from end to end, regardless of whether settlement was sparce or otherwise. And now my hon. friend talks of the disadvantages of sparse settlement. There are undoubtedly great advantages in having settlements close together. There are great advantages in compact communities particularly in a country like the North-west where the privileges and comforts that go with many years of settlement cannot be enjoyed as we enjoy them in the older provinces. Close settlement is advantageous in a variety of ways which I need not enumerate. But in dwelling upon these advantages hon. gentlemen opposite are taking a course directly opposed to that which their party took a few years ago and have accepted identically the platform laid down by the Liberal party in connection with the building of the first transcontinental line. If it were possible for the spirit of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie to visit these halls he would be astonished to find that his principle and his policy and his platform had been adopted by those who in his lifetime so bitterly denounced him.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) said it was not necessary to have another transcontinental line—not only that there was no urgency in it, but that there was no necessity for it. Well, if a transcontinental line is not necessary, what does he think of the plan proposed by his leader? What does he think of the alternative proposition laid before the House, I presume in all seriousness by the leader of the opposition? It is quite apparent from the speeches not only of my honoured and esteemed friend from South Grey, but from others as well, that the leader of the opposition did not discuss

with his followers the drafting of his policy, because they are all at sixes and sevens with regard to it.

Mr. CLANCY. Where ?

Mr. HOLMES. In the statement I have just referred to, to the effect that another transcontinental line is not necessary. That is one thing, and if that is not satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) I can give him others. I could quote from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite showing how in many ways they disagree with their leader. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in the earlier part of the debate spoke most vigorously against other railways getting running privileges over this road. He said it was an absurdity——

Mr. SPROULE. I repeat it—it is an absurdity.

Mr. HOLMES. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) disagrees with his leader.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Not at all.

Mr. HOLMES. Either the member for East Grey, or the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart), I am not sure which, stated that running powers. as provided for in the plan of the government were an absurdity and——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Hear, hear.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) says hear, hear. Well, he may have other railway interests in mind at the same time that he is thinking of this.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I wish to point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) that he has not put the case properly. No statement made by any hon. member here as showing the absurdity of the plan for running rights proposed by the government conflicts with the statement of the leader of the opposition. He pointed out the utter absurdity, we only pointed out the absurdity of such a scheme.

Mr. HOLMES. The explanation made by the hon. member for North Victoria may be satisfactory to himself, but I am sure it is not satisfactory to any other members of this House. Hon. members on this side will not accept as literally true—I am not suggesting that the hon. gentleman has wilfully misstated his statement of the case, for the hon. member for South Lanark, the hon. member for East Grey, and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) said that the scheme for running powers over this road was an absurdity. Let me quote from the leader of the opposition to show that that hon. gentleman took a view different from theirs :

It is difficult to give to one railway effective powers over a line under the control of another and competing railway. But if the government acquires the railway from North Bay to Fort William, it can maintain control over it and give all these railways running powers over it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Better tackle something you understand.

Mr. HOLMES. This is from the leader of the opposition himself :

The third point which I would submit to the consideration of the House, as a sound policy, is to assist in improving the grades of one or both lines from Winnipeg to Fort William upon the condition that complete control of rates is obtained and that the Grand Trunk Railway as well as the Intercolonial shall have running powers from Fort William into Winnipeg. This arrangement will bring the Grand Trunk Railway with all its great systems in Ontario and Quebec into direct touch with the railway system and industrial life of the west, inside of six months or a year.

There is clear confirmation of the statement I have made that hon. gentlemen opposite are at sixes and sevens among themselves and do not approve of what their leader proposes. The hon. gentleman from South Grey eulogized, as others on his side have done, the attitude of the leader of the Conservative party towards the Canadian Pacific Railway and have deprecated the attitude of the Liberal party towards that great institution. I have no quarrel with the Canadian Pacific Railway in any manner, shape or form; and I am willing to attribute to that company not only enterprise but engineering skill and ability of a very high order in the construction of its line. But I say and say without fear of successful contradiction, that every forecast made by the Liberal party when denouncing the concessions that were made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been verified by our experience since that time.

Mr. SPROULE. Including the one that it would never pay for the axle grease for the wheels ?

Mr. HOLMES. The Liberal party as a party, never said that. Some individual member may have said so.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member (Mr. Holmes) is not a reader of the debates, of that time, or he would know better.

Mr. HOLMES. The hon. member (Mr. Holmes) is a reader of the debates—not as long as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has been, perhaps, still, I have been in public life for a pretty long while for a young man. Some members of the Liberal party may have made that statement, but the Liberal party as a party never said that the Canadian Pacific Railway would not pay for the grease for the wheels. What does my hon. friend from East Grey think of the proposal made by his leader to buy the line from Fort William eastward ? Will that pay for the axle grease ? I am not saying it will not do so. But it certainly is not a paying proposition at the present time. My hon. friend from

East Grey was strongly in favour of government ownership. Hon. gentlemen on the other side seem to be of methodistical inclination. They evidently believe in sudden conversion. I am afraid they would not practice the principles favoured by that denomination. But their belief in the principle of government ownership is certainly a case of sudden conversion. During the sessions I have been in this House the members on the other side have denounced with all the ability they could command not only the management of the Intercolonial but the government ownership of that road. And when it was proposed to extend the government ownership by buying the Drummond County Railway to give the Intercolonial an entrance to Montreal, did these hon. gentlemen show themselves to be the friends of the principle of government ownership? There was not a man of them who was in favour of government ownership at that time.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) say that any member on this side of the House had expressed himself as opposed to the principle of government ownership, or was what we said merely a fair criticism of the management of the Intercolonial?

Mr. HOLMES. If my memory serves me well, these hon. gentlemen were opposed not merely to the management of the road, but to government ownership and the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. That is as near correct as the other statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) has made.

Mr. HOLMES. Hon. gentlemen opposite, to use a common phrase, do not like to take their own medicine. They like to rub it into this side, and we try to take it with as good a grace as we can. But when their disagreements and inconsistencies are referred to, they grow very uneasy and very sensitive.

It has been stated, stated more than once, and stated always with a sneer, that 'Senator Cox cannot wait.' I hold no brief for Senator Cox; I know nothing about him and do not feel called upon to defend him. But the fact that a senator happens to be identified with a project of this kind is not to his discredit, but very much the reverse. And, while hon. gentlemen opposite may sneer and throw out insinuations, I do not think they can place a finger upon anything of a discreditable character, so far as Senator Cox's public record is concerned. But I want to say this, that if there is one man on the other side of the House who, to my mind, should have remained in his seat while this discussion is going on and should not have taken any part in it, it was the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) I think it is exceedingly bad taste for a gentleman who is interested to the extent that the hon. member for West Toronto is supposed to be interested in the Canadian Pacific Railway, to offer any criticism of this project. I notice also that when any reference is made to that hon. gentleman the members of the opposition act as if they were sitting on hornets' nests. No one on this side can allude to the member for West Toronto without two or three of them jumping to their feet and taking us to task.

In the course of the speech made by the hon. member for South Grey, I did not hear him make any specific allusion to the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition. If I am doing him an injustice it is not intentionally, but I tried to pay close attention to his remarks, and I failed to hear him make any general reference to the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition. While he was condemning the government proposal, I certainly expected that he would mention the plan of the leader of the opposition, and refer in eulogistic terms to the constructive statesmanship of that hon. gentleman who has put before the House a proposal which even members on the other side have been very careful in referring to. They have been exceedingly guarded in any specific allusions to it. While we have referred to it in very general terms they have abstained from going into a general dissection of the proposal of the leader of the opposition, because they knew perfectly well that the more it was dissected the less there would be found in it. Now let us look briefly at one or two features of the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition and compare it with that proposed by the government. The plan proposed by the leader of the opposition, if I may use a term that they have used in other connections, is a sort of hit and miss combination. It is like driving over a snow road in winter, full of pitch holes. Once in a while you hit a pitch hole and you get a jolt, and so it is up and down, as you pass from one to another. The plan proposed by the govtrol of rates; while that proposed by the ernment involves the construction of a line of railway from one coast to the other. In a word, you have there the two plans side by side. The plan proposed by the opposition will be to a certain extent an anti-Canadian policy, because it involves running through American territory, while on the other hand the plan proposed by the government is an entirely Canadian line.

Mr. CLANCY. Where does the plan of the leader of the opposition involve running through American territory?

Mr. HOLMES. Does not the Canadian Northern run through American territory?

Mr. CLANCY. What has it to do with the Canadian Northern?

Mr. HOLMES. Because he proposes to accept a portion of it as part of his system.

Mr. CLANCY. Does not the Grand Trunk run through American territory ?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, but the Grand Trunk Pacific won't run through American territory.

Mr. CLANCY. Neither will the Intercolonial.

Mr. HOLMES. Well, when the Grand Trunk Pacific is built my hon. friend from Bothwell will no doubt enjoy the privilege of riding over it from one coast to the other. Then the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition provides for no government control of rates ; while that proposed by the government does. The plan proposed by the leader of the opposition means a joint operation, the company operating part of it and the government operating part of it; while the plan proposed by the government involves single control. The plan proposed by the leader of the opposition provides for the opening up of no new territory. The member for South Grey said we did not require to open up any new territory, that we had sufficient for all our needs at the present time. That may be true. We have a great deal of territory that is not occupied, it is open for settlement, and it is very encouraging to see that settlers are pouring into that territory by the thousands. The plan proposed by the leader of the opposition does not look to the opening up of one solitary acre of new territory ; while on the other hand, the plan proposed by the government opens up hundreds of miles of new territory which are, according to the reports laid before the House—though unfortunately our friends disagree with that—good for settlement and contain a great deal of undeveloped wealth. Then the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition provides for little or no development of the country; on the other hand, the plan proposed by the government proposes to develop the country for its entire distance. Anybody who knows what railway construction means knows that it involves an immense development of the country contiguous to it, and that will be the result of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Then another very material difference between the two plans is in respect of the mileage. The mileage of the plan proposed by the leader of the opposition from Winnipeg to Quebec is 1,654, that proposed by the government is about 1,400, showing a difference of nearly 300 miles in that one stretch in favour of the government plan. From Winnipeg to St. John over the Intercolonial, as proposed by the leader of the opposition, is a distance of 2,232 miles; the distance of the road proposed by the government is 1,802 miles; showing a difference of 430 miles in its favour. Therefore, if the difference in mileage is of any importance the advantage is decidedly with the government proposition.

Now, the question may be asked. How is this new railway going to benefit old Ontario ? It passes through the newer portion of Ontario, but of what interest is it to old Ontario ? Well, I believe it is of vital importance to nearly all the towns of any importance in western Ontario. It is of importance to the towns that have connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific, because it will give them better access and better facilities of transport into the great Northwest. It is of importance to the exporters and to the manufacturers in all those towns, and I am more than surprised that our friends who are generally so much concerned about the welfare of the manufacturers, should be short-sighted as not to see that their opposition to this line means opposition to the extension of manufactures. A couple of weeks ago, on going home to my own town after this proposal had been laid before the House, I met a Conservative who has gone into manufacturing industries. I may say that they have been started since this government came into power. This firm have started within the last two years a manufacturing industry in my own town which did not exist previously, and it is to-day employing between 75 and 100 hands. One of the proprietors is a Conservative and a personal friend of mine—he told me that he thought this was one of the best schemes that was ever put before the country ; and that so far as he was concerned he would be very glad to endorse it. I believe, Sir, the feeling of that gentleman is the feeling of a great many others. Then this scheme is important to the portions of western Ontario, especially those portions contiguous to the waterways of which the hon. member for South Grey spoke, because if their plan is carried out in the building of branches and in increasing the traffic, I believe that in the years to come there will be so great a development in the North-west that even the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canadian Northern and all the other lines running into the North-west, will not be equal to the demands that will be made upon them. The productions of that country will be so enormous that I do not think all the transportation facilities that we are providing will be adequate, and it will be necessary to make use of the waterways. Therefore, it is of importance to the western towns, especially those that are situated upon the lakes, because they will derive a very direct benefit by virtue of this road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been said by some hon. gentlemen opposite that this proposal was being put through regardless of the interest of the people of Canada. Well, who are the judges of what is to the interest of the people of Canada ? Is it our friends on the opposite side, or is it the government who best represent the people

of Canada ? As the Postmaster General asked, who should be the judges of whether it was in the interests of Canada or not, a party who had twice appealed successfully to the electorate, or a party who had been twice defeated ? I believe that when the people of Canada have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon this project they will show their approval in no unmistakable terms, that they will do as they did on two previous occasions, express their confidence in the general policy of the government, and in what I might call for convenience, the special policy of the government in regard to the transcontinental line. Our friends on the other side of the House are very fond of throwing out the challenge : Appeal to the country ! Dissolve parliament and appeal to the country ! I well remember that prior to the general election of 1900 our friends uttered the same challenge : Appeal to the country and we are sure the people will condemn you. Well the government appealed to the country, and surely the government were not dissatisfied with the result ; and I am sure that when the government again feels called upon to appeal to the country the answer will be the same and that the experience of 1900 will be repeated, only perhaps to a greater extent. Our friends on the other side who have prided themselves for a great many years on being the party that endorsed the principle of 'Canada for the Canadians,' have in a certain measure abandoned that principle. They do not stand up for it with quite the same zeal and enthusiasm and earnestness as in the days that are passed. Perhaps they do not find the same political advantage in so doing. At any rate, it can be said without fear of successful contradiction, that the policy of the government is a policy of Canada for the Canadians, and as such it will appeal to the sentiments of the people of this country and will be endorsed by them. If the proposal made by the government is not one that will appeal to the good judgment and to the good sense of the people at large then I am at a loss to understand what proposal can be brought before this House that would appeal to their judgment. I do not for one moment think that the policy proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is one that will appeal to the good sense and judgment of this country. I do not think that he himself believes it will do so, and if the policy proposed by the government is not one that will appeal to the judgment of the country then I do not think that it would be possible to frame a policy that would obtain their support. In this policy, the government have safeguarded all the interests of the people, they have not granted the concessions that were granted in previous charters, they are not granting an acre of land outside the right of way on the part that is built by the government, they are not granting any exemption from taxation or any concessions such as were granted under the previous administration. The government has taken the wise precaution of safeguarding and looking after the interests of the people ; and the people will appreciate that fact. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to justify their opposition by saying that if some other plan or proposal had been introduced they would have felt disposed to support it. That is an easy thing to say, but it has no meaning. The government are not asking support for some other plan or proposal but for this plan and for this proposal. And my experience in this House convinces me that no matter what proposition might be brought down by the government our friends on the other side would find an easy way to avoid supporting it.

Sir, I believe we are entering upon a new era so far as our railway policy is concerned. We are entering upon a policy that is a commendable one, which will be approved of and endorsed by the people at large, endorsed not alone by our political friends and political sympathizers of the government, but which will win to it the support and the good-will of many who have formerly voted on the other side. One cannot look on this great and wonderfully developing country of ours without realizing the urgent necessity of, as soon as possible, providing additional railway facilities for the vast and ever expanding production that will take place in the near future, and I am satisfied that when this proposition has been placed before the people it will meet with their cordial and warm endorsation and approval.

Mr. GEO. A. CLARE (South Waterloo). Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to make any lengthy remarks on this very important question, for I know that I cannot do it justice, and that anything I may say will be said in a very imperfect manner. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) made the remark that the farmers of this country had never asked the government for protection. He said this in reply to what was said by the hon. member for South Grey. I wish to state that I was with a deputation of farmers of this country who interviewed the government to ask for protection for the beet-root sugar industry. The hon. gentleman says that the farmers are free traders and do not want protection. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that to-day there are, at all events, ten times as many farmers in this country who are protectionists as there were twenty years ago. Let me say to him too that the farmers of South Waterloo who have found a home market by the establishment of manufacturing industries and consequent growth of the towns in that constituency, are protectionists to-day, so much so that this government has seen fit to gerrymander South Waterloo to prevent the farmers of that

county electing a Conservative member to this House. The hon. gentleman himself not long since performed a balancing feat, in this House, by supporting the tariff introduced by the Finance Minister and claiming that it was a good and a heaven-born tariff; but at the same time asking for an increased protection on salt, and there are many other members too on that side of the House who while they praise this heaven-born tariff have asked for protection for the particular industries carried on in their counties. The questions of transportation and the tariff are, I claim, the most important that can be discussed at this time, and therefore the long discussion we have had has been an education, not only to the members of this House, but to the country at large. In my opinion it is unfortunate that a question of this kind should be discussed as a party question. The government left no chance to their supporters to express an honest independent opinion upon this question. They made the bargain, signed the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific, and forced their supporters to vote for it. This may be party government, this may be as it should be, but in my opinion, so important a question should first be discussed in the House, or at any rate the government should discuss it with their supporters before signing or adopting the contract. Instead of this the government first made the contract, they then held caucus after caucus, forcing their followers to support it, and to-day, when it is being discussed in this House, members, who in caucus opposed this Bill are supporting it. When the right hon. the Premier brought down this Bill he was, as might be expected, received with great applause. When he talked of a great transcontinental road from the Atlantic to the Pacific he was applauded by his supporters, but when he talked of the bargain actually made with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, the House was silent and nothing but his own voice could be heard. It was not until he sprang the bonding privilege panthom and pictured the dangers which might arise from an abrogation of the bonding privilege, did his supporters enthuse, and I firmly believe they applauded because at first sight they thought there had been discovered an excuse, flimsy as it was, which they could give to their electors for supporting the perpetration of such an outrage upon the country. We saw a smile of relief cross their faces, and they cheered; but when the bonding privileges were explained to them, when it was shown by gentlemen on this side, that if the bonding privileges were abrogated, Portland would not do the business it is doing to-day, and that the result would be to bring trade to Canadian ports, a benefit not a loss to Canada, then these gentlemen became so afraid of the bonding privilege argument that they have not resurrected it in this House for many days. Why, the vey best thing that could happen for the eastern provinces would be the abrogation of the bonding privileges, for then the freight from the west which did not come over the St. Lawrence route to Montreal or Quebec, would have to go by rail to St. John, or Halifax, or Sydney, thus building up these Canadian ports. To hear the Prime Minister talk about the abrogation of the bonding privileges, one would think that there was no Intercolonial Railway.

I am not opposed, Mr. Speaker, to supporting at some future time a great transcontinental railway, if there is necessity for it. I believe that it is proper to help the Grand Trunk Railway to enter the fertile plains of the North-west Territories. I believe that we should give our settlers railway facilities to ship their goods eastward. But, Sir, before we build a railway from Winnipeg to Moncton we should know what the country is like, we should know what the difficulties of railway construction are likely to be in that country, and we should know the approximate cost of the railway to the people of Canada. This information we have not obtained, simply because the government have not such information to give us. Why was the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. Mackie) put up to tell us what that country is like? Why, because the government have no adequate information. He is the only man who has given us information about the northern part of Ontario and Quebec, and he claims that there are timber limits there and some lands suitable for agriculture. I am glad, and I believe every Conservative is glad, to hear that we have good farming and timber lands in that region. But what kind of information is this, to warrant the government in building a railway there. The hon. member (Mr. Mackie) saw good land and good trees there, but he knows nothing about the difficulties of railway construction in that territory. He tells us that he knows more about it than the engineers sent out by the Ontario government, who, he says, were never in the vicinity where this railway is to be built. If that be so, then the information given by the hon. member (Mr. Mackie) is the only information which the government has, and that is exceedingly poor information upon which to risk the expenditure of millions and millions of dollars. Accurate scientific explorations and surveys are the only source of such information, and these we have not got. For this among other reasons I am opposed to the line between Winnipeg and Moncton at present.

In contradistinction of this policy of the government we have before us the proposition of the leader of the opposition. His policy is to extend the great Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Depot Harbour; to build a connecting link from Scotia Junction to Sudbury; to nationalize the

road between Sudbury and Port Arthur and to improve the line between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. This scheme of our respected leader will not only allow the Grand Trunk Railway to enter Winnipeg within the next six months, but it will also permit the Intercolonial Railway to enter the prairie city. It will also give eastern connection to the Canadian Northern Railway, and if it is adopted, the Grand Trunk Railway would be enabled, and the Intercolonial Railway as well, to help in carrying out the crop of the year 1904. But, Sir, the most important thing of all is that these roads will be under government control. That is of untold importance in a new country like ours. The Minister of Agriculture, in the course of his speech a few days ago, made this statement:

> If we do not provide a means by which the Grand Trunk corporation may be able to get an entry into the North-west Territories, through our own country and under our own flag, we all know that the Grand Trunk Railway has its connections with the railroads of the western states of America, and that it will obtain an entry by means of those roads into our North-west, and will bring down a large portion of the traffic of that country through American territory and by American lines of communication instead of through Canadian channels of communication. It is the duty of the government of this country to see that an evil of that kind shall not arise in the near future; because we know that the interests of the people follow the channels of export traffic; and if a large portion of the people of our North-west Territories are looking to the great railroad corporations of the American union in alliance with the Grand Trunk Railway of eastern Canada, they will be looking towards the American union for other purposes; they will be buying their necessities in that country instead of buying them in eastern Canada, who can rightly and properly supply them. With this in view, it is a crying and immediate necessity that the government of Canada, supported by the parliament of Canada, should immediately arrange that the Grand Trunk Railway corporation should have an entry into the North-west Territories, and that in doing that we should provide a new and better line, the shortest and the cheapest means of communication for these territories, not only with eastern Canada but with other seaports so that their produce may be carried to the natural market of our food products, the mother country.

The hon. gentleman surely knows that the Grand Trunk Pacific, if the Bill receives the sanction of this House, will not be built for five or six years; he knows that the Grand Trunk Pacific, however, will be ready within one year to carry freight from at least a part of the province of Manitoba into the city of Winnipeg; and I ask him if, by the argument he has laid before this House, he is not providing a way by which the Grand Trunk can send its freight through American territory to the seaports? If, however, the plan submitted by the hon. leader of the opposition is adopted, the Grand Trunk Company will be able to carry freight from the west over their own road in the eastern provinces within six months. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will be able to carry the supplies and the materials for building their own road through Canadian territory to the North-west.

But the hon. Minister of Agriculture was not always so careful to have the crops of the North-west go through Canadian channels. Did he not, and did not the party which he supports, oppose the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior? Did not he and the party with which he is allied oppose the policy of protection introduced by the Conservative party into this country? I claim that these two acts of the Conservative party saved the provinces of the North-west to the Dominion of Canada. I ask again, Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian Pacific Railway had not been built in the North-west, and if hon. gentlemen opposite had had the opportunity of introducing free trade or commercial union into this country, would the grain of the North-west come east through the provinces to the sea-coast, or would it go to the south, which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said in this House this session was the natural market fot it? Would the western provinces now be a part of this great confederation if that policy had been carried out? I claim, and I believe a great many members on the other side of the House agree with me, that the confederation of Canada would have been disrupted long ere this if such a policy had been carried out.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture, in his address to the House on this question a few days ago, made an estimate of the probable crops of the North-west in 1906 and in 1911. He had an arithmetical way of reckoning them which I have not time to follow. I will take his word, for once at any rate, and admit that he was correct. The hon. gentleman calculated the number of cars that would be required to take the amount of grain which this country would have for export in 1906 and 1911, and he left his calculation there. It is my intention to carry the calculation a little further, and to show how many trains it will take to carry the grain from the North-west to the eastern provinces and the seaboard. He calculated that we would have for export in 1906 60,000,000 bushels of wheat and 28,000,000 bushels of other cereals, and 15,600 head of cattle. This would be equal to 88,000 cars of wheat and other cereals, 9,750 cars of cattle, taking 16 head to each car. To move this crop would require 1,955 trains of 50 cars each, or six trains a day. Now, 50 cars to a train may be a large estimate; but under the policy advocated by the Conservative party, the gradients on the railways are going to be made perfect. A train of 50 cars would be considered a very small train on the New York Central Railway. A

train would not be sent out on that railway unless it had more cars than that. Now, all this crop could be shipped in six months by 12 trains a day of 50 cars each over one road, or in three months by one train every hour. The hon. minister estimates that in 1911 we shall have for export 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and 40,000,000 of other cereals, and 250,000 head of cattle. This would be equal to 140,000 cars of wheat and other cereals and 15,625 cars of cattle; that is, 3.112 trains a year, or 8½ trains a day of 50 cars each. All this crop could be shipped in six months by 17 trains a day of 50 cars each, or in three months by one train of 50 cars every forty-three minutes. But we have two lines, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway, to Port Arthur, and if the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition is carried out, we will have also the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial Railway. But leaving these two railways out, I will show you how long it will take the two roads which we have to carry out that crop. In 1906 the whole estimated crop could be moved in three months by each road running one train every two hours. If they took six months to move it, they would have to run a train every four hours. In 1911 the whole estimated crop could be moved by each road running one train of 50 cars every one hour and twenty-six minutes in three months. Mr. Speaker, the congestion is in the west not in the east, and the hon. leader of the opposition and the members on this side of the House are prepared, as they have been in the past, to assist in building railways through the west, where they will be especially beneficial to the people of Canada as a whole.

But it is true that the farmers of the North-west have not sufficient granaries, and have to ship direct to the cars as soon as the grain is threshed. More elevators should be built, as stated by the hon. the leader of the opposition, and more elevators will be built if his policy is carried out. Even without any assistance from any government, the farmers and other interests of the North-west are building this year over fifty elevators, which will be completed before the crop is brought in, and these elevators will be capable of storing over 54,000,000 bushels.

The Minister of Agriculture a day or two ago in his defence of the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme advanced the argument that western wheat would before long be ground in the west altogether and shipped eastwards as flour and that this flour would be carried by rail. The argument is not sustained by the facts and is absolutely misleading.

Minneapolis is the greatest milling centre of the continent, shipping in 1901, 15,995,421 barrels of flour. The entire export of flour in 1901, from Atlantic ports, including Canadian as well as American ports, was 16,484,400 barrels. Deducting from this total the shipments via New Orleans and other gulf and southern ports (1,251,900 barrels) which were outside of the sphere of influence of the great lakes, leaves a total of 15,223,500 barrels exported from Atlantic ports. Minneapolis shipments therefore exceed the entire export trade of the continent for which a new route could compete. Several million barrels of these shipments were consumed in the west. The thing is to see what became of the east-bound portion of the traffic. Duluth shipped via the lakes in 1901, 5,634,225 barrels; Milwaukee, 2,238,778 barrels; and Chicago, 918,763 barrels, making a total water-borne traffic from these three ports of 8,791,766 barrels, equal to 57 per cent of the entire export trade of the continent from Atlantic ports, exclusive of the gulf. Shipments from other western ports brought the total receipts by lake at Buffalo up to 11,053,439 barrels. Other ports including Cleveland, Erie, Oswego, Ogdensburg, Montreal, Kingston, Midland and Depot Harbour received a considerable additional quantity of flour by lake, bringing the total of lake shipments to over 12,000,000 barrels. In other words if we consider the export trade alone, and that is all that can be considered in the present connection, the volume of traffic in flour carried by the lakes was four-fifths of the total export business of the continent. This would leave about 3,000,000 barrels of export trade to be accounted for and presumably carried by all-rail. Now if we deduct from this the flour carried east by railroads from the region south of the zone influence of the lakes it will be readily seen that a very small percentage of export flour is carried east by all-rail routes.

It is true that the total rail shipments by eastern lines out of Chicago amounted to 6,791,184 barrels, but the greater proportion of these were domestic flour for distribution through Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania and other states where lake competition does not come directly into play. It is worth noting, too, that while the total rail shipments from Chicago eastward including an enormous domestic distribution as above stated) amounted to 6,791,184 barrels, the lake shipments from Duluth alone were 5,634,225 barrels in 1901, and increasing in 1902 to 8,703,330 barrels.

The actual fact is that in the carriage of flour as well as of wheat the water-ways are handling more and more of the traffic, and the hope that the Grand Trunk Pacific may be able to carry flour if it cannot carry wheat is utterly delusive.

In this connection I wish to address the House for a few moments on our natural system of transportation, namely, our waterways—a question of immense and immediate importance.

We have within Canada from Fort William and Port Arthur to the ports of Georgian bay, an inland 'water-highway' which

properly equipped will surpass any commercial highway by land or sea in the world.

But without the expenditure of a dollar we can, to-day, lay down the products of the West in Liverpool, by our existing railways and water-ways as cheaply as we can by the proposed all-rail route, carry these products to Quebec alone.

It is established by the best known experts upon transportation questions that bulky commodities are carried by water for one-tenth the ordinary railway rates. In the United States with their magnificent railway equipment, their almost perfect gradients, return cargoes, and fierce competition the best result yet attained in railway freightage is an average of eight-tenths of one cent per ton per mile. On the other hand, the 28,000,000 tons of freight which passed through the Canadian and American Soo canals in 1901 were moved at the rate of eight-tenths of one mill per ton per mile—being one-tenth of the lowest average railway rates. In 1902, this freightage increased to upwards of 35,000,000 tons. Owing to higher wages and increased cost of fuel the water rate was almost nine-tenths of a mill per ton per mile in 1902, but, as the same conditions affected the railways, the proportion above stated still holds good.

I do not, however, propose to adopt these figures for the proposition just stated, namely, that it will cost as much to take the western produce as far as Quebec by the new all-rail route as it will cost to deliver it at its ultimate destination in Liverpool, if we utilize our waterways; as for this proposition, I need only adopt the figures and the argument of the hon. member for Burrard, and other hon. members supporting the government.

The member for Burrard said :—'The best transportation authorities have stated that freight can be carried four and a half miles by water for every one mile by land.' My hon. friend then proceeds to show that with the Panama canal completed, produce can be carried from Moosejaw west, by rail, to the Pacific, 960 miles, and thence via Panama canal to Liverpool, in all a distance 9,480 miles, as cheaply as it can be carried from Moosejaw, east, by an all-rail route to St. John, 2,124 miles, and thence to Liverpool (2,700) in all 4,824 miles—in short by water double the distance for the same money.

Now, taking the figures and the system of the hon. gentleman we have this startling result. The distance all-rail by proposed line from Winnipeg to Quebec is 1,500 miles. Assume that the road is made equal in all respects to American competing lines. The cost of carriage for this part of the journey is equal to 4½ times the same distance by water, namely, equal to water freightage for 6,750 miles. Add the distance, per steamer from Quebec to Liverpool, 2,632 miles, making a total distance in water mileage from Winnipeg to Liverpool via new road of 9,382 miles; and with this clear financial result that the grain and products of the west counting from Winnipeg only will cost as much landed in Liverpool as similar products of other countries carried by an all-water route will pay for a transport of 9,382 miles. We are thus 9,382 water-rate miles from Liverpool on every shipment made by the government's all-rail, all-Canadian, transcontinental route, via Quebec, and doubly worse if carried to Moncton.

Can we shorten the distance, is a practical question? Ocean freightage is the same from Montreal, as it is from Quebec to Liverpool. Quebec is nearer to Liverpool than New York by 418 miles, and the ocean rate being the same from Montreal as from Quebec; Montreal is for freightage purposes, 418 miles nearer than New York.

Make Montreal then our objective point. If we are to successfully compete with New York it will be by utilizing our magnificent waterways. Talk of American gradients. It is level—and where it is not level, it is down grade—by water, from Fort William to Montreal and Quebec.

The distance from Fort William, and not only from Fort William, but also from Duluth, Marquette, Milwaukee, Chicago, and the American Soo, to Liverpool, is shorter by way of Depot Harbour and Montreal or Quebec than by way of New York. Develop our waterways—nay take these great highways as they are and only equip them with proper transports and terminal facilities—equip them as the Minister of Agriculture, only last session, claimed they should and must be equipped—and we have the transportation problem solved, not only to the complete relief of the west, but in a way that will divert to Canadian channels an important share of the traffic east and west of 30,000,000 of Americans whose transport trade is tributary to the great lakes. This is the key to the situation—the key to the solution of a great transportation problem—and the key to national wealth.

Hope in the future of Canada. Why, Sir, already, history has written the Conservative party as the pioneer of Canadian hope, the founder of Canadian faith, the mainspring of Canadian progress, and the architect of Canadian fortune. Faith? Why, Sir, Providence has marked the way and nothing short of culpable ignorance and criminal incompetence can stem the flow of the mightiest stream of commerce, the world will ever witness through this great central continental channel. Why, already, Sir, more freightage passes through the Soo locks in their 240 to 260 days of navigation than passes through the Suez canal in the whole year, and it should be the ambition of every Canadian to secure, as we can secure, not only the carriage of our own produce but, in addition, the carriage

of an important share of American traffic, through Canadian channels, as nature designed it should flow.

I have shown that freightage from Winnipeg to Quebec has to be carried for what is equal at a water mileage to a distance of 6,750 miles to Quebec, and a total of 9,382 miles to Liverpool, and that as far as cost of ocean carriage is concerned it is the same from Montreal as Quebec. I propose to show that a saving of 2,632 water-miles or twenty-eight per cent of the total cost can be effected by adopting the rail and water system of carriage from Winnipeg to Montreal. First take route via Depot Harbour :

	Water Miles.
Distance from Winnipeg to Fort William 426 miles converted to a water rate, 426 x 4½..	1917
From Fort William to Depot Harbour said to be 444 miles, say..	491
From Depot Harbour to Montreal, 380 miles converted to a water rate, 380 x 4½..	1,710
Making a total from Winnipeg to Montreal, mixed water and rail, converted to a water mileage of....	4,118
To this add the distance from Quebec (and from Montreal the cost is the same) to Liverpool..	2,632
Making a total distance at an all-water rate from Winnipeg to Liverpool of, not 9,382 miles as it is if carried by all-rail to Quebec, but a total to Liverpool of..	6,750

In other words a saving of the total cost of carriage from Quebec to Liverpool, a distance of 2,632 miles, giving us a total carriage of 6,750 as against 9,382 water miles.

Other Georgian Bay routes.

Distance—by existing railways.

	Miles.
From Owen Sound to Toronto.. ..	120
" Meaford & Midland to Toronto..	118
" Penetang to Toronto	105
" Collingwood to Toronto	97

These distances can be shortened—particularly in the case of Collingwood. All these Georgian Bay ports are within a range of about 500 miles from Fort William, so that, although we have only a 14-foot channel through the St. Lawrence canals to Montreal the loss on this will probably be more than made up by the shorter railway haulage, and as has been shown in the route via Depot Harbour, it will be found, that, by these routes too the western output can be landed at Liverpool for the same money as it can be taken to Quebec by the proposed Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Three causes and three causes only, have barred our way to complete success in the past.

1. The lack of consumers in the west, preventing the possibility of large return cargoes.

2. The lack of transports or lake carriers sufficient to secure rapid concentration of the western products at Georgian Bay ports and at Montreal and Quebec, as well for immediate carriage to Liverpool as for the purpose of being forwarded in winter to our maritime ports.

3. The lack of adequate terminal facilities both in the matter of dockage and rapid handling.

The first obstacle is being overcome by the steady and rapid influx of settlers in the west, and this in itsef will go a long way towards creating the fleet of vessels we require ; and the third difficulty is one for the careful and immediate consideration of a competent administration.

I have, Mr. Speaker, particularly within the last few months, given a great deal of thought to our transportation needs, and I have come to the conclusion that I cannot support the proposal of the government. There are no means of ascertaining the extent to which the country is being committed by the proposed line. I believe it will cost the country over 150 million dollars. Mr. Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba, who has made the question of transportation a study, and who should know more about it than any other living man in the province of Manitoba or possibly as much as any man in the Dominion of Canada, is opposed to this scheme. Sir William Van Horne, the first choice of the government, as judge of this very question, is opposed to this scheme. It affords no solution of the great transportation problem. It postpones for fifty years government ownership of railways. These, Mr. Speaker, are some of the reasons which lead me to oppose the government scheme.

On the other hand, I can and do heartily endorse the policy so ably and clearly outlined by the leader of the opposition, and for the following reasons :—

1. It will give the people a chance to vote upon it before the country is finally committed to it, and the means of obtaining such information which will enable them to form and pronounce an intelligent judgment upon the question.

2. It will afford immediate relief to Manitoba and the west, stimulate and perpetuate the tide of immigration to Canada, and rapidly develop the resources, promote the industries, and mulitply the wealth of all sections of the country.

3. And I am prepared to support this policy not only as a means of so extending and completing our great national railway—the people's line—as to make it immediately remunerative, but also, working as it will, in harmony with our magnificent waterways and constituting a new bond of union, as a policy calculated to blend and unify the interests of the west and east, facilitate and increase interprovincial trade, and secure by a practical scheme, over nature's highway, the carriage of Canadian

products through Canadian channels to Canadian ports.

4. I support it as the only satisfactory proposal yet made for effective control and reduction of rates; affording as it does, immediate and effective competition of four rival railways east and west, and the complete utilization of the great lakes, our canals and the St. Lawrence.

5. I support it as the only feasible plan by which the vast and increasing output of the west can be carried cheaply to the sea and by which our people of the maritime provinces are secured in the enjoyment and benefit of a fair share of the transport trade of Canada east and west.

6. And I support it, with abounding confidence, as the statesmanlike policy of the great Canadian statesman of to-day—the worthy successor of Canada's greatest statesman—I support it as the fourth great step in the progressive history of Canada—(a) confederation (b) the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, (c) the national policy, and (d) the completement of these, the Conservative policy of to-day—Canada for Canadians and the empire,' 'Canada a nation within an empire.'

Mr. J. E. ARCHAMBAULT (Bertheir). (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I shall not undertake to deal exhaustively with the national transcontinental railway scheme; but the question is such an important one that I consider it my duty to point out to the House the advantages which the construction of this road would ensure to the province of Quebec as a whole, and more especially to the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I shall take up the matter without further preamble.

One of the main reasons brought forward by the government in support of the measure under discussion is the necessity of promoting settlement in the province of Quebec and of providing further means of transportation and of access. As regards my own constituency and the neighbouring counties, that reason is a most serious one. The county of Berthier is 75 miles long, extending from Berthierville to St. Michel des Saints, and is traversed by two railways: the Canadian Pacific and the Great Northern. The Canadian Pacific Railway crosses the lower part of the county, at a distance of about six miles from the villages of Lavaltrie and Lanoraie, on the riverside, and passing two miles away from the town of Berthier, one mile from the village of St. Barthelemi, and three miles from that of St. Cuthbert. There is also a branch line running from Joliette to St. Gabriel de Brandon, which is 21 miles from Berthier and 54 miles from St. Michel des Saints, and has no other connection with these parishes except the highway. As regards the Great Northern Railway, it croses the parishes of St. Norbert, St. Cuthbert and St. Berthelemi, about three miles to the north of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is it a wonder that the progress of settlement in the upper part of the county should be slow in spite of the efforts of the local authorities and of the liberal government of Quebec to promote it? Indeed, the worthy minister of Public Works and Colonization in the province of Quebec is tirelessly working to forward settlement in the county of Berthier as elsewhere. The proof is, that last year as well as this, Father Morin, who is connected with that department, and one of those most intent on developing colonization in our province as well as in other parts of the Dominion, caused a survey to be made of two townships forming part of the counties of Joliette and Maskinongé and situated opposite St. Michel des Saints. The official returns are not yet published, the reports and plans in that connection not being ready yet. However, we know that there are to be found in those parts marvellously rich lands, covered with a dense forest growth, well watered by rivers and pleasant lakes abounding in fish of all kinds. Who among us has not heard of the Mantawa country, that land so marvellously rich, covering, to the north of St. Michel an area of about 120 square miles already known as exceedingly fertile?

Let me quote from a book published in 1883 by Father T. S. Provost, at the time parish priest of St. Esprit, and intituled: 'La Bourse et la Vie.' The writer gives a fine description of the parishes of the northern end of my county: St. Gabriel de Brandon, St. Damien, St. Zénon and St. Michel des Saints.

At page 124, chapter 8 of his book, he writes:

> That immense valley to which I refer in this chapter runs 46° 45′ lat. N., and from 74° 30′ long. on the west up to its confluence with the river St. Maurice, in the east, with an average width of 75 or 90 miles. The valley is irregular in width, the heights which inclose it on either side by no means following a straght line, but in places approaching and in others receding from the banks of the river Mantawa. This river has its source on the same table land as the Red river, tributary of the Ottawa. On leaving Lake Bourget to ascend towards its source, we soon reach a point at the north end of a wide bay, where the river forks. The south-west branch is the main one; and about two miles further it divides again; a third, a fourth and a fifth branch are met with at distances from one another of a mile each. Lastly, a sixth point is arrived at, where several streams converge from all directions, especially from the south-west, the west and the north. It is the meeting point of the great valleys of the Red and Mantawa rivers which coalesce, offering the widest field for colonization.

At page 127 of his book, Father Provost, who was taken up with the idea of colonizing by land (that was in 1883) exclaims:

> Let a railway be built and parishes will spring into existence as if by enchantment.

At page 129:

> One word about Lake Bourget and vicinity. Six miles away from St. Michel des Saints, as-

cending the river Mantawa, above the rapid of the Three Firs.

There also fine, fertile, land is to be found.

At page 132 :

The whole south shore of the river Mantawa, for a width of about six miles from lake Bourget up to the table land, is a plain with an excellent soil, covered with fine forest growth. The same may be said of the opposite shore, with this difference that the plain on that side is not limited to only five or six miles ; it extends to the great Laurentian range, 75 or 90 miles distant, as we have seen. Let us take here, for purposes of settlement, the same width as we have on the opposite shore, and we shall have room for eight fine parishes.

And Father Provost adds (page 133) :

In order not to be accused of supplying, though unintentionally, incorrect data, I shall quote from a report of surveyor Laurier, who, no doubt, thoroughly went over the territory which he describes. 'The river Mantawa, he says, runs from south-west to north-east. Its average width is about 180 feet. Its waters are pure, palatable, and abounding in fish. The valley it runs through is wide and even, with only here and there low hills such as are not seen on the shores of the St. Lawrence.'

That report was written in 1864. At page 132, Father Provost quotes, in support of his contention, from a report made to the minister of Agriculture in 1869, and he winds up as follows :

I am therefore in a position to assert once more, and with greater assurance than ever, that the country of the Mantawa is a fertile one, and worthy of attention on that account.

I may be permitted to mention, by the way, that surveyor Laurier who, in 1864, surveyed the country of the Mantawa was the father of the man who, in 1903, as Prime Minister of Canada, submitted to parliament the scheme for the building of a railway through that region.

Father Provost also refers to lake Clair, Post river, Pike river, &c., &c. ; and at page 152, he goes on :

How often have we not heard people say : If a railway were built through the mountains, I would certainly settle in the Mantawa.

You will please observe that this book was written in 1883. The Canadian Pacific Railway did not then extend beyond Joliette ; the road to St. Felix and St Gabriel was not in existence.

Let us listen further to Father Provost. He is not prompted by political interest, but solely by priestly devotion to his people, love of colonization and of his country. At page 170, he deals with the aversion of people to settle at a distance. It seems as if he had foreseen what was going to happen. When the transcontinental passes through that country, his dream will be fulfilled :

Under what conditions were the eastern townships of Quebec opened up to colonization? What chain of setttlements led up to that country ? What prospects were there at the time of a railway running through those parts, rather than along the banks of the river St. Lawrence, either north or south ? Now, just go up to the first of those settlers of the townships you happen to meet and put the question : ' Are you sorry you came here ? ' With the marvellous progress which had taken place even before railways were built, and which has taken place since, we may well dispense with asking this man whether he is sorry he went there. Let us instead put the question to those who refused to follow him, saying : You know not what you are about ; you will be ruined.

Can it be conteded that a railway running through the northern portion of Quebec would not be of any use ? I have spoken only of the counties of Berthier, Joliette and Maskinongé ; but what I have said applies to all the others. I have ascertained on the spot the correctness of the statements made by Father Provost, when, in 1901, I was with him, Father Morin and some others on a trip to the country of the Mantawa. That trip was a most pleasant and useful one ; and the 'Presse', of Montreal, gave at the time a full account of it.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. An idea of the forest wealth of the upper parts of the counties of Berthier, Joliette and Maskinongé may be gathered from the fact that between St. Gabriel and St. Zenon only, on the three branches of the Mastigouche river, limits were sold recently to the amount of $240,000 ; and the Grand'-Mère Company controls several in that region which are worth quite as much. These facts speak for themselves ; they show the utter fallacy of the statements to the effect that the proposed road is useless, and that northern Quebec is worthless.

What, useless a road which will ensure the operation of these immense limits I have just referred to and which will cause twenty parishes or so to spring into existence ? Useless, a road which will open up for the settler that marvellous country ? Sir, I for one entirely approve of the scheme referred to and of the terms of the contract which ensures its carrying out. According to an old saw, pleasant things cannot be repeated too often. That is also evidently the feeling of the House. What fine, eloquent, powerful speeches have we not listened to for some time past in this House in favour of the scheme or against it. Notes of warning, loud protests on the part of the gentlemen opposite ; expressions of faith in our future, cogent reasons, incontrovertible arguments on the part of supporters of the government. At the risk of spoiling the harmony of this fine concert, I shall sound a few notes.

The Conservatives have not always lived in the cold shades of the opposition, where, as the poet says, they are painfully dragging on their miserable life. They were in power from 1878 to 1896, that is for 18 years, and they undertook then, themselves, to build a transcontinental railway. That scheme and its financing gave rise to what is known as the Pacific scandal. Nevertheless, these gentlemen take advantage of

every opportunity to boast of having constructed that road. I shall not delay discussing the expediency of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway ; I may say, however, that it cost the country a great deal. The granting of $35,000,000 in cash, and $25,000,000 in land, with exemption from taxation, and no security, was more than sufficient to show the extravagance of the then government.

On the other hand, a glance at the contract under discussion will convince one of the great advantages it confers on the country. Thus, the government undertake to construct the Moncton-Winnipeg section ; they will be the owners of it. The whole road will not cost the government $13,000,000, and the reimbursement of the moneys lent or advanced by them is perfectly guaranteed.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if the opposition, though their part is on all occasions to find fault with the government, know not what to say against this scheme and this contract whose excellence is manifest. On listening to them, one after the other, we are inclined to ask ourselves whether they still have a chief and subchief in whom they have some faith.

The hon. member for St. Mary's himself spoke for two hours without being able or willing to say whether he was in favour of or against the scheme.

That is more than is needed to show how important and necessary it is. Hoping that these few remarks will suffice to make clear the position I take, I now state that I shall vote in favour of the scheme and against the amendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), to whom, however, I give credit for his courage and good intentions.

I would not approve of the government undertaking to look after the details of the building or the administration of the railways. Experience is such a good teacher. We know what the construction and operation of the Intercolonial have cost us since 1867. Deficits have piled up from 1867 to 1896, under Conservative rule, and the Liberal government who, since 1896, have brought down so many reforms, have not yet succeeded in spite of the co-operation and high administrative ability of the ex-Minister of Railway and Canals (Mr. Blair), in demonstrating the advantages of government ownership and operation.

Sir, I repeat it, the rule of the liberal party since 1896 has been characterized by a spirit of progress and improvements of all kinds. They have introduced a new order of things ; agriculture, manufactures, commerce have enjoyed untold prosperity, which the carrying out of this undertaking will increase immensely. The building of the national transcontinental railway will have been the greatest achievement of the liberal party, and in itself it will suffice to perpetuate the name of the illustrious leader of that party, who will have been its prime mover.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, I hope I shall not be considered discourteous if I do not reply in full to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat ; and I am sure that he will not consider me so as he knows that I am not familiar with his language. That I regret, as I would very much like to be able to reply to him in the manner which I have no doubt his speech deserves.

I do not think any apology is necessary for taking part in this debate. Under ordinary circumstances, after the number of very able speeches that we have listened to on both sides of the House in which this question has been so fully discussed, it would seem as though we might refrain from further consideration of it and be prepared to vote. But, Sir, coming as I do from that portion of the country for whose benefit we are led to believe this great enterprise has to a very great extent been undertaken, I feel that I need not apologize for discussing this question which is to us in the west a very important one. In fact, Sir, I think I am justified in finding fault with the government for the late hour at which they have introduced this important measure to the House, and I have again to protest against the unseasonable time at which this House was called. It is true the hon. the Prime Minister has given his reasons for calling the House at that late date—his own illness—but, Sir, if we may judge from what has taken place in regard to the health of that gentleman—and I am as pleased at the improvement as any person here—I think it would have been better for him had he called the House together earlier, for it would seem that between the internal troubles that he has had in the cabinet and his followers, no doubt pressing him as they did, the leader of old who said that he had to sleep on his arms to protect the treasury of this country, it would have been a great deal better for that right hon. gentleman had he called the House at an earlier date. Then he would have been fighting gentlemen on this side of the House who would have fought him face to face and he would have understood exactly what they were doing. Therefore that excuse I think is not very good. We protest and have cause to protest at the House being called together at that very unreasonable time—the 12th of March. There is no excuse for it and there is no reason why parliament should be brought together at such a very late day. This important project which had been a matter of discussion all over the country and in the public press ; which was mentioned also in the speech from the Throne ; a proposition equal in importance to any that has been brought to the attention of this parliament or any other parliament since the time of the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway, was not introduced in this House until nearly six months after the calling together of the House. I say that it is treating the opposition most unfairly; and that the government is deserving of the censure of the people of Canada under the circumstances.

As I said a moment ago there is no portion of the Dominion to which this question is of such interest as to Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That is very easily understood, because our success has depended in the past and will in the future depend, largely upon our transportation facilities. Situated as we are, and with the conditions under which we are labouring to procure our livelihood, the success of that country depends on the cheapness with which we can export our products to the markets of the world. In considering that question, there are two propositions involved, as far as it affects the North-west, and I shall try as far as possible to discuss that question in a broad sense, and not in a sectional sense. The first question to be settled is—is any further railway construction necessary in this country? I unhesitatingly answer, yes, there is undoubtedly great opportunity for further development in railway construction in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Manitoba itself is fairly well served at the present time, as has been shown by the right hon. the Premier, who has said that the average distance of the ordinary settler in Manitoba from a railway is five miles. Notwithstanding that, however, the people of Manitoba would be quite prepared to accept any further railway construction that may come to them. That remark might be applied not to Manitoba alone but to any other part of the country, for it has been said by the hon. the ex-Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) you can put a railway any place, and the people will be glad of it. You might start a railway to the north pole and a certain amount of business would be developed; but the point is—will it be profitable to do so.

The next point is—is this the best proposition which we might expect for the relief, and the benefit, of that great western country? I have no hesitation in saying that I do not think it is. I shall quote a statement of the Premier, who in his speech said:

> We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people, to provide immediate means whereby the products of these new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that this proposal does not fulfil the promise held out to the people in that statement of the Premier. It must have been most conclusively proven to any open mind in this House that this railway is not going to take the products of the settlers of the west to the markets of the world at the least possible cost. In fact, Sir, it has been shown that it will give no relief in that respect whatever. I may say in passing, that if this appeared to be the best proposal that could be submitted to the people, if this was to my mind a project that is going to give to the settlers the cheapest possible outlet for their products, I for one, would have supported it. But it is not the best, as I shall endeavour as briefly as possible to show, this scheme does not fulfil, as I said the hope for the promise held out by the Premier. We have heard a great deal about this proposal. We all remember how it was considered in the Railway Committee, and the manner in which it passed through that body. The leading papers made reference to it before the House met. One of the earliest refrences was made on this subject more than a year ago in the city of Winnipeg, and the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of August 24th says editorially:

> A little more than a year ago, on July 23, 1902, the following article appeared in a Manitoba paper:
>
> The Toronto 'Globe' Hatching Again.
>
> The Toronto 'Globe' is publishing a series of articles on the railway traffic which for some mysterious reason it choses to believe is so great on Manitoba branch lines that the grain on those lines cannot be hauled out for want of more tracks. It says nothing about the lack of cars and engines which every one here knows was the cause of the blockade.
>
> Those who are familiar with the ways of the 'Globe' seem to be universally of the opinion that this is not merely a case in which the 'Globe' is drawing a herring across the track. Looking back over the preliminary symptoms it has manifested for some years, whenever a deal was hatching, they have come to the conclusion that another deal of some sort is in the incubator.
>
> Messrs. Jaffray and Cox, whom Mr. Sifton assisted to get hold of the Crow's Nest coal lands are, it is understood, in control of the Toronto 'Globe.' They are, also mixed up in a western railway transaction with 'Jim Hill' of the Great Northern and of the Morgan railway group. The question people are now asking is whether there is some Jaffray-Cox deal requiring legislation from parliament, for which the 'Globe' is to pave the way, and which their other domestic employs, Mr. Sifton, is to shove along.
>
> Whereupon Mr. Sifton's loyal organ (the 'Free Press') promptly asserted that this suspicion was absurd, and that the deal surmised was purely imaginary.

Now Sir, remember that that article was written over a year ago. It was written by a gentleman who at one time held a very high place in the ranks of the Liberal party, and who thoroughly understood what was the meaning of the articles that were appearing in the 'Globe.' You will observe Sir, that what has transpired in the Railway Committee and in this House, conclusively proves that the prophetic surmise of that experienced gentleman was absolutely correct. We first had a request for a railway charter by the Grand Trunk Railway to run from North Bay to the west.

Then the Liberal members from Quebec, and those associated with the Trans-Canada asserted themselves. Although Mr. Hays had led us to believe and had actually stated, that he had no intention whatever of constructing that road; much to our surprise he came back in a day or two and he was perfectly prepared to go to Quebec. Then, Mr. Speaker (Mr. Logan being in the chair) the success of the Quebec gentlemen became apparent to you, and in the interest of your constituents you stood up in the committee, and I well remember that cheerful and sonorous voice of yours demanding of Mr. Hays: Is it your intention to carry your railway to the eastern sea-board. If my recollection is correct, Mr. Hays answered: Certainly not. And you, Sir, came out most emphatically and you said: In that case I shall oppose your Bill, and you sat down heroically. The size of you Mr. Speaker, towering over Mr. Hays, and the manner in which you asserted yourself, supported as you were by other worthy supporters from the eastern provinces, and no doubt by the Minister of Justice as well——

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, no.

Mr. BOYD. Yes, the Minister of Justice came to your assistance Mr. Speaker, and much to our surprise in the committee, back Mr. Hays came the next day and he was ready to swallow the mountain, or for the matter of that, all the mountains between Winnipeg and Moncton. But, what I cannot understand about it is that the Liberal members from Prince Edward Island did not assert themselves. If there had been any life in them; if some of the old warriors of the Liberal party from Prince Edward Island in days gone by were present, they would ask Mr. Hays: Do you propose to build a tunnel to Prince Edward Island, and Mr. Hays would no doubt say: Certainly not; but he would return to the committee the next day and he would declare: Why, certainly I will build a tunnel for you. A small matter of that kind did not amount to anything with Mr. Hays, especially when the government would build the tunnel for him as they are building the railroad. I believe that Mr. Hays is the man behind the machine, but no doubt the Minister of Justice saw him and persuaded him to come back to the committee the next day to tell us that he would build to Moncton. However, as I said before, I do not understand why the Liberals from Prince Edward Island did not get him to promise a tunnel. I do not wonder at Mr. Hays promising to build through Quebec, or through New Brunswick, or up to the North Pole, for it was quite immaterial to him so long as the country was going to do the building, and to give him the road to manage for his benefit, although we may have it in fifty years from now if it does'nt pay the Grand Trunk Railway to keep it any longer. Of course, Mr. Speaker, these few trifling matters were arranged between you and the gentlemen behind the scenes, and so six months after the House met—against which delay I again protest—we had this scheme launched on an unsuspecting public. Well, we have heard a good deal about it for the last three weeks in this House, and we are going to hear more about it for some time, and when we get to the country we will hear more about it still. It is astonishing the amount of information we will be able to give to the electors from both sides of politics, when the proper time comes. But, perhaps the most astute part of the whole thing was the speech of the Minister of Finance when he told us that it was going to cost $13,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Prime Minister?

Mr. BOYD. Well, the Prime Minister said that too, but the Minister of Finance with his actuary settled the whole thing. However, that $13,000,000 story has been so exploded, that like the bonding privilege we have not heard much about it recently. But, Sir, fallacy of the calculation was so apparent that I did not expect it from the Minister of Finance, because I have a good deal of respect for him, and I did not expect that a gentleman occupying his position would try to delude the people of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had an actuary to work also on these figures, and I propose to engraft them into my statement so that they may be handed down to posterity, bound in that volume containing the speeches of this debate, which I have no doubt will be published so that in years to come posterity may see the fallaciousness of the men who now occupy the treasury benches. I will estimate that this government road from Winnipeg to Moncton will cost $48,900 per mile, which the Grand Trunk Railway in the little book which has been published by them says is the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, and therefore the 1,800 miles from Winnipeg to Moncton at $48,900 a mile, will, according to my actuary, cost in the neighbourhood of $88,020,000. There are 1,000 miles of prairie section at $13,000 per mile, making $13,000,000, and 625 miles of mountain section at $30,000 per mile, making $18,750,000; or a total of $119,770,000. Add interest during construction, $10,080,450, and at the end of the construction period you have a total of $129,850,450. Add interest for seven years, $29,885,603, or another total of $159,736,053. Add three years interest if the company do not pay any actual in the three years—and I do not expect they will, and I do not believe that any man in this House expects, they will when they are not bound to; that would be $14,374,357; or a total of $174,110,410.

In making up these figures, Sir, I have procured the services of as accurate an actuary as did the Minister of Justice; and

the Minister of Finance, no doubt, associated with the Minister of Justice. All that the gentleman asked was that his name should not be divulged owing to the position he occupies; but he could vouch for the accuracy of these figures, which I place on 'Hansard,' and I defy contradiction of them. That is the position the people of this country will find themselves in if this railroad is carried to the position where the government seem to think they are going to take it.

Mr. Speaker, the Grand Trunk Railway Company did not want this scheme. They showed it in every move they made before the Railway Committee. They are not anxious to get it even as a present, as my hon. friend says. What they did want they have got. They wanted a guarantee of their bonds to carry them across the profitable prairies of the west, where they did not need it and should not have got it, at any rate so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned. They have also got a guarantee of the mountain section. That, Sir, is what they sought when they came to this parliament; and what they did not want the government of this country has proposed to give them for nothing, and to saddle this country with the enormous debt that I have mentioned.

Now, where is the business of that railroad going during the time this road is under construction?—because if this Bill passes this House, in one year from the time it passes, the company, if they exert themselves to the extent that they should be able to, can have 500 or 600 miles of the producing portion constructed across the prairies. Before the government have the surveys made of the eastern division, they will have the total length of the line across the prairies completed. Where is the produce of that constructed line going? Has there been any arrangement made by the government? Have they placed anything in that contract to say that the produce shall pass through a Canadian channel? There is no clause of that kind. There is nothing to prevent the company sending the freight just where they intend to send it, and that is across the American boundary to their own American system. It has been reported in the papers that they have acquired the Wisconsin Central Railway, which brings them to the city of Duluth or within a few miles of it. It is well understood who is associated with the gentlemen who have managed to manipulate this matter through this House—Mr. Hill, who was, I think, connected with the Crow's Nest Pass matter, in which fortunes were made for a number of people; and it would be very easy to make arrangements with that gentleman whereby the business which the Grand Trunk Company procure in the prairies of Manitoba and the North-west Territories will pass over his system to Superior City, whence it will be shipped to Chicago. They will take the wheat to the lakes and carry it across to Georgian bay ports, and pass it on over the Grand Trunk system to Portland or wherever they see fit to take it; and there is no provision in this contract to prevent them doing so. I contend that some clause should be inserted to provide that during the time of construction the produce of the prairies shall pass through Canadian channels, and I think it is the duty of the opposition to see that a clause to that effect is inserted in the Bill.

We all remember the action of the Liberal party when they gained power in the province of Manitoba. One of the first things they did was to make an arrangement to bring an American system of railways into that province. They held an election on it. They said: We have made an arrangement that is going to be very beneficial to the people of Manitoba. They had a portion of the line built, and when the legislature forced the premier to lay on the Table of the House what that arrangement was, what do you suppose was the great concession they had obtained? That the American railway would not charge any more than the Canadian Pacific Railway charged. That was the great concession the Liberals in the province of Manitoba gave to the farmers of that province for saddling them with a debt of close on $1,000,000, and they had absolutely no control of rates. However, when the Conservative party removed them from power, they very readily got rid of that incubus, and succeeded in buying back that portion of the American system for the people of Manitoba. They have leased that to a Canadian system, and it has been a success from that day to the present. We have the Liberals in Ottawa introducing legislation into this House, which, if they succeed in carrying it through, will saddle Manitoba and the North-west Territories with another system leading into the United States. That is what the Grand Trunk Railway Company wanted when they came to this House, and that is what they have got; and there is where the business is going during the ten years that you will be constructing your railroad. I say, Mr. Speaker, and I speak with some experience, that the railway between Moncton and Winnipeg—if it should ever be completed—will not be completed inside of ten years and during that time this system which you are bonusing to carry the products of that western country down to the United States will have become so well established that you will have great difficulty—if you ever do it—to bring it back to Canadian channels. The grain will go to Duluth and the ordinary frieght will go down over the Grand Trunk Railway to Chicago.

Let me give a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to the consideration of this line which the government is going to build—what the ex-

Minister of Railways and Canals calls the lean portion—and they will find it very lean before they get through with it, politically as well as commercially. The Canadian Pacific Railway is built, some people say, too close to the shores of Lake Superior, and this will be a disadvantage in case of trouble with the Americans. Well, that is not a matter worth mentioning. But the building of a line close to the shores of Lake Superior has been a great benefit to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It has given them several coaling stations. Jackfish, Fort William, and another place, Peninsula Harbour, I think it is, are ports where they bring in large quantities of coal and freight and supply the railway system up and down on the north shore of Lake Superior. But what port will this road have at which to procure anything of the kind? The government will have to haul all that freight and other stores and material back to this proposed line, 150 miles north of Lake Superior. Then, what is the arrangement about building this branch from Port Arthur back? Who builds that? The Grand Trunk Railway will have that, and if at any time there should be any trouble, who will own the branch that will carry the grain from Winnipeg to the waters of the lake? That is another question which has not been considered as thoroughly as it should. I say that this road to be built by the Dominion government will be at a very great disadvantage indeed, being built so far back, during the time of construction, and even after it has been completed. How or where is the company going to get its coal? Every one who knows anything about it can readily understand what it will cost to handle coal two or three times in order to get it back 150 miles away from the lakes as against the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has three or four coaling stations along that lake. And not alone that, but if any trouble should arise, that very important portion of this road will be held by the Grand Trunk Railway themselves. Then we come to the question of the cost of the road. That, I think, is a very important part, or at least it is going to be with the people of the North-west, because the cost of that road is going to come very largely into consideration. I want to be fair, and I propose to quote from the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who was put up, as the mouthpiece of the government, to reply to the ex-Minister of Railways anl Canals, and the government is consequently bound by his utterances in this respect, and none of the ministers have repudiated them. On page 8481 of 'Hansard,' you will find these words:

> No road can claim to be a first-class road with grades more than ont-half per cent or twenty-six feet to the mile. In the construction of this short line and in the construction of the line from Quebec to Winnipeg it should be an absolute condition that the road should be first-class in point of grades, in point of construction and in point of weight of rails. The rails should not be less than ninety-pound rails, and the grades should not be more than four-tenths per cent, and if these conditions are complied with this road will compete with a water-route or anything else.

I would like the government to produce a contract from some practical contractor on the information given to this House. I would like some practical contractor to be asked what he would construct a railway of that kind for. When the hon. gentleman speaks of building a road like that for $28,000 per mile, he shows his total ignorance of the subject. I say that we cannot get any practical railway man who has any reputation or any money to lose, who will agree to build a railway such as that for $28,000 per mile—no, nor for fifty thousand a mile. I question if you can get any man to build such a road as has been described by the mouthpiece of the government, for $60,000 per mile. I speak with some experience. I spent some years in railway construction. I was a contractor myself; I spent two years upon the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as assistant to Mr. M. J. Haney, building a portion of the road which the contractor had failed to complete between Rat Portage and Winnipeg—building a portion of the road that cost, not $26,000, not $50,000, but a great deal of it $85,000 per mile.

Mr. EARLE. Ninety pound rails?

Mr. BOYD. No, and no such grades and curves as the mouthpiece of the government says this road must have. Why, the thing is an absurdity. No man who has a reputation, no man who knows anything at all about it, no man who has any money to lose, would agree, upon the information laid before this House, to build such a road even for $60,000 per mile. It cannot be done. We have to look at the cost of other railways. Here is the Intercolonial Railway, which cost $53,000 per mile and over, the Canadian Pacific Railway, which cost $52,000 per mile, the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of Lake Superior, which cost $50,000 per mile, the Canada Atlantic Railway, which cost $50,000 per mile, the Grand Trunk Railway, which cost $106,000 per mile. Are any of these such roads as the mouthpiece of the government says this road shall be? No. Why, the mouthpiece of the government, this prospective minister, says that the grades on those other roads will not do at all. They are away behind the times, totally unfit to meet the present requirements of the country, and this road is to be built up to the latest requirements. Mark what I tell you, if you build such a road as that between Winnipeg and Moncton it will cost nearer $60,000 than $28,000.

An hon. MEMBER. What will it cost to buy the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. BOYD. That is a point I propose to touch on a little later. As was shown by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), the Grand Trunk Railway has paid only one and a quarter per cent on its capital. It has never paid a dividend on its ordinary stock of about $110,000,000, although its prospectus promised the exact figure of 11½ per cent, to say nothing of the $74,000,000 or $75,000,000 which it owes the people of Canada. Even the actuaries of the present day cannot figure it out any more nicely than does the prospectus of the Grand Trunk . They were to make 11½ per cent. And the Grand Trunk has 3,142 miles. It has paid a dividend of about $800 per mile. That road runs through a first-class country, Ontario and down to Chicago. It owes $202,000,000, and it manages to pay dividends on only one-quarter of the said debt, or $800 per mile. Yet it is expected to pay interest on $28,000 a mile, at 3 per cent, which would make $840 per mile—more, mark you, than it paid on its mileage last year. Or on say $50,000 per mile—and it will be a great deal nearer $50,000 than it is $28,000—they would pay $1,500 per mile. Now, I would like any man on that side of the House to show how the people of Manitoba and the North-west are going to get the relief that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) was apparently pleading for, through the building of this road under these conditions. Sir, it is an impossibility—it cannot be expected, and it will not be done.

Mr. SCOTT. Would it be given by buying the Canadian Pacific Railway line around the north shore of Lake Superior ?

Mr. BOYD. I will deal with that in due order. In the meantime, I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) that I am prepared to discuss that phase of it with him here or in any other place he may select to have it done. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) with all his astuteness—and he has no superior, no equal, in fact among the members of this House in that respect—could not figure out a better rate on this new line than 10.85 cents per bushel on wheat from Winnipeg to the seaboard, and in making this rate he was most unfair taking what the member for Peel designated a bargain day rate between Kansas City and Chicago to get even that rate. But look at the rate that exists to-day. From Winnipeg to Port Arthur, six cents per bushel ; Port Arthur to Depot Harbour, one cent per bushel ; Depot Harbour to Montreal, 2¼ cents per bushel, or a total from Winnipeg to Montreal of 9¼ cents per bushel. Thus, the rate actually charged to-day is 1.60 cents per bushel less than the very best that the Minister of the Interior could figure out as possible on this new line. This applied to the Minister of Agriculture's figures, 200,000,000 bushels, would make the saving to the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west of $2,200,000 by the use of the present route as compared with what would be charged if this new line of the government were in use and were carrying the grain at the rates estimated by the Minister of the Interior.

Now, is this project going to work out to the interests of the people in Manitoba ? Is it going to be a benefit to the grain growers of that province, and will it give them relief in respect to transportation facilities ? We find, as I have shown, that if grain is carried over it, it will cost 1.60 per bushel more than is charged by the rail and water route at the present time. By the time this new road is constructed, ten years hence, it is hard to say how much lower the freights by rail and water will be. It has been shown in this House over and over again that, as rapidly as the railroad rates fall those on the rail and water route go down equally. If the Minister of the Interior could do no better than he did, and if this road is being built as a grain-carrying road——

Mr. SCOTT. Was that not a winter rate entirely ?

Mr. BOYD. The minister's quotation was on the all-rail route as against the rail and water route. He estimated from Port Arthur, and he has no roads to Port Arthur and there is no provision made for a railroad to that point under control of the government. If they are to get to Port Arthur it will be by the grace of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk will charge what they please. This is an all-rail rate ; that is what he wanted——

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. BOYD. If that is the best that can be done, this is not a proposition that would recommend itself to the people of Manitoba and the North-west. It will not give them the relief that has been spoken about. As a colonization road, to open up a new portion of the country as a means of creating more railway competition in Manitoba and out into the territories, and as a means of affording railway facilities for those who have none now, why, of course it will be acceptable. Such railways are always acceptable, one or twenty of them. Now, what is the local trade that we may look for on that north shore of Lake Superior ?

Mr. BENNETT. Christmas trees.

Mr. BOYD. Yes, as the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) suggests, Christmas trees and woodpeckers, as it was stated by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in speaking of the immigration agent of the Ontario government. There is a crop of these almost all the time. The building up of any other business, however, is problematical. The possibility of settling these

lands while thousands, hundreds of thousands and millions of acres of good land in Manitoba and the North-west remain untilled, is very remote indeed. I do not believe that any man would be the friend of his son or his neighbour and advise that son or that neighbour to go into these wilds to make a home when he might direct him to the prairies of the west. But, suppose that the timber of which the hon. gentleman speaks is in existence to the north of us here, why should settlers be sent in there at this late date in the history of Canada to destroy that timber by cutting it down and burning it and so losing it to the country? Our timber, if of merchantable quality, is the most valuable asset we have in Canada to-day. Why, then, should it be burned up and destroyed, it must be if settlers are to go in there and make farms for themselves? The probability of these lands being settled by people who will make a business for the road is very remote indeed. It seems to me strange that the government of Ontario did not discover these lands years ago, especially strange when you consider how near they are to the city of Toronto. It is also strange to me why the government of Ontario did not give the volunteers their grants in these valuable agricultural lands instead of placing them, as they did, upon the rocks a mile square apart and with the pine timber reserved.

Mr. CLANCY. Where there was any.

Mr. BOYD. Yes, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) remarks, where there was any. When they wished to recompense these men for the sacrifices they had made it is strange that they did not give them these agricultural lands. It looks very much—and subsequent events have indicated the same thing—as if all this was due to the approach of an election. We do not hear so much about it now, at any rate. I could quote from page 23 of the pamphlets that the Grand Trunk Railway has issued and sent to members of the House the description of the country and of the business they expect to do there. As there will be no business done there possibly within the life of the present generation, what benefits are we likely to derive, we people in the west, from this road passing through the wilderness such as that will be at such an enormous cost as will be involved in the construction and operation of this road.

Now, Sir, I have shown that you cannot construct that road at any such price as the government has intimated. No man knows the distance, no man in this House can tell the cost per mile, no man can tell where it is to be located, and no man can tell what benefit it is going to be to the people, especially to the people of the west. Under these circumstances, why this hurry, why this anxiety? After sitting here for seven years, what has occurred to make this departure necessary? We are told that there was great congestion in that country in 1901 and 1902, but the government did nothing then. Now, Mr. Speaker, when there is no likelihood of congestion this year, or possibly next year, owing to the great increase in the rolling stock of these two railways, why this hysteria on the part of the government? Well, some hon. gentlemen say that time won't wait. I think the extract I read from that paper printed over a year ago explains the whole reason, as showing the manner in which the Grand Trunk Railway Company expects to handle this business. The whole question is wrapped up in uncertainty. There has been nothing but 'perhaps' and 'ifs' presented to this House as reasons for voting away $174,000,000. That seems to be the only certain thing that we know in regard to it. According to the statement of the mouthpiece of the government who was put up to reply to the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, there is no possibility that the government will get any return for their money, there is no possibility of any lowering of rates, in fact it is almost certain that no lowering of rates will take place under these conditions.

Now, Sir, I have always been a believer in the extension of the Intercolonial across the continent, and I still believe that it would be a governor of the rates, and as such it would certainly be a great benefit to all the people of the country. It is bound to be a great benefit to the railway itself. If it is removed from political control—and it will have to be removed from political control, it can be removed from political control—when that is done, I am satisfied that if this road were constructed across the continent it would be a great national benefit. In this connection I may say that I would like to see a branch built to the Hudson's bay. When this road reaches across the continent the country may well look for some control of rates; for some relief from high freight rates. I am not prepared to go so far as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) and to purchase the whole railroad system of this country. At the same time, I would like to see the Intercolonial cross this continent, and if that proved a success, then the extension of the principle of government ownership would follow in the natural course of events. Now the proposition of the leader of the opposition is the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Georgian bay, and I am in favour of that idea. But what may we expect from that? We have absolute control of rates in the province of Manitoba, we control the rates over almost every portion of that province, and in a few years I expect the extension of the Canadian Northern into the Territories, when the same control will I presume apply. It has been shown repeatedly in this House that one cent a bushel carries grain across Lake Superior, then when it

comes to the Georgian bay and passes into the hands of a government road, any person will readily see that we have in that case almost absolute control of the carriage across the lakes. Competition will keep the rate at the lowest possible point and in that way the people would have almost absolute control of rates. You can readily see what benefit that will be to the farmers in Manitoba and to the people in the east, because the managers of the Intercolonial in that case will be able to say where the freight should go ; and they will take it undoubtedly to Canadian ports, to Montreal in the summer season, and to Quebec and the maritime province ports in winter.

We are told by the Minister of the Interior that the Intercolonial Railway has not paid in the past. Why has it not paid ? The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals told us when he was at the head of that department, and he was loudly applauded by the hon. gentlemen who then sat around him, why it did not pay. If I charged, said he, the same rates as are charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, I could make one or two millions a year. It has not paid because the rates have been low. Another reason why it has not paid is because it is located, as I understand, in Montreal where it receives no through freight from any railroad ; or if it receives any, it is a very small amount, and practically it has to depend upon its local freight business ; what it may pick up in the city of Montreal, and along its line. When you come to carry that railroad to the shores of the inland seas, and place it in a position to compete with traffic across the lakes, when you place that railroad in a position to receive a great portion of the business from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, then you will find a magnificent business for that road ; you will be doing good to the west and good to the east, and you will be building up your whole system. I think that will mean a great deal more business for the lower provinces, a great deal more business for the winter ports in which the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) is so deeply interested. Because you cannot carry wheat down there, and if you are not going to carry wheat on your proposed Grand Trunk Pacific, what business are you going to do ? I am told on very good authority that the average freight movement over the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior, is one train and a half per day.

Well, if that is all that the Canadian Pacific Railway has now in the carriage of freight, then when the Grand Trunk Pacific is running around, as it will, by Duluth and Chicago, what are you going to carry over your road, even admitting that the great increase which we expect and hope for takes place ? Where is the business in ordinary freight that is to accumulate around our winter ports ? You cannot haul wheat ; that has been conclusively shown. Therefore, I claim that by constructing this road to the Georgian bay—and a modern road 380 miles long could be constructed with easy grades, a road on which you would be able to haul trains of 60 or 70 cars—you would be doing something that would be profitable to the people of the west, profitable to the Intercolonial, and profitable to the winter ports. That road would be bound to secure business, and I am satisfied that when the proposal of the leader of the opposition has been studied and weighed and considered by the people of Canada, it will appeal to their better reason. The closing words of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) were that no road without a paying connection is any good. The Intercolonial Railway has not a paying connection at the present time, but it would have a paying connection if it were extended to the Georgian bay and thence on across the continent. In order to support the position that was taken by the hon. leader of the opposition, I wish here to quote a portion of an interview with Mr. Meighen, president of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, one of the largest shippers of heavy freight from the province of Manitoba. This interview was given on August 6th, before the proposal of the leader of the opposition had been submitted to this House, and it bears out almost to the letter what the leader of the opposition said. This gentleman has had as much experience in this matter as any man in Canada, because the whole business of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company is a matter of freights, the grinding of flour and the passing of their goods on to the market. This interview appeared in the St. John 'Telegraph' on August 6th, and is headed 'All-rail route no good for grain.' It is as follows :—

> You will never bring the products of Manitoba or the North-west, either by the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk Pacific, or an all-rail route around the north of Lake Superior to our Canadian ports ; neither will you ever bring but a small portion by our Canadian canals, east of the Soo.
>
> These are the words of Robert Meighen, president of the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, who arrived in St. John yesterday, to attend the annual meeting of the New Brunswick Railway Company.
>
> Mr. Meighen is emphatic in his declaration that the lakes must be taken into account in any scheme of transportation for the grain of the great west. Only a portion, he says, of the products of our western prairies will ever be handled through Canadian ports by an all-rail route north of Lake Superior, or even through the canal system.
>
> What are needed, he says, are double-track railways from Montreal to Georgian bay, and ample elevator space there to store grain for shipment by rail to St. John and Halifax—when navigation is closed to the St. Lawrence. If wheat is purchased in Brandon, or west of that point after October 25, the shipper cannot get it through the canals. He has only two alternatives—he can store it in the elevator, or send

it forward to Fort William, and from there to Buffalo, and on by rail to an American winter port. For it can be taken from Fort William to Buffalo until early in December.

Now, said Mr. Meighen, what Canada needs is facilities on Georgian bay for receiving grain, and railways to carry it on via Montreal to St. John and Halifax. It could be shipped from Fort William to Georgian bay ports up to the 12th of December, and elevators there could be filled to provide trainloads of grain for the whole winter, to be shipped from our own winter ports. At present a large amount of our grain goes by way of Buffalo.

You can get ports on Georgian bay that will give you a grade to Montreal over which eighty cars of grain could be hauled in a single train.

With sufficient elevator capacity at Georgian bay ports, and railway from there to Montreal, you can cut out Buffalo, and give the Canadian grain trade to Canadian ports. You can freight wheat across the lake from Fort William to Georgian bay ports for one cent, and from there to Montreal for three and a half cents, or less, per bushel winter and summer.

Our canals are closed for six months in the year. With elevators at Georgian bay you can store there all the grain that is too late to be forwarded by the St. Lawrence route, and with proper railway facilities from those elevators to Montreal you can send this grain on to St. John and Halifax.

'When the foregoing is accomplished,' said Mr. Meighen, 'our western prairies will ship their products by an all-Canadian route, and only a portion of them will ever be handled through Canadian ports under our canal system or an all-rail route north of Lake Superior.'

Mr. Meighen is very emphatic in his declaration that Canadian ports should get the western trade in winter as well as in summer. St. John and Halifax, he says, are a part of Canada, and their claims deserve support.

Asked if he favoured extending the Intercolonial Railway to Georgian bay, Mr. Meighen replied that he had no suggestion to offer on that point, further than what he had already stated. Railways and elevators were needed, and should be in some way provided.

This is the statement of a gentleman who has possibly given that aspect of the transportation question more consideration than any other man in Canada, and, as I have said, this statement was made some days, or even weeks, before the proposition of the leader of the opposition was laid before this House. I think, Sir, that these are words which should recommend themselves to the people of this country ; and I believe that they will. I have also a quotation from Mr. Ashdown, who in Winnipeg said :

I, personally, would have preferred the government not only to have owned the eastern section, but owned and operated the whole.

And Mr. Ashdown is one of the gentlemen quoted by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) during his remarks.

Then, here is the opinion of Mr. Fisher, who for many years was president of the Liberal Association of Manitoba and who has stood high in the ranks of the Liberal party. He is a Liberal to-day, a gentleman who is no political friend of the Conservative party, and whom I have found opposed to me in nearly every political campaign I have been engaged in in Manitoba. Here is what he says :

I confess I entertain some doubt as to whether the proposed route will be a valuable competitor in the near future, owing to the location. What Manitoba needs above all things is the shortest and cheapest route to Lake Superior. I doubt if much of our wheat for a long time to come, will be carried all-rail. That is, I doubt if for a long time to come any road can afford to carry it all-rail. It strikes me that the proposed line is so far north as not to give so favourable a route as either the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern. Perhaps the most valuable addition to our transportation facilities at the present time would be the double tracking of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Lake Superior, because it is, I believe, the shortest exclusive Canadian route to the great lakes, and will continue for many years to come the great funnel through which our grain will pass outward to the east ; and my doubt is that whether with a line so far north, the cost of operating through a country little known and in which the local traffic is not a measurable quantity the cost will not be so heavy as to make the rates excessively high.

There is the opinion of a gentleman who is no friend of the Conservative party, no friend of the leader of the opposition ; a gentleman who has spent a quarter of a century in the province of Manitoba ; a man of ability and of intelligence and discernment ; a gentleman who was selected by the Greenway government to represent them on the expedition that went to the Hudson bay ; that is the opinion of that gentleman on the western portion of the scheme of the leader of the opposition. I have given you the opinion on the eastern portion of that scheme, by one of the largest shippers in Canada. We cannot overlook these opinions. There is no place in the Dominion of Canada where the people are giving, day by day, the question of transportation such consideration as they do in the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba generally. When you get such an opinion as that from a gentleman who is not a political friend of ours, it ought to cause the government supporters to pause. I fear they will not be impressed by anything that might be said from this side of the House, but an opinion such as this is worthy of their serious consideration. A great deal has been said about the routing of freight over the government road. Well, if you want to control the routing and the rating retain the railroad in your own hands. That is the only way to do it. Not a gentleman on the other side of the House has yet proven that the Grand Trunk Railway is bound to send one dollar's worth of its freight to any eastern port in this country.

What we in the west want is cheaper freight rates, especially for our cattle and our grain. I claim that the proposition submitted by the government will not secure that for us. I claim that under the conditions on which this road is to be constructed

the settlers of the west cannot hope for cheaper rates. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad is to be capitalized west of Winnipeg at $56,660 per mile. That capitalization is as high as the present capitalization of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The capitalization of the Canadian Northern Railway, controlled by the Manitoba government is $12,500 a mile. How can you charge cheap freight rates on a road capitalized so high as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway? And who is going to get that $20,000,000 of common stock. No one has yet told us where that portion of the $56,000 per mile is going. I have no doubt that is some of the watered stock that the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) referred to. I have tried, Mr. Speaker, to lay before the House my views on this subject. I am opposed, Mr. Speaker to this scheme which you are largely instrumental in giving to this country. The leader of the government pleaded for immediate relief for the traffic of the west. We will get no immediate relief from this road, which will not be constructed for the next ten years at least. The member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) spoke for an hour and the only advantage he could claim for the road was that it would give additional railway facilities and consequently competition. It has not been shown yet and it cannot be shown that this road will give cheaper freight rates. If you go ahead with this enterprise you will involve the country in enormous expense. That expenditure being such a heavy burden on the country it will prevent us grappling with other schemes which are an absolute necessity for Canada.

On the other hand the scheme submitted by the leader of the opposition will commence to pay immediately. If we acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway and make it a portion of the Intercolonial Railway, it will commence to pay at once. The plan of the government is uncertain as to its completion, and it is bound to be expensive. By our plan we will own the road, but by the government plan the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway owns the road and have control of the rates. But, Sir, there is one thing certain about the government scheme, and that is its enormous cost. It would seem as if the government and those who were pressing them on are more anxious as to what the results will be at the approaching elections than they are as to what benefits their project will confer on the people of the North-west and Canada generally. The member for West Huron (Mr. Holmes) told us that no one on this side had given information as to the cost of the proposal of the leader of the opposition, and the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) followed him in that assertion. Well, if they had listened to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) they would have had full information on that point, but when a member on this side speaks hon. gentlemen opposite get out. They don't want any information or any enlightenment. When one of their own side speaks, they pile into the chamber and start hammering their desks..

An hon. MEMBER. We are here now.

Mr. BOYD. Yes, there are a quorum of you here, but if you could do with less you would not be here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) is not very successful amongst his own friends.

Mr. BOYD. It is Friday night, we all know what that means.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So it is on this side.

Mr. BOYD. Well, I am making the same retort as was made by the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). Now, Sir, we already have the Intercolonial Railway from Halifax to Montreal and the distances and cost involved in the scheme proposed by the leader of the opposition have been given by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) as follows :

Montreal to Coteau Junction, 30 miles at $40,000 a mile	$ 1,200,000
Coteau Junction to Depot Harbour, 342 miles, with equipment	12,000,000
Scotia Junction to Sudbury, 104 miles at $40,000	4,160,000
Interest during construction	200,000
Sudbury to Fort William, 555 miles	25,000,000
Betterments	3,000,000
Fort William to Winnipeg, 426 miles at $30,000	12,780,000
Betterments	2,100,000
Total	$ 60,440,000

Against this you have the government project, which I have shown will cost $174,000,000. With the plan of the hon. leader of the opposition we give immediate relief to the people of the west; we give the people of Canada immediate control of rates not only in the west, but in the east; we give business to the Intercolonial Railway, and we make the property profitable. For my part I want to see the Intercolonial extended further than is proposed. I hope the day is not far distant when we shall see it across this continent controlling the rates. There is no question about the success that is bound to attend this proposition. Before we leave this House, we shall very likely be able to bring the government around to our way of thinking. I am prepared to make this challenge: Let this House submit the proposal of the leader of the opposition and the proposal of the leader of the government to three or five of the best expert, practical railway men in America; and if they do not say that the proposal of the leader of the opposition is a better solution of the problem than the one that has been submitted by the government, they can have my support. But they are not likely

to receive for their proposal the endorsement of any practical and experienced railroad men.

I claim that this government has no mandate from the people on this question. It was never discussed by the people and they have had no opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. I claim that they should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it before it is made law, and I do not think the opposition will be fulfilling their duty in this House if they permit this measure to pass until the people of this country have that opportunity. If my views are entertained in the councils of the opposition, they will not permit this measure to pass in the form in which the government expect to carry it, regardless of what time it may take in order to give the public an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon it. It is an enormous expenditure and an enormous undertaking—an undertaking that very few people in this country know anything about, that very few men in this House know anything about; and before asking us to vote such an enormous amount of money to build a railroad through what is practically a wilderness, so far as we are able to learn, and thereby leave it impossible for us to undertake the many other great enterprises required for the benefit of the country for possibly fifty years to come, it is the duty of the government to give the people of this country an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. If the government and their supporters are as sanguine as they claim to be, and as much in earnest as they pretend to be when applauding their speakers, they should be willing to say: We are so certain of the merits of this scheme that we will let it stand, and after the session we will go to the country and fight it out. As the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) said, let us all act as Canadians, and let us work in the best interests of the country. Sir, I am prepared to say if the government will submit this question to the people, and the people say yes, it is the best proposal, and we want you to go ahead with it, we on this side of the House will say, all right, we will join with you and push it to a success as fast as we possibly can; and we will not act as the Liberal party acted during the time of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We will not decry the road and the country through which it passes, and make it embarrassing for the people who are carrying on the work, to finance it; but you will find the opposition, if we are in opposition, after the people have an opportunity of expressing their opinion, giving your great scheme, as it would then be, but as it is not now, our full approval and support.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, there is no place in the Dominion of Canada where this matter has such vital interest for the people as it has in the west. I have made a study of this question to the best of my ability, as every other man in the west has done. Our way of making money, in the meantime, at least, and our way of spreading money through eastern Canada, has largely been by raising and shipping wheat. We have spent throughout Canada between $35,000,000 and $40,000,000 which we received for last year's crop, and we spent nearly as much the year before; and that money has been realized largely from the wheat that we have raised. We will do a good deal more in the future. This is a matter that the government should think very seriously about, and before this measure is made law, I trust that they will satisfy themselves that they are acting in a manner that is going to be in the best interests of the people of the west and of the whole of Canada. I have no hesitation in saying that their scheme is not, in my opinion, going to give immediate relief. I do not believe it is going to give relief at any time in the matter of the haulage of that wheat which has made the millions which we have circulated in the country and which will make the millions which we hope to circulate throughout Canada in the future. A very serious responsibility rests upon the people who are governing this country at the present time, as a false step now may have very serious results in the future.

I have said that I am not in favour of the proposal of the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), who proposes that we should take charge of all the railroads of this country; but I am in favour of the extension of the government system, and I propose, Mr. Speaker, with your permission, to close my remarks by moving an amendment to the amendment. I beg to move:

> That all the words in the amendment after the word 'policy' in the third line be left out and the following substituted: 'of extending and developing our system of government railway and of placing the operation thereof entirely beyond the influence of party politics.'

Mr. T. G. JOHNSTON (Lambton). At this late hour, Mr. Speaker, I shall take up but a very few moments; but before speaking to the subject, I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite what authority they have for constantly taunting us with dissenting and disagreeing among ourselves. Evidently, in their case the wish is father to the thought. But let me inform these hon. gentlemen that when, by any chance, dissensions or disagreements do take place on this side, either a resignation occurs or is asked for. We are not given to backbiting or going out on strike, and in that respect the present cabinet is in striking contrast with its predecessor. The present cabinet has completely changed the aspect of Canadian government and Canadian public life. The low standard of public life. the unseemly strife, the undermining, the

corruption and all that sort of thing which formerly prevailed, and of which the last Conservative administration was so striking an example, have all disappeared and been replaced by a spirit of confidence and honour among public men and an aggressive policy on the part of the government, which command the admiration and confidence of the country. As this debate goes on from day to day the policy of the government gains in strength. The reasons given in support of that policy are in marked contrast with the chaotic argument furnished by the opposition, who seem to have no idea of union among themselves except the union of opposition, who seem to be guided by no particular principles, who lay down contradictory policies, and who fail utterly to agree, not only in their attacks on the government policy, but in their support of the position taken by their own leader. As these hon. gentlemen address the House one after another, we are more and more at a loss to know what it is they really do want, except to get back into office at any price and by any possible means.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to go into any details regarding the cost of the road, because that has been thoroughly gone into by speakers on both sides who have preceded me. But I wish to put myself on record as thoroughly and as strongly in favour of the project submitted to us by the government. This road proposed by the government will pass from the Atlantic to the Pacific all through Canadian soil.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he is at the Atlantic when he reaches Moncton ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly ; Moncton is on the Atlantic.

Mr. SPROULE. I am afraid it will be a poor ocean port.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Lambton). I say that this road will go from the Atlantic to the Pacific on Canadian soil and will serve a threefold purpose. In the first place, it will be a colonization road, which will promote settlement and local development, passing from the north-west to the south-east. Through New Brunswick it will open up a most fertile country, heretofore undeveloped, and in doing this, it will not parallel the Intercolonial Railway, but, on the contrary, by developing new resources which have hitherto lain dormant and thus increasing traffic generally, it will be an advantage to the Intercolonial Railway. Through the province of Quebec it will develop magnificent water powers and mineral regions, which will, in all probability, in the comparatively near future, become manufacturing centres of this great continent. Going through Ontario, it will develop an immense extent of arable and timber land and mineral resources of the extent of which we can now form no adequate idea. Through Manitoba and the territories it will go over the old Mackenzie route, now recognized to be the one which should have originally been taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will pass through a section of country which is the home of the finest hard wheat in the world. Then, in British Columbia it will develop a country which is blessed with a climate and soil and resources that are unequalled. It will be a national road, which, by creating a certain amount of interdependence among the provinces, will strengthen confederation. It will be further a national highway and a link in the commerce around the world. We all know the extent of the commerce upon the Orient that has been developed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we may reasonably expect a much greater development to take place in that commerce on the completion of this road.

So far as the agreement made by the government with the Grand Trunk Pacific is concerned, I cannot see how a firmer and tighter contract could have been made. I do not see how the interests of the people could have been better safeguarded than they are by this agreement. In fact, what strikes me is that the contract is such a hard and fast one, looking at it from the standpoint of the people, that I am surprised at the company accepting it. In every possible respect the interests of the public have been guarded. That cannot be said of the proposition submitted by the hon. leader of the opposition. What he would have us do is to buy up the existing railways which are running through a developed country, buy up roads that have already been subsidized by the government. On the contrary, our idea was to go on and develop a new country, almost a new Canada, with resources in timber, mines and agriculture as yet unknown and undeveloped, which, when completed will more than ever emphasize the fact that we are a growing young nation. Lying to the south of us is a nation with a population fourteen times our own. The constant tendency of our young men is to leave home and engage in various occupations in that country. When our policy is carried out, as I say, it will enlarge our working territory, it will increase our advantages in every possible way, it will keep our young men at home, and will develop the country that we are all so proud of. Of course, it is absolutely necessary that a policy of some sort should be announced by the opposition, and we have had one presented, composed of all sorts of immature propositions such as might be presented by any irresponsible person utterly incapable of accomplishing or carrying out what he proposed. The policy of the government has been described as a hybrid policy. It would be fair to characterize the policy of the opposition as the same.

Mr. SCOTT. Only more so.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Lambton). Yes, probably, a little more so. Now, in all seriousness, several members of the opposition have asked for an appeal to the country on these two rival policies. I have no doubt whatever that, if the truth were known, they, in their hearts are not honest in their expressions of opinion. To a very great extent, they agree with us in our line of action, and it is only party exigencies and not patriotic motives that influence them in the course that they have taken. I heard with great pleasure the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) express the wish that the young men of our country should be better and more properly educated and inspired. I can suggest no better way for their education and their inspiration than for them to realize that we who are the descendants of those who preserved Canada to the British Crown, thoroughly appreciate the responsibilities we are undertaking and are willing still further to incur responsibility in the worthy cause of our country's development. I say we are the descendants of those who preserved Canada to the British Crown. And this is true. In 1776 our French Canadian compatriots resisted the invaders, and in 1812, at Chateauguay and Lundy's Lane, men of both races co-operated towards the same good end. It is for us to prove ourselves no mean descendants of those ancestors and to leave to those who come after us a worthy and lasting heritage.

Now, I must say, I have been a little perturbed by the lateness of the hour, and have not made the remarks I intended making. Let me say briefly that I believe in the construction of this road, and my reasons for doing so are these: The policy of the government appeals to me because it is patriotic. It will develop our country and keep our young men within our own borders, will increase our commerce and make us a nation. It is based upon a strong and earnest belief in the magnificent and certain future greatness of our country. It is practicable. It will have the further effect of strengthening confederation. As I said before, it will give a certain amount of provincial independence without having any tendency to decrease provincial inter-dependence. It will have an elevating effect on national thought and aspiration. It will promote immigration, settlement and commerce and conduce to the maintenance and furtherance of prosperity in every sphere. It is within our means. We are financially able to stand it without feeling the burden. It is thoroughly in accord with the energetic, go-ahead, optimistic spirit which has permeated this country ever since the quickening influence of Liberal rule was felt. And, when Canada becomes a nation, a great nation, as she assuredly will, the building of this transcontinental road will be found to have been no mean factor in her growth and advancement.

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

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1903.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward.*

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Collection, &c. (Ques.) 14684 (vi).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 12703 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 75) 12705 (v).

——— Pets *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13274 (vi).

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13134 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, armoury) 13133 ; Dom. (rentals, &c.) 13133 ; Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13129 ; Ont. (Cobourg, P.O. 13118 ; (Deseronto, P. O.) 13113 ; (Picton, P.O.) 13113 (vi).

Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5192 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10349 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6493 (iii).

Archambault, Mr. J. E., *Berthier.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co's. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10071 (iv).

Avery, Mr. M. *Addington.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5461 (iii).

Avery, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14007 (vi).

Ry. Act Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4710 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11606 (v).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4107 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wolfe Island, shoal) 13252 (vi) : Que. (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 ; (Grande Valleé, pier) 1515 ; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 : St. Alexis Bay) 2290 (i) ; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13345 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Ball, Mr. G., *Nicolet.*

Atlantic & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 446 ; 2° m., 852, 1505 (i).

Budget, The, 2234 (i).

Chambly Canal Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Drill Hall, St. Johns, Que., Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10165 (v)

Moreau, H., Collector, Chambly Canal, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).

Ottawa & Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) M. to ref. back to Com., 6617 (iii).

St. Johns, Que., Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 12496 (v).

Barker, Mr. S., *Hamilton.*

Audit Act. Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Auditor General and Civil Service Amt. B. (remarks) in Com., 13808 (vi).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) in Com., 5987 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7426 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4963 (ii) 5623, 5634, 5786 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5883 (iii).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4420 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 830 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com on Res., 12521 (ii), in Com. on B., 13808 (vi).

Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3394 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (Compulsory Voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 909 (i), 14416 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12296 (v).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2410 (i).

Govt. Railways Act Amt. B. 258: *See* 'Ry. Act' B.

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5156 (iii), 7852; on M. for 3°, 8062 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8593 (iv); in Com., 10446, 11190, 11249, 11377, 11835, 11918, 11972, 11999, 12187, 12263 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12768 (vi).

G. T. Pacific, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits (remarks) 14848 (vi).

Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).

I. C. R., Expenditure Chargeable to Capital (remarks) 14107 (vi).

——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3669 (ii).

——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Cars, &c., in Stock, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).

——— Trackmen: *See* 'Trackmen.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10762, 11410 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5093 (ii).

Montreal Terminal Co. (remarks) 6097 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12326 (v).

Ont. & Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2716 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Over-Expenditures by Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iii).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10796 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing census schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7063 (iii).

Public Works Dept. Control and Management B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14741 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1336 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); on M. for Com., 2590; in Com., 2598, 3563, 3723, 3833, 3887 (ii); 5252, 5569, 5682, 5768, 6073, 6087, 6179, 6214, 6244 (iii), 8153 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13841; (remarks) *re* Free Conference, 14760 (vi).

Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12576 (v); in Com. on B., 12952 (vi).

Railway Appropriations, Transfer, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on Sen. Amets., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1241 (i); in Com. (Brant) 11101, 11032; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12438 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6521 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7063 (iii); (contingencies) 4353; (postage, &c.) 4355 (ii).

Canals: Trent (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7558 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Finance (Insurance) 12586 (v).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7782 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 6000 (iii).

Militia (Hamilton drill hall) 6950 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 12589; (Dom. and Prov. arbitration) 12591; (Paris agency) 12589 (v).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5841; N.S. (Arichat) 5830; (Middleton armoury) 5841; (Military college) 5842; Toronto post office) 5842 (iii); Ottawa (census building) 991; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 435 (i).

Barker, Mr. Saml—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1454; Generally (dredges, repairs) 2615; Man. (Lake Francis outlet) 1449; Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Wendover wharf) 1435 (i); Que. (Hull wharf) 5901; (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726; (engineers' salaries) 2726; (surveys, &c.) 2721 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691(ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Mar. Provs., cables) 2709 (ii); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii).

Railways: G.T.R. (rentals) 12890 (vi).

I.C.R. (air brakes, freights) 8282; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 3699 (ii), 8272 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12602 (v), 14094 (vi); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v); (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw-bars, exchange) 8288 (iv); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (Miramichi bridge) 8309 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12599 (v); (Moncton, station) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312 (iv); (original construction) 3698 (ii); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14101 (vi); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081; (steel rails, &c.) 14098 (vi); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).

Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A.) 2726 (ii).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown station) 14131 (vi); (general vote) 12608 (v); (Hillsborough bridge) 14108, 14116 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9419 (iv).

Trackmen on I. C. R., Wages Increase, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14087 (vi).

Transportation Commission, Sir Wm. Van Horne's Views, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).

Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14475 (vi).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9152 (iv).

Beith, Mr. R., *Durham W.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Bowmanville) 511 (i).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*

Chicoutimi and North-eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. (B. 168) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10224 (v).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dymont*) on Ques. of Order, 7342. (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 1643 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337, 12505, 12567 (v); on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 7508 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14418 (vi).

Dom. Gas Improvement Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1193 (i).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8246 (iv).

Federal Oil Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 367 (i).

G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted and 'Debates' not being reported (ruling) 10633 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14849 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 758 (i),

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Wade*) to conc., 8042 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 2° m., 1512.

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 3° m., 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Electric Ry. Co.'s (B. 108) 1°*, 1378 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1318 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864, 5868 (iii).

Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1023 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6302 (iii).

Ry. Debts. Bill: *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

SUPPLY:

Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6027; (ry. mail clerks) 6027 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa post-office) 438 (i).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13796 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Lord Alverstone's Communication, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* 13671 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14819 (vi).

Amherst Postoffice, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4249 (ii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14193 (vi).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11170 (v).

Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) 13811 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6360 (iii).

Budget, The, 1907 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5053, 5074 (ii), 5432 (iii).

Canadian Mail via New York, Tons, &c. (Ques.) 10713 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co. Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4367 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B. (remarks) 267 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 368 (i).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13740 (vi).

See: Supply—Agriculture.'

Chamberlain, Mr.: *See* 'Militia Act.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13811 (vi).

Clergue Co. and Govt. Contract *re* Steel Rails (remarks) 14098 (vi).

Commanders of Govt. Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii.)

Conciliators, Settlement of Labour Disputes, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).

Customs Act (Surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3076 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 583 (i).

Dom. Elections Act. Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to ref. to Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6913 (iii).

Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).

Financial Review (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 68) 14642 (vi).

Fire at Mortimer & Co.'s, Govt. property destroyed (Ques.) 4836 (ii).

Fishing within Three-Mile Limit, Guysboro, N. S. (remarks) 4179 (ii).

Govt. Rys. Act Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12583 (v).

Govt. Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5167 (iii); on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9784 (iv), 11213, 11243, 11368, 11936, 11991 (v); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 12772 (vi).

———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13287 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, 13286 (vi).

See 'Ry. Policy.'

Halifax Marine and Fishery Offices, Resolution of City Council, Tel. (read) 14279 (vi).

House of Commons, Clerks, &c.: *see* 'Civil Service B.'

Hurley, Mr. (remarks) 13744 (vi).

Hydraulic Dredge, Mar. Provs. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13319 (vi).

Hydraulic Leases, Yukon Ter. (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6577 (iii).

I.C.R., Free Transportation, Names, &c. (M. for ret.) 2337 (i).

General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).

——— Lorne Siding, Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ques.) 2918 (ii).

——— Rates for Cattle and Coal, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7975 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4279 (ii).

Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 4003 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8213 (iv).

Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).

Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Mail *via* New York: *see* 'Can. Mail,' &c.

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, sent from H. of C., 14536, 14574 (vi).

Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5995 (iii).

Militia Act. Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 186 (i).

Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers, &c. (Ques.) 3631 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 12811 (vi).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe (remarks) 13988 (vi).

N. S. and Can., Financial Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3001 (i).

Parliamentary Librarians: *see* 'Librarians.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep. Distribution, &c. (remarks) 879 (i).

Pugwash, N.S. Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidies B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14696 (vi).

'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7121 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14370 (vi).

Railway Subsidies *re* Provinces, &c. (remarks) 14687 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028; in Com. (N.S.) 11809 (v).

Safe purchased by Bank of N. S., Customs Duties *re* (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Scotch Hill Station, Pets, *re* (Ques.) 872 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6494, 7214 (iii).

Springhill, N.S., Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 1856 (i).

Steel Rails: *See* 'Clergue,' &c.

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, Coté's circular) 4661; (general statistics) 4429 (ii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 12585 (v); (public dept) 14254 (vi).

Civil Government: Customs (salaries) 325 (i).

Customs (preferential tariff) 3937 (ii).

Excise (adulteration of food, &c.,) 5389; (analysts, &c.) 5389 (iii).

Fisheries (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fishways) 4174 (ii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr. appnmt.) 6818; (explorations, &c.) 6818 (iii).

Indians: Mar. Provs. (schools) 6414 (iii).

Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Legislation: H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14113 (vi); (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries) 4132; (Montreal pilot commission) 4173; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4159 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6000 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Art Gallery) 12589; (Mining Institute) 12591 (vi.)

N. W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (arrears of salaries, postmasters) 5922; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923; (salaries, &c.) 5924 (iii).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 982 (i); (ventilation of Chamber) 13007; Quebec (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military iron foundry) 14247 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176; N.S. (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Glace Bay) 1094; (Meteghan Cove) 1137 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur dredging) 13021 (vi).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917.

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3700; (Lévis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow freight shed) 14096; (Pictou accommodation) 14088; (rolling stock) 14101; (steel rails) 14098 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8299 (iv).

Yukon Ter. (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tariff Policy of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4912 (ii).

Thanksgiving Day, Adjournment (remarks) 13379.

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, &c. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

——— Hydraulic Leases, &c. (M. for cor.*) 288.

——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 5242 (iii).

——— Tel. from Dawson Board of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 1195 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796 (ii).

Voters' Lists, N.S.: *See* 'Electoral.'

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1044 (i).

Yukon, Hydraulic Leases: *See* 'Hydraulic.'

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *E. Simcoe.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 6629 (iii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Bayfield, Str., Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5742 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12761 (vi).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., &c., 108 (i).

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ques.) 2757 (ii).

Collingwood Dock, Estimated Cost (remarks) 5871 (iii).

Collingwood Harbour Dry Dock, &c.: Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4016 (ii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2308.

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ques.) 7914 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 895; in Com., 902 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007, 4679 (ii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Timber Licenses, &c. (Ques,) 2757 (ii).

Grain Importation through Western Lake Ports (Ques.) 97 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9198 (iv); in Com. on B., 10607, 11372, 11871, 12076; on M. for 3°, 12761; (amt.) 12767 (v).

G. T. Pacific Bill, Pets., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13276 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Barrie, Customs Collector, Sureties, &c. (Ques.) 5991 (iii).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks) 207, 215 (i).

I.C.R., Stations, Restaurants, Fire Protection, &c. (Ques.) 14663 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7970 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10765, 10771; in Com. on B., 11420 (vi).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8089 (iv).

Longford, Output of Wood Alcohol, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7918 (iv).

Mail Bags, Repairs, &c., in Aurora, Remarks in Com. of Sup, 6139 (iii).

Midland Water Front *re* Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 173 (i).

Moose Deer Point Islands, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co., *re* Personal Explanation (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).

Orillia Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Ottawa Supply Co., *re* P.O. Contracts, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Pratt & Co., Lease of Water Front at Midland: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11564 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11467, 11611, 11617, 12294 (v).

Ronan, W. and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12719 (vi).

Soulanges Canal, Stewart *vs.* King (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Standard Chemical Company, Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).

Stewart *vs.* King, Litigation Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census, Cote's circular) 4667; (Simcoe census) 4825; (Diamond Baker Lumber Co.'s exhibit) 4613; (St. Louis exhibition) 4612 (ii).

Canals—Peterborough (lift lock) 12927 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7556 (iii).

Civil Government: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 207; Railways (salaries) 340 (i).

Customs (Midland collector) 3912; (salaries) 3911 (ii).

Dom. Lands (inspector's expenses) 6768; (land guides) 6768 (iii).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5408 (iii).

Excise (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5285; (Collins, inspector, &c.) 5131; (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5131; (steamers, &c.) 5283; (water front lease, Midland) 5294 (iii).

Indians: Generally (legal expenses) 6419; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 6423; (medical attendance) 6329; N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348; (supplies) 6423; Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6339; (survey reserves) 6410; Que. (Waby trial) 6419 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise examinations) 5363; (Standard Chemical Co.) 227 (i), 5363 (iii).

Justice (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 5735 (iii).

Militia (Martineau investigation) 3753; (Valleyfield strike) 3593, 3754 (ii).

Post Office (jubilee stamps) 6060; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6146 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland armoury) 13133; (Rossland P.O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi); **Dom.** (Orillia, caretaker) 1016; Generally (armouries) 968 (i); **N.B.** (Marysville) 5835 (iii); **N.W.T.** (Macleod, court house) 959; (Red Deer, court house) 960 (i); **N.S.** (Arichat) 5827; (Guysborough) 5839; (Middleton armoury) 5841 (iii); **Ont.** (Alexandria P.O.) 488 (i); (Deseronto P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Midland) 5832 (iii); (Orillia armoury) 968; (Orillia, caretaker) 1007, 1016 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13110, (vi); (Owen Sound) 5832 (iii); (St. Mary's P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie P.O.) 13107; (Wingham P. O.) 13122 (vi); **Ottawa** (caretakers, &c.) 982; (census building) 990; (elevators) 1012; (furniture, &c.) 973; (rentals, &c.) 990; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 998; (Royal mint) 345 (i); (steel shelving) 13088 (vi); (telephones) 1014 (i); **Que.** (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (L'Assomption) 429 (i); (Longueuil P.O.) 13069; (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi), (Montmagny) 5842 (iii) 13066; (St. John's;

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1175 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher, breakwater) 13234; **N.S.** (Fort Lawrence pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 13198; (Indian Harbour, wharf) 13199; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 13201; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (Middle river dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point wharf) 13203 (vi); (New Harbour) 1143 (i); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (Tiverton breakwater) 1149; (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Blind River wharf) 13235; (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Collingwood, improvements) 13239 (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239 (vi); (Goderich harbour) 1367 (i); (Gore's wharf) 13244 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Midland harbour) 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246; (Parry Sound, wharf) 13248; (Port Arthur, dredging) 13012 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; (Victoria harbour) 13255; (Wiarton, wharf) 13256 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee pier) 1517; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii).
Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).
Railways and Canals: Generally (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi); I.C.R. (Chapman ball-bearing apparatus) 8283 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7277 (iii).
Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy, &c. (Ques.) 2308 (i).
Transportation Commissioners and Tariff Inquiry (remarks) 855, 862 (i).
Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2319 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 284 (i).
Wood Alcohol manufactured at Longford, Output, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i) 5363 (iii).
Yukon Stenographers, Appnmt. of Mr. J. A. Valiquette (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E., (Minister of Inland Revenue) *St. Hyacinthe.*
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 881 (i).
Chabot, Mr. F. X., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2015 (i).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. (B. 187) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007 (ii).

Bernier, Hon. M. E.—*Con.*
Excise Taxation, Revenue for 1896 and 1903 (Ans.) 14284 (vi).
Grain Weighing in Man and N.W.T. in Com. on B. 188 (remarks) 4189 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act. Amt. (B. 186) 1° *, 3708; in Com., 4007 (ii).
Inland Revenue Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Milk Can Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B. 20.
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remark) 13979 (vi).
Postal Scales Bill: *See* Weights and Measures B.
Standard Chemical Co., Purchase of Wood Alcohol, Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i).
Electric Light (inspectors) 5407 (iii).
Excise (adulteration of food, &c.) 5389; (analysts) 5389; (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machines) 5382; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii) 13974 (vi); (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373 (iii); (Prescott, salaries) 13968; (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967 (vi); (Standard Chemical Co.) 5373; (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373, 5404; (wood alcohol) 5373 (iii).
Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage guarantee) 5405, 5407; (excise examinations) 5363; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412; (Guay, Mr., compensation, &c.) 5407; (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5365, 5378; (Kelly, Mr., refund, &c.) 5404; (minor revenues) 5404; (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 440 (i).
Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ans.) 2104 (i).
Tobacco, Duty on raw Leaf, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).
Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2340 (i).
——— (Postal scales) Amt. (B. 188) 1°*, 3708 in Com., 4009, 4187, 4189 (ii).
Wood Alcohol, Purchase, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup. 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Bank of Montreal Co.'s (B 72) 1°*, 814 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of (prop. res.) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Cigarettes, Prohibition (B. 133) 1° m., 2014 (i), 2° m., 3286 (ii).
See 'Supply-Excise.'
Companies, Incorporated Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Dom. Burglarly Guarantee Co.'s Change of Name (B. 92) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3581 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 814 (i); in Com., 3170 (ii).
Incorporated Companies (B 94) 2° m., 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4459 (ii).
Montreal Savings Bank incorp. (B. 153) 1°*, 2501 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6109 (iii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Shipping Federation of Can. incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 1193 ; 2° m., 1328 (i).
SUPPLY :
Excise (cigarettes analysis) 5394 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7594 (iiii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3483 (ii).

Birkett, Mr, Thos., *Ottawa.*
Blind River Wharf, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 1298 (i).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 189) 1°*, 3864 (ii); in Com. 7479; 3° m., 7485.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12335 ; (amt.) 12349, 12370, 12500 ; (amt.) 12510, 12570 (v) ; 13812 (vi).
Geological Museum, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10216 (iv).
Nepean Point Improvement, &c. (Ques.) 11829 (v).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6808 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5859 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4168 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings—Ottawa (electric lighting transformers) 5844 (iii) ; (geological museum) 352 (i) ; (post office elevator) 5844 (iii) ; (Royal Mint) 347 (i) ; (steel drawers, &c.) 13087 ; (Victoria museum) 14244 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit, 6969 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Cost in 1901-2, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).
——— Names of Purchasers (Ques.) 3798 (ii).
——— Prices for current year, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).
See 'Supply—Justice.'
Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ques.) 10101, 10714, 10954 (v).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10732 (v).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
Bruce Mines Shed, architect : *See* 'Gordon,' &c.
Budget, The, 1785 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5853 (iii).
——— (remarks *re* Irish butter) in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
Cable Press Despatches from England : *See* 'British Cable.'
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
Census Expenditure (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13699 ; Neg. (Y. 35 ; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
Census Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel for 1891 (Ques.) 6894 (iii).
Census Schedules, 1891-1901, Questions *re* Peel, Halton, &c. (Ques.) 11425 (v).
See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Halton,' &c.
Civil Servants, Interference in Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii).
Compulsory Voting. *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3,'
Criminal Code Amt. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).
Country Postmasters' Salaries : *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'
Crown Tailoring Co., Toronto, Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup , 6152 (iii).
Cummings, James, Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 9458 (iv).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3053, 4038 (ii).
Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 3799 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13594 (vi).
Doukhobors, Pilgrimage, Govt. Action, &c. (Ques.) 1030 (i).
Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 1856.
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Fishing Industry of N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13165 (vi).
German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation under Preferential Tariff (remarks) in Customs Act Amt. B., 3056 (ii).
Gordon & Hellowell, Architects, *re* Bruce Mines Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 5914 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9495 (iv) ; in Com., 10709, 12100, 12280 (v) ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12724 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13273 (vi).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14650 (vi).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ques.) 6436 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10774 (v).

Kelly, Wm., Census Account, &c., Letter *re* (read) 13705 (vi).

Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8214 (iv).

Lunenburg Co., Assistance to Fishermen, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13174 (vi).

Macpherson, D. F., Census Enumerator: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 9351 (iv).

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

Milk Can Bill : *See* 'Weights,' &c.

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12325 (v).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13627.

Postmasters Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Postmasters in Rural District, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 5863 (iii) 14039 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5863 (iii).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. (remarks) 14660.

——— *See* 'Supply—Postoffice.'

Post Office Savings Bank Defalcations, &c., in Com., of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Talbot*) 3127 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B.21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6101, 6256 (iii).

——— (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B.258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12969 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380.

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11623, 12293; (Toronto) 11742 (v).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census enumerators) 4646, 4820; (census, land, &c.) 4638; (census schedules) 7054 (iii); (Clinton, census, &c.) 4820 (ii); (cold storage) 7626; (creameries, N. W. T.) 7633 (iv); (exhibitions, furniture, &c.) 4604; (exhibition, Treadgold exhibit) 4612; (experimental farms) 4553; (Japan exhibition) 4635 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).

Canals: Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); Galops (deepening, &c.) 8268 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651; Welland (mitre sills lowering) 14148 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (salaries) 231 (i).

Customs (Bracebridge custom house) 3960; (contingent expenses) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3958; (legal expenses) 3963; (linseed oil fraud) 3934; (preferential tariff) 3945; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

Excise (methylated spirits contract) 5378; (Standard Chemical Co.) 5378 (iii).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi).

Immigration (expenditure) 6868; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6848; (U.S. agents) 6848 (iii).

Indians: B. C. (expenditure generally) 7266; (industrial schools) 7256; (surveys, &c.) 7269; Generally (legal expenses) 6416; N. W. T. (supplies) 6425; (Stewart, E., travelling ex. penses) 6416; Yukon (education) 7274 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7764, 7772; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7764 (iv).

Interior (Amos Barnes, claim) 6924; (Banff museum) 6927; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795 (iii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14643 (vi); (Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3515 (ii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268, 14652 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638; (Marconi stations) 13641 (vi); (St. Lawrence route, insurance) 5761 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13680 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5879 (iii) 7749; (G. B. and Can.) 7728; (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7738 (iv).

Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14268, 14652 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (Martineau defalcations) 6991; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Post Office Savings Bank, defalcations) 14655 (vi).

N. W. M. Police (Yukon) 5005 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4061, 4104, 5039 (ii); (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13531 (vi).

Post Office (box rents, &c.) 6139; (country postmasters) 6053; (mail service) 6065; (superannuations) 5932; (supplies, &c.) 6151 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Rossland, P. O.) 13161; (Vancouver, P. O.) 13132 (vi); Dom. (heating, &c.) 1065; Generally (Brampton armoury) 966; (experimental farms) 973 (i); N.B. (St. John drill hall) 13051 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5829; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13028; Ont. (Belleville, armoury) 13083; (Guelph, armoury) 13084, 13085; (Hawkesbury, P. O) 13119; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111; (St. Mary's, P. O.) 13110;

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

(Sarnia, P. O.) 13117; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (Windsor, P. O) 13113; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125 (vi); **Ottawa** (census building) 993 (i); (coal sheds) 13117 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 980 (i); (gas, &c.) 5845 (iii); (heating, &c.) 1010; (lighting, &c.) 974 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1006; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 997 (i); (steel shelving) 13089; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13063; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13071; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13059; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13068; (St. Johns, examining warehouse) 13069; (St. Johns, P. O.) 13060 (vi); Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii);

Dredging (new dredges) 2674 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3365 (ii); **N.B.** (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13234; (Petit Rocher) 13234 (vi); **N. S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Frudes Point, wharf); 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13188 (vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Grand Narrows wharf) 1094 (i); (Iona, harbour) 13200 (Jeddore, wharf) 13179; (Margaretville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Middle River, dam) 13202; (Morrison's Point, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1140 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Poirierville, wharf) 13205; (Port George, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1147 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Porter's channel) 13206; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Spry Bay, wharf) 13213; (Swim Point, wharf) 13211; (Victoria beach wharf) 13216; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314; **Ont.** (Amherstburg dredging) 13235; (Barry's Bay) 13236; (Blind River wharf) 13236; (Bronte, improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce mines) 5912 (iii); (Cumberland wharf) 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1374; (Orillia wharf) 1377; (Petewawa Narrows) 1443; (Pickering harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Credit) 13251 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1438 (i); **Que.** (Cacouna wharf) 5897 (iii); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Grande Vallee pier) 1533; (Murray Bay wharf) 2268; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5909 (iii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2260 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3311 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339; (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2698; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2679 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918; (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5827 (iii); Generally (Marconi system) 2712 (ii); N.W.T. (Alexander Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Woodmountain, &c.) 13336 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii); (Belle Isle) 2712 (ii); (Yukon, construction) 14042 (vi); (Yukon) 2994 (ii).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501; (Rutherford, Dr., duties, &c.) 5509 (iii); (small-pox) 5010 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I.C.R. (air brakes, &c.) 8287 (iv); (car shops machinery) 14106 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7523 (iii); (Miramichi bridge) 8308 (iv); (Moncton locomotive works) 14090 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8312; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Rivière du Loup yards) 8310; (rolling stock) 8294 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14060, 14107 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8302 (iv); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 14120 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7761; (international customs bureau) 7760 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276, 7286 (iv).

'Teapot,' German, purchased in N.W.T.: *See* 'German,' &c.

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Web cloth, blankets, &c. (Ques.) 10410 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

Wood Alcohol, purchased, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).

See 'Supply—Excise.'

Yukon, Mail Deficit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*

Alberton Ry, Station, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2503 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims, &c. (remarks) 3201 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5068 (ii).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

——— O.C., *re* (remarks) 3302 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Securities B. 209 (prop. Res.) 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5101 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; in Com., 5589, 5786,

Canadian Northern Ry. Co., Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227, 3982 (ii).

C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ans.) 2306 (i).

C. P. Ry. Expenditure for Rolling Stock, 1902-3 (Ans.) 2311 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Geo. Robertson (Ans.) 668 (i).
——— Names, &c. (Ans.) 875 (i).
——— Rep. to Govt. (Ans.) 669 (i).
——— Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).
——— Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Charlottetown P. E. I. Ry. Station, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).
Commercial Travellers, Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B.'
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1325 (i) 3237 (ii).
Demurrage on Cars, I.C.R., collected, &c. (Ans.) 3672, 4959 (ii).
Dixon, F. A., Chief Cor. Clerk, &c. (Ans.) 5319 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13609, 14425 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3007 (ii).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578, 3982 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 615 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii) 7823 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8406; ('Senator Cox cannot wait') 8410 (iv).
G. T. Transcontinental Ry. and Govt. Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 675, 1031 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'
Hamilton Electric Light, &c., Power, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ans.) 2758 (ii).
——— Contractor's Name, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract (Ans.) 4444 (ii).
Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 1°, 2795 (ii).
Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1855 (i).
I. C. R. and G. T. R. Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).
I. C. Ry., Coal Rates (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
——— Demurrage Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
——— Free Passes, Names, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— General Statement, on M. for Sup., 3633 (ii).
——— Gross Earnings, Interim Reps., &c. (Ans.) 4445 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3538 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*
I. C. Ry., Locomotives, Cars, purchased, &c. (Ans.) 4361 (ii).
——— Lorne Siding (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3535 (ii.)
——— Ouelle River Spur Line, &c. (Ans.) 541 (i).
——— Private Cars (Ans.) 2309 (i).
——— Rates for Live Stock and Coal, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Pottinger, on M. (Mr. *Haggart*) for Copy, 3806 (ii).
——— Scotch Hill Station (Ans.) 872 (i).
——— Sussex, N.B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).
——— Trackmen's Wages, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).
——— Traffic Rates, on Inquiry for Papers, 3712 (ii).
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 932 (i).
Inverness and Richmond Ry., Subsidy (Ans.) 873 (i).
Lévis Land Purchase, I.C.R., Payment, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512.
Lorne Siding, I.C.R., Ry. Traffic, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ans.) 1197 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Ministerial Changes, on Mr. Tarte's Resignation (explanation) 145 (i).
——— on Mr. Blair's Resignation (explanation) 6736 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (*Mr. Fielding*) in Com., 4454 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 6080 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (*Mr. Lemieux*) in Com., 3222 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (*Mr. German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets (Ans.) 2503 (ii).
——— Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks) 1680 (i).
Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ans.) 2309 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4206 (ii).
Pugwash, N.S., Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 1856 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14728 (vi).
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ans.) 1032 (i).
——— Investigations, &c. (remarks) 1331 (i).
——— Loss of Life (Ans.) 873 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 561 (i); (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c. (agreed to Y. 99: N. 53) 565 (i).

Railway Act (Consolidation) Amt. (B. 21) 1° m., 244 (i) on M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728, 4743 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5561, 5680, 5765, 6071, 6173, 6206, 6273 (iii), 8139 (iv).

——— Conference with Senate *re* Amts. to B. 21 (remarks) 14763 (vi).

—— (telephones) 5534 (iii).

Railways and Canals Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92.

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Land Grants voted by Parlt., &c. (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546 (i).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14440 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, Interest payable, &c. (Ans.) 3971.

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 1677 (i).

Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Ry. Subsidies paid by Govt. since Confederation (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Subsidies voted and paid, 1901-3 (Ans.) 2306.

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11812 (v).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 872 (i).

Semaphore Lights, P.E.I., Discontinuance, &c. (Ans.) 4443 (ii).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452 (i).

Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2584 (ii).

South Shore Ry., Complaints *re* Safety (remarks) 206 (i).

——— Working of, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).

Station Agents, P.E.I., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 4361.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ans.) 285 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 333 (i).

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. John and Belfast) 7733 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John quarantine water service) 419 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (general statement) 3633; (Levis accommodation) 3703; (original construction) 3698; (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).

Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ans.) 2585 (ii).

Ties on Govt. Rys., Importation, &c. (Ans.) 1679.

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Govt. Aid, &c. (Ans.) 1026 (i).

——— Contract with Govt. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

——— (personal explanation) 2794 (ii).

——— Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. P. R., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., Proposals to Govt. (Ans.) 874 (i).

——— *See* G. T. P. Bill.

Treadgold Concessions, Appmnt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2863, 4513 (ii).

——— Appmnt. of Commission (remarks) 3878.

Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 129 (i).

——— Surveys at Rice Lake, on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2317, 2327 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2345 (i).

Welland Canal Water Power and St. Catharines Board of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

——— O. Cs. *re* (Ans.) 1859 (i).

West Lorne Accident, Commissioners (Ans.) 6168 (iii).

——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 5088 (ii).

——— on inquiry for Rep., 5242 (iii).

——— Verdict, &c. (Ans.) 3232 (ii).

White, Albert S., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4673 (ii).

Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Papers laid on table, 3712 (ii).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1048, 1053 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick W., K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *Kings, (N.S.)*.

Blankets, Web Cloth, &c., Dates of Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 10954 (v).

Brigade Camp, Sussex, N.B. (Ans.) 3236 (ii).

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ans.) 1675 (i).

Can. S. A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ans.) 14287 (vi).

Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ans.) 2103 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646 (iii).

Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* S. Africa War (Ans.) 7914 (iv).

Dundonald, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2404 (i).

Fishery Guardian, J. M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ans.) 10955 (v).

G. O. C. Commanding, Rep., &c., Suppression of (Ans.) 670 (i).

Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co., Par. in *Globe*, 5894 (iii).

Hutton, Maj. Gen., on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 207 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir F. W.—*Con.*
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ans.) 10491 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Payment of Militia, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. and Mr. Chamberlain's Suggestions (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ans.) 669 (i).
Militia Deptl. Rep. (presented) 283 (i).
Militia Pay and Allowance, General Statement in Com. of Sup., 13379 (vi).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. (B. 78) 1°m., 872 (i); and in Com., 2°m., 1116, 2240 (i).
Militia Reserve at Port Moody, &c. (Ans.) 447.
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville (Ans.) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores, Erection of Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13055 (vi).
Mills, Mr., Annapolis, Claims against (Ans.) 6167 (iii).
Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).
Permanent Corps Officers, Qualifications, Certificates (Ans.) 4443 (ii) 6434 (iii).
Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ans.) 13372 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3132 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ans.) 3802 (ii).
St. Johns Drill Hall, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 12497 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Action (remarks) 12718 (vi).
——Par. in 'Star' *re* Militia (remarks) 12939.(vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Complaints *re* Grievances, &c. (Ans.) 1028 (i).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, Reinstated, &c. (Ans.) 1027 (i).
——Medals, Regulations, &c. (remarks) 8319.(iv).
———Pensions to Canadians (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
———Saddles and Bridles (Ans.) 1675 (i).
See 'Canadian,' &c.
Springhill Armouries, Caretaker, &c. (Ans.) 1857 (i).
Sussex Armoury, Construction, &c., Overseer's Qualifications (Ans.) 8332 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Militia (salaries) 221 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 3603; (Association grants) 3767; (contingencies) 3778 (ii); (Cook *vs.* Cole, costs) 6950; (coronation contingent) 6950 (iii); (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G. O. C.) 3781 (ii); (Hamilton drill hall) 6949 (iii); (Martineau commission) 3585, 3752; (Military college) 3778; (military stores branch) 3608; (pay and allowance) 3584 (ii); (pay and allowance general statement) 13379 (vi); (paving streets, Winnipeg barracks) 6949 (iii); (properties) 3611; (Toronto, drill shed) 3618; (transport and freight) 3752; (Valleyfield strike) 3587, 3753 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 970 (i); Man. (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; N. B. (military buildings) 13041; (St. John, drill hall) 13043; N. S. (Middleton, armoury) 970 (i); N. W. T. (Strathcona Horse, barracks) 13130; Ont. (armouries, generally) 13084; (Belleville, armoury) 970 (i) 13082; (Military College, Kingston) 13094; (Toronto, drill hall) 13086; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086 (vi); Ottawa (desks, &c.) 986; (Royal Mint) 346 (i); Que. (citadel, drill shed) 13056 (vi); (L'Assomption) 430 (i); (military buildings) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i).
Tents for N. W. Mounted Police, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3804 (ii).
——— *See* 'Woods,' &c.
Transcontinental (Can.) Ry., Representations *re* Military Purposes (Ans.) 541 (i).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ans.) 13571 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c.
Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Service (Ans.) 11189 (v).
Volunteers Man. and N. W. T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ans.) 820 (i).
Woods, J. W., Amount paid for tents, &c. 5764 (iii).
——- *See* 'Tents,' &c.

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*
Address, on The, 23 (i).
Colonial Conference, 25; Conference between Colonies, 24; Discrimination by Germany, 29; Relations with Newfoundland and French Shore Question, 30; Alaska Boundary, and Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, 31; Naval Reserve, 36; Transportation Question, 37; Tariff Revision, 38; Chinese Immigration Policy, 39 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Award, Alleged Interview with Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13667, 13958 (vi).
——— remarks *re* Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Criticism *re* Award, 13958, 13963 (vi).
——— Alverstone, Lord, Telegram (remarks) 13806 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Alaskan Boundary Arbitration, Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers *re* (remarks) 878 (i), 14521 (vi).

——— convention respecting (remarks) 480 (i).

——— Notice of Remarks, 14765 (vi).

——— Official Information, Cor., &c. (remarks) 14521 (vi).

——— Mr. Sifton's Telegram *re*, 14530 (vi).

——— Protest of Canadian Commissioners, Cor. *re*, 14689 (vi).

American Cattle purchased for British Govt., Par. in Montreal *Gazette*, 5414 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4244 (ii).

Apples, Canadian Packing, &c., on Ques. of Order, 11185 (v).

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5966 (iii)

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. *re* Debts, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Atlantic Fast ss. Service (remarks) on Notice of M., 13948 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 14159; (Neg. Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

Requirements of present age, 14159; average time from Can. to G.B. 9, 10 and 11 days; forty years ago, logs of Str. *Asia*, stmt. of mercantile journal, 14159; records, &c. 14159; Sir Chas. Tupper's contract, 1896, 14161; Petersen, Tate & Co.'s tender, 1896, 14161; Allan's contract, Sir Wilfrid's reasons for non-acceptance, 14161; Toronto speech of Sir Wilfrid, 'Economical Govt.,' 14162; deposit returned to Petersen & Co., 14163; unpopularity, &c., 14164; prophecy, 14165; 21-knot service, no 2nd class service, 14166; New York route supplying boats, 14166; Govt. not enthusiastic, inspiration in Ottawa *Free Press*, 14167; tenders from Allan and British North Atlantic ss. Co., 14168; development of western country, willing to assist in giving aid, 14169; freight carried, 14169; cost of building, 14169; negotiations for short periods, 14170.

Atlantic Fast Service, Govt. Policy (remarks) 4007 (ii).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4120, 4445 (ii).

——— Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See "Supply—Mail Subsides", &c.

Atlantic, North Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).

——— *See* 'North.'

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11163 (v).

——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).

——— Inquiry for Cor., &c., 11427, 11692 (v).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N. W. T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 884 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Autonomy of the N.W.T. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

——— O.C.'s, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2778 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret., 5083 (ii).

——— Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6891 (iii).

——— Return *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 256,' &c., 'Provincial,' &c.

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6365 (iii)).

Binder Twine Bounties Res., on Ques. of Order, 7305 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6757 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6522 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) 12758. vi

Bopp, Mr., German Consul, Cor. with Germany and Dom. Govt. &c. (remarks) 12218 (v),

——— *See* 'Budget,' &c.

B.C. Canners: *See* 'Salmon,' &c.

B.C. Statutes, Disallowance of, &c. (M. for O.C.'s, &c*) 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

——— (M.) to print cor., 2675 (ii).

Brunet, Arthur and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O.Cs., &c., 106 (i).

Budget, The, 1462 (i).

Prosperity of Canada and former declarations of ministers, 1463; imports and exports, 1476, 1491; taxation, former utterances by ministers, 1465; expenditures, comparisons with former govts., 1468; per capita expenditure, 1470; capital and revenue expenditure of different depts., 1471; Public debt, 1472; surpluses and former utterances of ministers, 1473; Colonial Conference, Mr. Chamberlain's speech *re* preference, 1480; post office revenue, letter carrier's salaries, 1483; I.C.R. 'alleged' surplus, 1483; trade negotiations with other countries, 1484; cor. with Herr Bopp, &c. (remarks) 1484; German surtax former amt. *re*, 1485; Preferential trade, attitude of Govt., 1487-1490; tariff revision, 1493; policy should be, 1494; Canada as an agricultural country, adequate protection, 1495, 1500; and relations with U.S., 1496; fiscal policy of govt. and free trade utterances, 1498; protection to the farmers, 1500; protection to Can. industries, 1501; tariff relations with U.S., 1502; Res. *re* tariff policy 'adequate protection,' 1503; editorial of N.S. paper *re* coal duty, 1503 (i).

Budget, The,—Report of Winnipeg Speech *re* Agricultural Implements, 2192 (i).

——— Amt., Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

Business of the Hse., Announcement *re* Further Govt. Business (remarks) 13667 (vi).

——— (remarks) 1110 (i), 3794 (ii),

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Explanation.'

Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8234 (iv).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian-German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Herr Bopp (remarks) 12218 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 4398, 4999, 5091, 5111, (ii), 5590, 5788 (iii).

C. P. R. Lands Exempt from Taxes in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).

Capital Cases, Commutation of Sentences, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).

Cargill, Henry, late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12938 (vi).

Carlin, Peter J., Postmaster at Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130, 668 (i).

Carver *vs.* King, Commutation, &c., Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. (remarks) 267 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., &c. (remarks) 1199 (i).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21.'

Census, &c. (remarks) 13672 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture, Census, &c.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6201 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 601 (i).

Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3191 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12505, 12539 (v).

Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 in Com. on prop. res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 594 (i).

Clayton-Pulwer Treaty, Cor., &c., Inquiry for Papers *re* Alaskan Boundary, 14521 (vi).

——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c.

Colonial Conference, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii), 7923 (iv).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) on Sen. Amts., 6894 (iii).

Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Election B. 3.

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7492 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045, in Com. on B., 4010; on M. for 3°, 4187 (ii).

——— B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14757 (vi).

Dawson Board of Trade, Communication *re* Treadgold Concessions (read) 1024 (i).

——— *See* 'Treadgold,' &c.

Debates, Official (remarks) 6 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Desjardins Canal B. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4213 (ii).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13683 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 899; in Com., 907 (i); (compulsory voting) 13584; on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to dischg. Order, 14769 (vi).

——— Govtl. Intention (remarks) 12218 (v); 12719 (vi).

——— B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95, in Com., 635, 1115; (objection) 945 (i).

——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1064 (i).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6440 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3023, 3036, 4680 (ii).

Easter Adjournment, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (v).

——— *See* 'Dom. Election Bills.'

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244 (iv), on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93; in Com., 620 (i).

Farquharson, Mr., Decease of (remarks) 5513 (iii).

Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.

Ferries, Control of, in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6538; in Com., 6896, 6910 (iii).

Fishing Industry, N.S., Harbour Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13153 (vi).

See 'Privilege,' &c.

France and Canada, SS. Service (telegram read) 4957 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt, B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3820 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4789 (ii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

German Consul Bopp, Cor. with Can. Govt., &c. (remarks) 12218 (v).

German Surtax, in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

——— *See* 'Customs Bills,' 'Budget,' &c.

'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation B 66.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 4178; in Com., 4842 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).

——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

——— Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

——— Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).

——— *See* 'Business,' &c.

Govt. Ry. Policy (remarks) *re* Delay, 7298 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 13807 (vi).
Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).
Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4189 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automatic,' 'Weights and Measures,' 'Man. Grain B.' &c.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 5137 (iii); 7816, 7842; on M. for 3°, 8059 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Bill Subsidy 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8961; on M. for 1°, 7697; 'Alternative Policy,' 8988, 8994, 9005 (iv); in Com. on B., 11190, 11204, 11240, 11263, 11308, 11395, 12075; in Com. (Amts.) 11833, 11890; in Com. (Amt. *re* securities 11959, 12015 (v); on M. for 3°, 12612; (amt.) 12642; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; on M. for 3°, 12755, 12770; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Bill, Pets. *re* Authenticity, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13267 (vi).
——— (remarks) 13559 (vi).
——— Meetings of Com.. (remarks) 13671 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to read Affidavits, Ques. of Order 14846 (vi).
G. T. P. Ry. Bill, Customs Duties, Legal Opinions (read) 11337 (v).
——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399, 8086 (iv).
——— Plans presented (remarks) 8082 (iv).
——— Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).
Halifax Common, Rights of City, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
Halifax Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
Halifax P. O. Employees, Pet. *re* Salaries (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks(in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
——— (remarks) 1057 (i).
Hides Inspection: *See* 'Gen. Inspection B. 48.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 782 (i).
Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4588 (ii).
Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1131 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt's. Refusal, &c. (remarks) 9457 (iv).
——— Report *re* (remarks) 3632 (ii) 7923 (iv).
——— *See* 'Alaskan,' &c., 'Colonial,' &c.
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2385 (i), 2788 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927, 930 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928 (iv).
——— on M. for Sup. (remarks) 4040 (ii).
——— (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).
——— Tariff Protection (notice of amt.) 3864 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).
Judges of N.W. Ters. Act. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 12610 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11406 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts and Sup. Courts, Quebec (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 11821 (v).
Judges Retiring Allowances B (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8093 (iv).
Judges of the Superior Court (Retiring Allowance) B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 93 (i).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2778 (ii).
Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Cor., 100 (i).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
Librarians of Parlt., Salary B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res. 13832 (vi).
Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administration (remarks) 112 (i).
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2349 (i).
Long Lake & Sas. Ry. Surveys: *See* 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8048 (iv).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1586 (i).
Lumber Trade in B.C., Tel. from Manufacturing Industry *re* U.S. Duty, &c., Importations, 14766 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Stmnt. *re* Certain Rooms in H. of C. (remarks) 14530 (vi).
———Forwarding, &c. (remarks) 14569, 14682 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Threats to Express Cos. (remarks) 14851 (vi).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8005 (iv.); on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).
Man. Judgeship, Delay of Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
Man. School Lands, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com. 5098 (ii).
Master and Mates B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6544 (iii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5720 (iii).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (i).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 20.
Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).
Mining Cos. Incorporation B. (remarks) 14850 (vi).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 148 (i) 6757 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6 (i).
Ministers, Reduction in Number of Depts.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease of (remarks) 1578 (i).
——— *See* 'Lt. Gov.,' &c.
Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).
Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779 (vi).
Newspaper Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6428 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 13372 (vi).
———Inquiry for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).
N.W. Ter. Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 13856 (vi).
——— Govt. Financial Aid B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12843 (vi).
——— Naturalization Returns (M. for Stmnt.*) 3804 (ii).
——— Prov. Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com,, 2719 (ii).
Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452, 6807.
Pacific Cable, Concessions by Australia to Eastern Tel. Co. (remarks) 2675 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Pardons, Preogative of His Ex., &c., on M. (Mr *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14857.
——— *See* 'Sessions,' &c.
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3625; in Com., 4213, 4676 (ii).
Peggy's Cove Lighthouse, Retirement of Geo. Swinehammer (Ques.) 2312 (i).
Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada* Canvassing (remarks) 13985 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii).
Pension for S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14595 (vi).
Petersen, Tate & Co., Ref. to in Deb. on Atlantic Fast ss. Service, 14159 (vi).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., on Res., 12782; on M. for 2°, 12984 (vi).
——— *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Posters, Indecent, Handbills, Exclusion, &c., in Com, on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14676 (vi).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5657; in Com., 5667 (ii).
Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'Cable,' &c.
Private Bills, Pets.: *See* 'Rules,' &c.
Privilege, Ques of (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* 'Outskirts of Civilization,' Ques. of Order, 13374 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11565 (v).
Provincial Autonomy, Further Cor,, &c. (remarks) 7296 (iii).
——— in N.W.T. (M.) to print ret., 5582 (iii).
——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
——— *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Com., Addition of Name (M.) 3431 (ii).
Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4204 (ii).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com.. 4221 (ii).
Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com.. 14749 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4586 (iii).
Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).
——— Consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 245 (i); in Com., 2599, 3714, 3746, 3841, 3886, 3974, 3985, 4128, 4564, 4693 (ii); 5699, 5770, 6076 (iii), 8131 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr, *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2786 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12946 (vi).

Ry. Debts B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2545 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14514, 14735; (auditing by Aud. Gen.) 14516; (location of rys., &c.) 14514; (payments, &c.) Suggestions *re* Safeguarding (remarks) 14512; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 (vi).

Ry. Mail Clerks, &c., in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Mail Service, N. W. T., Overcrowding of Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5933 (iii).

Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down (M. to adjn. Hse.) 7109 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (remarks) 12805, 12843, 13005 (vi).

Rainy River Mail Service, Tel. (read) 6889 (iii).

Redistribution B.: *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Reformatory Prisons, B. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8087 (iv).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 715; on M. for 2°, 1207, 1265; on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1290 (i); in Com., 11439, 11589; (Dauphin) 11759; (N.S.) 11793; (Quebec) 11793; (Toronto) 11695; (Waterloo) 11645; on M. for 3°, 12481 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 11618 (v).

——— Evidence laid on Table, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— N.B., Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley, 941 (i).

——— P.E.I. and N.B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).

——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks) 11423 (v).

——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 5413 (iii).

——— Complaint *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills, 4441 (ii).

St. Chrysostome Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6999 (iii) 13303, 13377 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 3298 (ii); in Com., 6920 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Salmon Industry, B.C., Tel. from Fraser River Canners Ass'on (read) 9970 (iv).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12717 (vi).

——— and Militi a(remarks) 12941 (vi).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. Mr. *Boyd*) 467 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Settlers' Claim *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup., 13954 (vi).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12802; in Com. on B., 12994; on M. for 3°, 13560 (vi).

——— *See* 'Safety' &c.

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, &c., Quebec.'

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267 (iv).

S. A. War, Purchase of Supplies by Imp. Govt. (M. for copies of O. Cs., &c.) 2760 (i).

——— *See* 'Hay and Oats,' &c.

Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Strs., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 13519 (vi).

Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 13667 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6543; in Com. on B. 6916 (iii).

——— B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12777 (vi).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7029 (iii).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

Stuart, Capt. D. C.: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,'

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 250,' &c.

Supply Bill in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5996 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* Prop. Res., 6003 (iii).

Supply Bill, 218, in Com., 6170 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643, 4801; (census tabulators) 4656; (dairying branch) 4671; (Japan exhibition) 4626; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal, &c.) 4353 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (electric stations by-wash) 12906; (tow paths) 12907 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 225 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770 (vi); Gov. Gen's Office (salaries) 207; Indian Affairs (salaries) 274; Inland Rev. (salaries) 227 (i); Interior (clerical assistance) 13769 (vi); (salaries) 268 (i), 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13763 (vi); Justice (salaries) 212 (i); N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 13761 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13985 (vi).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955 (vi); (boundary delimitations) 6790; (homestead entries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6767; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. survey) 6941 (iii); (salaries, outside service) 13773 (vi); (surveys) 6939 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13776; (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

Electric Light (inspectors) 5407, 5410 (iii).

Excise (Montreal office, reimbursement) 5405; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5404 (iii).

Fisheries (fishery officers salaries) 5122; (lobster factories inspection) 5122 (ii).

Geological Survey (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi); (plans, plotting, &c.) 6826 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6709; (repatriation, &c.) 6709 (iii).

Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; Man. and N.W.T. (surveys, &c.) 13784; N.S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

Inland Revenue (Mr. Bourassa, shortage) 5408 (Mr. Ferguson, legal services) 5412; (Mr. Kelly, refund) 5406 (iii); (wood alcohol) 231 (i).

Interior (Amos Barnes, claims) 6923; (astronomical observatory) 6793; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).

Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc judges allowances) 3402; B.C. (judges travelling allowances) 3399; Exchequer Court (Admiralty, accommodation) 3408; (Admiralty registrar) 3408; Man. (judges' travelling allowance) 3399; Miscellaneous (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3399 (ii); (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi); N.B. (divorce court) 3400; Supreme Court (law books) 3405; (library) 3402; (Yukon law books) 3506; (police magistrates) 3422; (sheriff Eilbeck, salary) 3410; (stenographers) 3411; (travelling allowance) 3409.

Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str., &c.) 5746 (iii); (St. Lawrence route) 4157 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 5997 (iii), 7606 (iv), 13673 (vi); Can. and S. Africa) 7752; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii); Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); Manchester and Montreal) 7745; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 7744; (P. E. I. and mainland) 7742 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695; (St. John, N. B. and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv).

Militia (Cooke *vs.* Cole, costs) 6951 (iii); (Valleyfield strike) 3759 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13958; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965 (vi); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984; (naturalization Act, expenses) 6952; (Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (salaries) 13966 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6952 (iii).

N.W.T., Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946 (iii); (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116; (Govt. steamers, repairs, supplies, &c.) 4074 (ii), 13519; (masters and mates examination) 13524 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii).

Post Office (Halifax) 6004; (P. E. I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5933; (salaries) 5924 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (architect's staff) 962; (armouries) 967; (clerks of works) 963; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting) 1067; (water supply) 1067 (i); **N.B.** (Moncton, P.O.) 13038; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041 (vi); **N.W.T.** (courthouses, &c.) 958; (Dom. buildings, repairs) 959; (Macleod, court-house) 959; (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax immigration shed) 13033; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030 (vi); (Middleton armoury) 969 (i); (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P.O.) 488 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082; (Brantford, drill hall) 13108 (vi); (Clinton, P.O.) 518, 528 (i); (St. Catherines drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13110; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086; (Toronto, P.O., addition) 13101; **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13007 (vi); (census buildings) 992; (elevators) 1011; (heating, &c.) 1009; (lighting) 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015; (repairs, &c.) 987; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087; (steel shelving) 13093; **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, Dom. Buildings) 13036; **Que.** (Acton Vale, P.O.) 13061; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13076; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 13058; (Montreal, postal station) 13081; (Quebec, drill hall) 13078; (citadel drill shed) 13054, 13056; (military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13050; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi).

Dredging (new dredging plant) 2673 (ii).

Generally (transportation facilities, Port Colborne) 13024.

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 13304 (vi); **Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3358; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., compensation) 13231; (Campbellton wharf) 13005; **N.S.** (Abbott's harbour) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's breakwater) 13143; (Baxter's Cove) 13143; (Bayfield wharf) 13141; (Big harbour wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond wharf) 1073 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13153 (vi); (Campbellton wharf) 1142; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1079 (i), 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Economy wharf) 1087; (Fort Lawrence pier) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay wharf) 1087 (i), 13184 (vi); (Grand River entrance) 1094; (Green Cove harbour) 1100; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1102 (i); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103; (Kingsport pier) 1103; (Lingan beach) 1105; (Lunenburg harbour) 1110; (Margaree wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (New harbour) 1145; (Ogden's Pond) 1145; (Petit de Grat) 1146; (Port George breakwater) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146; (Sandy Cove breakwater) 1149; (Short Beach breakwater) 1149 (i); (Summerville wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point wharf) 13211; (Tenecape breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Three Fathoms harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria beach wharf) 13215; (Wallace harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i); (Wentworth wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Bay wharf) 13217 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Kingston graving

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

dock) 13023; (Midland) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3344 (ii); (Port Arthur dredging) 13012; (Port Perry) 13249 (vi); Que. (Bonaventure East breakwater) 13446; (Cacouna wharf) 13448 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grand Valley pier) conc., 6070 (iii); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Lake St. John dredging) 13459; (Lotbinière wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 2265 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay wharf) 2266, 2270 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i), 13476; (Rivière Verte) 13471 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3308 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13474; (Sacre-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (Sorel wharf) 2296 (i); (Sorel deep water wharf) 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi); (Touladie river) 2287 (i).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Art gallery) 2725; (surveys, &c.) 2724; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2663 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2695.

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2680 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 2992; (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2997; (N.W.T.) 2991 (ii); Que. (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Petite Riviere, St. Agnes) 13331; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Railways—Generally (Dixon, F. A.) 2730; I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); (Halifax accommodation) 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi); (Lévis accommodation) 3704 (ii), 7520 (iii); (Sydney accommodation) 3696 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).

Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 6940, 7282; (Lithgow, Mr., controller, &c.) 7287; (roads and bridges) 7286 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2366 (i).

Swinehammer, Geo., Light-Keeper at Peggy's Cove, Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 2312 (i).

Swing Bridges B.: *See* 'Navigable.'

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt, (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12800; in Com. on B., 12993.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4931 (ii).

Tariff Negotiations with France, Telegram read, 4957 (ii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation of: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Toronto Post Office, Tender of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13101 (vi).

Trans-continental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 7697 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. R.'

Transportation Commission, &c. (remarks) 1199.

——— Formation, Personnel, &c. (remarks) 4727, (ii), 7206 (iii), 9819 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3432 (ii).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Inquiry *re*, 4840 (ii).

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 854 (i).

——— *re* Speech from Throne remarks) 3129 (ii).

——— Sir Van Horne's Acceptation (remarks) 7297 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 3298, 3303, 3713, 3872, 4727 (ii), 6638, 7297 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com of Sup., 2887 (ii).

——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4509 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep., 3397, 4840 (ii), 13134, 13258 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions and Dawson Board of Trade (remarks) 1024 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, Free Representations, Tel. *re*, 6427 (iii).

——— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4564 (ii).

——— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).

——— Representations, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

——— Tel. from W. A. Beddoe, *re* Commissioner's Refusal to produce Files, &c. (remarks) 9818 (iv).

——— Tel. from Board of Trade *re* Scope (remarks) 8086 (iv).

——— Telegram *re* Charges (remarks) 9979 (iv).

——— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120 (ii).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

U. S. Coasting Laws, Regulations *re* Bonding Privileges (remarks) 13137 (vi).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Vankleek Hill Postal Service, Complaint *re*, on Conc., 14764 (vi).

Vegetables imported from the U. S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal (M. fo ret.*) 1058 (i).

Ways and Means *re* G. T. Pacific Survey, in Com., 14765 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2347 (i).

——— (scales for grain) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4189 (ii).

Whitney Pier Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1056 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Wood Alcohol purchased from Standard Chemical Co. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 231 (i).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Woodstock Post Office, N.B., Inquiry for Ret., 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, &c., in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).
Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 94 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Address, on The, 75 (i).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, History of the Case, &c., 14773 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14764 (vi).
See 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.
Business of the House (remarks) 2395 (i).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B. (M. for cor.*) 110 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4383 (ii).
Chambers of Congress Banquet, Speech of Gov. Gen. (Ques.) 10100 (v).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Abrogaton, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 7297 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (translators), on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) 111 (i).
Dundonald, Earl, G.O.C., Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).
Fire Sufferers in Ottawa Valley, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup. 4768 (ii).
G.O.C.: *See* 'Dundonald.'
Gov. General's Speech at Chambers of Commerce Banquet (Ques.) 10100 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9666 (iv).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Gov., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 689 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 763 (i).
Immigration Agents, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 289 (i).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4329 (ii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c. on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5722 (iii).
Minto, Earl of, Speech at Montreal, 10100 (v).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G. B. and Can. (M. for copies*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 7298 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3133 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Stock Gambling, 7204 (iii).
Procedure *re* Adjournment of House (remarks) 6634 (iii).
Speech of Gov. Gen.: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'
Stock Exchange Speculations (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).
——— (personal explanation) 7204 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2362 (i).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669 ; (expenditure) 6616 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).
Veterans, Pet. *re* Indemnity for Military Services, &c. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*
Assiniboine and Red Rivers, Navigation, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 12 8 (i).
Automatic Grain Weighers, N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 849 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 5051 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5081 (ii).
Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4393 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 397 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12367, 12532 (v).
Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3280 (ii).
Fyfe, Mr., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5384 (iii).
Grain Weighing for Threshing in Man and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on Weights and Measures Act Amt. B., 4191 (ii).
See 'Automatic.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10076 (iv); in Com. on B., 10453, 12094, 12269 (v).
Immigrants, Accommodations for Settlers, Par in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1119 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14233 (vi).
Man. and N. W. T. Senators, Increased Representation, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992, 8004 (iv).
Man., Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 216 (i).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 263 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12320 (v).

Boyd, Mr. N.—*Con.*

N. W. Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1296 (i).

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) *re* Delay, 462 (i), 14853 (vi).

Postmasters' Association of Man., Memorial *re* Salaries (remarks) 14026 (vi).

Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to Rural Offices (remark) 14026 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2465 (i).

St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit, &c. (Ques.) 4837 (ii).

Schooley, W. F. Relief (B. 128) 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223 (ii).

——— (M.) to return Evidence to Senate, 3224.

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting (M.) 462 (i), 14853 (v).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13953 (vi).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., (remarks) 11824 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census schedules) 4636; (St. Louis, exhibition) 4608; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621.
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 216 (i).
Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5384; (liquor inspection) 5401 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423; (living allowances) 3418; (telegraph operators) 3418 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13536 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings, Man. (generally) 442; Ont. (rural mail delivery) 514; Que. (Thetford Mines) 442 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); Telegraph Lines (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Telegraph Operators—Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr, *Bernier*) in Com., 4187, 4191 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R., *Centre Toronto.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).

Book-keeping on G. T. R. & C. P. R.: *See* 'G. T. R.,' &c.

Butter Adulteration Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5851 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5635 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5886 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 844 (i).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3262, 3271 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6641 (iii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 15) in Com., 3239 (ii).

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. (B. 39) 1°*, 541; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058, 3071 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. ss. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12299 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9871; in Com., 10544, 11903, 12012, 12140 (v).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. R. Fiscal Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).

International Ry. Appliances Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 40) 1°*, 591 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft & Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14394 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
See Toronto and James' Bay.

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2510 (ii).

Patent Act Relief: *See* 'International Ry. Appliances Co.'

Printing Bureau and Union Organizations, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).

Railway Commission (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 253 (i); in Com. (drainage) 4747 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2554 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14352 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) 14352 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11705 (v).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Grenville (guide pier) 12909 (vi); Trent (construction) 7551 (iii).
Customs (preferential tariff) 3946 (ii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6684; (U.S. agent) 6877 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (schools, industrial, &c.) 7259 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence route) 4155 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7600 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (quarantine station, drainage, &c.) 487; Ont., (Alexandria P.O.); (Bowmanville) 507; (Clinton P.O.) 526; (Ft. William) 636 (i); (Toronto, branch office) 5920 (iii); Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 985; (Royal Mint) 354; Que.: (L'Assomption) 427 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919 (iii); N. B. (St. John river, wharfs) 1179 (i); Ont. (Bruce Mines) 5911; (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Port

Brock, Mr. W. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi); Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5896; (Grosbois Isle) 5903; (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sorel wharf) 12849, 12869 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13349.

Telegraph Lines:—N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13336; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335 (vi); Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii).

Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 12884; (G.T.R. rental) 12889 (vi); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4880 (ii).

———Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6684 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Inspection: *See* 'Customs,' &c.

Tilsonburg & Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14383 (vi).

Toronto & James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

See "James Bay."

Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of, &c., (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies Res., 14352 (vi).

———(Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4241 (ii).

Budget, The, 2119 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5454, 5853 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canal Employees, Wages, &c. (remarks) 2303 (i).

Cattle Purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5478 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14641 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9394 (iv) Com. on B., 10702 (v); on M. for 3°, 12695 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 754 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10783 (v).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14543 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom, Govt. (remarks) 14590 (vi).

S.A.War, Pensions by Govt.(remarks) 14590 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7616 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 492; (Morrisburg) 492 (i).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 540 (i).

St. Chrysôstome Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 2582 (ii); M. to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Quebec (Chateauguay river) 3209 (ii).

Bruce, Mr. F. C., *Hamilton.*

Mutual Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 707 (i).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7219 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Hamilton P.O.) 439; (Hamilton public buildings) 13113 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burlington channel) 1359; (Hamilton, dredging) 2638 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep-water wharf) 12857 (vi).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7379 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9906 (iv).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Public Debt, Amount of Decrease, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4173 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4093 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3217 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286 (i) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dredging) 13469 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 1295 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).

Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°m., 1193 (i).

Canadian Order of Woodmen of World (B.31) 1°*, 367; in Com., 1854 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 1378 (i); in Com., 2755 (ii).

Halton, Peel and Cardwell, Schedules for 1891-1901 (Ques.) 7092 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11584 (v).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 203) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11909 (v).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14657 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Galops (channel completion) 14645 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii).

Campbell, Mr. A., *W. York, Ont.*

Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3710 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B., 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3113 (ii).

Canada National Ry. and Transport Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 367 (i).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360 (iii).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13686 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 14423 (vi).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Supt., 4792 (ii).

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12044, 12185 (v).

Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures Act.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank incorp. B. 153 (M.) to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 210) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3561 (ii), 6105, 6290 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11007, 11115; (Kent) 11580; (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11667; on M. for 3°, 12461 (v).

Sault Ste. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 1462 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 5835; N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii); Ont., (post offices) 511; (rural mail delivery) 511; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (St. John, accommodation) 14069 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 147) 1°*, 2396; in Com., 4868; M. for Com., 4672 (ii); Resuming adjnd. deb., 5555 (iii); in Com., 7812, 9419 (iv).

——— (remarks) on adjnd. Deb., 5555, 5883 (iii).

——— (remarks) 6105 (iii).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14468 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. (B. 20) 1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i); on M. for 2°, 3245; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 5238 (iii).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) M. for Com., 9149 (iv).

Cargill, Mr. H., *E. Bruce.*

Animals Contagious Disease B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B. on M. for Com. of Sup., 395 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10146 (v).

——— Remarks *re* Vote, (remarks) 10538 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones, &c.) 5521 (iii).

Railways, Comparison of Different Systems (remarks in Com. of Sup., 12891 (v).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10940, 10998 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Touladie river) 2287 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (book keeping) 12891 (vi).

Carroll, Hon. H. G., (Solicitor General) *Kamouraska.*

Binder Twine, Cost of in 1901-2 (Ans.) 447 (i).

——— Name of Purchasers (Ans.) 3798 (ii).

——— Prices fixed, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 286 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 925 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation of Warden (Ans.) 286 (i).

Statutes Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ans.) 1030 (i).

Carroll, Hon. H. G.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2358 (i).
Tobacco Combine, Rep. of Commissioner (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *N. Hastings.*
Canadian Mint, Erection, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).
International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ques.) 8116 (iv).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8227 (iv).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G., (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *S. Oxford.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Opinion of Lord Alverstone, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Atlantic Fast Line, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 3882, 4727 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Binder Twine Inspection, Method of Inspection (Ans.) 14685 (vi).
——— Inspector Haycock, Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).
Budget, The, 1596 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *Wm. Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v).
Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 4360 (ii).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels, Provisions (read) 13681 (vi).
——— (remarks) 7583 (iv).
France and Canada ss. Service Subsidy B. 252 (prop. res.) 10410; in Com. on Res., 11422; in Com., 12295 (v).
Grain Inspection Act (weighmasters) Amt. (B. 266) in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808 (vi).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ans.) 4837 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9622 (iv).
——— Pets. *re* Irregularities, Meetings of Com. (remarks) 13671 (vi).
Haycock, Joseph, Inspector of Binder Twine (Ans.) 4959 (ii).
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appmnt., &c. (Ans.) 3627 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890–1903 (Ans.) 11556 (v).
——— *See* 'Supply—Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Japan Trade, Customs Duties *re* (Ans.) 8617 (iv).
Mails carried via New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i),
Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Cartwright, Rt. Hon. Sir Richard—*Con.*
N. W. T., Provincial Autonomy (remarks) *re* Ret., 5088 (ii).
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 11447 (v).
Rideau Canal Employés, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13302 (vi).
St. James Division, Electoral District (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Sessions of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i), 14858 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Indian Affairs (salaries) 274 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 7573 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763; (Man. Grain Act) 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada; and G.B.) 5997, (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi); (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi); (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv); (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iii); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756; (Grand Manan and mainland) 7742 (iv); (Halifax and Canso) 6002 (iii); (Halifax and Liverpool) 7730 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str.) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi); (Magdalen islands) 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi); (Manchester and Montreal) 7745 (iv); (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694 (vi); (P. E. I. and G. B.) 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv); (P E. I. and mainland) 7741 (iv); (P. E. I. and Newfoundland) 13676; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13695 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731; (St. John and Digby) 7739; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740; (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv), 13695; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677 (vi); (Victoria and San Francisco) 7741 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2246 (i).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration act) 7759; (commercial agencies) 7760; (international customs bureau) 7760; (iron and steel bounties) 7762 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 92 (i).
Treadgold Commission, *re* Tel. from Dawson (remarks) 9980 (iv).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2321 (i).
Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. Th. Chase, *Montmorency.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 4224 (ii).
Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Acts (M.) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 101 (i).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills, 483 (i).
———(Remarks) 2395 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G. B,, on M. for Com. of Sup., 385 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt, B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 95 (i).
Ellis, Dr., Immigration Medical Inspector, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
Gaynor & Greene, Extradition (M. for copies of cor., &c.) 109 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12117, 12122, 12165 (v).
See 'Transcontinental,' &c.
Hides Inspector, Geo. Roy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 3627 (ii).
I.C.R. River Ouelle Spur Line, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13806 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10760 (v).
Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 95 (i).
Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., Cor., &c. (M.) for copies, 98 (i).
Levis, Land Purchase for I.C.R. (M for O. Cs., &c.) 3806 (ii).
——(Ques.) 3631 (ii).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (ii).
Patent Relief B. (remarks) 2397 (i).
Medical Examiner of Immigrants, Quebec (Ques.) 3536 (ii).
N.W.Ter. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 13855 (vi).
Orleans, Island of, Mail Service, &c. (Ques) 670 (i).
Pardons, Prerogative of His Ex., O. Cs., &c. (M. for ret.) 567 (i).
——Number, Names, &c. (Ques.) 96 (i).
See 'Ticket of Leave,' &c.
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ques.) 97 (i).
Pilotage Act (Quebec and Montreal) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13937 (vi).
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Quebec Harbour, Wharf Construction, Contract, &c., Par. in *Le Soleil* (remarks) 2237 (i).
Railway Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2594 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec (M. for ret.*) 109 (i).
——Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 2109 (i).
Royal Trust Co.'s (B. 103), 1°*, 1295 (i).
South Shore Ry. Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 449 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084; (tidal survey) 4115 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; Ottawa (geological museum) 363; (Royal Mint) 346; Que. (Lévis) 431; (St. Hyacinthe) 439; (Thetford Mines) 441 (i). Docks (commissioner's report) 2984; (Lévis graving dock) 2978; (Montreal dry dock) 2983 (ii).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2632; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632; Ont. (Port Arthur) 3351 (ii). Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2632, 2953 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle station) 2990 (ii).
Ticket of Leave Act, Releases, &c. (M. for ret.) 566 (i).
——(Ques.) 96 (i),
See 'Pardons,' &c.
Transcontinental (Canadian) Ry., Representation *re* Military Purposes (Ques.) 541 (i).
See "G. T. P. R."
Translation of Parliamentary Papers, &c. (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3471 (ii).
See 'Supply—Public Works, &c.
Treadgold Concession (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).
——Appnmt. of Commission (M. to adjn.) 3864 (ii).
——Appnmt. of Special Com. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4486, (amt.) 4498; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4516 (ii).
——(Remarks) 2394, 2424 (i).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7513 (iii).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. 1st Rep. (presented) 654 (i).
—— 1st Rep. Conc. (M.) 814 (i).
—— 2nd Rep. (presented) 939 (i).
—— 2nd Rep. (translator) Conc. (M.) 1111 (i).
—— 3rd Rep. of Com. Conc. (M.) 1764 (i).
—— 4th Rep. of Com. (presented) 1674 (i).
—— 4th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 1936 (i).
—— 5th Rep. (M.) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).
—— 6th Rep. of Com. (presented) 7658 (iv).
—— 6th Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 7922; (Amt.) 9349 (iv).
—— 8th Rep. of Com. (presented) 12216 (vi).
—— 7th and 8th Reps., Conc. (M.) 14053 (vi).

Charlton, Mr. J., *N. Norfolk.*
Address, on The, 67 (i).
Alien (Restriction) Labour Act Amt. (B. 106) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i). 3282 (ii).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5874 (iii).
Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7315 (iii).
Budget, The, 1643 (i).
Business of the House, Procedure on Order Papers (remarks) 2300 (i).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3,' &c.
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3268 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7503 (iii).
Divorce Court in Can. (prop. res.) 568; (M. wthdn.) 588 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 92; 2°m., 885; in Com., 905, 1200 (i); (compulsory voting) 13560 (vi).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3033 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8467 8489, (iv); in Com. on B., 10445, 10594, 11879, 11906, 12124, 12232, (v); on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 734 (i).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 948 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2508 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp, (B. 68) 1°*, 813 (i).
McDermid, Ellen Relief B. 229 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for Com., 9148 (iv).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Grant to, &c. (remarks) 12805 (vi).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1305 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5864 (iii).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11562 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army, on M. for Sup., 3130 (ii).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. (B. 2) 1°, 92; 2°m., 545; in Com., 550, 1059; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 700; 3°m., 1199 (i).
Ry. Act (supplies to I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 12964 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11613; on M. for 3°, 12399, 12426 (v).
Salmon Industry, B. C., Complaint, &c. (remarks) 9972 (iv).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Schooley, Wm. F. Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for 2°, 2305 (i); in Com., 3224 (ii).
Sessions of the Hse. Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 470 (i).
Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports (remarks) 11828 (v).
Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (ventilation of Chamber) 13009; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3459 (ii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9149 (iii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11168 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (vi.)
Bills of the Hse., Delay in Printing (remarks) 482 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7319, 7359, 7383 (iii).
See 'Supply—Justice,' &c.
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10737 (v).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7425; on Ques. of Order, 7341 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).
Budget, The, 1681 (i).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Bridge Co. and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
Cattle Guard Commission, Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13755 (vi).
——— Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 289 (i).
——— Cost of (remarks) 205 (i).
——— Payment to Date, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).
See 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c., 'Pub. Accts.' &c.

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).

Civil Servants and Dom. Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3189.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502, 12552 (v).

Country Postmasters, Salaries : *See* 'Postmasters.'

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3094, 4012 (ii).

Customs Salaries, Montreal (Ques.) 8115 (iv.)

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Dom. Elections Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 904 (i) ; (compulsory voting) 14425 (vi).

——— (B. 15) 2° m., 704, 1061 ; in Com., 1062 (i), 3237 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6442 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 302, 616 (i).

Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14653 (vi).

Ferries on Navigable Waters : *See* 'Navigable,' &c.

Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14633 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7911 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9683 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10554, 10618, 10690, 11221, 11873, 11974, 12077 (v).

——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., 13265 (vi).

——— Surveys, Expenses, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14649 (vi).

Halifax and South-western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).

Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup. 3685 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926, 7982 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).

ames Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Joggin's to Minudie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8104 (iv).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10743 (v).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (ii), 14278, 14657 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

Lobster Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1589 (i).

McNulty : *See* "Lambton."

Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14235 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).

Members Rights to speak on Questions before the Chair (remarks) 10535 (v).

Middleton and Victoria Beach, N.S., Ry. Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).

Nepigon Ry, Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).

News Cable from England : *See* "British," &c.

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

N. W. Ters. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12319 (v).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14679 (vi).

Postmasters' Salaries, Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14032 (vi).

Post office Removal, Pet. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).

Post office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Privilege, Ques., of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., "Grafters," 10529 (v).

Public Accounts Com., Meeting concurrently with Sittings of Hse. (remarks) 8334 (iv).

——— Producing Census Schedules, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7066 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3727, 4706 (ii) 6183; (telephones) 5535 (iii).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 ; (auditing books by Aud. Gen.) 14518 (vi).

——— (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12963 (vi).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., Res. of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1894 (remarks) 14365 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10963, 11115, 11438, 11624; (Kent) 11567; (Toronto) 11744; on M. for 3°, 12419; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 12486 (v).

Revenue and Expenditure, Amount for 1903 (Ques.) 12715, 13370 (vi).

Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323.

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. Peters and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6473, 7212 (iii).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Supplies for I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429; (census) 4594, 4800; (census, cost, &c.) 4816; (census schedules) 4635 (ii), 7066 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7088, 7623; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (dep. minister) 4357; (exhibitions) 4600; (experimental farms) 4551; (fumigating stations) 4434; (general statistics) 4430; (health act) 4440; (imperial institute) 4436; (Japan exhibition) 4631 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7646 (iv); (prof. Shutt's rep.) 4556; (San José scale) 4434; (St. Louis exhibition) 4600; (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4614; (Washington, Mr., Rep., &c.) 4430; (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

Canals, Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929; Chambly (tow paths) 12906; Rideau (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 332; (salaries) 323 (i); Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 235, 241; Interior (salaries) 271; Public Works (salaries) 333; Railways (salaries) 334 (i),

Customs (contingent expenses) 3783 (ii); (Dresden, port of entry) 3960; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3950; (salaries, &c.) 3909; (Walpole office) 3961; (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake & Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6944; (Teulon road) 6927 (iii).

Immigration (on ques. of order) 6855 (iii).

Indians (St. Regis lock-up) 6415; (Walpole islands) 6412 (iii).

Justice—Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3532; (Manitoba) 3534 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).

Miscellaneous (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14653 (vi); (arbitration, Dom. and

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—Con.

Provs.) 12590; (Micmac dictionary) 12592 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6957 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6947.

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4043 (ii).

Post Office (country postmasters) 6033; (Lambton postmaster, dismissal) 6166; (letter carriers, salaries) 6033; (mail bag repairs) 6148; (Ottawa Supply Co., &c.) 6148 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers, &c.) 1018; (clerks of works) 964; **N.B.** (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, quarantine water service) 420; **N.W.T.** (Red Deer, court house) 960; **N.S.** (Halifax) 412; **Ont.** (Ft. William) 636; (renewals) 636; (Toronto Dom. buildings, renewals) 650; (Toronto post office) 957; (Toronto Junction post office) 650; (Wallaceburg) 505; **Ottawa** (astronomical observatory) 344; (Major's Hill Park) 1016; (Royal Mint) 351; (telephones) 1014; **Que.** (Grosse Isle) 426 (i).

Dredging (dredges, repairs) 2619 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665; (ii); (repairs, &c.) 1185; **N.B.** (Shippegan harbour) 1183; (Negro Point breakwater) 1182 (i); **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143; (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1191 (i); (Pembroke, wharf) 13248; (Point Edward, dredging) 13249; (Sydenham river) 13250 (vi); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3209; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii).

Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (clerical assistance) 2753; (engineers, salaries) 2726 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13342 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2720; (temporary clerks) 2733 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2690.

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Magdalen islands) 2714 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5507; (hog cholera) 5507 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3699; (Levis accommodation) 3706 (ii); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (power saw) 12607; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (St. John, increased accommodation) 12596 (v); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12920 (vi).

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Timegami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Tobacco, Duty on foreign Leaf (Ques.) 446 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Walpole Islands, Adoption of Boy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yukon Post Office, Deficit (remarks) 14015 (vi).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *S. Waterloo.*
Ayr Postmaster, Dismissal of (Ques.) 1195 (i).
Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85) 1°*, 1023 (i).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10736 (iv).
Free List, Changes in Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10060 (iv).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Waterloo) 11641 (v).
Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ques.) 1195 (i).
SUPPLY:
Customs (salaries at ports, &c.) 3917 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3531 (ii).
Post office (country postmasters) 6056 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (coal contract 1066; Ottawa (astronomical observatory, 343; (census building) 991; (furniture, &c.) 984; (rentals, &c.) 989; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 1071; (Church Point breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1085; (Glace Bay) 1093 (i); Ont. (Port Arthur) 3353 (ii); Que. (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3326 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (iv).
Tariff Changes, Free List, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3505 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *W. Toronto.*
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Publication of Cor., Objection (remarks) 14690 (vi).
——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 1296; on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
American Exporters, Discriminating Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13674, 13681 (vi).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5963 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iii).
——— *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies, &c., Miscellaneous, &c,'
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11166 (v).
Audit Act *re* Civil Servants, Extra Work (remarks) 13992 (vi).
Auditing Deptl. Finances, System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6354 (iii).
Bayfield and Can. Navy: *See* 'Navy.'
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7313 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Binder Twine, Average Price for Sisal, &c. Ques.) 7566, 8085 (iv).
——— Quantity imported from U. S. (Ques.) 7566 (iv).
See Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.
British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 8236 (iv), 10719 (v).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7412; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7346 (iii).
Budget, The, 2206 (i).
Business of the House, &c. (remarks) 2301 (i).
Cable News from England: *See* 'British,' &c.
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Associated Press: *See* 'British,' &c.
Can. Iron Foundry Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res,, 4368, 4961, 5089, 5108 (ii); in Com. on B., 5597 (iii).
Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; in Com., 2303.
Can. and S. Africa SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on Can. and France Subsidy, 10820 (v).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company's incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com. (amt.) 7479; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7485; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).
Census Expenditure 1901, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13708 (vi).
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 55) 1°*, 707 (i).
Chambers of Commerce Delegates: *See* 'Delegates,' &c.
Cigarettes: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215,' &c.
Citizens' Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 213) 1°*, 5679; in Com., 7478 (iii).
Civil Servants, Canvassing for Outside Business, &c. (remarks 13992 (vi).
——— and Guarantee Companies, &c. (Ques.) 3233 (ii).
——— Imperial Decorations: *See* 'Imperial,' &c.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12510, 12535 (v), 13822; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).
Coal imported in Ont. from June 1901 to March 1903, and June 1902 to March 1903 (Ques.) 669 (i).
Coleman, Mr. A. B., Tender *re* Toronto P. O., Mr. Gouinlock's Letter (read) 13096 (vi).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4685 (ii).
Commercial Travellers, Reduced Ry. Fares, &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5680 (iii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3263, 3274 (ii).
Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 5582; in Com., 6640, 7491 (iii); (cigarettes) 10750 (v).
Current Wages and P. O. Contracts: *See* P. O. 'Supplies.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3045, 3088, 4012 (ii).
Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Debates, Translators, Rent of Building, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Ill-treatment at Newport, Vt., Par. in Newspapers, &c. (read) 12495 (v).
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) 13674, 13681 (vi).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (remarks) *re* Business for Thursday, 5589 (iii).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dredges building at Sorel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012, 4680 (ii).
Dundonald: *See* 'G. O. C.'
Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
Excise Taxation, Revenue 1896 and 1903 (Ques.) 13935, 14284 (vi).
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6899 (iii).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10814; in Com. on B., 12295 (v).
Freight Rates Discrimination against Canadians. *See*: 'Discriminating,' &c.
Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).
G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2417 (i).
German Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Good Shepherd Reformatory, St. John, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4840 (ii).
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re*, Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Grain Inspection, Cost per Car, &c. (Ques.) 4837.
Grain Inspection, Toronto Board of Trade, Res. *re* Grain Standards (remarks) 11177, 12535 (v).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians, Tel. read, 10745 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5139 (iii), 7820, 7829, 7846 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10308, 10317; in Com. on B., 10453, 11192, 11294, 12076, 12143, 12241 (v).
G. T. P. Bill and Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections (amt.) 13272 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 14765 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677.
Hibernian SS., Wreck: *See* 'Shipping,' &c.
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 794 (i).
Immigration, Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ques.) 2756 (ii).
Immigration Office in Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 1031 (i).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Service (Ques.) 12715, 13669, 13936 (vi).
Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).
I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3677 (ii).
——— Official Guide, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3535 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582.
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Official.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3301, 3398 (ii).
See 'Windsor.'
Japan Trade *re* Customs Duties (Ques.) 8617 (iv).
——— *re* U.S. Products (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).
——— B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10764, 10776 (v).
King's S. A. Medal, Pet. from N.C.Os., &c. (Ques.) 10491 (v).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Purchase of Engines for I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7537 (iii).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10489 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8197 (iv).
Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672. *See* 'Supply—Postoffice,' &c.
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13833 (vi).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 663 (i).
See 'Mowat.'
Listowel Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2518 (ii).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14222, 14542 (vi).
——— Special Trains, &c. (remarks) 14680, 14688.
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Tel. System, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13327 (vi).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 226 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6917 (iii).
Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5729 (iii).
Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt.-Gov. of Ont., Decease of (remarks) 1579 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 4700 (ii), 6081, 6112 (iii).
Murray, Immigration Agent, Scotland (cor. &c.) in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 949 (i).
Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5295 (iii).
Nelson Postoffice, B. C., Racine Bros. Claim (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iii), 8126 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from G.B : *See* 'British,' &c.
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10742 (v).
Official. &c., Cars, Haulage paid, &c. (Ques.) 9682 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup.. 13065 (vi).
Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).
See 'Supply—Public Works. Buildings,' &c.
Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4220, 4675 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8262 (iv).
Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. (remarks) on M. to wthdr. Res., 12493 (v),
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Matters (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 ; in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Clerks, Promotions, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
P.O. Supplies and Current Wages, Declaration, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12220 (v).
Printing Bureau and Typographical Union, &c. (Ques.) 4182, 4444 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10517 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5979 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr, *Blair*) in Com., 3988, 4697, 4728 (ii), 5326, 5680, 6080, 7300 (iii), 7610, 8126 (iv) ; (telephones) 5538 (iii), 8142 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv) ; on Sen. Amts., 13836.
Railway Accidents, Duties of Public Officials (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ques.) 9217 (iv).
See 'West Lorne,' &c., 'Windsor,' &c.
Ry. Accidents. Investigation, &c. (remarks) 1329.
——Loss of Life, &c. (Ques.) 873 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2575 ; in Com., 2580 ; on M. for 3°, 3004, (ii).
Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7132 (iii).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10899 ; 10958, 11125, 11431, 11503 ; (Kent) 11579 ; (Toronto) 11693, 11732 ; (York) 11665 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12459; on M. for 3°, 12438 (v).
Ronan, W., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).
St. Lawrence Navigation, Quotations from London Newspapers ; in Com. of Sup., 4133 (ii).
Salmon Canning Industry, B. C. (remarks) 10241 (v).
——Complaints *re* (remarks) 9978 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Militia Transportation (remarks) 12940 (vi).
Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12994 (vi).
Sisal, Price per Pound for Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine.'
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11827 (v).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. Subsidy, 10820 (v).
S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, &c. (remarks) 1027 (i).
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv) 10491 (v).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).
——B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6915 (iii).
——B. 237 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 12494 (v).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Stock Gambling, on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7204 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Poultry Farming) 7649 (iv.)

Canals: Galops (deepening, &c.) 8269 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii); Post Office (promotion, &c.) 13998 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses. Toronto, &c.) 3901; (preferential tariff) 3926; (salaries, &c.) 3901 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North road) 6930 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep.) 5382 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5295, 5299; (Ottawa) exhibit) 5308 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6669; (agents, old country, &c.) 6726; (exodus to U. S.) 6727, 6874; (Galicians) 6863; Glockling's Mr. Robert, cor., &c.) 6728; (Murray, agent, Scotland) 6827; (settlers' effects) 6727; (trachoma, &c.) 6696; (Ques. of Order *re* quoting Speeches) 6873 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv); (Man. Grain Act) 13698 (vi).

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii); Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 14643 (vi); Supreme Court (law books, purchase) 3405; (reps. binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (Dugas, judge) 3413; judges' living allowance) 3413; (sheriffs' salaries, &c.) 3410; (living allowances, &c.) 3509; (telegraph operators) 3419, 3509; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3516; (general expenses) 3511 (ii).

Labour Dept. (fair wage schedule) 7174; (Racine Bros. claim) 7174 (iii).

Legislation: H. of C. (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence, improvement) 4133; (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4133 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13677 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5997, (iii) 7573; (Can. and S. Africa) 7747 (iv); (*Lord Strathcona*, str,) 6003 (iii), 13697; (Magdalen Islands) 13676; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 13694; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi); (St. John and Digby) 7739 (iv); (St. John, N,B., and Glasgow) 13674 (vi); (St. John and London) 7739; (St. John and W. Indies) 7740 (iv); (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694 (vi); (wrecking plant) 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

Militia (grants to associations) 3773; (pay and allowance) 3590; (Toronto drill shed) 3614 (ii), 13086 (vi); (Valleyfield strike) 3590, 3754 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit 6966 (iii).

N.W.M. Police, (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262; (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (St. Lawrence transportation) 4044 (ii).

Post Office (affidavits *re* supplies) 6138; (automobiles, &c.) 6050; (boots, &c., purchased in Aurora) 6142 (iii); (cities, promotions, &c.) 14009; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi); (letter box collections) 6139; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (mail bag repairs, &c.) 6142; (mail service) 6065; (ry. transfer agents) 6136 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6113 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 963; (caretakers) 1022; (Toronto armoury) 972 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton P.O.) 13037; (St. John, drill hall) 13042; (St. John, immigrant shed) 13040; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039; (Woodstock, armoury) 13040; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13041; **N.S.** (Antigonish, post office) 13034; (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 13030; (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax. immigration shed) 13033; (Sydney Mines) 13029; (Sydney, post office) 13035; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 534 (i); (Cobourg P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Dom. exhibition) 534 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Kingston, barracks) 13119; (Kingston, military college) 13094 (vi); (Kingston, military stables) 639 (London, drill hall) 646 (i); (Peterborough, armoury) 13083; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto, custom house) 648, 957; (Toronto, Dom. exhibition) 534; (Toronto, drill hall) 3614 (ii), 13086; (Toronto, examining warehouse) 13118; (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115; (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto, postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, renewals) 956, 957 (i); **Ottawa** (additional rooms) 13006; (coal sheds) 13115, 13116 (vi); (elevators) 1012; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (lighting, &c.) 975; (Major's Hill Park) 1015 (i); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996 (i); (steel shelving) 13089 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); **P.E.I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. buildings) 13036; **Que.**, (Levis, P.O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081; (Montmagny, P O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13077; (Que. Citadel drill hall) 13053, 13057, 13078; (Que., military buildings) 13054; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451; (Columbia river) 1451 (i); (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); **Generally** (dredges, repairs) 2619; **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2668 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312; **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 13006; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; **N.S.** (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's river, wharf) 13141; (Bayfield, wharf) 13142; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; (Breton's Cove, 13151, 13152 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1077 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi); **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; (Bowmanville, pier) 1352; (Burk's Falls) 1359; (Depot Harbour) 1364; (general repairs) 1373 (i); (Goderich, breakwater) 13242 (vi) (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i); (Kaministiquia river, dredging) 13013; (Kingston graving dock) 13024; (Little Current) 13245; (Magann & Phinn, claims) 13255 (vi); (Midland Harbour) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1427 (i); (Port Arthur) 2636, 3350 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1442; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claims) 13255; (Toronto, pier) 13254 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13313; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1520 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320 (ii);

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys, &c.) 13340.
Telegraph Lines, N.W.T. (Edmonton and Athabaska) 13335; (Edmonton agency) 13334; P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13327 (vi).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (smallpox) 5492 (iii).
Railways (Murray Harbour branch) 7537 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).
Surtax: *See* 'Customs,' &c.
Tariff and N.W.T. Immigration, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).
Telegraph Operators, Yukon, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3419, 3509 (i).
Telephone Cos. in Mar. Provs., Names, &c. (Ques.) 2585 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 4672 (ii), 5555 (iii); in Com., 9421 (iv).
——— on M. to resume adjnd. deb., 6198 (iii).
——— on M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 (iv).
——— (Remarks) 6102 (iii).
Toronto and Niagara Power Co., 6116 (iii).
Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ques.) 5589 (iii).
Toronto, Labour Council and Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ques.) 1854 (i).
——— Military Stores Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 3614 (ii), 13055, 13086, 13115, (vi).
——— Post Office, A. B. Coleman's Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— Toronto St. Ry. (remarks) 4700 (ii), 6082 (iii).
——— Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport, Treatment of English Delegates (remarks) 12495 (v).
Valleyfield Labour Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 13371 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Valleyfield Post Office, Tenders *re* (remarks) 11187 (v).
West Lorne Investigation, Commissioners, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— Jury's Verdict, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4726 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Accidents.'
Windsor Junction Ry. Accident, Rep. of Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3496, 3712 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

Cochrane, Mr. E., *E. Northumberland, Ont.*
Allan SS. Co., Reductions of Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14077 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4236 (ii).
Apples, Canadian Packing, Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 11184 (v).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11176 (v).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bill (remarks) 485 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5059 (ii), 5424, 5072 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Campbellford Post Office, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5103 (ii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3227 (ii).
Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5483 (iii).
Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Cobourg Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13084 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.
Cumberland Ry. & Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14426 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3026 (ii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 293, 625 (i).
Ferries: *See* 'Navigable.'
Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11180 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5167 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10440, 11190, 11362 (v).
G. T. P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13280 (vi).
Johnson, W. H., Purchase of House on Murray Canal (remarks) in Com of Sup., 14143, 14147 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).
Le Journal, Canvassing for: *See* 'Pelletier,' 'Political,' &c.
Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12917 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14551 (vi).
Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 20.'
Murray Canal, Supt.'s duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780, 12987 (vi).

Owen Sound, Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13064 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L. and Canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13982 (vi).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13630 (vi).

Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials (remarks) 13991 (vi).

Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights & Measures B. 188.'

Postmasters in Rural Districts, Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

Preston, Mr. and Can. Apples: *See* 'Apples,' &c.

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (ii).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4222 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14755 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5981.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3833, 4706 (ii), 6210 (iii), 8130 (iv); (drainage) 4756 (ii).

Ry. Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12962 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14464, 14506 (vi).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10979, 11139, 11468, 11625; (Toronto) 11720 (v).

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).

Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (aids to societies) 4433; (census enumerators) 4817; (census, Haldimand) 4822 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv).

Canals: Generally (toll collectors) 12931; (Johnson, W. H., purchase of house) 14143, 14147; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Interior (Mines branch, salaries) 13769 (vi).

Customs (Campbellford collector) 3913; (salaries) 3913 (ii).

Dom. Lands (tree culture) 6780 (iii).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5124; (steamers, B. C.) 5278 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6699; (agents' expenses) 6887; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6853; (White, W. J., agent) 6853 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6345; (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7768 (iv).

Legislation: House of Commons (*Montreal Herald*, printing) 5271; (printing, &c.) 5271 (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str.) 5745 (iii); (Marconi stations) 13645 (vi).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iii): (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13675 (vi); (St. John and Halifax) 7742; (St. John and London) 7737 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt steamers, supplies, &c.) 4086 (ii); (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).

Public Works: Buildings, N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13044 (vi); Ont. (Campbellford) 504; Ottawa (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1002 (i); Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14245; (military buildings) 13054 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton, wharf) 13230; (damages to schooner) 13231 (vi); N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 1069 (i); (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1073; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Cow bay) 1079; (Economy wharf) 1087 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13190 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Green Cove harbour) 1101; (Kingsport pier) 1104; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Necum Teuch wharf) 1139; Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1355; (Depot Harbour) 1362 (i); (Moira river, flooding) 13470 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3346 (ii); (Trenton, dredging) 1434; (Wendover wharf) 1436 (i); Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5898 (iii); (Chateauguay river) 3211 (ii); (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13465; (Port Daniel wharf) 13468; (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469; (Rivière Verte) 13470; (St. Andre de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Perade) 13488; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13497 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3219, 3308, 3327 (ii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12855 (vi).

Miscellaneous (engineers, salaries) 13340; (Ottawa river surveys) 13345 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2692 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs. cable lines) 2701 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (general vote) 12881; (Moncton, locomotives, &c.) 14093; (Pictou accommodation) 14089; (sidings, additional) 14057, 14082; P. E. I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14110, 14116; (Murray Harbour branch) 12832 (vi),

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2348 (i).

——— (postal scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4188 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*

County Court Judges, N. S., Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Dodd, Judge of County Court No. 7, N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi).

Fisheries (fish hatcheries) 13660 ; (sardine industry) 13653 (vi).

Justice, Administration of : N.S. (county court judges) 14259 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14251 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Meteghan Cove) 1135 (i) ; (Victoria beach wharf) 13214 (vi).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*

Civil Service (superannuation) Act Amt. B. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 597 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9064 (iv).

Home Rule for Ireland (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 720 ; Agreed to (Y. 102, N. 41) 812 (i).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com. (objection) 5971 ; in Com., 5978, 6399 (iii).

Rocky Mountain Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 197) 1°*, 4262 (ii).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 367 ; on M. for 2°, 630 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com. on Private Bills, 664 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *S. Essex.*

Detroit River, &c., International Waters, &c., U. S. Govt. Work (M. for. cor.*) 2778 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 ; in Com., 908 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Properties (B. 19) 1° m., 202. *See* 'Ry. Act. B. 21.'

Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 149) 1°*, 2396 (i).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 1764 (i) ; in Com., 4588 (ii).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i) ; in Com., 4726 ; (drainage) Amt., 4729 (ii) ; 5325, 6178 ; (farm crossings) 5774 ; (screens, &c., 6072 ; (Toronto and Niagara Power Co.) 6115 (iii) ; (race horse *Hen ry R.*) 8191 (iv).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 102) 1°*, 1295 ; 2° m., 1812 (i).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10883 ; in Com., 10993 (v).

Cowan, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2947 (ii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry., 6118 (iii).

Treadgold Commission, Pars. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Culbert, Mr. J., *Brockville.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11485 (v).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5877 (iii).

Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13896 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6391 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) 1°*, 2582 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 ; 3° m., 5988 (iii).

Budget, The, 1715 (i).

Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ques.) 14286 (vi.)

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 1462.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4371, 5100 (ii) ; in Com. on B., 5611, 5650, 5799 (iii).

Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3179 (ii).

Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13567 (vi).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 707 (i).

Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11181.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5145 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10019 ; ('red headed boy') 10020, 10035 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 11250, 11989, 12048, 12231, 12268 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 13028 (vi).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6571, 6596 (iii).

Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) 1580 (i).

Mailing and Franking Privilege: *See* 'Campaign.'

Man. and N.W.T., Ry. Co.'s. Land Subsidies granted by Govt. (Ques.) 1197 (i).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7993 (iv).

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Con.*
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).
Public Works, Generally, Amount expended in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Ry., &c., on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10501, 10507 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5682, 6274 (iii); (amt. *re* fire-guards) 8173 (iv).
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* received (Ques.) 13028 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies (money) paid by Govt. in Provs. (Ques.) 1197 (i).
See 'Man. & N.W.T.' &c.
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2455 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11033, 11115, 11460, 11718; (Dauphin) 11757; (Macdonald) 11781; (Winnipeg) 11787; (York) 11688 (v).
Senate Representation in N. W. T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 471 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Stewart River Development Co.'s incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 2582 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 532 (i).
Tariff Protection, Govt. Policy: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6691 (iii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11086 (v).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4544 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Delisle, Mr. M. S., *Portneuf.*
Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 3°, 13940 (vi).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (seconded) 18 (i).
C.P.R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 837 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7505 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13571, 14410 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. (B. 155) 1°m., 2501 (ii), 2°m, 8243; in Com., 8244, 8361 (iv).

Demers, Mr. L. P.—*Con.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4784 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 928 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654 (i).
Private Bills, Notices, &c., Rep. of Com. *re* Revision of Rules (M.) 12216, 13547 (vi).
See 'Rules,' &c.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4752 (ii); (fire indemnification) 6299 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8349 (iv).
Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. (B. 23) 1°m., 283 (i); 2°m., 2780 (ii).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1257 (i); in Com., 11034.
Rules of the Hse. (M.) to amend, 12216 (v), 13547 (vi).
Rules, Revision, &c. *re* Pets. for Private Bills (M.) for Sel. Com., 4441 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (experimental farms) 4548 (ii).
Supreme Court Act Amt. (B. 22) 1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4901 (ii).
Tarte, Hon. J. I., and C.P.R. Car 001, &c. (Ques.) 14282 (vi).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Terrebonne (M. for cor.*) 288 (i).
Jesus River, Deepening, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289.
Terrebonne Post Office Buildings, &c. (M. for cor.*) 289 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 8th Rep. (M.) to conc., 13788 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. (binder twine) M. to conc., 14043, 14047 (vi).
Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., Distribution, &c. (M.) 13788 (vi).
——— Rep. of Com. on Ag., Distribution of Copies (M.) to conc., 14043 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5812 (iii).
C. P. Ry. and Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Elevator Rates, Advance, &c. (remarks) 11062.
Great North-west Central and C. P. R. Co.'s Agreement (Ques.) 2306 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv); on Sen. Amts. (amt.) 13625.
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5785, 6233 (iii).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2478 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 1295 (i) ; in Com., 6655 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Nepigon Iron Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) Pet. (presented) 2396 (i) ; 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14399, 14436 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (Duncan, Mr., inspector, Georgian Bay) 5134 (ii).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5015 (ii).

Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Fisheries Commission, Rep. of Commissioner (remarks) 1199 (i).

Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).
See 'Salmon,' &c.

Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).

False Creek Lease, Cor., &c., (M. for copies*) 2337 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii) ; 5513, 6354.

——— Lease to Kelly and Burnett (Ques.) 7565.

Flagship at Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal, &c. (remarks) 10957 (v).

Fraser River Canning Industry, &c. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Kelly & Burnett, Lease of False Creek, &c. (Ques.) 7565 (iv).
See 'False Creek.'

Labour Commission B.C., Rep. *re* (Ques.) 8116.

Port Moody, Military Reserve, &c. (Ques.) 446.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions *re* (Ques.) 11557 (v).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C. (remarks) 10103, 10241 (v).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, Letter from Canners Ass'n. (read) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France, Tariff *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (exhibitions, Treadgold exhibit) 4614 (ii).
Fisheries (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (agents, travelling expenses) 7262 ; (Clayoquot school) 7269 ; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7264 ; (reserves, re-allotment, &c.) 7263 ; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7268; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258 (iii).

Earle, Mr. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5050 (ii),
Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151 (iii).
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Esquimalt graving dock) 5919 ; (Hardy Bay wharf) 5916 ; Que. (Cacouna wharf) 5899 ; Telegraph Lines, B. C (Alberni Clayoquot) 5918 ; (Quesnel Atlin branch) 5827 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iv).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R., *Westmoreland.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12570 (v).

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 1115 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14409 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5190 (iii), 7891 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8706, 8718 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 11389 (v) ; on M. for 3°, 12731 (vi).

Harvey and Salisbury Ry. Subsidy, Remarks, &c. 14471 (vi).

Immigrants for Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 1855 (i).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2375 (i).

I. C. R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3682 (ii).

International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans, by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12798 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14679 (vi).

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. (B. 180) 1°*, 3391 (ii) ; in Com., 7771, 7914 (iv).

P. E. I. Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1049 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (N.B.) 11818 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14321 (vi).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14324 (vi).

St. John Valley, Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3596 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13038 ; (St. John, drill hall) 13042 ; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).
Railways : I. C. R. (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 ; (Metis station) 12605 ; (Moncton accommodation) 12599 ; (Truro accommodation) 12604 (v).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R.—*Con.*
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).
Ties on Govt. Rys., Importations, &c. (Ques.) 1679 (i).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *S. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5441 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6216 (iii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4777 (ii).
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 264) 1°*, 12993 (vi).
Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c. (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2778 (ii).
Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Privilege, 7567 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6637 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, on Notice of M. (Mr. *Borden*) 14765 (vi).
——— *See* 'Joint-High,' &c.
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan SS. Co., Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13937, 14064.
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6955 (iii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in C~m., 1807 (i).
Audit Act Amt. (B. 251) 1°m., 11159 (v).
——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Auditing Deptl. Finances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iii).
Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circulars, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Auditor General and Treasury Board *re* Payment to Members (remarks) 10956 (v).
Auditor General, on Inquiry for Cor., 11427 (v).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Bankers' Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 285 (i).
Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Rep. (presented) 3804 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation *re* Injuries (remarks) 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Binder Twine Bounties (B. 233) prop. Res., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300; 1°*, 7382; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
———Inspection and Penalties collected, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).
Birkett, Mr. T., M.P., Lease of Lands, &c. (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6522 (iii).
Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400 (iii).
———on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
Condition of Country, 1378; Details of Revenue, comparison with 1900-1, 1379; Excise, 1379; Post Office Dept., 1381; I.C.R. Revenue and Expenditure, Consolidated Fund, 1382; Capital and Consolidated Fund, Expenditures, 1383; Revenue for 1902-3, Estimate of, 1385; Public Debt, 1897-1903, 1385; Public Debt, reduction of, 1387; Surpluses, 1387, 1390; Net Debt. per capita, 1388; Chartered Banks Deposits, 1389; Increase in paid up capital and note circulation, 1395; Total Trade, Tables, 1389; Public Accounts, 1391; Iron Bounties, 1391; Reasons for borrowing while Finances are prosperous, 1392; Redemption of Treasury Bills before maturity, 1392; Loans, maturing, 1392; New sources of revenue by sale of C.P.R. lands, 1394; Increase in circulation of Dominion notes, amts. to Currency Act, 1396; Tariff amts. and free list not practicable at present, 1398; Trade Relations with England, Preference should be reciprocal, 1400; Preferential trade, memo. of Mr. Gerald Balfour, 1402; memo of Can. Ministers at Colonial Conference, 1404; Colonial Conference, 1400-1406; U.S. relations, 1406; Cor. between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and U.S. Senator Fairbanks *re* Joint High Commission and Alaskan Boundary, 1407; Tariff Policy of Govt., 1409; German Surtax, 1412-1418; Cor. with Mr. Bopp, 1414; Steel Rail industry and Sault Ste. Marie works, bounties to, 1419; Lead Industry of B.C., 1419; Binder Twine, 1420; Foreign Built Ships, and registration in Can., coasting privileges, 1420; Beet Root Sugar Machinery, 1421; Alluvial Gold Mining Machinery, 1421; Transportation Problem, Canal tolls, 1422; Resolutions *re* Customs Tariff Amt., 1423 (i).
Budget, The (remarks) 410, 1114 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 1743 (i).
Business of the House (remarks) 871, 1110, 2395, 2501 (i), 3969, 5051 (ii), 5510, 5581, 5959, 6352, 7090, 7201 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Business of the House. Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 484 (i).

——— Late Sittings (remarks) 3207 (ii).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4347 (ii).

——— *re* Suppl. Estimates (remarks) 4957 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 1593, 1857 (i).

Cable News Service between Can. and G. B. (B. 240) prop. Res., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of Bill, 8243 (iv); 2° m., 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).

——— Brierly, Jas. S., Letter read, 10739 (v).

Canada Central Ry. and Brockville and Ottawa Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation to Municipalities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5613 (iii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2304 (i).

C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).

C. P. R. Steamers sailing from St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).

C. P. R., Transcontinental Ry. Trains, Water Supply (remarks) 9457 (iv).

Canadian Press Despatches: *See* 'Cable,' &c.

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5556, 5884 (iii).

Canals in Ont. and Que., Amount expended (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 375 (i).

——— Ret. *re* (papers laid on Table) 591 (i).

——— (remarks) 267 (i), 14054 (vi).

Cattle-Guard Commission, Rep. laid on Table, 14758 (vi).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 203,286, 1593 (i).

——— (remarks) 204 (i).

——— Cost, on M, for Ret. (amt.) 289 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 479 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5960, 6199 (iii).

Chambers of Commerce, Delegates, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers at Newport (remarks) 12496 (v).

Chambly Canal, Collector, Superannuation (Ans,) 7203 (iii).

——— *See* 'Moreau.'

Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 1575 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c, (remarks) 4427 (ii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act (general increase) Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12538 (v).

——— (superannuation) Amt. (B. 49) prop. Res., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B,, 597; 2° m., 1116 (i),

Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ans,) 9682 (iv).

——— Temporary, &c, (remarks) in Com. on P. O, Bill, 5869 (iii).

Civil Service Examiners List (presented) 479 (i).

Clergue Steel Works at the Sault, Contract, &c. (Ans,) 13668 (vi).

——— *See* 'Steel.'

Cochrane, Hon. Senator, Tel. *re* (read) 3000 (ii).

Collingwood Dry Dock, remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4681 (ii).

——— *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'

Colonial Conference, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).

——— *See* 'Alaskan.'

Congratulations to Prime Minister *re* Twenty-five years as Member, 11690 (v),

Consolidated Revenue: *See* 'Audit,' &c.

Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).

Corry & Laverdure, Award, &c., *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., injured at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

——— *See* 'Belmont.'

Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

Cummings, Jas., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 9458 (iv).

Customs Act Amt, (The Tariff) Prop. Res., 1423 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3058; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).

——— (B. 273)—(surtax) in Com., 14755 (vi).

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9349 (iv).

Debert Coal Mines and I. C. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 587.

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 914 (i); M. for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); in Com., 13591 (vi).

——— Govtl. Intention *re* (remarks) 12720 (vi).

——— (M.) to add Name *re* Sel. Com., 6734 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 704 (i).
Dom. Notes Security (B. 222) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; in Com., 6913 (iii).
Drummondville Siding Accommodation (remarks) 14081 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction (B. 178) prop. Res., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.' Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14341 (vi).
Election Law, Legislation *re* (remarks) 12218 (vi).
——— *See* 'Dom. Elections.'
Election Printing in *Advocate*, Prince Albert, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).
Electric Lighting, Cardinal and Iroquois Canals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
Estimates, The (presented) 90 (i).
——— Suppl., 1903 (presented) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).
——— Suppl., 1904 (presented) 12868 (vi).
——— Further Suppl. (presented) 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— (remarks) 5002, 5122 (ii).
Experimental Farms Report (presented) 1937 (i). *See* 'Butter, &c.'
Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic.'
Financial Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) 14617 (vi).
Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1592 (i).
Fishing Industry in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
France and Canada ss. Service (remarks) 4958 (ii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).
Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i), 2789 (ii).
——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).
Galops Rapids, Deepening (M.) to conc., agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4785 (ii).
German Surtax, in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).
——— *See* 'Budget.'
——— Cor., &c., papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).
Govt. Business (remarks) 13547 (vi).
——— *See* 'Business of the House.'
Govt. Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8405 (iv).
Govt. Official Cars, Amounts paid for Haulage (Ans.) 9682 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on Order for Com., 4132 (ii); in Com., 5147, 5236 (iii), 7901; on M. for 3°, 8328 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (B. 235) prop. Res., 7915; on. M. for 1°, 7725; on M. for Com. on Res., 8546 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10420; in Com. on B. 10588, 10614, 11191, 11302, 11838, 12076, 12168 (v); on M. for 3°, 12694 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ans.) 13027 (vi).
——— Parishes crossed, Levis to Temiscouata (Ans.) 8117 (iv).
——— Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (remarks) 5734 (iii).
——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
——— Surveys, Reps., &c, (remarks) 8231 (iv).
——— Ways and Means *re* Surveys (M.) for Com., 14765 (vi).
G. T. Ry., and C. P. Ry. Fiscal Bookkeeping, Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12880 (vi).
G. T. Ry. Rates, Discrimination between Americans and Canadians (remarks) 10745 (v).
——— Loans by Govt. (Ans.) 2920 (ii).
——— and Two Cent Rate, *re* Original Charter (Ans.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Halifax Cotton Co., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14478 (vi).
——— Elevator, Land Purchase (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
——— Marine and Fishery Office, Removal, &c. (remarks) 14279 (vi).
——— Museum, Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— P. O., Pet. *re* Salaries of Employees (remarks) on Conc., 14759 (vi).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 4587 (ii).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 676, 1057 (i).
Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Imperial Defence *re* Lord Rosebery's prop. Res. (remarks) 411 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2373 (i).
Insurance Cos. of Canada, Abstract of Statements (presented) 1025 (i).
——— Rep. of Supt. (presented) 9350 (iv).
I.C.R., Pension System, &c. (Ans.) 9216 (iv.)
——— *See* 'Trackmen.'
——— Stations, Restaurants, &c., Fire Protection (Ans.) 14664 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. (B. 238) prop. Res., 6629 (iii); in Com. on Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10799 (v).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4278 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4040 (ii).
——— Bounty Payments (Ans.) 6435 (iii).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).
Japanese Tariff *re* U. S. Products (Ans.) 9217 (iv).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joint High Commission *re* Par. in Toronto *World* (remarks) 14054 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) wthdn., 634 (i).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14518; (Amt.) 14519 (vi).
Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 14140 (vi).
Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Lead Bounties (B. 239) prop. Res., 6169; in Com. on Res., 8195 (iv); in Com. on B., 10798 (v).
Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).
Lime Ridge, Megantic Co. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).
Locomotive Contracts *re* I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ans,) 11829 (v).
Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation (Ans.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) 1580 (i).
Lumber Trade in B. C. and U. S. Importations (remarks) 14766 (vi).
Mabou and Gulf Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14326 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 266 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commission, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 90,707 (i), 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Middleton and Victoria Beach Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
Midland Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Militia Defalcation, Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6934 (iii).
Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5719 (iii).
Milk Can. Bill: *See* 'Weights.'
Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (remarks) 90 (i).
——— on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 164. (i).
Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan (B. 201) prop. Res., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445 (ii); in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii).
Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
Moreau, H., Salary as Collector on Chambly Canal (Ans.) 8488 (iii), 12497 (v).
——— *See* 'Chambly.'
Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter (Ques.) 8084 (iv).
Newspaper Despatches from England B.: *See* 'Cable.'
N. S. and Dom., Financial Terms, &c. (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N. W. T., Financial Aid (B. 256) prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°*, of B., 12330 (v); in Com., 12843 (vi).
——— Autonomy to N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13918 (vi).
——— *See* 'Provincial.'
North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).
Ottawa Experimental Farm: *See* 'Butter.'
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. (B. 223) prop. Res., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6449; 1°*, of B., 6456; in Com., 6806 (iii).
Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Ouelle River, I. C. R. Branch Line, Total Cost (Ans.) 10491 (vi).
Patent Act Amt., Legislation *re* (Ans.) 97 (i).
Patent Relief Bill (remarks) 2397 (i).
Penny Banks (B. 198) 1°m., 4175 (ii); in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793 (v).
Posters, Handbills, Exclusion, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240; in Com., 5662, 5869 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank (B. 220) 1°m., 6353; in Com., 6814 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
P. O. Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14276, 14655 (vi).
Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3220 (ii).
Preferential Trade and Mr. Chamberlain's Proposals (remarks) 13936 (vi).
Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate : See* 'Election Printing.'
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines (remarks) 14474 (vi).
Printing Bureau and Union Organizations (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
Private Cars : *See* 'Govt. Official,' &c.
Prorogation (remarks) 14763 (vi).
Provincial Autonomy, N. W. T., Imperfect Rét. (remarks) 6892 (iii).
——— *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.
Public Accounts (presented) 89 (i).
Public Debts, Amount of Decrease (Ans.) 14665 (vi).
Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulation, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Quebec Bridge Subsidies Agreement (B. 272) in Com. on Res., 14690 ; 1°* of B., 14734 : 2° m., 14734 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).
——— Application for Further Aid (Ans.) 10496.
——— Subsidy paid by Govt. (Ans.) 10496 (v).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14450 (vi).
Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 7203 (iii).
Questions by Members, Answers *re* (remarks) 544 (i).
Railway Accidents in Canada, Official Inquiry, &c. (Ans.) 9218 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation) B. 21 (M.) for Com. to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14520 (vi).
——— (M.) to appoint Managers to confer with Senate *re* Amts., 14690 (vi).
——— Rep. of Special Com. (presented) 14663.
——— (remarks) *re* Conference with Senate, 14740.
Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).
Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B, 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1060 (i).
Railway Appropriations *re* Expenditure, Transfer to other Votes (remarks) 14055 (vi).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8124 (iv).
Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 8488 (iv).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Policy, Govt. Announcement (remarks) 6426.
Railway Subsidies (B. 270) prop. Res., 13549 ; M. for Com. on Res., 14053 ; in Com. on Res., 14314, 14423 ; (auditing Co.'s books, &c.) 14516 ; (location of rys.) 14514 ; (payment of subsidies,

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Railway Subsidies—*Con.*
&c.) 14511 ; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14515 ; 1°* of B., 14519 ; 2°m. and in Com., 14735 ; (Amts.) 14740 (vi).
——— Cost of Bridges, Safeguard *re* (remarks) 14512 (vi).
——— granted to provs., Amounts to each, &c. (remarks) 14484, 14687 ; Stmnt. (presented) 14852 (vi).
——— Payments of, Safeguarding, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).
——— voted by Govt., 1900-1902 (Ans.) 13027, 13259 (vi).
——— in 1901-2-3, &c. (Ans.) 13934 (vi).
——— Amounts paid since 1900 to 1903 (Ans.) 12842, 13370 (vi).
——— voted for past ten Years, &c. (Ans. 13934.
Railway Act (Supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. (B. 258) prop. Res., 8332 (iv) ; 10715, 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°* of B., 12584 (v) ; in Com., 12944 (vi).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032 ; (N. S.) 11800 ; on M. for 3°, 12482 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12445 (v).
——— (remarks) 408 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (remarks) 544 (i).
Revenue and Expenditure, Amounts collected, &c., for 1903 (Ans.) 12715, 13370 (vi).
Rideau Canal Employees, Delay in Paying (remarks) 13303 (vi).
Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'
St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
St. John, Long Wharf : *See* 'Long.'
See 'Allan,' 'C.P.R.', &c.
St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
St. Louis Exposition, Canadian Exhibits (Ans.) 3001 (ii).
St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4589 (ii).
St. Peter's and Louisburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).
Salmon Industry, Fraser River, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).
Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14325 (vi).
Sinclair, James : *See* 'Patent.'
South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).
S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Gov., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., &c., 2761.
See 'Hay,' &c.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Steel Rails and Clergue Govt. contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
See 'Clergue,' &c.

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7028 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

Supply (M.) for Com., 89 (i).

Supply (B. 206) 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 5243 (iii).

Supply (B. 218) prop. Res., 6003; conc. (M.) 6069; in Com., 6170 (iii).

Supply Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5995 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

——— (B. 241) 1°m., 8404 (iv).

——— (B. 271) prop. Res., 14767; 1°* of B., 14768.

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census) 4597, 4644, 4801; (census, N.B., religions) 4810; (gold exhibits) 4617; (Stuart, Capt. dismissal) 4353 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (electric station by-wash) 12906; (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (macadamizing tow path) 14151; (tow paths) 12906 (vi); **Cornwall** (electric equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12895; **Farran's Point** (acetylene gas plant) 14155 (vi); (enlargement) 7565 (iii); 12898, 14150; **Galops** (channel completion) 14644 (vi); (deepening, &c.) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7804 (iv); 12899, 14141 (vi); (north channel) 7803 (iv); 14142 (vi); **Generally** (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157; (operating expenses) 12920; (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (surveys, &c.) 12900; (tolls, collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; (investigation *re* supt.) 14157 (vi); **Lachine** (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (hydrographic surveys) 12904; (lock gate protection) 14142; (masonry walls) 12906; (Mill Street paving) 14153; (Lake St. Francis dam) 14152; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (general vote) 12910; (Heath, Geo., compensation) 14155; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Murray** (Johnson's purchase of house) 14145; (wire fencing) 14151 (vi); **North Channel** (dam construction) 7803; **Rideau** (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (Hog's Back, swing bridge) 12904; (swing bridge at Concession St., Ottawa) 14150; **St. Ours** Lock (stop logs) 12908 (vi); **Sault Ste. Marie** (construction) 7560 (iii); 12904; **Soulanges** (bank repairing) 14154 (vi); (construction) 7549 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi); **Trent** (construction) 7551 (iii); 14645; (Corry & Laverdure claims) 14651; (Peterborough pier) 14645 (vi); **Welland** (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv); (deepening long level) 14148; (drainage) 12905 (vi); (Dunnville dam) 7809 (iv); (electric lighting) 12900, 14148; (elevator foundations) 14149 (vi); (land damages) 7805 (iv); (land surveys) 12905 (vi); (mitre sills) 7804 (iv); 14148; (Port Colborne improvements) 12902; (Port Colborne, rock cut) 14148; (protection walls) 12905 (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902; (summit level) 12903; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905; **Williamsburg** (gate lifter) 14149; (scow) 14154; (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing, &c.) 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi); (Receiver General) 12584 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.: Aud. General (promotion) 14255, (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 320; Finance (contingencies) 226; (salaries) 224 (i); (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries, &c.) 207 (i); (High Commissioner's Office) 12586 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239; Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Railways and Canals (2nd-class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 335; Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223 (i); (2nd-class clerks) 14254 (vi); (salaries) 222 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (miscellaneous expenditure, &c.) 3967; (preferential tariff) 3940 (ii).

Fisheries (fishery officers) 5050; (inspectors' salaries) 5128 (ii); (lighthouses, &c.) 5312 (iii); (lobster hatcheries) 13661 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6070 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6668; (exodus, &c.) 6729 (iii); (general expenses) 2299 (i); (repatriation, &c.) 6716 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (Henry, Justice, retiring allowance) 14662 (vi).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Halifax harbour buoys) 13638 (Marconi stations) 13647 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249 (vi).

Militia (annual drill) 5005 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan Boundary commission) 2299 (i); (arbitration, Dom. and Prov.) 12590 (Art Gallery) 12589 (v); (Barton, Sir Edmund, expenses, &c.) 6952 (iii); (classifying records) 12592 (v); (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii); (Micmac Dictionary, printing) 12592; (Mining Institute) 12591 (v); (naturalization act, expenses) 6952 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589 (v); Petersen, Tate & Co., deposit) 6953 (iii); (Prince Albert *Advocate*, printing) 14652 (vi); (Printing Bureau plant) 12587 (v); (St. Lawrence Islands, improvements) 14661 (vi); (S. African memorial association) 6992 (iii); (tobacco commission) 8267 (iv); (trade combinations investigation) 14654 (vi); (unforeseen expenses) 6951 (iii), 12588 (v); (Victoria Memorial, Can. contribution) 14655); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce, compensation) 14274 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6889 (iii); (salaries, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4043; (St. Lawrence, transportation) 4044; (supplies) 5046 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works. Buildings, N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i); (Halifax custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); **Ont.** (rural mail delivery) 515 (i); **Ottawa** (buildings) 5007 (ii); (census building) 992 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 996; (Royal mint) 346 (i)

Docks (commission's rep.) 2982 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2644 (ii); **N.B.** (St. John River, wharfs) 1180; **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1071 (i); (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Cow Bay) 1079; (Drumhead Breakwater) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1088 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1096; (Green Cove, harbour) 1100; (Kingsport, pier) 1104; (Lunenburg, harbour)

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
1108; (Three Fathoms, harbour) 1149 (i); (Victoria Beach, wharf) 13125 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150; **Ont.** (Belle Rivière) 1191; **Que.** (Grande Vallee, pier) 1552 (i); conc., 6070 (iii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2271 (i).
Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2747; (Dixon, F. A.) 2729; (temporary clerks) 2732 (ii).
Slides and Booms (repairs) 2980 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (Marconi system) 2712; (Mar. provs.) 2711; (telegraph lines, St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).
Railways—G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646; (G.T. R., rental) 12887 (vi); **I.C.R.** (air brakes, freight) 7527 (iii), 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (v); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093; (car shops, machinery) 14106 (vi); ('Chapman' ball-bearing apparatus) 8283: (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8315 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi); ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284 (iv); (Connolly's claim and interest) 14103: (double tracking, &c.) 14062 (vi); (draw bars) 7520 (ii), 8288 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7529 (iv); (Eel River, agent's house) 12600 (v); (general vote) 12873; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14094 (vi); (Halifax accommodation) 7522 (iii), 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080; (Halifax terminus) 14646 (vi); (Lévis, accommodation) 7520 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8290 (iv), 14106; Metapedia station) 14096 (vi); (Metis station and road) 12604 (v), 12828 (vi); (Miramichi bridge) 8307 (iv); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (Moncton, freight sheds) 14090 (vi); (Moncton workshops) 8312; (Muhlfeld's rep. *re* 'Cleveland' cylinder) 8284 (iv); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14095 (vi); (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (North Sydney, station) 14089 (vi); (operating expenses) 7811(iv); (Ouelle river branch) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi); (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Point Tupper improvements) 8309 (iv); (power saw) 12607 (v); (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv); (Riviere du Loup engine house) 12593 (v); (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309 (iv); (River Ouelle, spur line) 7526 (iii), 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8292 (iv), 14100; (St. Flavie. accommodation) 12602 (v); (St. John, accommodation) 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063; (*Scotia* Str., salvage) 14107 (vi); (steel rails) 5005 (ii); (Stellarton, increased accommodation) 8296 (iv); (sidings, additional) 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi); (Truro, accommodation) 12603 (v); (vestibule equipment) 7529 (iii), 12600 (v); (Windsor station) 14097 (vi)
Miscellaneous (gratuities) 14155; (ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).
P.E.I. (Albany station) 14133; (Alberton station) 14132 (vi); (Blue Shank line, straightening) 7530 (iii), 14133; (Charlottetown station) 14131; (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14115; (Kensington accommodation) 12840; (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Mount Stewart, freight house) 7530; (Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge) 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (steel rails) 7803 (iv); (Summerside, coal sheds) 12828; (water service) 12841 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
Superannuations (Casselman, W. J., lockmaster) 14272 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7795; (preferential tariff in France) 7799 (iii).
Unprovided Items, 6993 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Court Act Amt, B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2369 (i).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4920, 4937 (ii).
Tariff Act Amt. B. 273 (surtax) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).
——— Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii).
See 'Budget,' &c., 'Customs,' &c.
Telephone Legislation (remarks), 409 (i).
Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14134, 14380 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).
Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks), 5702 (iii).
Tobacco in Foreign Countries, &c., Amt. paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas *re* Trip (Ans.), 1035 (i).
Tobin Co. and Subsidy to Trois Pistoles Ry. (remarks) 14462 (vi).
Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks), in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14086 (vi).
Transcontinental Ry., &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*), 7727 (iv).
——— *See* 'G.T. Pacific.'
Transportation Commission, Formation, &c., (remarks), 9819 (iv).
Transportation Commission and Tariff Inquiry, *re* Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 854 (i).
Treadgold Commission, Tel. from W. A. Beddoe *re* Refusal of Commissioner to produce Files (remarks) 9818 (iv).
Trent Canal, Medical Officer (Ans.) 8117 (iv).
——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ans.), 8118 (iv).
——— Rep. of W. McLeod *re* Route, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (v).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Tyerman, P. D., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.), 286 (i).
United Empire Life Insurance Co,'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*), in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*), in Com., 4587 (ii).
Veterinary Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ans.), 1591 (i).
Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electora.,' &c.
Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Ways and Means (Res. for Com.), 89 (i).

——— The Tariff (M.), 1378 (i).

See 'Customs,' 'Budget,' &c.

Ways and Means re G.T.P. Surveys, in Com., 14765 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans), Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).

Welland Canal, Lock Tenders (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 12923 (vi).

Wheat Freight Rates for Export to Montreal, &c. (Ans.), 11188 (v), 11426 (v).

Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ans.), 12074 (v).

Williamsburg Canal, Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12928 (vi).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Wood Alcohol manufactured, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

See 'Supply—Civil Govt., Inland Revenue.'

Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*

Agricultural Lecturers, Names, &c. (Ans.), 8615 (iv).

American Cattle purchased for British Govt. (remarks, 5415 (iii).

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks), 13508 (vi).

——— Appnmt. as Fruit Inspector (Ans.) 13372 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases (B. 194), 1° *, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690 (ii).

Archives, Rep. (presented), 5417 (iii).

Art Gallery and Can. Artists, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13515 (vi).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14050 (vi).

Burrard, B.C., Census, McCraney's Letter *re* Enumerators (remarks), in Com of Sup., 7079 (iii).

Business of the House, Misleading Statements (remarks), 4348 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention (B. 207) prop. Res., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052; 1° m., 5240; in Com., 5419, 5846 (iii).

Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re* (Ans.), 5414 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c., (remarks), 10746 (v).

Canadian Exhibit at Imp. Institute, London (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13509 (vi).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5467 (iii).

Census, Burrard: *See* 'Burrard.'

Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Classification, &c. (Ans.), 4004 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13707 (vi).

——— Grand Manan, N.B., Religious denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).

——— 1901, New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ans.) 13936 (vi).

——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ans.) 3801 (ii).

——— Schedules, Halton, Cardwell and Peel, for 1891 (Ans.) 6894 (iii).

——— *See* 'Halton,' &c.

——— Sunbury, &c., N.B., Religious Classification (Ans.) 4005 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Agriculture,' 'Pub. Accts.' &c.

Fruit Inspector Anderson: *See* 'Anderson.'

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3810 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3826 (ii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9512 (iv); in Com. on B., 11296 (v).

Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 5316 (iii).

Halton, Cardwell and Peel, Census Schedules (Ans.) 6436, 7092 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).

Herald Co., Ques. of Privilege, 5314 (iii).

Imperial Institute Exhibit: *See* 'Can. Exhibit.'

Kelly, Wm., Census Commissioner for N. Hastings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).

Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).

Patent Act Amt. (B. 184) 1° m., 3622; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii).

Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter: *See* 'Butter,' &c.

Privilege (Ques. of), Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 5314 (iii).

Public Accounts Com., Production of Census Schedules, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

St. Louis Exposition, Live Stock Exhibit (Ans.) 4837 (ii).

San José Scale, *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).

Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ans.) 4959 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale (B. 200) in Com. on Res., 5084; 1° m., 4442 (ii); in Com. on B., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (Acadian historical data) 13505 (vi); (aid to societies) 4432; (archives) 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi); (Canadian exhibit at Imperia Institute) 4435 (ii), 13509 (vi); (census) 45941 (census, Côté circular) 4657; (census enumerators) 4646; (census, N.B.) 4801; (census

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Agriculture—Con.

schedules) 4635 (ii), 7053 (census, total cost) 7053 (iii); (classification of patents) 4433 (ii); (cold storage) 7086 (iii), 7670; (creameries, N.W.T.) 7632 (iv); (criminal statistics) 4429; (dairying branch) 4671; (exhibitions) 4599; (experimental farms) 4548; (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi); (general statistics) 4429; (Health Act) 4440, 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (Japan Exhibition) 4626; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7641 (iv); (Prof. Shutt's report) 4556; (St. Louis exhibition) 4599; (San José scale) 4434; (Stuart, Capt., dismissal) 4354 (ii); (Toronto Industrial exhibition) 13501 (vi); (Tracadie lazaretto) 4439; (Treadgold exhibit) 4612 (ii); (tuberculosis, aid to Can. Association) 13517 (vi); (*Year Book*) 4429 (ii).

Immigration (exodus to U.S.) 6875; (repatriation, &c.) 6713 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (freight rates, &c.) 7583 (iv).

Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Magog P.O.) 13081 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502; (diseased immigrants) 5492; (hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 4440 (ii), 5490 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5007 (ii); (small-pox) 5491 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308 (vi).

Tuberculosis, Aid to Can. Association, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5875 (iii).

Anglo-American Cable Co. and P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13332, 13338 (vi).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 155, 14771 (vi).

Binder Twine, Average Price, &c. (Ans.), 7566 (iv).

——— Average Price for Sisal, &c. (Ans.), 8085 (iv).

——— Circular *re* Sales, &c. (Ans.), 4182 (ii).

——— Cost, &c. (Ans.), 2311 (i).

——— Mr. Haycock's Powers under Act (remarks) 14047 (vi).

——— Residences of Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 4183 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries,' &c.

Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Elections Act, on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Pets., O. Cs., &c., 105 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan. B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5121 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Lands, School Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5556 (iii).

Capital Cases, Commutations, &c. (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Carver *vs.* King, Commutation of, Reps. *re* (remarks) 13303 (vi).

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 604 (i).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s incorp. (B. 150) in Com., 5559 (iii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3281 (ii).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

——— Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ans.), 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Judges'.

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Act Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 95; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i).

——— (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 2779, 3242 (ii).

——— (general) Amt. (B. 215) 1° m., 5581; 2° m., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746; (cigarettes), 10748 (v); Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4023 (ii).

Desjardins Canal (B. 183) 1° m., 3393; in Com., 4213 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 906 (i); (compulsory voting), 13583, 14405 (vi).

——— Controverted Elections Act Am. (B. 13) 1° m. 95; 2° m., 635; in Com., 1115, 2239 (i).

——— Elections Act Amt., B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1061; in Com., 1062 (i); Amt., 3236 (ii).

Dorchester Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Fuel (Ans. 10101 (v).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1° *, 1378 (i).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom.' &c.

Empire Accident Surety Co.'s incorp. B. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 2755 (ii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8244, 8360 (iv).

Expropriation Act Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 93; in Com., 291, 613, 634 (i).

Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.), 1676 (i).

Good Shepherd Reformatory N.B. (B. 199) 1° m., 4178; in Com., 4840 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5216 (iii); 7817, 7824, 7845 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9006 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10568, 10619, 10649, 11190, 11210, 11319, 11833, 11864, 12063, 12074, 12164; (amt. to amt. *re* securities), 11963 (v).

——— Legal Opinions (read) 11335 (v).

——— Pets. *re* on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13269 (vi).

——— 2-cent a mile rate, 10465, 12225 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Taylor, 10564 (v).

Haycock: *See* 'Binder Twine.'

Hêtu, R., Pardon, &c. (Ans.), 7915 (iv).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*), 788 (i).

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).

Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

Judges appointed from Local Bars: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).

Judges of the Superior Courts, Retiring Allowance (B. 7), 1° m., 93; prop. Res., 203 (i); (M.) to discharge Res., 2582 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowance (B. 243) prop. Res., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8087, 8369; 1° * of B., 8372 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14296 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 250), prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1° *, 2° *, and in Com., 10792, 11406 (v).

Judges of Provincial Courts (Quebec) B. 255, in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res. m., 11833; in Com. on B., 12301 (v).

Judges of N. W. T. Act Amt. (B. 259) 1° m., 12610; in Com., 13853, 14287 (vi).

Judges of Ont., Judges' Salaries, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 96 (i).

——— of County Courts, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3628 (ii).

——— *See* 'County,' &c.

Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented), 90 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) 1° m., 94; in Com., 314 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ans.), 10100 (v).

Law Library in England, Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for cor., 100 (i).

Librarians of Parlt. (B. 267) prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14299 (vi).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).

Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

See 'Myers.'

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5100 (ii).

Miller Bros., P.O. Saving Bank Deposits, Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14659 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4465 (ii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver, and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113, 661 (i).

Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada's B. 65 (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com., 2304 (i).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ans.) 285 (i).

See 'Man.,' &c.

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) M. to ref. back to Com., 2753 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6432 (iii).

N.W.T. Representation in Senate (B. 253) 1° m., 11691; in Com., 12302 (v).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. 2717 (ii).

Pardons, Prerogatives, &c. of His Ex., on M. (Mr. *Casgrain*) for Ret., 567 (i).

———Number, Names, &c. (Ans.) 96 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 217) 1° m., 5763 (iii) 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v).

Penitentiaries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. (B. 182) 1° m., 3392, 4203 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii).

Public Works Dept., Control and Transfer (B. 269) 1° m., 14281; in Com., 14741; (Amt.) 14755 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Co.'s B. 145 (Mr. *Power*) in Com., 4587 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14705 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14455 (vi).

Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ans.) 14665 (vi).

See 'Judges' B. 255.'

Ry. Act (commission) Amt. B. 21, Salaries (prop. Res.) 8085; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

Ry Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2599, 3847, 3886, 4126, 4578 (ii) 5780, 7299, 7609, 8125 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Two Cent Rate to M. for 3°, 8357 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13834 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate Managers *re* Amts., Report of Progress, 14740, 14761; Rep. (read) 14844; M. to conc., 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, Iberville) on M. for 2°, 2784 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill; *See* 'Exchequer,' &c.

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14429, 14507; in Com. on B., 14736 (vi).

Reformatory Prisons (B. 221) 1° m., 6427 (iii); in Com., 8087 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Registrar of Supreme Court Salary (B. 268) in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com. on B., 14300; (Amt.) 14403 (vi).
Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 719; on M. for 2°, 1230 (i); in Com., 10943, 10976, 11490; (Quebec) 11792; (Toronto) 11735; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12435 (v).
Representation of P.E.I. and N.B. (Ans.) 5316 (iii).
———Papers *re* N.B. (remarks) 1110 (i).
———*Re* P. E. I. and N. B., Cor. respecting (remarks) 876 (i).
Revised Statutes; *See* 'Statutes,' 'Supply—Justice, Miscellaneous.'
St. James Division (Electoral) Vacancy (remarks) 409 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ans.) 10832 (iv).
———Hospital, &c. (Ans.) 13669 (vi).
———Investigation of 1898 (Ans.) 14285 (vi).
Schell, Mr., M.P., (M.) to ref. Stmnt. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 5417 (iii).
Saunders, Mr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm, &c. (Ans.) 1676 (i).
Scotia, Str. Salvage Claims, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii) 14107 (vi).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *see* 'N.W.T.'
Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
Shipping Casualties Act Amt. B. 263 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13000 (vi).
South Shore Ry., Working, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 450 (i).
Statutes, Revised, Publication, Act Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 94; in Com., 334 (i).
Statutes, Revision (B. 265) 1° m., 13667; in Com., 14297 (vi).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7034, 7047 (iii).
Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14429 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).
Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Customs (salaries) 321; Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 208 (i); (McGillivray, A. J.) 14255; (Morris, Thos.) 14255; (Messrs. Power and Fraser) 14255; (Miss Quain) 14255 (vi); (salaries) 207 (i).
Customs (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3951 (ii).
Indians (legal expenses) 6418; (Waby trial) 6418 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (Ad Hoc Judges) 3402; **B.C.** (judges' travelling allowances) 3400; **Exchequer Court** (Admiralty accommodation) 3409; (Admiralty, registrar 3408; (reports) 3407; (registrar) 3407; (salaries) 3406; (travelling expenses) 3407; (execution

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Justice, Administration of—Con.
expenditure) 3401; **Man.** (judge's travelling expenses) 3399 (ii); **Miscellaneous** (Statutes, revision) 14643; **N.B.** (divorce court) 3401 (ii); **N. W. T.** (fees, &c.) 14257 (vi); (Prince Albert court, clerk) 3401; (prisoners in N.W.T.) 3398; (Regina jail, land purchase) 5135 (ii); (Supreme Court judge) 14257 (vi); **N. S.** (county court judge Dodd) 14259; **Ont.** (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); **Supreme Court** (contingencies) 3404; (law books) 3405; (library) 3403 (ii); (reports) 14257 (vi); (Reps., binding, &c.) 3405; (reporter) 3402 (ii); (Taschereau, E. R. A.) 14257 (vi); **Yukon** (clerk of court) 3411; (Dugas, judge) 3411; (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3410, 3414, 3507; (judges living allowances) 3411; (law library) 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi); (police magistrates) 3416; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3416; (travelling allowances) 3409 (ii).
Dom. Police (salaries) 3511 (ii).
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3511; (general expenses) 3511; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4171; (pilotage *re* St. Lawrence) 4144; (St. Lawrence, improvements) 4144 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3589, 3600 (ii).
Miscellaneous (British American Bank Note Co.) 14279; (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4068 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); Harbours and Rivers: Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2033; Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); N. S. (Neil's Harbour) 1141; Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Chateau Richer) 13456 (vi); (Le Tableau wharf) 2254 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Perade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Famille pier) 13489; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 13495; (St. Louis River, improvements) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480 (vi); Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2688 (ii); Telegraph Lines, Que. (Belle Isle system) 13332; (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332 (vi).
Rys. and Canals: Miscellaneous (Dixon, F. A. D.) 2729 (ii); (litigation expenses) 12911; (Stewart *vs.* King) 12913 (vi).
Trade and Commerce (iron bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).
Supreme Court of Ontario, Judges' Salaries B., prop. Res., 10102 (iv).
See 'Judges' B. 250.'
Supreme Court Registrar (B. 268); in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; in Com., 14300 (Amt.) 14403 (vi).
Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12305 (v).
Ticket-of-Leave System, Releases &c. (Ans.) 96.
Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
——— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4533 (ii).
Two-cent Ry. Rate: *See* 'G. T. P. R.,' &c., 'Ry. B. 21.'
Valiquette, Mr. J. A., Appnmt. as Stenographer, Yukon (Ans.) 4005 (ii).
Yukon Ter. Act (summoning of jurors) Amt. (B. 9) 1°m., 94; in Com., 313 (i).
——— (Court of Appeal—quorum)—(B. 254) 1°m., 11692 (v).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's (N.B.)*
Albert, N.B., Harbour Master, Capt. Bishop, Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Allan Line Steamships, Withdrawal from St. John (remarks) 13937 (vi).
——— Reduction of Sailings from St. John, N.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14064 (vi).
Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Boundary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi)
Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6384 (iii).
Bathurst, N.B., Fishery Overseer, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14686 (vi).
See 'Daly.'
Beersville Coal Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).
Belmont Disaster Victims, Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
See 'Crandall.'
Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master at Albert, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
Bloomfield Postmaster, N.B., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 818 (i).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).
Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).
Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 12498, 12716, 13968 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12500; I. C. R. trackmen, 12561 (v); on M. for 3°, 13942 (vi).
Crandall, Brakeman on I. C. R., Inquiries at Belmont (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
See 'Belmont.'
Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s (Parrsboro') Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
Daly, M. T., Bathurst, Harbour Master, N.B. (Ques.) 2919 (ii).
See 'Bathurst.'
Demurrage Regulations, I.C.R. (Ques.) 4672, 4952 (ii).
Digby Port Wharf, Extension, &c. (Ques.) 2101.
Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7604 (iii), 13687 (vi).
See 'Ry. Act B. 21.'
Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570, 14405 (vi).
Elgin and Havelock Ry. Co.'s (B. 142) 1°*, 2237.
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255, 8257 (iv).
Ferries on St. John River: in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Freight Rates on Ocean Vessels, Discrimination: *See* 'Discriminating.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5173 (iii); in Com., 7844, 7883; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8055, 8067, 8321 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10243; in Com. on B., 10670, 11215, 11876, 12045 (v); on M. for 3°, 12744; (amt.) 12709 (vi).
Hatfield's Point, Lighthouse-keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
House of Commons Officials, Salaries: *See* Civil Service B. 257.'
Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ques.) 2502 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s (Megantic) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
I. C. R. Demurrage of Cars, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 4672, 4959 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3675 (ii).
——— Private Cars: *See* 'Private.'
——— Supplies entered Duty Free (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
See 'Trackmen.'
International, Dredge leased by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 12218 (v).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8110 (iv).
Kars, Census Enumeration, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 3804 (ii).
Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
Lake Superior, &c., Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).
Long Wharf, St. John, Lease by Govt. (Ques.) 11828 (v).
Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ques.) 6896 (iii).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory (remarks) 13979 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5659 (iii).
Post Office Revenue, Increase, &c. (remarks) 14019 (vi).
Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14658 (vi).
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7914 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Private Cars, I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 2309 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14717 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5329, 5566 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5630 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14438 (vi).

Ry. Wrecks, in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10953, (N.B.) 11809; on M. for 3°, 12490 (v).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. John, Long Wharf: *See* 'Long Wharf.'

——— Allan Line, &c., Withdrawal: *See* 'Allan.'

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Schell, J. T., M.P., Goods supplied to Govt. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6474 (iii).

Small-Pox Patients, Gloucester, N.B., Contribution by Govt. towards Expenses *re* (remarks) 14688.

Springhill Public Building, Explosion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—N.W.T. (fees, &c.) 14257; N. S. (county court Judge Dodd) 14259; Ont. (Nipissing Judgeship) 14258; Supreme Court (salaries) 14257; Yukon (law library) 14267 (vi).

Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4801 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7647 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (landing wharfs) 12908; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, services *re* investigation) 14157 (vi); Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (promotions) 14256; Public Works (architect's salary) 13499; (contingencies) 13500; (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499 (vi).

Dom. Lands—(Banff bath house) 13956 (vi).

Excise (analysts, &c.) 5399 (iii); (inspectors salaries) 13974 (vi); (liquor inspection) 5399 (iii); (salary of private sec.) 13968 (vi).

Immigration (Barr colonists) 6696 (iii).

Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

Legislation—Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 11269 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7604 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 13695 (vi).

Militia (rifle associations) 3768 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Miller Bros., P. O. Savings Bank defalcations) 14658 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543; (life-saving awards) 13544; (masters and mates examination) 13524; (naval militia reserve and school of navigation) 13545; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (architect's staff) 961; (dismissals, &c.) 1019; (furniture) 1006; Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 973; (Nappan farm) 973; (Sussex armoury) 965 (i); **N. S.** (Arichat) 5828 (iii); **Ottawa** (census building) 982; (furniture, &c.) 974, 979; (heating, &c.) 1010; (ventilation, &c.) 974 (i); **Que.** (trachoma hospital) 14245 (vi).

Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Windsor, sheer dam) 14248 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée pier) 1523; (Le Tableau wharf) 2250 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; Notre Dame du Portage) 13463 (vi); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (St. André de Kamouraska pier) 13492; (Ste. Anne de la Pérade) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13490; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2263 (i); (St. Maurice, dam) 13492; (St. Michel de Bellechasse, pier) 13494; (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i).

Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau River) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

Railways—Generally (wrecks, investigations *re*) 14154; I.C.R. (Amqui accommodation) 12601 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Eel river, agent's house) 12600; (Halifax accommodation) 12597; (Métis station) 12604; (v); (North Sydney improvements) 12598; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292 (iv); (Rivière Ouelle, spur line) 12599 (v); (rolling stock) 8293 (iv); (St. John accommodation) 12597 (v); (St. John accommodation) 14063 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv); (Sussex accommodation) 12601 (v); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Sussex Armoury, Overseer's Qualifications *re* Constructions, &c. (Ques.) 8331 (iv).

——— Brigade Camp (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

——— I.C.R. Roundhouse, Gates, &c. (Ques.) 4672 (ii).

——— Station Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tiffin, Genl. Manager, I.C.R., and Private Cars (Ques.) 2309 (i).

Trackmen on I.C.R., &c.: *See* 'Civil Service B. 257.'

White, Albert S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*

Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. 212 (Mr *Russell*) in Com., 7477 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5969 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).

Fraser Mr. D. C.—*Con.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7330 (iii).

Brockville, Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. for Com., 7339 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).

Budget, The, 2131 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5079 (ii); in Com. on B., 5453 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry, Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5631, 5820 (iii).

Canadian Steel Co.'s (B. 185) 1°*, 3708 (ii).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Ques. of Order, 7483 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5557 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 74 5 (iii); in Com. (cigarettes) 10749 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1203 (i), 13579, 14407 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6443 (iii).

Erie, Ontario, Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3780 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8254, 8361 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6908 (iii).

Fishing Industry N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13159 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5229 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7829.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10643, 12236 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Beauharnois, Rep. of Com. (presented) 7202 (iii).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

Privileges and Elections Com., M. to employ stenographer, 7202 (iii).

Public Accounts Com. (M.) 867 (i).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5977; in Com., 5983 (iii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3731 (ii), 5776 (iii) 8128, 8170.

Ry. Debts. B.: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14327.

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11115, 11501 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7249 (iii).

Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. 14297 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Public Works (architects' salary) 13499 (vi).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6718 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7788 (iv).
Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3517 (ii).
Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5270 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—N.S. (Guysborough) 5839 (iii); Ottawa (electric lighting) 988; Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176 (i); N.S. (Big Harbour wharf) 13147; (Breton's Cove) 13159 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1076; (Cheverie breakwater) 1078; (Drumhead breakwater) 1083; (Larry's River) 1104; (New Harbour) 1145 (i); (Paspebiac, landing pier) 13467 (vi).
Yukon Govt. (hospital grants) 7293 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9421 (iv).

Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9151 (iv).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne.*

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 227 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13825 (vi).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507.

Macdougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief (B. 169) Pet. presented, 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12783 (vi).

Postmasters Salaries, Increase of 10 per cent (remarks) 14025 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506 (vi).
Canals—Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
Excise (liquor analysis) 5393 (iii).
Militia (military properties) 3620 (ii).
Public Works—Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2987; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7313, 7326 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5986 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7143, 7403; 3° m., 7468 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).

Budget, The, 2062 (i).

Columbia River Improvement Co.'s Limited incorp. (B. 150) 1°*, 2396 (i); on Sen. Amts., 6847; (amt.) 6894 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14415 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5228 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10464, 10690 (v).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8096 (iv).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8203 (iii).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s (B. 216) 1°*, 5679 (iii).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14594 (vi).

Nelson Post Office, Claims of Racine Bros. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7170 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 3°m., 6428, 6432 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14677 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5661, 5862 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5341, 5570, 5766 (iii), 8126 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2784 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2553 (ii).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5661 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14337, 14489 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claim) 7170 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6726; (on ques. of order) 6873 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (Agassiz reserve, &c.) 7266; Ont., (Dr. Secord) 6341; Ont. (medical attendance) 6341 (iii)

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6989 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1451; (Sinclair's dismissal) 1451 (i); Generally (dredging) 2650 (ii).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11085 (v).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*

Cattle Guard Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Geo. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Census, Grand Manan, N.B., Religion, &c. (Ques.) 3801 (ii).

——— St. John, N.B., Religious Denominations, &c. (Ques.) 3800 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9327 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Mail Subsidies and ss. Subventions (St. Stephen and Back Bay) 7759 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231; (Black Brook) 13227; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Campbellton, wharf) 13229; (Cocagne wharf) 13231; (Grand Manan, wharf) 13234; (Richibucto, pier) 13235 (vi).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Gaspé & Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 166) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

I. C. R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 12497 (v).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pets. *re* Increase of Salaries (Ques.) 14665 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière du Loup) 13477 (vi).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

Grand Trunk Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 29) 1°*, 367 (i).

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 156) 1°*, 2582 (ii); in Com., 5558 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateauguay River) 3216 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12856 (vi); Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2970 (ii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 452.

South Shore Ry., Complaint *re* Safety (remarks) 205 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5807 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. (B. 176) 1°*, 3126 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7500 (iii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 2100; in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9708 (iv,)

Hamilton, Lake Erie Power Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*. 2582 (ii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 707 (i).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 154) 1°*, 2501 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3574, 4577 (ii), 5259, 5778, 6071, 6243 (iii).

Ry. Act (fire compensation) Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 3291 (ii)

German, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7561 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2619 ; Ont. (Port Colborne) 3371 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. A., Jr., *York, N.B.*

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14342, 14488 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river wharfs) 1180 (i).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 14488 (vi).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *E. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5421, 5432 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10758 (v).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3822, 3827 (ii).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8097 (iv),

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12311 (v).

Permanent Force, Increase of Pay (Ques.) 13371.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4573 (ii).

Representation in H. of C. B. '66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879 ; in Com., 10975, 11585 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6478, 7213 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 7635 (iv).

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (London, magazine) 13115 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5502 (iii).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9992 (iii).

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1° *, 707 (i).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6487 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. John) 2245 (i).

Gould, Mr. I. J., *W. Ontario.*

Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 165) 1° *, 2582 (ii), in Com., 5361 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10896 (v).

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*

Accommodation for Members in H. of C. (remarks) 14577 (vi).

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14824 (vi).

——— Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks), 13961 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay, &c., by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14204 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6369 (iii).

Bass River, N.S., Marine Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks), 12816 (vi).

Brookfield Station Enlargement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Budget, The, 1657 (i).

Campaign Literature : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4975 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*), to Com. of Sup., 5469 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), in Com., 10747 ; (cigarettes) 10749 (v).

Cumberland Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

Customs Tariff Act (surtax) Amt. B. 273 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 14756 (vi).

Debert Coal Mine Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14328 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*), in Com., 13615 (vi).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

Election Pamphlets : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).

Govt. Officials canvassing for newspapers : *See* 'Political,' &c.

G.T. Pacific Ry, Co.'s incorp, B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5164 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com on Res., 10353 ; in Com. on B., 10674, 11234, 11385, 11977 ; 'Shadow of Cox,' &c., 11859, 12056, 12146 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13282 (vi).

——— on M. to adjn. debate (remarks) 8807 (iv). *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14335 (vi).

House of Commons, Door-keeper's Salary : *See* 'Door-keeper.'

I.C.R. Pension System, &c. (Ques.), 9216 (iv).

——— (remarks) 14727 (vi).

——— Trackmen and Labourers, Increased Wages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7944, 7972 (iv).
James Bay Ry Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10769; in Com. on B., 11416 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14294 (vi).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14542, 14577 (vi),
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Maps, Printing and Publishing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand), 5717 (iii).
North Pole Expedition: *See* 'Bernier, Capt.'
N. W. T. Act Amt B. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14288 (vi).
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi)
Parrsboro to Truro, Ry. Subsidy: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Political Partisanship *re* Govt. Officials canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13983 (vi).
Post Office Revenue, on Statement of P.M.G. (remarks), 14022 vi).
P. O. Savings Banks, Defalcations of Postmaster (remark) in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14708, 14726 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5779, 6308 (iii), 8178 (iv).
Ry. Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7135 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14317, 14491 (vi).
——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14377 (vi).
——— for N. S., Colchester County (remarks) 14491 (vi).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11618 (v).
Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).
Statutes, Revision B. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14297 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: N.S. (county court judges) 14265 (vi).
Canals: Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv); Soulanges (Goodwin's claim) 14143 (vi).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing) 14272 (vi).

Gourley, Mr. S. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13656; hatcheries 13661; (steamers, new) 13569 (vi).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7787; (Man. grain act) 7798 (iv).
Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268; H. of C. (door-keeper's salary) 14115 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13642 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and London) 7736; (St. John and Halifax) 7743 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13961 (vi).
Public Works: Buildings, generally (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi); Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 490 (i); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Five Islands, wharf) 13180; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13210; (Port Hood, pier) 13209; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13212; Ont. (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Goderich, breakwater) 13241; Que. (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Perce pier) 13467; (River du Loup) 13477; (Saguenay dredging) 13473; (Seven Islands wharf) 13480; Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13355 (vi).
Railways: I. C. R. (siding facilities) 14083 (vi); (Stellarton accommodation) 8298 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 12603 (v).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).
Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301 (vi).
Tariff (N. S. steel industry) Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4919 (ii).
Tatamagouche Postmaster, Letter *re* Insurance Fund (remarks) 14660 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14492 (vi).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *N. Ontario.*
Budget, The, 2109 (i).
Eureka, str., Loaned by Govt. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections, &c. (Ques.) 13027 (vi).
Judges in Quebec as Bank Directors, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands (M. for copies of reps., &c.) 2762 (ii).
Quebec Judges and Legal Business, &c. (Ques.) 14665 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10993 (v).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Investigation, 1898 (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Toronto Public Works, Amount expended since 1890 (M. for stmnt.*) 1203 (i).
Transcontinental Ry., Contracts *re* Short Sections (Ques.) 13027 (vi).

Guthrie, Mr., H., *S. Wellington.*
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3277 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada (B. 129) 1°*, 1936 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H.—*Con.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9082 (iv).
Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 1764 (i).
Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8113 (iv).
Niagara Welland Power Co.'s Limited, Change of Name (B. 90) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7610, 8145, (amt.) 8153 (iv).
——— (employees) Amt. (B. 74) 2°m., 3247 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E., *W. Prince, (P.E.I.)*
Alberton Ry. Station, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I. and the Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13328 (vi).
Annandale Pier, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques) 2921 (ii).
——— Range Lights, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).
Archives and Mr. Casey: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'
Art Gallery and Can. Artists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
Ballot Boxes in P.E.I.: *See* 'Latour.'
Bonded Warehouses, P.E.I., Rental, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 12073 (v).
Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E I. (remarks) 14001 (vi).
Brennan, Mr. J. P., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13994 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10725 (v).
Budget, The, 2017 (i).
Buote, Mr. J., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 405 (i).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 13806, 14010 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12535 (v); in Com. on B., 13824; on M. for 3°, 13947 (vi).
Conroy, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13993 (vi).
Currie, Mr. James, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).
DesRoches, John M., Alleged Fraud *re* Fishing Bounties (Ques.) 10955 (v).
Dominion Elections Act, Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 901 (i); in Com., (compulsory voting) 13569 (vi).
Fishery Guardian, John M. DesRoches, Alleged Fraud, &c. (Ques.) 10955 (v).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Frozen Fish, &c., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7880; (amt.) 7909; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8326 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9459 (iv); in Com., 10637 (v); on M. for 3°, 12740 (vi).
G.T.P. Bill, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Agreement, &c., Amt. paid (Ques.) 2758 (ii).
——— Preparation of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4444 (ii).
See 'Supply—Railways.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 731 (i).
——— (remarks) 13894 (vi).
House of Commons, Official's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service B.'
Keith, Mr., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).
Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaints against (Ques.) 2922 (ii).
Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvas for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14006 (vi).
Mutch, Mr. H. W., P.E.I., Increase of Salaries (remarks) 13824 (vi).
North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12822 (vi).
O'Leary Station, P.E.I., Branch Line (Ques.) 6168 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'Reilly, Mr., Claim *re* Tobacco Factory, P.E.I. (remarks) 13978 (vi).
Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13999 (vi).
Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).
Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.
P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).
P.E.I, Fishing Industry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13177 (vi).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
See 'Winter,' &c. 'Supply—Ocean and River Service,' &c.
P.E.I. Ry., Sale of Tickets, &c. (Ques.) 2503 (ii).
P.E.I. Telegraph System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 13333 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche*, Hfx.) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13375 (vi).
Queens, West, P. E. I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; in Com., 11030; (amt.) 12432 (v).
Representation in the Cabinet from P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, P.E.I., par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*, 13806 (vi).
See 'Charlottetown.'
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Semaphore Lights, P.E.I. Ry., Discontinuance, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii).
Skinner's Pond, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 13445 (vi).
Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 4361 (ii).
Telegraph Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 13333 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13505; (archives) 13504 (vi); (Census, Cote's circular 4657; (census, P.E.I.) 4656 (ii).
Civil Govt., Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i).
Customs (Curry, Mr., superannuation, &c.) 3918; (salaries, &c.), 3918 (ii).
Excise (salaries, P.E.I.) 13978 (vi).
Fisheries (Provincial claims) 5311 (iii).
Immigration (agents, P.E.I.) 6884 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 6001; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 6001 (iii); (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).
Militia (pay and allowance) 13442 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13534; (Govt. Strs., repairs, &c.) 13519 (vi); (Govt. steamers, service, &c.) 4059; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4081 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers, P.E.I.) 6058; (mail service) 6066; (P.E.I. winter service) 5944 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, P.E.I., (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); **N.S.** (Big Pond wharf) 1072 (i); (Breton Cove) 13152; (Broad Cove) 13200; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge) 1095; (Green Cove Harbour) 1101 (i); (Kingsport, pier) 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201; (Livingstone Cove) 13201; (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Pleasant Bay) 13205; (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151; **P. E. I.** (Aitkin's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach Point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast Pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Carleton Point) 13220 (vi); (Cascumpec Harbour) 1153; (Cove Head Harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber, &c.) 1155 (i); (dredging, &c.) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux Harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222 (vi); (New London) 1160; (piers, repairs) 1161 (i); (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13308; (Summerside breakwater) 13226 (vi); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13448; (Caplin breakwater) 13448 (vi); (Father Point pier) 1513; (Grand Vallee pier) 1515 (i); (Mont Louis wharf) 13462; (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463); (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; **Yukon** (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Miscellaneous (Ottawa River surveys) 13341.
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi).
Telegraph Lines—P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. tel. lines) 2707 (ii); (P.E.I. and mainland) 5917 (iii); Que. (Marconi, Murray Bay, &c.) 13326 (vi).
Quarantine (Pethick, Dr., expenses) 5505; (veterinary division) 5504 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8275 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 12603; (Metis, station) 12604 (v); **P. E. I.** (general vote) 12891; (Hillsborough bridge) 12833; (Kinkora, accommodation) 12841 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii), 12833; (Northam and Richmond stations) 12841 (vi); (O'Leary's station) 7538 (iii).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) for Cor., 1040 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.
Winter Navigation, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*
Alaskan Boundry Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14778 (vi).
——— (remarks) 14287 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5873 (iii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5962 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr *Fielding*) in Com., 7392 (iii).
——— Res., on Ques. of Order, 7308 (iii).
Bonding Privileges with U.S. (remarks) in Com. on G.T.P. Ry. Bill, 12751 (vi).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342, 7352 (iii).
Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).
Budget, The, Rep. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 410 (i).
Business of the House, on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7812 (iv).
——— *See* 'Govt.'
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4962, 4993, 5090 (ii), 5590, 5786 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr *Oliver*) in Com., 3226, 3982 (ii).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Chapman Double Ball-Bearing Co., &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4424 (ii).
Chinese Restriction Act Amt. B. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid*

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Laurier) in Com. on Res., 610; in Com. on B. 2241 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12337 (v); in Com. on B., 13810 (vi).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4680 (ii).
Corry & Laverdure, Contracts *re* Trent Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. (immoral entertainments) B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i), 7514 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 3065, 4024 (ii).
Dom. Coal Co. and Glace Bay Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13192 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1202 (i), 13561, 14406 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3024; in Com. on B., 4680 (ii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8250, 8360 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 291, 618 (i).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12295 (v).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal. *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
Govt Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 940 (i).
——— *See* Business.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5159 (iii), 7816, 7845, 7867 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8680; on M. for 1°, 7717 (iv); in Com. on B., 12096, 12289 (v); on M. for 3°, 12676, 12757 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Scheme, 5892 (iii).
——— Surveys, Information, &c. (remarks), 8230 (iv).
——— Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for cor., 448 (i).
——— *See* 'Transcontinental'.
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14331 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
I. C. R., Book-keeping: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'
——— Freight Cars on connecting Lines, &c. (M. for ret. *) 3805 (ii).
——— General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3657 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Papers, 3537 (ii).
I.C.R., Mr. Pottinger's Rep. (M. for copy) 3806(ii).
——— Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'
——— Ties issued, purchased, used, &c. (M. for ret.*), 3805 (ii).
International Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).
Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7926 (iv).
Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14317 (vi).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt, B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).
Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 315 (i).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks), 658 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2523 (ii).
Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, 8041 (iv).
Lumber Combine in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks), 1590 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks), 14543 (vi).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13626 (vi).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Mr. *Borden*, Kings) in Com., 1117, 2240 (i).
Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. to introduce, Ques. of Order, 14281 (vi).
Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com. 3221 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Gallihcr*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).
N.W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12313 (v).
——— Sen. Representation B.: *See* 'Senate.'
Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res,, 14327 (vi).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1311 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6809 (iii).

Ottawa, Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

——— *See* 'Waltham.'

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).

Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3623 (ii).

Perth Public Building, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5240, 5661; on M. for 2°, 5658; in Com., 5854 (iii).

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 14691 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) on M. for Com., 5972; in Com., 5984 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt B 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i); in Com., 2597, 3542, 3720, 3830, 3885, 3975, 3985, 4124, 4573, 4696 (ii), 5256, 5681, 6197 (iii), 8125, 8133 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13836 (vi).

——— Commissioners' Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8120 (iv).

——— *See* Ry. Act (consolidation).

——— Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2577 (ii).

——— (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550, 1059; on M. for 3°, 1199 (i).

——— Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14428 (vi).

——— (supplies for Govt. rys.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12944 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 5892 (iii).

Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 720; on M. for 2°, 1259 (i); on M. for Com., 10885; in Com., 10975, 12294; (Kent) 11577; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12404, 12427; neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12431 (v).

——— (remarks) 408 (i).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Ross Rifle, Manufacture, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

St. Eustache to St. Placide Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Labour Disturbances and Militia (remarks) 12940 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6469 (iii).

Senate Representation in N.W.Ter., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry. Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 454, 458 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Supplies to I.C.R.: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4656 (ii).

Canals—Galops (deepening) 8268; conc., 8374; (enlargement) 7803; Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806; North channel (dam) 7803; Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563; (construction) 7560; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7557; (Corry & Laverdure, contract) 7557 (iii); Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804; (Dunnville bridge) 7809; (land damages) 7805; (mitre sills) 7804 (iv).

Charges of Management (public debt) 14253 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Aud. General (promotions) 14255 (vi); Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 322; Interior (salaries) 270 (i); Justice (salaries) 14255 (vi); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i); Public Works (contingencies) 5824 (iii); Railways (salaries) 334 (i); Sec. of State (2nd class clerks) 14254 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7799 (iv).

Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 6762 (iii).

Excise (Perth, salaries) 13969 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (Man. Grain Act) 7798.

Justice, Administration of: N.S. (county court judges) 14261; Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Dugas, Judge) 3430; (sheriffs' salaries) 3410 (ii).

Legislation: H. of C. (debates, amamuenses) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii), 13693 (vi); (Can. and G. B.) 5998; (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14249; (St. Catharine's Bay and Tadousac) 13696 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election pet.) 14252 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268.

Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 412; (St. John, immigration) 413; (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i); **N.S.** (Halifax) 411 (i); **Ont.** (Guelph armoury) 13084 (vi); **Ottawa** (Royal mint) 349 (i); (steel shelving) 13094 (vi); (Victoria museum) 366 (i), 14243 (vi); **Que.** (citadel, drill shed) 13057; (Longueuil P.O.) 13075 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. Andrew's wharf) 5894, (St. John tributaries) 5895 (iii); **N.S.** (Glace Bay wharf) 13192 (vi); (Necum Teuch wharf) 1137; (Neil's Harbour) 1141; **Que.** (Isle aux Coudres) 2242; (Lake St. John wharf) 2243; (Laprairie ice piers) 2249; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257; (repairs, improvements) 2242 (i); (rivière du Nord) 5908; (St. Laurent wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

ship channel) 3307 (ii); (St. Maurice river) 5904 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5906 (iii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes to freight cars) 7528 (iii); 8281; (air signals) 8311 (iv); (book keeping) 12876 (vi); (bridge strengthening) 8269 (iv); (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii); (Chaudière junction, engine house) 8314; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8285; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Eastern Extension, award, &c.) 7528 (iii); (G. T. R. rental) 12887 (vi); (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); (Lévis, accommodation) 7522 (iii); (machinery for shops) 8291; (Miramichi bridge) 8307; (Moncton workshops) 8312; (operating expenses) 7811 (iv); (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); (Pictou, accommodation) 8317; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8291; (Restigouche bridge) 8304; (Rivière du Loup, work shops) 8314; (Rivière du Loup, yards) 8309; (rolling stock) 8293; (St. John, accommodation) 8315; (Stellarton accommodation) 8296 (iv).

P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7530 (iii) 7801; (steel rails) 7802 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7796 (iv).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14301, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314, 14382 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M for Com., 4672 (ii).

Transcontinental Ry. and Sir William Mulock's Speech (remarks) 367 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M, for Com. of Sup., 3444 (ii).

——— (remarks) *re* Sorel Wharf, 12854 (vi).

——— *re* Speech from the Throne (remarks) 6404 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s B. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. B. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*) on M. to refer to Com., 664 (i).

Woodstock, N.B., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).

Hale, Mr. F. H., *Carleton (N.B.)*

Census, Carleton, &c., N.B., Religious Classification, &c. (Ques.) 4004 (ii).

Hale, Mr. F. H.—*Con.*

Drill Shed, Woodstock, N.B., Purchase of Site, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3236 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5191 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12733 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3734 (ii); (telephones) 5534 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7230 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Post Office, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 672 (i).

——— Retaining Wall, &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 591 (i).

Queen's College of Kingston (B. 190) 1°*, 3864 (ii),

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4169 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Alliance Bank of Can. incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) on M. for 2°, 5585; in Com., 7470 (iii) (amt.) 7477 (iii).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4224 (ii).

Atlantic, Quebec & Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular from Aud. Gen. (remarks) 11553 (v).

Bank Act Amt. (B. 234) 1° m., 7565 (iv).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6404 (iii).

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to North Pole Expedition (remarks) 12813 (vi).

Binder Twine Inspector, Authority as to Penalties, &c. (remarks) 14048 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to ref. back to Com., 5239; in Com., 5985; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5988 (iii).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10721 (v).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7464; on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7345 (iii).

Bruce Mines & Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

Budget, The, 2076 (i).

Burrard, B.C., Census, Letter of Mr. McCraney *re* Enumerators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7077 (iii).

Business of the House *re* Printing of Bills (remarks) 2394 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5062 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5452, 5850 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, &c. (remarks) 10712, 10745 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5626 (iii).

C.P.R to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Can. Associated Press Despatches B.: *See* 'British.'

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5468 (iii).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13730 (vi).

See 'Burrard,' &c., 'Supply—Agriculture,' &c.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5969, 6199 (iii).

Citizen's Bank of Canada incorp. B. 214 (Mr. *Clarke*) 7478; (amt.) 7479 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12359 (v).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).

Country Postmasters, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5676 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5582, 6654, 7503 (iii); (cigarettes) 10756 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3050; in Com. on B., 4036 (ii).

See 'German,'

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. 1062 (i); (compulsory voting) 13575, 14423 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4782 (ii).

German Surtax, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Tariff B. 273, 14757 (vi).

See 'Customs.'

Govt. Railways Act (supplies to I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12582 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7820, 7856 (iv).

G.T Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9942 (iv); in Com. on B., 10687, 11911, 11934 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12770 (vi).

——Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13271 (vi).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ques.) 13935 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, Ques. of Order, 3297 (ii).

I.C.R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Govt.,' &c.

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7974 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties paid 1890-1903 (Ques.) 11556 (v).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8111 (iv).

Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 8007 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14400 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5359 (iii).

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights.'

Niagara, Queenston & St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Nicola, Kamloops & Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6431 (iii).

North-West Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2753 (ii).

N.W.T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12327 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4871 (ii).

Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6457 (iii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 13631 (vi).

Postmasters and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14680 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5676, 5859 (iii).

Preferential Tariff Imports: *See* 'Imports.'

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British,' &c.

P. E. I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) in Com., 4223 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14711, 14731; on M. for 2°, 14734 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3737 (ii), 6102, 6119, 6173, 6323; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14315, 14428, 14736 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14347 (vi).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1812 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10851; in Com., 11541, 11584, 12294; (Brant) 11111, 11152; (Toronto) 11747; (Waterloo) 11643, 11652 (v).
Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5085 (ii); in Com. on B., 6470 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5845 (iii).
Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).
Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7040 (iii).
Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14315 (vi).
Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).
Sugar entered for Home Consumption, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 14285 (vi).
Supplies for I. C. R.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 258.'
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi); (census schedules) 7076 (iii); (deputy minister) 4356; (experimental farms) 4557 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7653 (iv); (Shutt's, prof., report) 4557 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Public Works (contingencies) 5824.
Excise (liquor inspection) 5402 (iii).
Fisheries (bait freezers) 13655 (vi).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6707 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7765 (iv).
Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3415; Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3525 (ii).
Legislation (voters' lists) 5276 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Bronte lighthouse) 5755 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7754 (iv).
Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590; (Printing Bureau plant) 12587; (unforseen expenses) 12588 (v).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4088; (meteorological service) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Man. (immigration building) 5844 (iii); N. B. (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037 (vi); N. S. (Arichat) 5833; Ont. (Clinton, P. O.) 519 (i), 5834 (iii); (Guelph) 638; (London drill hall) 642 (i); Ottawa (electric lighting, transformers) 5843; Que. (Montmagny) 5841 (iii).
Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1355 (i); (Burlington channel piers) 13238 (vi); (general repairs) 1374 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Oakville pier) 1376 (i); P. E. I. (Summerside, breakwater) 13227 (vi).
Miscellaneous (Ottawa river) surveys) 13357; (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Portage du Fort) 2691 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways: I.C.R. (Canso ferry service) 12603 (v).
Tariff and Taxation *re* N. W. Immigration: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6866 (iii).
Tariff Policy of Govt., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iii).
———*See* 'Customs,' &c.
Textile Fabrics B.: *See* 'Inspection.'
Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737; (amt.) 14739 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).
Tobacco Duties collected, 1902 (Ques.) 2103 (i).
——— 1903 (Ques.) 12217 (v).
Tobacco Excise Duties, Par. in *Globe* (remarks) 5701 (iii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) Inquiry *re* resuming adjnd. deb., 5882 (iii).
Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14465 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2341 (i).

Halliday, Mr. J., *N. Bruce.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10952 (v).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *S. Brant.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com, on Res., 7319, 7361, 7391 (iii).
Binder Twine, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Budget, The, 1764 (i),
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5073, 5082 (ii).
Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. on Sup., 13724 (vi).
——— New Basis *re* Work of Staff (Ques.) 13935 (vi).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 838 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9305 (iv); in Com. on B., 10556, 10669, 11969, 12032, 12242 (v).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 13286 (vi).
———*See* 'Ry. Policy.'
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7975 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4338 (ii).
Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2350 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B.—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8055 (iv).

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G. T. P. R.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6433 (iii).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4746 (ii), 5554, 6127, 6274 (iii), 8168 (iv), 12964 (vi); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* 2 cent fares, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Policy of Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7126 (iii).

Railway Subsidies for past ten Years, voted by Parlt. (Ques.) 13934 (vi).

Rathbun Co.'s (B. 122) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10893, 10922, 11088, 11657 (v).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5087 (ii); in Com. on B., 7219 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Railways (salaries) 338 (i).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3794 (ii).
Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6334; (medical attendance) 6334 (iii).
Inland Revenue (wood alcohol) 239 (i); (Keilty, Mr., appnmt.) 5370 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7768, 7773 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7603 (iv).
Post Office (letter carriers, salaries) 6022 (iii).
Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 8276 (iv).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9427 (iv).

Two cent Ry. Passenger Fares: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Holmes, Mr. R., *W. Huron.*

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8239 (iv).

Budget, The, 1953 (i),

Can. Associated Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British,' &c.

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13733 (vi).

Chickens, Fattening of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 824 (i).
See 'Criminal,' &c.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3266 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes), 10752 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13570 (vi).

Holmes, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3014 (i).

Fattening of Chickens: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Fire Protection of Parliament Buildings: *See* 'Ottawa.'

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3819 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*), to Com. of Sup., 4771 (ii).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Ft. William (Ques.) 542 (i).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10049 (iv).

——— Member (Mr. *Taylor*) asked to keep to Clause under Discussion, 10565 (v).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Kemp, 11987 (v).

Huron Judgeship, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt (remarks), 220 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks), 12814 (vi).

Ottawa Govt. Buildings, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation and Security from Fire (Ques.) 4673 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (under-crossings, &c.), 6202 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Huron), 11003 (v).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644 (iv),
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 220 (i).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.), 5288 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7778 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5272 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Clinton, P.O.) 520 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove), 13164 (vi); Ont. (Goderich, breakwater), 13241 (vi).

Vegetable Duties: *See* 'Garden,' &c,

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's* (*P.E.I.*).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10731 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*), on M. for 3°, 13944 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 13590 (vi).

Elmira Branch Line on P.E.I. Ry. (marks), in Com. of Sup., 12836 (vi).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6903 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*), on M. for 3°, 8329 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for Com. on Res., 9183 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Post Office Revenue, on Postmaster General's Statement (remarks), 14021 (vi).
P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Misrepresentation, &c. (remarks), 1679 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), on M. for 3°, 12451 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale, B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7235 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office—Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5948 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside breakwater) 13227 (vi); Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. cables), 2710 (ii).
Railways—P.E.I. (Elmira Line), 12836; (Murray Harbour branch), 12832 (vi).
Winter Communication with P.E.I., Cor. with Govt. (M. for copies), 1036, 1051 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *N. Victoria (O.).*
Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*), 14786 (vi).
Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ques.), 12717 (vi).
See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*), in Com., 5970 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v).
Bedford Basin, I.C.R., Land acquired (remarks), 14062 (vi).
Belmont Disaster, Widows' Gratuities (remarks), 14157 (vi).
Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties collected (remarks), 14048 (vi).
Bracebridge, Post Office Building (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi),
Bridges over Canals, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
British Cable News Service between Can. and G.B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10716 (v).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canadian Artists and King Edward's Portrait, &c. (Ques.), 13026 (vi).
Canadian Beef supplied to British Troops (remarks), 483 (i).
Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).
Can. Central and O. & B. Ry. Amalgamation, Compensation, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Can Foundry Co.'s strike: *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii); 5648 (iii).
C.P.R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).
C.P.R. (Medicine Hat) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
C.P.R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Can. Press Despatches Bill: *See* 'British.'
Can. S.A. Constabulary, Attestation, Discharge, &c. (Ques.), 14287 (vi).
Canal Locks, Opening, &c. (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
Cartoons in *Military Gazette*, &c. (Ques.), 2103 (i).
Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 400 (i).
Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).
Civil Service B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res. (M.) that Com. rise, 12562 (v).
Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re*, &c. (Ques.) 9683 (iv).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Remarks in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4687 (ii).
Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbance (remarks) 12610 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7501 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 (ii).
Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Dixon, Capt., Rep. *re* Canadians in S.A. (Ques.) 7914 (iv).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3002 (ii); in Com., 14422 (vi).
Dom. Lands, Sale, Locations, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 670 (i).
Drill Sheds established, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13068 (vi).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Election Printing in Prince Albert *Advocate*, in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elevator Accident, &c. (remarks) 5417 (iii).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 615 (i).
False Creek, B.C., Agreement, &c. (remarks) 2758 (ii).
Ferries Regulation B.: *See* 'Navigable.'
Franking of Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Freight Rates, Discrimination: *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Furniture Trade with Australia, 13679 (vi).
G.O.C., Rep., &c., Publishing of (Ques.) 669 (i).
——— Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton *re* Defence Scheme, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2406 (i).
——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'
Good Shepherd Reformatory, N.B., B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Gordon Highlanders' Trophy (remarks) 7253 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (ii), 5171 (iii), 7816, 7880; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8065 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Wilmot's Amendment, 8067 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 7826 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8874 (iv); in Com. on B., 10421, 10586, 11238, 11887, 11346, 11887, 11901, 11950 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736, 12762 (vi).

G.T.P. Ry., Mr. Hays' Statement *re* Plans for Completion, &c., 14648 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Privs. and Elections Com., 13272 (vi).

——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).

Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt. for S.A. War, Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).

Hides, Trade with Australia. *See* 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 769 (i).

——— (personal explanation) 871 (i),

House of Commons Elevator: *See* 'Elevator.'

Hutton, Maj.-Gen., Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 206 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).

James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14447 (vi).

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (Dawson) Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14300 (vi).

Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s (B. 146) 1°*, 2396 (i).

Lindsay Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2530 (ii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14239 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).

Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Reps., &c., 2764 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7992 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14399 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Military Gazette Cartoons: *See* 'Cartoons.'

Militia Bill, Date of Introduction (Ques.) 669 (i).

——— Estimates (remarks) 13368 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia,' &c., 'Personal,' &c.

Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 12985 (vi).

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similakameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

N.W.M. Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).

——— Appnmts, Promotions, &c. (Ques.) 2921 (ii).

Ninety-fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).

Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).

Painting of King: *See* 'Portrait.'

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14461 (vi).

Patent Act. Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4674 (ii).

Patent Relief Bills (remarks) 2397 (i).

Pensions to S.A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14597 (vi).

——— *See* 'S. A.,' &c.

Personal Explanation, *re* Misprint in Speech on Militia Service, 14850 (vi).

Portrait of His Majesty, King Edward VII and Canadian Artists (Ques.) 13026 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Press Despatches from G. B.: *See* 'British.'

Press Gallery Representatives, Payment as Sessional Clerks (remarks) 14114, 14242 (vi).

Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing, &c.: *See* 'Election.'

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134, 3136 (ii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3728, 3750, 4124, 4703, 4728 (drainage) 4752 (ii); 5354 (iii).

Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14502 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, Ruling asked for, 14360 (vi).

Ry. Wrecks Investigation: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10892; in Com., 10951, 10957, 11439, 11505; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Roach, Mr., Census Enumerator for N. Ontario (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 6997 (iii).

St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Saturday Sittings, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13265 (vi).

Sault Ste. Marie Disturbances, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 12610 (vi).

Scotch Labourers, &c., Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7238 (iii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11823 (v).

S. A. Contingents and Govt. Employees, reinstated, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

——— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'

——— Pensions to Canadians (Ques.) 2920 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pensions.'

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).

——— B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6916 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7038 (iii).

Strathroy and Western Counties Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (census enumerators) 7083 (iii); (census, N. Ont.) 4826; (imperial institute) 4437; (patent branch, salaries) 4350 (ii).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing tow path) 14152; Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139; Farran's Point (acetylene gas plant) 14155; Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation services) 14157; Lachine (Guilbault, Mr., gratuity) 14157; Lake St. Francis (dam) 14152; Murray (purchase of Supt.'s house) 14146; (wire fencing) 14151; St. Ours (landing wharfs) 14154 (vi); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7560; Trent (construction) 7553 (iii); 14645; (Peterborough pier) 14645; Williamsburg (overseer's house) 14150 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Finance (Insurance) 12586; Geological Survey (salaries) 12592 (v); Gov. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 207 (i); High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v); Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 241 (i).

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6775; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6772 (iii); (homestead entries) 13966 (vi); (roads, &c.) 6772; (surveys) 6768; (tree culture) 6775; (Winnipeg office) 6767 (iii).

Electric Light (inspections) 5407, 5412 (iii).

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., rep., &c.) 5387; (grain weighing machine) 5387; (liquor inspection) 5401; (methylated spirits, &c.) 5373; (wood alcohol) 5375 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278, 5288; (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6677; (creed lines) 6698; (mechanics, &c.) 6832; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849; (tents, &c.)6849; (N.W.T. expenditure, &c.) 6882; (on ques. of order) 6871 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., shortage) 5406; (retirements, &c.) 5404 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7774 (iv).

Interior (Amos Barnes) 6925; (Liard River miners) 6926; (meteorological observatory) 6793; (squatters' claims) 6925 (iii).

Justice Administration of: Miscellaneous (prisoners. N.W.T.) 3398 (ii).

Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7198 (iii).

Legislation—House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5267 (iii) 14243; (sessional clerks) 14242 (vi); (voters' lists) 5275 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 13678 (vi); (Can. and G.B.) 5998 (iii), 7582; (Can. and S. Africa) 7746; (freight rates, &c.) 7582 (iii); (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).

Militia (defence scheme) 3763 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (G.O.C.) 3779; (pay and allowance) 3755 (ii), 13434 (vi); (rifle associations) 3767; (target practice) 3772; (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 12589 (iv); (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing, &c.) 14652 (vi); (Art gallery) 12589 (v); (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 (iii); (Paris agency) 12589; (printing bureau plant) 12588 (v); (S. A. memorial association) 6992.

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4078 (ii).

Post Office (letter boxes) 6153; (letter carriers) 6037; (locked boxes, H. of C.) 6026; (Mallon, A. D., retirement, &c.) 6037; (ry. mail clerks) 6026 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings, Man. (Winnipeg, immigration stations) 13126; **N B.** (Campbellton, P.O.) 13037, 13040; (military buildings) 13041; (quarantine station, water service) 13042; (St. John drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John immigration) 414 (i); (St. John immigration shed) 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 415 (i), 13042; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; **N.W.T** (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130; (Moosejaw, P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129; **Ont.** (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 510; (Guelph, armoury) 13084; (Kingston, barracks) 13118; (Military college, Kingston) 13094; (Peterborough, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock armoury) 13125; **Ottawa** (additional (bath rooms, H. of C.) 13006 (vi); (ventilation of Chamber) 13011; (ventilation, lighting, &c. of H. of C.) 13087; (Victoria museum) 14244; **P. E. I.** (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; **Que.** (Levis, P. O.) 13053; (Longueuil, P. O.) 13072; (Magog, P. O.) 13081; (military buildings, arsenals, &c.) 13054; (Montreal, barracks) 13076; (Quebec drill hall addition) 13077; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's, P. O.) 13059; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Columbia river) 1457 (i); (Victoria harbour, dredging) 13306; **Man.** (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Mar. Prov.** (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); **N.W.T.** (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i); **N.S.** (Abbott's Harbour) 13141;

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
(Big Harbour, wharf) 13145; **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 13235; (Blind river, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1354 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte harbour) 1357 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland, wharf) 13239; (Goderich, breakwater) 13240; (Parry Sound) 13248 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3342 (ii); (Port Perry) 13249; (Rosedale, wharf) 13249; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13314 (vi); **Que.** (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallee pier) 1516, 1521 (i); (Quebec harbour improvements) 3341; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3306; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2657 (ii).
Roads and Bridges (Bryson, approaches) 13321; (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post Road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).
Telegraph Lines, Que. (Anticosti, Fox River) 13325; Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).
Railways: G. T. Pacific (surveys) 14646 (vi); I. C. R. (air brakes, freight cars) 7527; (Canso ferry service) 12602; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 12594; (Rivière du Loup, engine houses) 12593; (Halifax accommodation) 12597 (v); (investigation *re* wrecks) 14154 (vi); (Metis station) 12604 (v); (miscellaneous, gratuities) 14155 (vi); (Ouelle River, spur line) 12599 (v); (Pictou accommodation) 14088 (vi); (power saw) 12608 (v); (rolling stock) 14100 (vi); (St. Flavie accommodation) 12602 (v); (sidings, additional) 14058 (vi); (vestibules) 12600 (v); P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 14119 (vi).
Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6994 (iii).
Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6932 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4889 (ii).
Thunder Bay, Nepigon and St. Joe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14401 (vi).
Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14388 (vi).
Trent Canal, Medical Officer, &c. (Ques.) 8117 (iv).
——— Payment to Thos. Dodds (Ques.) 8118 (iv).
——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2324 (i).
Toronto Armouries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13085 (vi).
Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3456 (ii).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14 48 (vi).
Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Yamaska to Lotbinière Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14319 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*
Bills withdrawn (M.) 7203 (iii).
Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4591 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.), Meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse., 8405 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4441 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry Co.'s incorp. B. 154 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 4592 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10860; in Com., 10942, 10958, 11584, 12293; (Brant) 11098; (Toronto) 11698; (Waterloo) 11642; (York) 11682; on M. for 3°, 12408, 12416, 12463 (v).
——— Rep. of Tel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (London drill hall) 641 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *E. Elgin.*
Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 42 8 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1510 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6976 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1808 (i).
Bankers Association, Inspection Duties, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).
Brockville and Sault St. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7340 (iii).
C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
——— (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14504 (vi).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 401 (i).
Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B. in Com. on Res., 611 (i).
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12494, 12517 (v).
Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3183 (ii).
——— (Ques. of Order) 3107 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i); in Com., 3260 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3243 (ii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3103 ; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).
Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 896 ; in Com., 905 (i) ; on M. for Sel. Com., 3003 (ii).
——— B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com., 1062 (i).
Dom. Notes Security B. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6914 (iii).
Dorchester Penitentiary, Tenders for Fuel (Ques). 10101 (v).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3009 (ii).
Elgin County, Redistribution, &c., Par. in Toronto *Globe* (remarks) 6540 (iii).
Fast Atlantic : *See* 'Atlantic.'
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6905 (iii).
German Surtax : *See* 'Customs.'
Gerrymander Bill : *See* 'Representation B. 66.'
Glace Bay, N.S., Wharf, Letter of Mr. Shields (read) 13185 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7819, 7843, 784 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10425, 10613, 10671, 11297, 12240 (v).
——— on M. to adjn. Debate (remarks) 8807 (iv).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 68 (i).
Hog Cholera, Outbreak in Yarmouth, Ont. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 809 (i).
Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3172 (ii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).
Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2516, 2532 (i).
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, *re* (remarks) 14224 (vi).
Manufacturers' Delegation *re* Tariff (remarks) 265 (i).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3802 (ii).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 5725 (iii).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).
Order, Questions of, on Mr. Speaker's Rulings (remarks) 10537 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6810 (iii).
Patent Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3624 ; in Com., 4217 (ii).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 82 3 (iv).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4177 (ii).
Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11563 (v).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. 'Grafters,' 10521 (v).
Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4212 (iv).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1334 (i).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 250 (i) ; in Com., 3839, 3891, 4128 (ii), 5765, 6133, 6217, 6259, 6324 (iii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 77 (Mr. *Smith*) on M. for 2°, 2387 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2 60 ; in Com., 2581, 2924 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14499 (vi).
Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Blockade, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2492.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10879 ; in Com., 10940, 10981, 11014, 11140, 11456, 11496, 11157, 11 87, 11 24, 11637, 11662 ; (Brant) 11099, 11110 ; (Toronto) 11713 ; (Waterloo) 11662 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12489 (v).
Rural and Free Mail Delivery (remarks) 516 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13378 (vi).
St. Thomas, Armoury Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3224 (ii).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c. (Ques.), 1027 (i).
Springhill Boiler Explosion (remarks) 13258 (vi).
Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7052 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Agriculture (patent branch, salaries), 4350 (ii).
Canals—Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 ; (land damages) 7805 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272; Justice (salaries) 211; Militia (salaries) 222; Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3785; (salaries, &c.) 3907 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff hot springs) 6789 (iii).

Geological Survey (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (new building) 6824 (iii).

Immigration (exodus to U. S.) 6880; (general expenditure) 6880; (on ques. of order) 6862; (Ques. of order, quoting speeches) 6871; (U.S. agents) 6849 (iii).

Labour Dept. (B.C. labour commissioners) 7198 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse supplies) 4172; (lightkeepers, salaries, &c.) 4166; (St. Lawrence navigation) 4150 (ii).

Militia (defence scheme) 3765; (G.O.C.) 3782; (grants to associations) 3770 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13396 (vi); (transport and freight) 3752, 3767 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6976 (iii).

N. W. T. Govt. (general expenses) 6858 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4084 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 1068; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1066; (postmasters) 1020 (i); **Mar. Provs.** (renewals, &c.) 422 (i); **Ont.** (Alexandria, P. O.) 506; (architects) 524; (Clinton P.O.) 522 (i); (Oshawa P.O.) 13111; (St. Mary's P.O.)13109(vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 651 (i); **Ottawa** (heating) 1009; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (telephones) 1013 (i).

Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river) 1455 (i); **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1174; (Great Salmon river) 1177; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1181; (Richibucto, pier) 1177; (Shippegan, harbour) 1184 (i); **N.S.** (Amagandus, wharf) 1069); (Cow Bay) 1081; (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi); (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1037 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102; (Kingsport, pier) 1103; (Larry's River) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105; (Margaree, wharf) 1133; (Meteghan Cove) 1134; (Neil's Harbour) 1140; (New Harbour) 1144; (Port Hawkesbury) 1148 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13209 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1151 (i); **Ont.** (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185; (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Burlington channel, piers) 13237 (vi); (Depot Harbour) 1361; (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1368 (i), 13240; (Kingsville) 13244; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Sarnia, dredging) 2638 (ii); (Wendover wharf) 1439 (i); **P.E.I.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1164; (Cove head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155; (New London, wharf) 1160; (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay River) 3211 (ii); (Cross Point, pier) 1513 (i); (dredging plant) 2674 (ii); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515; (Murray Bay, wharf 2269; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Law)rence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St-

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3306 (ii); (St. Maurice River) 2286; (Sorel, wharf) 2295 (i); (Temiscamingue Lake, dredging) 2246 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2639 (ii).

Miscellaneous (art gallery) 2725; (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2731; (temporary clerks, &c.) 2731 (ii).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2700; (Portage du Fort) 2696 (ii).

Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2689 (ii).

Tel. Lines (Belle Isle) 2712; (B.C.) 2992; (Magdalen islands) 2714; (Mar. Provs.) 2709 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes, freight cars) 8282 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 3700 (ii); 8270, 8273; ('Cleveland' cylinders) 8284; (draw bars, exchange) 8289 (iv); (Levis accommodation) 3704 (ii); (steel rails) 7803; (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993 (iii).

Surtax: *See* 'Customs.'

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14738 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9422 (iv).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspaper (remarks) 11081 (v).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Mackinnon*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).

Glace Bay Wharf, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13185 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11348 (v); on M. for 3°, 12700 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, Member reading Speech, 10249 (v).

I.C.R. Extension from N. Sydney Junction to North Sydney (M. for cor.*) 447 (i).

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12972 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11028, 11534; (N.S.) 11798; on M. for 3°, 12484 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5836 (iii); (Sydney Mines) 13030; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Glace Bay, wharf) 13185 (vi).

Railways—I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v); (Sydney accommodation) 3697 (ii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4921 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell.*
Alton and Caledon Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14019 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7318, 7367 (iii).
Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ques.) 4185 (ii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com., 5436 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10640, 12109, 12252.
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13285 (vi).
Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5732 (iii).
Montreal Northern Ry. and St. Agathe Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 564 (i).
——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4711 (ii); 6135, 6217 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14483 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11746; on M. for 3°, 12428.
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (census enumerators) 4825 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c. 4114 (ii).
Postoffice (country postmasters) 6037 (iii), 14019.
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).
Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14483 (iii).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *Lambton, W.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10096 (v).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5435 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4426 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 839 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).
Cornwall Road and Mahone Bay Postal Service (remarks) 14038 (vi).
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3099 (ii).
Dog Fish: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries.'
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14423 (vi).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6897 (iv).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E.—*Con.*
Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13167 (vi).
Glass Factory, Pictou, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7892; on M. for 3°, 8323 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12062, 12254 (v).
Halifax and S. Western Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Judge's Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Lunenburg Marine School, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13534 (vi).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5992 (iii).
Penny Banks B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii).
Postmasters in Country Postoffices, in Com. on Postoffice Bill, 5662 (iii).
——— Increase of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
Post Office Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. (country postmasters), 5662, 5864 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14332 (vi).
Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6919 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Agriculture (experimental farms) 4555 (ii).
Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658; (Behring Sea arbitration) 13658; (dog fish pest) 13651; (hatcheries, Lunenburg) 13660 (vi).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).
Immigration (repatriation, N.S.) 6722 (iii).
Indians: Mar. Provs. (schools) 6415 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour lightship) 4165 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13646; (Nfld., aids to Navigation) 13647 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 7751 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Micmac dictionary, printing) 12592 (v).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination) 13532; (naval reserve, school of navigation) 13546 (vi).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13167 (vi); (Larry's river) 1104; (Lunenburg harbour) 1106 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Tancock breakwater) 13217; (Victoria, beach wharf) 13214 (vi); (West Baccaro channel) 1152 (i); (Yarmouth bar) 13218 (vi); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3350 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (North Sydney improvements) 12598 (v).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *E. Toronto.*
Budget, The, 2050 (i).
Canadian Freight Classification, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 3537 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5595 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3046; in Com. on B., 4035.

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Freight Classification (Canadian) O.C., &c. (remarks) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. freight, &c.' Supply—Mail Subsidies,' 'Ry. Bill 21.'
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
German Tariff, Cor., &c., laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).
Grain Standards, Samples *re* &c. (remarks) 11179.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5211 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 8066 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9152 (iv); in Com. on B., 10450, 10478, 10538,10569, 11280, 11310, 11360, 11973, 11984 (v), 12102, 12180, 12274; on M. for 3°, 12729 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Grafter,' 10190 (v).
See 'Privilege.'
G. T. Pacific Subsidy, Par. in Ottawa *Journal*, 5733 (iii).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 766 (i).
Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
I. C. R. & G. T. R., Traffic Arrangements (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7928, 7956 (iv).
Militia Force, Condition, &c. (remarks), 5733 (v).
Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10509 (v).
Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks), 1334 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), on M. for Com., 2589; in Com. (express rates), 2596, 3539 (ii); (freight rates) 5685, 6285 (iii); 8125 (iv).
Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7127 (iii).
Railway Sidings for Private Corporations, &c. (remarks), 14061 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11051; (Toronto) 11695; (Winnipeg) 11791; (York) 11667; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12467 (v).
——— Printing of Amendments, &c. (remarks), 11424 (v).
Sorel Deep Water Wharf, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12851 (vi).
Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'
SUPPLY:
Customs (contingencies, &c.) 3903; (preferential tariff) 3921; (salaries, &c.) 3911 (ii).
Justice—Penitentiaries (binder twine), 3518 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7574; (freight rates, &c.) 7588 (iv).
Militia (Valleyfield strike, pay), 3602 (ii).
Postoffice (letter carriers, &c.), 6009 (iii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings (Toronto custom house), 647.
Harbours and Rivers—**Man.** (St. Andrew's Rapids), 3355, 3364 (ii); **Ont.** (Depot Harbour), 1361; (Goderich harbour) 1366; (Toronto, harbour) 1433; (Wendover wharf) **Que.** (Quebec harbour improvements)1439; 3338; (Sorel, deep water wharf), 3374 (ii); 12851 (vi).
Railways—I.C.R. (Eastern Extension, fees), 7529 (iii); (sidings, additional) 14061 (vi).
Trade Commissioner in London, Eng. (remarks), 3497 (ii).
Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks), 865 (i).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3470, 3486 (ii); 12851 (vi).
United Counties Ry., Letter of E. D. Lafleur (read) in Com. of Sup., 12852 (vi).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*), on M. for 2°, 2340 (i); on M. to refer to Special Com., 3247 (ii).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate to Montreal, &c. (Ques.), 11188, 11425 (v).

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com., 6900 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com., 11298, 12052 (v).
Insurance Rates *re* Ocean Steamers (remarks), in Com. of Sup., 7598 (iv).
I.C.R., Coal Rates, &c. (Ques.), 6167 (iii).
——— Trackmen, Wages, &c. (Ques.), 1297 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Res., 7972 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax), 4288 (ii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8102 (iv).
Labour Commission, 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.), 8083 (iv).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks), 2525 (ii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), in Com., 3744 (ii), 5340 (iii), 8143, 8165 (iv); (telephones) 5521 (iii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), in Com. (N.S.), 11794 (v).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, N.S. (county court judges), 14267 (vi).
Fisheries (dog-fish pest), 13653 (vi).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations), 13646 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.), 7598 (iv); (Petit de Grat and Mulgrave) 14250 (vi).
Ocean and River Service (masters and mates examination), 13528 (vi).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Cow Bay), 1082 (i); (Gabarouse breakwater) 13182 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1090 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13196 (vi); (St. Ann's, wharf) 13204 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox), 5021 (ii).

Kidd, Mr. E., *Carleton, (O.).*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Montreal harbour), 3367 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4231 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5887 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5816 (iii).
Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. B.'
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 13813 (vi).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup. 3158 (ii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7516 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3063, 3114 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 908 (i), 13577 (vi).
Drainage across Rys.: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4681 (ii).
Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bays, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) on M. for 2°, 3815 (ii).
Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville (Ques.) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 7827 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9909 (iv); in Com. on B., 10627 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12720 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13293 (vi).
Hamilton Electric Light & Power Co., Rental, &c. (Ques.) 3803 (ii).
Hamilton and Grimsby Electric Line (remarks) 6084 (iii).
James and Hudson's Bays, Fishing Rights, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
——— (M. for cor.*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8112 (iv).
Lt.-Governor of Ontario, Appnmt of Administrator (remarks) 112 (i).
Macnee Fishing License, Inquiry for Ret., 4727 (ii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) in Com., 9148 (iv).
Mowat, Lt.-Gov.: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
Post Offices, Opening and Closing Hours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 93; 2° m., 552 (i).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. 2591, 3571, 3717, 3881, 3883, 3888, 3974, 4001, 4121, 4565, 4691, 4748 (ii), 5323, 5539, 5563, 5766, 6071, 6084, 6204, 6305 (iii), 8128 (iv); (cattle guards) 5774, 6204—6250 (iii); (drainage) 4748 (ii); (telephones) 5539 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 13845 (vi).
Representation in the H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1250 (i); in Com., 11157 11435 (v).
Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7232 (iii).
Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 635 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Chambly (By-wash station) 12906; (tow path) 12907; Generally (operating expenses) 12920; Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12912 (vi); Welland (deepening, &c.) 7804 (iv); (drainage improvement) 12905; (electric light) 12900; (land surveys) 12905; (Port Colborne improvements) 12903; (protection walls) 12904; (Ramy's Point obstruction) 12902; (Townsend valve, lock gates) 12905 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Public Works (architect's salary) 13499 (vi).
Customs (inspection, preventive service, &c.) 3953 (ii).
Excise (analysis, food, &c.) 5402 (iii).
Interior (Liard River miners, relief) 6926 (iii).
Justice, Administration of: Yukon (law library) 14268 (vi).
Militia (annual drill) 3604; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).
Post Office (Ottawa Supply Co.) 6151; (inspectors' salaries) 5931; (ry. mail service) 5956; (salaries) 5925 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, **N.S.** (Arichat) 5829 (iii); **Ont.** (Cayuga P.O.) 502; (Clinton P.O.) 526; (Cobourg armoury) 639; (London drill hall) 641; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 428 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, **N.B.** (Campbellton wharf) 1164; (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i); **N.S.** (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146 (vi); **P.E.I.** (New London 1160 (i); **Que.** (Rimouski pier, &c.) 13469; (Rivière du Loup) 13476; (Rivière Verte) 13470; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13489; (Ste. Fidèle, wharf) 13493; (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gedeon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489; (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495; (St. Louis river) 13473; (St. Maurice, dam) 13491; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13488; (Sacre-Cœur, wharf) 13478; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13482; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479.
Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13649.
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11089 (v).
Welland Canal Lock Tenders, Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— Water Power, O. C.'s *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).
——— rep. of Board of Trade of St. Catharines, &c. (Ques.) 668 (i).

Lang, Mr. John, *East Peterborough.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11013; (Peterborough) 11625.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Assiniboine and Red River Nav. Rep. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1859 (i).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5558, 5887, 5960 (iii).
Business of the House, *re* Private Bills Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5852 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5790 (iii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
See 'P. O. Bill,' 'Memorial,' &c.
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).
Customs Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14406 (vi).
Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Half Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
Imperial Co.'s incorp. B. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).
Interior Dept., Permanent Officials, &c., Date of Appnmt. (M. for list*) 2338 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10791.
Judges' Salaries, County Courts, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 3628 (ii).
——— Increases (remarks) 5242 (iii).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7919 (iv).
Lumber Combine in N. W. T and Man. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Man. and N. W. T. Postmasters' Association Memorial *re* Remuneration (Ques.) 13259 (vi).
Memorial of Man. Postmasters' Association (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13994, 14020 (vi).
Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name (B. 88) 1°*, 1193 (i).
Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).
Paradis, Amable, Claim against Pub. Works (M. for cor.*) 2337 (i).
Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).
Postmasters' Association, Memorial from Man. and N W.T. (Ques.) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677, 5865 (iii).
Private Bills, Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11034; (Dauphin) 11770; (Portage LaPrairie) 11782 (v).
Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots, &c. (Ques.) 5319 (iii).
St. Boniface Money Order Branch, Closing, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
——— Postal Facilities, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 13949 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Postoffice (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).
Post Office (salaries *re* transfers) 13994; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995 (vi).
Winnipeg P. O.: *See* 'P.O Bill 208,' 'Supply—'Post Office.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *E. Quebec.*
Address, on The, 40 (i).
Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6635 (iii).
Agriculture and Colonization Sel. Com. (M.) to add name, 5679 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission *re* Lord Alverstone (remarks) 13963 (vi).
——— Aylesworth, Mr., Alleged Interviews (remarks) 13668, 13957 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— Award, Govt. Responsibility, &c., Reply to Mr. Borden, Halifax, 14810 (vi).
——— Official Information (remarks) 14523, 14529 (vi).
——— Award, &c. (remarks) 14280, 14287 (vi).
——— Bond-Hay Treaty, &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 878, 1324 (i).
——— Convention respecting Treaty (remarks) 481 (i).
——— Cor. *re*, Papers laid on Table, 14688 (vi).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to review Case, 14764 (vi).
——— Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign Award (remarks) 14403, 14689 (vi).
——— Summary published, &c. (remarks) 10536 (v).
——— Tel. from Lord Alverstone (read) 13806 (vi).
——— Tel. from Mr. Sifton (read) 14529 (vi).
Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5136; in Com., 5872, 5874 (iii); 3°m., 5991 (iii).
Alverstone, Lord: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'
Ascension Day Adjournment (M.) 3127 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allan Co. (Ans.) 7092 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com of Sup., 14171 (vi).

Lavish expenditure criticised by opposition, 14171; not satisfactory service, 14172; efforts by former Govts., 14173; Mr. Foster's scheme in 1888, 14173; no tenders received—offer by Allans, 14174; conditions, 14174; Petersen, Tate & Co., Tender, 14175; obvious reasons for doing nothing 1899 to 1902, 14176; negotiations in Eng. with different firms 1902, 14176; invitations for tenders in March, 1902, 14176; Toronto speech, 14177 (vi).

——— (remarks) notice of M., 13948 (vi).

——— Tenders, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11165 (v); wthdn., 13444 (vi).

Aylesworth, &c.: *See* 'Alaska Boundary.'

Banff Coal Reserve, Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Bass River, N. S., Marine Light (remarks) 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties, on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine, Prices for current Year (Ans.) 203 (i).

Beauharnois District, Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 7106 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (announcement) 6540 (iii).

——— (explanation) 6735, 6754 (iii).

Blankets, Web cloth, &c., purchased by Govt. (Ans.) 10101, 10410, 10714 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

Bopp, Mr.: *See* 'Can. & German,' &c.

Boyd, Chief Justice, Relatives in Govt. Employ (Ans.) 4185 (ii).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance, on Inquiry for Ret., 2016 (i).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7489 (iii).

——— Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Business of the Hse. (M.) 3127 (ii).

——— Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Misleading Statements (remarks) 4349 (ii).

——— Procedure on Order Paper (remarks) 2302.

——— (remarks) 1204 (i).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

Calgary and Edmonton Mortgage Deed, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. and German Fiscal Policy, Cor. with Dom. Govt. and Herr Bopp (remarks) 12220 (v).

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, &c. *re* St. Francis River Bridge, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

Canadian Mails via New York, Tons, &c. (Ans.) 10713 (v).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., 209, in Com. on Res., 4963, 5000 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14500 (vi).

Canals Tonnage Dues, Abolition (Ans.) 874 (i).

Cargill, Henry, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 12937 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 388 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission, on Inquiry for Rep. (remarks) 3396 (ii).

Census Schedules, Questions in Peel, Halton, &c. (Ans.) 11425 (vi).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff 13376 (vi).

Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Charbonneau, Miss Edna, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486, 14510 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v), 12716 (vi).

Chinese Restriction Immigration Act Amt. (B. 82) prop. res., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°*, 945; in Com., 2241, 2399 (i); on Sen. Amts, 5872 (iii).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 845 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3198 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) prop. res., 10410 (v); on Sen. Amts. 14845 (vi).

Civil Service List (presented) 125 (i).

Clergue Steel Works, Labour Disturbances (remarks) 12611 (v).

——— *See* 'Sault.'

Coasting Laws, U. S. Privileges, &c. (remarks) 12714, 12758 (vi).

——— *See* 'U. S.'

Cold Storage and Fruit: *See* 'Fruit.'

Coldstream Guards Band, Arrangements *re* Visit to Can. (Ans.) 9683 (iv).

Colonial Conference, Report, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial.'

Committee, Joint Printing, List (presented) 244 (i).

Committees, Sel. Standing, to prepare Lists (M.) 5 (i).

———Lists presented, 197 (i).

———Meeting concurrently with sitting of (Hse.) (remarks) 8333 (iv).

Corn Duties, Abolition by Imp. Parlt. (remarks) 1681 (i).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1324 (i).

———(immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 319 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Coal Lands, Application *re* (Ans.) 12217 (v).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 5 (i).
———6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 7922 (iv).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).
Dom. Day, Adjnmt. (M.) 5589 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1200 (i); 13583, 14407; M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; Order dschgd., 14769 (vi).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 945 (i).
Dundonald, Lord: *See* 'G.O.C.'
Easter Adjournment (M.) 1115 (i).
Electoral Lists, N.S., Changes since Printing (Ans.) 8331 (iv).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Removal of Flagship (remarks) 10957 (v).
Estimates, Suppl., on Inquiry for (remarks) 10832 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) (M.) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115; 2° m., 8243 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
False Creek, Lease, &c. (Ans.) 2919 (ii).
Farquharson, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5512 (iii).
Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'
France and Canada SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10802, 11422 (v).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T., Tel. from Board of Trade, &c. (read) 2106 (i).
———Tel. to Dep. Min. of Int. (read) 2238 (i).
See 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'
Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. 86 (Mr. *Smith*, Wentworth) on M. for 2°, 3257 (ii).
Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3233 (ii).
General Inspection Act (weigh-masters) Amt. B. (prop. res.) 13264 (vi.)
See 'Inspection.'
G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2420 (i).
German Discrimination and Bond-Hay Treaty, on Inquiry for Papers, 1324 (i).
Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Monday (M.) 3708 (ii).
———Precedence on Thursdays (M.) 940 (i).
———Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 1114 (i).
———Redistribution Bill (remarks) 204 (i).
———Stmnt. *re* further Business (remarks) 13559 (vi).
Gov. Gen's Speech at Banquet of Chambers of Commerce (Ans.) 10101 (v).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Grain Inspection *re* Standard Samples (remarks) 11179 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5158, 5218 (iii), 7847; on M. for 3°, 8060 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7828 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 235) M. for Com. on Res., 8406; 1° m., 7658; ('mountains of information') 7679 (iv); in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°* of B. and in Com., 10412; in Com. on B., 10540, 11191, 11247, 11273, 11312, 11969, 12015, 12055; (two-cent rate) 12233 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12644, 12730, 12758; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12743; on Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) to M. for 3°, 12770 (vi).
———Alternative Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 13028 (vi).
——— Distribution of Bill among Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).
———Govt's. Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton Scheme, 10537 (v).
———Govt. Policy, &c. (Ans.) 2308 (i).
———Delay, &c. (remarks) 6806, 6922, 7299, 7399, 7488 (iii).
———Papers laid on Table, 11302 (v).
———Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to refer to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13267, 13560 (vi).
———Plans by E. A. Hoare (presented) 8082 (iv).
———Sir William Mulock's Speech, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 368 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn. Deb., 8806 (iv).
——— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
See 'Ry. Policy.'
Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13764 (vi).
Hawkesbury to South Indian, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14344 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).
Herchmer, L. W., Pension, &c. (Ans.) 5322 (iii).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 778 (i).
——— Address to His Maj. (M.) 1193 (i).
Imperial Conference Cor., Can. Govt.'s Refusal to publish, &c. (remarks) 3633 (ii), 7923, 8230, 9458 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 9582 (iv).
Imperial Service Orders to Civil Servants, &c. (Ans.) 12715 (vi).
——— Names of Officials, &c. (Ans.) 13669, 13936 (vi).
I.C.R., Shops at Rivière du Loup, Construction (Ans.) 12497 (v).
——— Lévis Accommodation: *See* 'Lévis.'
——— Windsor Junction Accident, Evidence *re* (remarks) 3398 (ii).
Internal Economy Com. (M.) 91 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2787, 3248 (ii).

Insolvency Act, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 818 (i).

Inspection General Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on B., 14311 (vi).

James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).

Jonquières to Ha Ha Bay, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11408 (v).

Judges of Provincial Courts, Superior Court, Que. (prop. res.) 11426; Res. 2° m., 11833 (v).

Judges Retiring Allowances on Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4262 (ii); in Com. on Res., 8090 (iv); (M.) to conc. in Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).

—— Increase of, &c. (remarks) 14307 (vi).

Judgeship offered by Mr. Dansereau to Conservative (remarks) 13805 (vi).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 2779 (ii).

Labour Day Adjournment (M.) 10742 (v).

—— (remarks) 10489, 10712 (v).

Lac Bouchette Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

Lake St. John Ry. and La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Le Canada, Mr. Latour's Canvass: *See* 'Postmasters.'

Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14299 (vi).

Library of Parlt. Com. (M.) 244 (i).

Lt. Governor of Ont. and Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 119 (i).

—— (remarks) 111, 656, 1206 (i).

—— *See* 'Mowat.'

Loan Companies Extension Act Amt. B. 35 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2504, 2517, 2677 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7918 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn., 14571 (vi).

—— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi.)

—— Use of certain Rooms, &c., 14534 (vi).

Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi).

Man. and N.W.T., Increased Representation in the Senate (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 6169 (iii).

Maps for Geological Survey, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 14272 (vi).

Martineau, Mr. P. R., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).

Matane and Gaspé Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14484 (vi).

Members of H. of C. Appnmts. to Govt. Positions (Ans.) 3632 (ii).

Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1204 (i).

Mills, Hon. Mr. Justice, Decease of (remarks) 2794 (ii).

Mining Cos. Incorporation (remarks) 14850 (vi).

Ministerial Changes, Explanations, &c. (remarks) 6, 110, 130, 159 (i); 6735 (iii).

Ministers, Reduction of Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Minto, Earl of: *See* 'Gov. Gen.'

Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4470 (ii); in Com. on B., 5419 (iii).

Montreal *Star*, Par. *re* Judgeship: *See* 'Judgeship.'

Morning Sittings (M.) 8333 (iv).

Mortimer & Co.'s Fire, Govt. property destroyed (Ans.) 4836 (ii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver, Lt. Governor of Ontario, Decease (remarks) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Gov.'

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'

Naturalization of Aliens Act Amt. (B. 204) 1° *, 5136 (iii).

—— *See* 'Aliens.'

Naval Defence, Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 945 (i).

Navigable Waters Act Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 12992; Order dschgd., 14768 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for 2°, 1328 (i).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6429 (iii).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

North Atlantic Transportation Co., on Inquiry (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) for Papers, 13667, 13933 (vi).

—— Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 13372 (vi).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. (B. 242) 1°m., 8321 (iv); 2°m., and in Com., 10741 (v).

—— Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) M. to introduce, 14281 (vi).

North West Mounted Police, Deptl. Rep. (presented 92 (i).

—— Promotions, &c. (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12321 (v).

North West Provincial Autonomy, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1296 (i).

Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro forma*, 4 (i).

Order in the House (remarks) 12723 (vi).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for copies, 1303 (i).

Ottawa Valley Fire Sufferers, Govtl. Assistance (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Pacific Cable, & Eastern Tel. Co.'s Concessions, &c. (remarks) 2676 (ii).

Paris Chamber of Commerce: *See* 'Chamber.'

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 242 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) M. to dschg. Order, 13444 (vi)

Pensions to S. A. Soldiers by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14596 (vi).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138 (M.) to dschg. Order for 2°, 11302 (v).

Post office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241 (iii).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14671 (vi).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G. B. (remarks) 3221 (ii).

——— *See* 'Chamberlain,' &c., 'South Africa,' &c.

Preston, W. T. R., Suit by Can. Employment Bureau (remarks) 12221 (v).

Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1192 (i).

Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ans.) 4180 (ii).

Printing Bureau and Union Employees (Ans.) 4182 (ii).

Private Bills, on M. to extend Time, 10490 (v).

——— (remarks) 2396 (i); 4959 (ii).

——— Order of Procedure (remarks) 5137 (iii).

——— *See* 'Rules,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).

——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors (remarks) 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' &c., Western Rys., 10515 (v).

Provincial Autonomy to N. W. T., Papers laid on Table, 5512 (iii).

——— N. W. T. Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 6893 (iii).

——— *See* 'N. W. T. B. 256.'

Provincial Subsidies Increase, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).

Public Documents, Distribution to Boards of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).

Pulp Wood, Duty by U. S. (remarks) 4363 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Duties, B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14748 (vi).

Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

Quebec Bridge Agreement, &c. (prop. res.) 14523 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14280 (vi).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Queens, P.E.I., Representation in Parlt. (remarks) 13378 (vi).

'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3134 (ii).

Ry. Act B. 21, Salaries of Commissioners, in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephone, &c.) 5531 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8350 (iv).

——— Ry. Conference with Senate (remarks) *re* Procedure, 14760 (vi).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Railway Policy of Govt., Delay in bringing down, on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to adjn. Hse., 7115 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 551 (i).

Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314, 14329; (running powers, Govt. control, &c.) 14516 (vi).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10956 (v), 12805 (vi).

Representation in the House of Commons (B. 66) 1°m., 708; 2°m., 1207, 1218, Agreed to (Y. 72, N. 37) 1292 (i); M. for Com., 10832, 10848; in Com., 10912, 10953, 10957, 11114, 11508, 11621, 12293; (Kent) 11567; (Norfolk) 11427; 3°m., 12372; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12432 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284 (i).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Mr. *Tisdale*, 11474 (v).

——— Evidence *re*, &c. (remarks) 11423 (iv).

——— Schedules, Maps, &c. (remarks) 877 (i).

——— Stmnt. of Hon. Mr. Pugsley *re* N. B., 943 (i).

Returns ordered, Complaint (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 13140 (vi).

River du Loup Ry. Shops: *See* 'I. C. R.'

Roberval to James Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Ross Rifles, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 2759 (ii).

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (remarks) 13376 (vi).

——— Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 6998 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
St. John Valley Ry., Fredericton to Woodstock, Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday (Ans.) 1858 (i).
Salmon Canning Industry in B.C. (remarks) 10102 (v).
Saturday Sittings (M.) 13264 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Disturbances, Govt. Proposals (remarks) 12718 (vi).
—— Labour Troubles, Wages, &c. (remarks) 12941 (vi).
See 'Clergue.'
Sec. of State Deptl. Rep. (presented) 125 (i).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.'
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 465 (i).
Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885 (remarks) on M. for Sup., 13952 (vi).
Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. *re* (remarks) 14669 (vi).
Small-pox Patients in Gloucester, N.B. (remarks) 14688 (vi).
Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11826 (v).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12845, 12850 (vi).
S. Africa and Can. SS. Service (remarks) in Com. on France and Can. SS. B., 10821 (v).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ans.) 1679 (i).
—— Hay: *See* 'Hay and Oats.'
South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).
Speech from the Throne (M.) 5 (i).
Steel Industry: *See* 'Iron and Steel.'
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772.
Indian Affairs (contingencies) 13760 (vi); (salaries) 274 (i).
Interior (clerical assistance) 13769; (salaries) 13761; (Mines branch, salaries) 13762 (vi).
Geological Survey (A. P. Low, salary) 13770; (salaries) 13769, 13966; (technical officer, salary) 13772 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (Drake, E. F., salary) 13761; (salaries) 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Privy Council Office (salaries) 207 (i).
Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13955; (homestead entries) 13966; (maps, printing, &c.) 14272, (salaries, outside service) 13773, 13966; (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777; (tree culture) 13775, 14272 (vi).
Geological Survey (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778; (metallurgical, salaries) 13778 (vi).
Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).
Indians—B. C. (Hazelton hospital) 13787; (medical attendance) 13785; (salaries) 13785; (schools) 13786; (steam launch) 13787 (vi).
Man. and N.W.T. (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys, &c.) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).
N. B. (fire damages) 13782; (salaries) 13782.
N. S. (land purchase) 13781 (vi).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve, roads) 13779; (Rama reserve, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).
Justice, Administration of—Miscellaneous (N. W. T., expenditure) 3398 (ii); Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi); Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3423 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13957; (Assay Office, B.C.) 13965; (Canadian Mining Institute) 13965; (Turtle Mountain, land slide) 13965 (vi).
N. W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264; (pay of force) 5262 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5262 (iii).
Pensions (Lady Lafontaine) 14252 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (trachoma hospital) 14246 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Kamouraska pier) 13458; (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12845 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2932 (ii).
Tariff Policy of Gov., Ques. of Order *re* Quotations, 4843 (ii).
—— (remarks) 4263 (ii).
Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291 (i).
Thanksgiving Day Adjournment (M.) 13790 (vi).
—— (remarks) 13379 (vi),
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to refer back to Com., 7813 (iv).
Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific (remarks) 7567 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. (B. 235) 1° m., 7658 (iv).
See 'G.T. Pacific.'
—— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765 (iii).
Translation of Parliamentary Documents (remarks) 545 (i).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt of Commissioners (notification) 5137 (iii).
—— Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 9582 (iv).
—— Appnmt. of Sir Wm. VanHorne (remarks) 7297 (iii).
—— (Ans.) 8330 (iv).
—— Further Arrangements, &c. (remarks) 9458 (iv).
—— O.C., Cor. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).
—— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
—— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 7206 (iii).
—— Rep. *re* Commission (remarks) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Transportation and Treadgold Commissions (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (ii), 12850 (vi).
Treadgold Commissioners, Appnmt. of (notification) 5136 (iii).
—— Appnmt., &c. (remarks) 3713 (ii).
—— Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4541 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Treadgold Commissioners, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2880 (ii).
—— Appnmt. of Commission (remarks) 2424, (i), 3298, 3397, 3870 (ii).
—— and Dawson Board of Trade (remark) 1025 (i).
—— Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
—— Names of Commissioners (remarks) 4727.
—— Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11065 (v).
—— Personnel, &c. (remarks) 6638 (iii).
—— Tel. read from Dawson Board of Trade *re* Scope (Ans.) 1196 (i).
—— (remarks) 8086 (iv).
—— Terms of Commission (remarks) 4120, 4564 (ii).
—— and Transportation Commission (remarks) 4840, 4960 (ii).
—— (remarks) 13792 (vi).
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).
Turnpike Trust, Montreal, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Stmnt., 676 (i).
U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (remarks) 13138 (vi).
See 'Coasting.'
Voters' Lists: *See* 'Electoral.'
Wiallard, Paul, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 11188 (v).
Woodmen of the World B. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) in Com., 1854 (i).
Yamaska and Lotbiniére Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14318 (vi).
Yukon Ry. through Can. Ter. (remarks) 14497 (vi).
Yukon Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds & Grenville.*
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9431 (iv); in Com. on B., 10648, 11401, 12186 (v).
'Ragging' in the British Army (remarks) 3140.
SUPPLY:
Justice, Administration of: Yukon (living allowances) 3419 (ii).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5500 (iii).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond & Arthabaska.*
Drummondville Ry. Sidings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14081 (vi).
Mathurin, Jos. A., Death Sentence, Judge's Rep., &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).
Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 105) 1°*, 1295 (i).
SUPPLY:
Railways and Canals: I. C. R. (Drummondville sidings) 14055 (vi).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*
Can. Temperance Act Amt. (B. 14) 1°*, 113 (i).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4101 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers (dredges, repairs) 2629 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *E. Prince (P.E.I.)*
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212) Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7476 (iii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. Monopoly (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7380 (iii).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7351 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Ry. Subsidy (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
Charlottetown, Ry. Station, P.E.I., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4442 (ii).
—— Wharf and Dock Accommodation (remarks) 14132 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12537 (v).
Dom. Coal Co., and Glace Bay Harbour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13189 (vi).
Elmira Branch Line on P. E. I. Ry., Res. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I., Claims for Damages *re* (Ques.) 13373 (vi).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi).
—— Losses, &c., Pet. *re* (Ques.) 3394 (ii).
Georgetown, P.E.I. Ry. Warehouse Accommodation (remarks) 14088 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9529 (iv); in Com. on B., 10601 (iv).
—— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13275 (vi).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Contractor's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
See 'Supply—Rys.'
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
Kinkora Station, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 14133 (vi).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209, 8223 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, P E I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14126 (vi).
Oyster Fishing, P. E. I., Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2920.
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13522 (vi)
See 'Winter.'
P. E. I. Ry., Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
P. E. I. Ry. Subsidies to Branch Lines, &c. (remarks) 14472 (vi).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
P. E. I., Winter Communication by Str. *Stanley* (Ques.) 4006 (ii).
——— Winter Communication (M.) for Copies of Pets., &c., 2765 (ii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).
Representation in the H. of C. B.'66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1269 (i); on M. for 3°, 12432, 12446; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12454 (v).
Representation in the H. of C. for P. E. I. and N. B. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).
Richmond and Northam Station, P.E.I.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 472 (i).
Shippers of P. E. I., Claims for Damages (Ques.) 13373 (vi).
See 'Frozen Fish.'
Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., P. E. I., Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2584 (ii).
Summerside Breakwater, P.E.I, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 3234 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5300 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations) 6824 (iii).
Immigration (repatriation, &c.) 6725 (iii),
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse construction) 5762 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G. B.) 7744 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii); (masters' and mates' examination) 13529 (vi); (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4049 (ii).
Post Office (Kelley's Cross P. O.) 6064; (P.E.I. letter carriers) 6063; (P.E.I. winter service) 5937 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; P.E.I. (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—N. B. (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); **N.S.** (Glace Bay, wharf) 13189; **P.E.I.** (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219; (Carleton Point) 13219; (North Cardigan) 13223; (Summerside breakwater) 13223 (vi); (Summerside harbour) 3367 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (P. E. I. and mainland) 2988; (P. E. I. cables) 2702 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle and vet. division) 5505; (Pethick, Dr., allowance) 5505 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8271 (Canso ferry service) 7525 (iii), 14094; (Halifax accommodation) 12827; (locomotives, &c.) 14093 (vi); (Moncton accommodation) 12600; (North Sydney station) 12597 (v); 14090; (St. John accommodation) 12823 (vi).
P.E.I. (Alberton station) 14132; (Charlottetown, accommodation) 14131; (Elmira line) 12835; (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 14108, 14111, 14126; (Kensington accommodation) 12840 (vi); (Kinkora accommodation) 12841; (Montague bridge) 14132 (vi); (Murray Harbour branch) 7535 (iii); (Summerside coal sheds) 12828 (vi).
Trackmen on Govt. Rys., Increase of Salaries (remarks) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14472 (vi).
Winter Communication with P. E. I., Memorial from Emerald, &c. (M. for copies of pets., &c. 2765 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*
Agricultural Lecturers, Que., Names, Counties, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 367; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).
Aylesworth, Mr. A. B., Reported Interview *re* Alaskan Commission (remarks) 13960 (vi).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) on M. to ref. back to Com. on Rys., 5238 (iii).
Budget, The, 2167 (i).
Canadian (New) Company Limited incorp. (B. 83) 2°m., 1328 (i).
——— *See* 'New.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4977 (ii).
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J., and Pref. Trade: *See* 'Preferential.'
Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).
Dom. Subsidies to Provinces, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).
Fishermen in Gulf of St. Lawrence, Pet. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).
Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ques.) 665 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8776 (iv).
Lecturers on Agriculture, Names, &c. (Ques.) 8615 (iv).
Lighthouses, Floating, Applications, &c. from Captains (Ques.) 665 (i).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2505 (i).
Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7919 (iv).
New Canadian Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1023; 2°m., 1328 (i); in Com., 3221 (ii).
Ottawa and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6625 (iii).
Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).
Pilots on River St. Lawrence, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5658 (iii).

Lemieux, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Preferential Trade, Mr. Chamberlain's Colonial Scheme, Mr. Fielding's Remarks *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

Provincial Subsidies, Increase, &c. (M. for cor.) 691 (i).

——— (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6301 (iii).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2783 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7000 (iii).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ques.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ques.) 2915 (ii).

St. Louis International Exhibition, Can. Exhibits (Ques.) 3001 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Hospital, &c. (Ques.) 13669 (vi).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., *re*, on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7032, 7045 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6674; (Fabre, Mr., salary) 6674 (iii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, &c.) 4058 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Lake St. John, wharf) 2244; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2248; (Magdalen island) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Rivière aux Renards) 2279; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3309 (ii); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13480 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i).
Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2950 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2370 (i).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H., *S. Simcoe.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6966 (iii).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6358 (iii).

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Grant (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 13452 (vi).

Brockville & Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7402 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1348 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5449 (iii).

Canadian Construction Co. and Farran's Point Contract (M. for ret.*) 1323 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4368, 4973, 5116 (ii); in Com. on B., 5632 (iii).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7482 (iii).

Cattle Guards Commission, Appnmt. of Mr. Holt and Retirement of Mr. Robertson, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1059 (i).

———Names, &c. (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Rep., &c. (Ques.) 669 (i).

———Withdrawal of Mr. Robertson, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

———Inquiry for Papers, 3396 (ii).
See 'Ry. Bill.'

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5484 (iii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6200 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 831 (i).

Correspondence Clerk, Ry. Dept., Name, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Corridors of Hse., and Visitors, Ques. of Priv., 11558 (v).

County Court Judges, Appnmt. from local Bars (remarks) 5582 (iii).

———Appnmts., Retirements, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7514 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4027 (ii).

Dixon, F. A., Chief Clerk in Ry. Dept., &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

———Promotion as Chief Clerk, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1058 (i).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 580 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 312 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7888 (iv).

G.T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8808 (iv); in Com. on B., 10488, 10583, 10698, 11341, 11394, 11839, 11867, 12006 (vi).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 681 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3251 (ii).

Insolvency Act, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 818 (i).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 927 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7966 (iv).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8114; in Com. on B., 11421 (iv).

Judges appointed from Local Bar, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 210 (i).

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Lt. Governor of Ontario and Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 661 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8069 (iv).

Metropolitan Ry. Co., running on highway (remarks) 6099 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7060 (iii).

Public Works, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 13451 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1341 (i).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4121, 4573, 4712, 4738 (ii), 5251, 5332, 5524, 5560, 5680, 5698, 6080, 6189, 6219, 6298, 7201, 7299 (iii), 8160 (iv); (cattle guards) 6244, 6253; (drainage) 4738 (ii); (telephones, &c.) 5524 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11427; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12488 (v).

———Ques. of Order *re* Mr. Campbell, 11710 (v).

Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 874 (i).

———Withdrawal from Cattle Guard Commission (Ques.) 1034 (i).

See 'Cattle Guards,' &c.

Saskatchewan Land Company, Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5086 (ii); in Com. on B., 7225 (iii).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census schedules) 7060 (iii); (general statistics) 4431 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (appnmt. of Judges) 210; Railways (salaries) 334 (i).

Dom. Lands (homesteads) 6771; (inspector's expenses) 6766; Long Lake, &c. (Saskatchewan Ry. survey) 6942 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5290 (iii); (Hurley, J. M., fishery inspector) 5126 (ii), 5283 (iii).

Indians: Man. and N.W.T (medical attendance) 6350; Ont. (medical attendance) 6327 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of: Exchequer Court (reports) 3408; Penitentiaries (Kingston, binder twine) 3518; (Regina jail, Land Purchase) 5135; Sup. Court (reps., binding, &c.) 3405; Yukon (judges' living allowances) 3412; (sheriffs' salaries) 3411; (telegraph operators) 3421 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, binding, &c.) 5267; (Room 56, furniture) 5266 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6966 (iii).

Postoffice (Barrie branch) 6062; (rural mails) 6137 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Dom.** (electric power) 1068; **Ont.** (Alliston) 495; (Clinton P. O.) 521; Ottawa (census building) 992; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 1003; (Royal Mint) 358; **Que.** (Levis) 432; (quarantine, Grosse Isle) 425; (renewals, &c.) 424; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Man.** (St. Andrews Rapids) 3364 (ii); **Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); **N.B.** (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton wharf) 1165; (St. John river wharf) 1178, 1186; **N.S.** (Amagandus wharf) 1069; (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1074; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074; (Cow Bay) 1079; (Meteghan Cove) 1133; (Neil's Harbour) 1142; **Ont.** (Barrie wharf) 1186; (Petewawa narrows) 1426; (Port Hope, pier) 1425 (i); (Sault Ste. Marie, improvements) 13252 (vi); (Southampton, harbour) 1429; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1432; (Wendover, wharf) 1434; **P.E.I.** (Cascumpec harbour) 1154; (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1156; (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); **Que.** (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Father Point, pier) 1514; (Grande Vallée, pier) 1515 (i).

Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 3698 (ii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276; (roads and bridges) 7285 (iii).

Telegraph Operators, Yukon: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3421 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Wharf Building by Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Binder Twine, Circular issued *re* Sales, &c (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

———Residence of Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 4182 (ii).

Civil Service Employees, Classification, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 9681 (iv).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3° (amt.) 592 (i).

Duchesneau, Dr., Warden of St. Vincent de Paul, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 286 (i).

Electoral Lists, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 288 (i).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100 4799 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry. B. 235, French Translation (remarks) 8118 (iv).
Latour, L. J., Circular issued *re Le Canada*, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Le Canada, Circular issued to Postmasters, &c. (Ques.) 1032 (i).
Market Gardeners: *See* 'Garden Products,' &c.
Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6531 (iii).
Postal Facilities to Parishes near Montreal, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 12498 (v).
Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c. (M. for ret.) 1058 (i).
St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 7001 (iii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Acting Warden, &c. (Ques.) 10831 (v).
——— Resignation of (Ques.) 286 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470 (vi).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 22 (Mr. *Demers*) on M. for 2°, 2361 (i).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14203 (vi).
Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5475 (iii).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4404 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 833 (i).
——— *See* 'Criminal,' &c.
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12559 (v).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3279 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).
Cumberland Coal & Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5184 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8324 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9238 (iv); in Com. on B., 12043, 12116 (v).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13290 (vi).
Joggins to Minudie, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).
Judgeship, Offer by C. A. Dansereau to Conservative, Par. in Montreal *Star* (remarks) 13805.
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10789 (v).

Logan, Mr. H. J.—*Con.*
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2526 (ii).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1° *, 2237 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act. Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6455 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 135) 1° *, 2100 (i); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978; (amt.) in Com., 6399 (iii).
Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2581; in Com., 2923 (ii).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 3°, 12450 (v).
Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Co.'s (B. 116) 1° *, 1575 (i).
St. Joseph's Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 152) 1° *, 2396 (i).
Springhill, N.S., Boiler Explosion in Dom. Building (remarks) 13257 (vi).
Steel Co. of Can., Loan of Rails, &c. (remarks) 14482 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Geological Survey (exploration, information, &c.) 6823 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7602 (iv).
Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (Victoria museum) 365; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 13181; (Victoria beach, wharf) 13214 (vi).
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. (M.) to receive Pet., 4261 (ii).
Trackmen on I.C.R., Salaries, &c., 12559 (vi).
Truro to Parrsboro Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14494 (vi).

Loy, Mr. G. M., *Beauharnois.*
Beauharnois Canal, Damages *re* Floods (remarks, in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Statement (read) 7102 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Lake St. Francis (dam *re* flooding) 14153 (vi).
Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3594 (ii).

Mackie, Mr. T., *N. Renfrew.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9414 (iv).
Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8107 (iv).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1321 (i).

Mackie, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11157 (v).

Mackinnon, Mr. D. A., *E. Queen's, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. Ferry Co.'s incorp. B. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 7771 (iv).

SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7615 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4083, 4105 (ii).
Post Office : Outside Service (P.E.I. winter service) 5940 (iii).
Railways : P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 7539 (iii).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s (B. 26) 2° m., 630 (i).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *N. Perth.*
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5075 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9898 (iv).
Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telephones) 5542 (iii).

SUPPLY :
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 1366 (i); 13242 (vi).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Budget, The, 1937 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5434 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. B 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3086 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10139 (v).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6187, 6307 (iii); (drainage) 4758 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7226 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *E. York (O.)*
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) in Com., 5361 (iii).
Bell Telephone Agreement : *See* 'Telephone,' 'Ry. B. 21.'
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7304 (iii).
Business of the Hse., Delay in printing Bills (remarks 482 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5431 (iii).
Cabinet Changes : *See* 'Ministerial.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369, 4379 (ii).
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5360, 5555 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 318 (i).
Crisis in Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3045; in Com. on B., 4038 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 308 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7814, 7821; on M. for 3°, 8056 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 7825 (iv).
——— (M.) that Com. rise in order to get Speaker's decision *re* Ques. of Order, 7831, 7832 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10429; (two-cent rate) 10462, 12221 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 448 (i).
G. T. Ry. Two-Cent Fare, Repeal of Clause in Original Charter (Ques.) 11556, 11828 (v).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 677 (i).
Hudson's Bay Change of Name (B. 173) 1°m., 2794 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11416 (v).
Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7991 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 166 (i).
Montreal-Longueuil Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 156 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 5558 (iii).
Mowat, Lt. Gov. of Ont.: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'
Municipal Rights *re* Tramways, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6082 (iii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Co.'s B. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) on M. for 3°, 6430 (iii).
N. W. T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12309 (v).
——— Representation in Senate B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12302 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6453 (iii).
Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2597, 3538 (ii), 5344, 5352, 5561, 6082, 6173, 6253, 6271 (iii), 7609, 8126 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5513 (iii); on M. for 3°, 8334; (amt.) *re* two-cent rate, 6271 (iii); 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Railway Subsidies (B. 270) in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Roberval to James' Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Vacancy (remarks) 410 (i).

St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6485 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 478 (i).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 455 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7042 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Excise (liquor analysis) 5395 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7581 (iv).
Militia (pay and allowance) 3592 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3597 (ii).
Post Office (rural mails) 6137 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (mail delivery) 506 ; (amt.) 511 ; Ottawa (additional land) 353 ; Que. (Montreal renewals) 437 ; (Valleyfield P. O.) 444 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Arthur) 3352 ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii).

Telephone, Bell, Agreement with C. P. R., &c., in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5513 (iii).

Telephone Co.'s (B. 4) 1°*, 92 ; 2°m., 700 (i).

——— (B. 5.) 1°m., 92 ; 2°m., 701 (i).

Telephone Legislation (remarks) 291, 409 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. (remarks) 6091 (iii).

Toronto, Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Two-cent Ry. Fare : *See* 'G. T. P. Ry. B. 235,' 'Ry. B. 21.'

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Burrard.*

Alaskan Boundary Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14789 (vi).

Aliens, Naturalization Act Amt. B. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5876 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7353 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com on Res., 4398 (iii).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5487 (iii).

Chinese Immigration : *See* 'Aliens,' 'G. T. P. B. 235.'

Dom. Election Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13575, 13593 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. Res., 3014 ; in Com. on B., 4683 (ii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup.. 4798 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9218 (iv); in Com. on B., 12046, 12205 (v).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 949 (i).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8209 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature (remarks) 14232 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9976 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. : Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237 (i).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6685 (iii).

Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1111 (i).

Vancouver Land Acquisition (B. 76) 1°*, 872 (i).

Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 446 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *N. Simcoe.*

Barrie Wharf, Govt. Aid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Canada Industrial Corporation Limited incorp. (B. 112) 1°*, 1462 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5625 (iii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3226 (ii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5584.

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3265 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10753 (v).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3015 (ii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. (B. 48) 1°m., 592 (i), 2°m., 2786 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 707 (i), Order for Com., 4132 ; in Com., 4871 (ii), 5138 (iii), 7814-7913 ; 3°m., 8055, 8321 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ques. of Order, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11358 (v).

Hawkestone Wharf, Govt. Aid (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).

Judges of Provincial Courts Salaries B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8108 (iv), 10772, 10777 ; in Com. on B., 11410 (v).

Lt. Governor of Ontario, Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 113 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 707 (i) ; in Com., 2716 (ii).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation of Lawn (remarks) 2422 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6237, 6305 (iii); (drainage) 4741 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 136) 1°*, 2100 (i), 2°m., 3288 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office (Barrie, branch P.O.) 6062 (iii).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Limited Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 707 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *W. Northumberland (O.)*
Alnwick, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 6895 (iii).
Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. (B. 121) in Com., 3223 (ii).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14446 (vi).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 1462 (i).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 591 (i).
Nipissing Surveys on Ottawa River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13350 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Miscellaneous (Ottawa river survey) 13350 (vi).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).
Waltham to Ferguson, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Wendover, wharf) 1441 (i); Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 2977; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (roads and bridges) 7289 (iii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*
Allen, Wm., Relief (B. 196) 1° m., 4179 (ii).
Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961 (iii).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7361 (iii).
Binder Twine, Prices fixed (Ques.) 1595 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5846 (iii).
Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1294 (i).
Canada Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4388, 5117 (ii); in Com. on B., 5806 (iii).
Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3982 (ii).
C.P.R. Expenditure for Rolling Stock in 1902-3 (Ques.) 2311 (i).
Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3132 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters.'
Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Grain Weighing in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4198 (ii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5151, 5227 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10417 (v); on M. for 3°, 12684 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13279 (vi).
Great North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 541.
Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1123 (i).
Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2523.
Lumber Combine in N.W.T. (remarks) 1585 (i).
Magness, Mr.: *See* 'Weights B. 188.'
Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14221 (vi).
Man. School Lands, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 6169 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4481 (ii).
Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) in Com., 2753 (ii).
Osler, Mr.: *See* 'Privilege.'
Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14856 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 132) 1°*, 2014 (i).
Postmasters, Country, Salary Increases (remarks) 14011 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafter,' 10523, 10529 (v).
Ry. Act. (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 251 (i); in Com., 3539 (ii), 6275 (iii).
Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14338, 14494 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man. Rys., &c. (remarks) 14494 (vi).
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11041; (Dauphin) 11774; (Portage La Prairie) 11782; (Toronto) 11743; Winnipeg) 11789 (v.)
Revenue contributed by Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ques.) 14284 (vi).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7217 (iii).
S. African Colonies and Preferential Tariff, Res. of Winnipeg Board of Trade (Ques.) 1678 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3292 (ii).
Steele, James Reid, Relief (B. 195) 1°*, 4178 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (stationery, &c.) 3966 (ii).
Dom. Lands (homestead entries) 13966 (vi).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works: Buildings—**Man.** (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 13126 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2645 (ii); **Man.** (Dauphin Lake) 1448 (i); (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i); **Ont.** (Port Arthur) 3345 (ii).
Quarantine (public health) 5016 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).
Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4009, 4198 (ii).
Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14388 (vi).

McEwen, Mr. G., *S. Huron.*
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7362 (iii).
Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13753 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10755 (v).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3382 (ii).

McGowan, Mr. J., *C. Wellington.*
Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).
Bankers, Private, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 285 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5442 (iii).
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 930 (i).
Private Bankers: *See* 'Bankers.'
Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11027 (v).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6470 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Customs (linseed oil, seizure) 3935 (ii).
Post Office (postal mail service) 6053 (iii).
Public Works: Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2685 (ii).

McGugan, Mr. M., *S. Middlesex.*
London Loan Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 1295 (i).
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s (B. 63) 1°*, 707 (i).

McIntosh, Mr. J., *Sherbrooke.*
Eastern Township's Bank (B. 25) 1°*, 367 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).
Keller Heating Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 231) M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294 (iii).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F.—*Con.*
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 177) M. to rec. Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 131) 1°*, 2014 (i); in Com., 5093 (ii), 5359 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, **N.S.** (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143 (vi); **Que.** (Grande Vallée, pier) 1544 (i).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Euxine, Scuttling of Schr. (M. for cor.) 699 (i).
SUPPLY:
Postoffice: Outside Service (ry. mail service, N.S.) 5949; (postal service, Inverness) 6051 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredges, repairs) 2628 (ii); **N.S.** (Broad Cove) 13199 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1095; (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Pleasant Bay) 13205 (vi); (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206 (vi).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1461 (i).
Sugar imported into Canada, 1902 (M. for stmnt.*) 3236 (ii).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9882 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 1506; (amt.) 664 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6621 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) on M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806 (i).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., and Sen. Amts. to Exchequer Court Amt. B. 155 (remarks) 14770 (vi).
——— *See* 'Exchequer B. 155.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Subsidy, Claims' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 3299 (ii).
Baie de Chaleur Ry.: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.
British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8241 (iv).
Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order, 7342 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Improper Use of Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14219 (vi).
C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British.'
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8259 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14770 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9351 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. C.—*Con.*

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 751 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2507 (ii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaint *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 14219 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s incorp. B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 1327, 1511 (i); on M. to ref. back to Com., 6530, 6621 (iii).

Press Despatches from England: *See* 'British.'

Public Works Dept., Control of, &c.: *See* 'Supply —Public Works.'

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13507 (vi).

Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 7756 (iv).

Militia (Valleyfield strike) 3754 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan breakwater) 13449 (vi); (Cross Point pier) 1513; (Grande Vallée pier) 1515 (i); (Maguasha pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Newport breakwater) 13463; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle breakwater) 13490; (Shegawake harbour) 13479 (vi); (transfer of works to Marine Dept.) 2649 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Restigouche bridge) 8304 (iv).

Marcil, Mr. J. E., *Bagot.*

G. T. P. Ry. B., Pets. from Bagot (ques. of privilege) 12941 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6502 (iii).

Matheson, Mr. J., *Richmond (N.S.)*

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6911 (iii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13172 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11029; (N.S.) 11797 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5828 (iii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13172 (vi); (Janvrin's Island wharf) 1102 (i).

Meigs, Mr. D. B., *Missisquoi.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10472 (v).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*

Pensions to S. A. Contingent by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14598 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3895 (ii).

Monet, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6506 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7043 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6687; (creed lines) 6698; (repatriation agents) 6700 (iii).

Militia (military properties) 3620; (properties) 3613 (ii).

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 861 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Address, on The, 55 (ii).

Alaskan Boundary: *See* 'Colonial,' &c.

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 36) 2°m., 664 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iii).

Beauharnois Electoral District Representation, and Independence of Parliament Act (M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com.) 7095 (iii).

Boards of Trade and Distribution of Public Documents (remarks) 1378 (i).

Bonaventure Station, Terminal Facilities, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

——— (Ques.) 666 (i).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 10715; in Com., 10718 (v).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on M. for 3°, 7468 (iii).

Business of the Hse, Delay in printing Bills (remarks) 482 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1343 (i).

——— (remarks) 5051 (ii); 11062 (v).

Butter and Cheese Weighing, Rep. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5414 (iii).

Butter sold at Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 1593, 1857 (i).

Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Canadian Chamber of Commerce at Paris, &c. (Ques.) 1297 (i).

Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British,' &c.

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v). *See* 'Racine,' &c 'Nelson,' &c.

Census Commissioners for Prov. of Que., Travelling Expenses, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 1058 (i).

Census Expenditure, Notice of M., 13368 (vi).

Census 1901, Cost to Date, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, Speech *re* Canadian Tariff (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Chambly Canal, Collector, &c., Superannuation (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Rickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3288 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B., on M. (Sir *William Mulock*) to wthdrw., 11301 (v).

Colonial Conference, Bond-Hay Treaty and Alaska, Inquiry for Ret., 853 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Committees meeting concurrently with Sittings of the Hse. (remarks) 8333 (iv).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3261 (ii).

Consolidated Trust Corporation incorp. B. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) in Com., 3223 (ii).

Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5677 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6640, 7498 (iii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1326 (i), 3241 (ii).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3100; in Com. on B., 4010 (ii).

Customs Employes, Transfers, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. Blaise, Amount paid *re* Trip in Foreign Countries (Ques.) 1034 (i).

Dundonald, Earl: *See* 'G.O.C.'

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3582 (ii).

Estimates, Suppl., Inquiry for, 10832 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8360 (iv).

Fair Wage Clause in Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).

——— *See* 'Nelson,' &c.

Fisher, Chas. A. L., Inspector of Public Works, Salary, Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).

France and Canada SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10804 (v).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4772 (ii).

G. O. C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2413 (i).

G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7821, 7858; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 8324 (iv).

G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8526 (iv); 10411; in Com. on B., 10412, 10574, 10650, 11287, 11302 (v).

——— on M. for Com. on Res., Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) 10315 (v).

——— Order, Ques. of, Ruling asked *re* reporting debates of Com., 10633; Ruling of Chairman (Mr. *Belcourt*) sustained (Y. 52; N. 30) 10634 (v).

——— Govt's Intention *re* Quebec to Moncton scheme, 10537 (v).

——— Govt. Policy (remarks) 5765, 7487 (iii).

——— Subsidy from Govt., &c. (Ques.) 671, 1031 (i).

——— Surveys, Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).

——— *See* 'Transcontinental.'

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

G. T. Ry., Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6612 (iii).

Incorporated Companies B. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2°, 3258 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4008 (ii).

Insolvency Act Amt. (B. 53) 1° m., 654 (i); 2° m., 2373 (i), 2787, 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).

I. C. R. and G. T. Ry., Terminal Facilities at Bonaventure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

——— *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'G.T.R.'

I. C. R., River Ouelle, Branch Line, Total Cost (Ques.) 10490 (v).

Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 18) 1° m., 125; 2. m., 566, 705, 916 (i).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7953 (iv); in Com. on B., 10799 (v).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759, 10768 (v).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10712, 10743 (v).

L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ques.) 3230 (ii).

——— Letters, Tenders, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).

——— Receipts, Cheques, &c. (M. for copies*) 3236 (ii).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).

Lévis, Land purchased for I.C.R., on M. for O. Cs. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3806 (ii).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator (remarks) 659 (i).

Litigation Expenses, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action (remarks) 2504 (ii).

——— *See* 'Montreal.'

Loy, Geo. M., M.P., Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) 7095 (iii).

——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. (amt.) 8008 (iv).

——— (M.) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).

Martineau, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 10242 (v).

Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 9082 (iv).

Ménard, Denis, Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Milk Can Bill: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 90, 179 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4448, 4482 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia (Ques.) 4006 (ii).

——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'

Montreal Post Office Buildings, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re*, &c. (Ques.) 3972 (ii).

——— *See* 'Post Office.'

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Murray Bay and St. Denis Wharf SS. Service, Amount paid by Govt. (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Nelson P.O., B.C., Labourers, Claims *re* Contractors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

——— Agreements between Employees and Contractors (read) 7162 (iii).

——— Letters read from Labour Dept., &c., 7164 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' &c., 'Racine.'

New Canadian Company, Limited, B. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

Newspapers in United Kingdom, France and U.S., Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

See 'British.'

North Halfway Point, Lightkeeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3536 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10741 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Be'court*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 707; 2°m., 1327 (i); (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10794 (v).

Petersen-Tate: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 138, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to wthdrw. B., 11302 (v).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5677 (iii).

Post Office Buildings, Montreal, Enlargement, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

See 'Montreal.'

Post Office Employees, Holidays, &c. (Ques.) 4005 (ii).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6815 (iii).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Preferential Tariff, Speech of Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain (remarks) 13375 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., and Speech *re* 'Transcontinental Ry.': *See* 'Transportation,' &c.

Printing of Bills: *See* 'Business,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 'Grafters,' 10531 (v).

——— (ques. of order) 10505 (v).

Public Accounts Com. producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7059 (iii).

Public Documents, Distribution to Board of Trade (remarks) 1378 (i).

Public Works Act Amt. B. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) on M. for 1°, 3970 (ii).

Public Works Dept., Transfer of Control, &c., B. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14746 (vi)

Public Works, Preservation of Health, Regulations *re*, &c. (Ques.) 1857 (i).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14697, 14700 (vi).

Quebec Bridge, Application for Further Aid (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quesnel, Jules, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 7203 (iii).

Racette, V., Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 3231 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors *re* Nelson Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

See 'Cartierville,' 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Commissioners, Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3549, 3832, 4728 (ii), 5694 (iii), 8134, 8170 (iv).

——— (fire damages) Amt. B. 23 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) on M. for 2°, 2782 (ii).

——— (fire guards) Amt. B. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 2°, 871 (i).

Ry. Debts Bill: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2564 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 546; in Com., 550; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 551 (i).

Railway Subsidies, Inquiry for, 10955 (v).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., Grain Blockade, on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. to Sup., 2472 (i).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ques.) 10496.

Reports, Deptl., French Translation, Delay in Issuing (remarks) 479 (i).

Representations in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10832; in Com., 10958, 11028, 11114 (v).

St. James (Montreal) Electoral Division, Issue of Writ (M.) 707, 940 (i).

——— (remarks) 409 (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone (M. for copy of contract*) 706 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. (M.) that Com. rise, 6496 (iii).

Session of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

Slater Shoe Co. and Alien Labour, Res. of Shoemakers Union (read) 14666 (vi).

S. African Contingent, Saddles and Bridles, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

S. A. War, Supplies purchased by Imp. Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for O. Cs., 2761 (ii).

See 'Hay,' &c.

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron,' &c.

Steel Rails, Contract, Price, &c. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7036 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (archives) 4429; (criminal statistics) 4429 (ii); (Drolet, census schedules) 7055 (iii); (experimental farms) 4548; (general statistics) 4432; (imperial institute) 4435 (ii).

Canals: Chambly (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12909; Generally (salaries and contingencies) 12933; (toll collectors) 12929 (vi).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. ('Gazette' correspondents, Montreal) 7155 (iii).

Customs (inspectors, preventive, &c.) 3949; (preferential tariff) 3943; (stationery, printing, &c.) 3963 (ii).

Geological Survey (Dr. Bell's appnmt.) 6816; (explorations, &c.) 6816; (instruments purchased) 6820 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (expenditure) 6615; (Fabre, Dr., medical inspector) 6662, 6850; (Hungarians, &c.) 6694; (medical inspection) 6852; (trachoma, inspection) 6668; (U. S. agents) 6850 (iii).

Indians: Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7271; (travelling expenses) 7272 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (Genelle *vs.* The King) 6795; (Keewatin govt., expenses) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6795; (maps, engraving, &c.) 6800 (iii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Statutes, Revision) 14644 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Anticosti lightship) 5737; (*Bayfield*, str., reps. *re*) 5748; (light houses construction) 5737; (St. Lawrence route) 5758 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal ports) 7591 (iv).

Militia (annual drill) 3607 (ii); (Cole *vs.* Cooke, costs) 6950 (iii); (Cottee, Herbert, salary, &c.) 3610; (pay and allowance) 3586; (properties) 3612; (stores branch) 3609; (Valleyfield strike) 3586 (ii).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6986; (naturalization act, expenses) 6953; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6962 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5033; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4041; (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4047; (St. Lawrence, obstruction, &c.) 4041 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

N.B., St. John (quarantine, water service) 415, 486 (i); (St. John water service) 486.

N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).

Que. (Lévis) 431; (Montreal examining warehouse) 433; (Montreal, renewals) 436; (renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 441; (Valleyfield P. O.) 443 (i).

Docks (commissioner's reps.) 2984 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 3354 (ii).

Ont. (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii).

Que. (Montreal harbour, 3365; (Quebec harbour improvements) 3336; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3304; (Sorel deep water wharf) 3376 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration and awards) 13339 (vi); (general expenditure) 2925 (ii); (Ottawa river surveys) 13341 (vi); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2925 (ii); (transportation commission) 13365 (vi).

Slides and Booms (repairs, &c.) 2979 (ii).

Telegraph Lines: N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Railways: I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7526 (iii); Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 12913 (vi); P.E.I. Ry. (Murray Harbour branch) 7534 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802 (iii).

Tarte, Mr., Resignation: *See* 'Ministerial.'

Telegraphic System, N.W.T. and C.P.R. Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13336 (vi).

Tobacco (Canadian) in Foreign Countries, Sale, &c., Amounts paid to Mr. Blaise Dugas, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).

Tobacco Combine, Rep. (Ques). 1297 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Application for Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 1026 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry., Sale to G.T. Pacific Co., Par. in Toronto *News*, 7566 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry., Govt. Policy (remarks 5765 (iii).

———Proposals to Govt. (Ques.) 874 (i).

See 'G.T.P.R.'

Translation of Deptl. Reports: *See* 'Reports.'

Transportation Commission and Tariff Inqury, Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 853 (i).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13365 (vi).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. on Sup., 4505 (ii).

———(remarks) 3876 (ii).

———Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11064 (v).

Trent Canal Surveys, &c. on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2330 (i).

Turnpike Trust, Montreal, Indebtedness, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 672 (i).

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7569 (iv).

Valleyfield P.O., Erection, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 98 (i).

Veterinary Chief Inspectors, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1591 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*

Victoria Bridge, Montreal, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 3245; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Wiallard, Paul, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 11188 (v).

Yukon District Newspapers, Amounts paid by Govt. (M. for stmnt.*) 706 (i).

Morin, J. B., *Dorchester.*

Budget, The, 2034 (i).

Chabot, Mr. F.X., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2015 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12553 (v).

Employees in H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7903 (iv.)

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12053 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12774 (vi).

——Parishes crossed, Lévis to Temiscouata (Ques.) 8117 (iv).

—— on Pets. presented (remarks) 12942 (vi).

——Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 14647 (vi).

House of Commons, Employees: *See* 'Employees.'

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5726 (iii).

Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c. (Ques.) 8616 (iv).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. at Chambly Canal (Ques.) 8331, 8488 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Subsidy paid, &c. (Ques.) 10496 (v).

Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1337 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14449 (vi).

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1815 (i).

Ross Rifle, Examination, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 2758 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6517 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (U.S. agents) 6857 (iii).
Legislation: H. of C. (tradesmen, &c.) 14115 (vi)
Post Office (country postmasters) 6060 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—**N.W.T.** (Yorkton court-house) 961; **Que.** (L'Assomption) 429; (Levis) 432 (i); (Levis, P.O.) 13055; (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (St. John's, P.O.) 13060 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers—**Que.** (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna, wharf) 5897 (iii); (Caplan, breakwater) 13451 (vi); (Chateauguay River) 3209 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette, wharf) 13457; (Grand Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514 (i); (Grosbois Isle) 5902; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13458; (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3305 (ii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5907; (St. Jerome, wharf) 5909; (St. Maurice River) 5905; (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 3374 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 5905 (iii)
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2678, 2689.
Telegraph Lines (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5025 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (Chaudière, engine-house) 14106 (vi); Ouelle River Branch) 7527 (iii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7280 (iii).

Trottier, Louis M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 8488 (iv).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ques.) 2759 (ii).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 654 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 591.

Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 175) 1°*, 3126.

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 611 (i), 5555, 5583, 6199 (iii).

Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering (B. 32) 1°*, 367 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6901 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8859 (iv).

Japanese Immigration (remarks) 3713 (ii).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 33) 1°*, 367 (i).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 591 (i).

Man. and North-western Ry. Co. of Can. (B. 44) 1°*, 591 (i).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 8261 (iv).

Private Bills (M.) to extend Time, 10489 (v).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9970 (iv).

Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) in Com., 4588 (ii).

Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 249) 1°*, 10744; (M.) to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Par. in *Post Intelligencer*, 7003 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General) *North York, O.*

Alliance Bank of Canada's incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7471 (iii).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Alien Labour Act, Prosecutions, &c. (Ans.) 3971.
See 'Naturalization.'

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3285 (ii).

Ashcroft-Barkerville Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1595 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6958, 6966 (iii).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies,' &c.

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Auditor General and Civil Service Bill (remarks) in Com., 13809 (vi).

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ans.) 13263 (vi).

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6383 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7367 (iii).

Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 6758 (iii).

Bloomfield Postmaster, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Brecken, Mr., P.O. Inspector, P.E.I. (remarks) 14002 (vi).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Commissioners' Appnmt. (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).
See 'Labour.'

Brockvillle and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7445 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).

Business of the Hse., Govt. Legislation, &c, (remarks) 1346 (i).

——— (remarks) 3794 (ii), 7487 (iii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii).

Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— and Mail Bags, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Govt. Ownership (Ans.) 14286 (vi).
See 'Mail Bags.'

C.A.R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canada Foundry Co'.s Strike (remarks) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch,'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5105 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man. Exempt from Taxation, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).
See 'Lands.'

Cane Bros., Timber License, &c. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Cartierville Workmen, Treatment by Govt. Contractors (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11288 (v).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5480 (iii).

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Free Delivery, &c. (remarks) 14010 (vi).

Chevrier Family, Number in Govt. (Ans.) 12499 (v).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 245) 1°m., 9079 (iv), wthdn., 11301 (v).

Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 257) Res. prop., 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330, 12493, 12500, 12574 (v), 13809, 13833 (vi); 3°m, 13942 (vi).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3176, 3185 (ii).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Companies (Ans.) 3233 (ii).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks Bill.'

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) on M. for 2°, 3259 (ii).

Conciliation Boards, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Country Postmasters: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

——— (Ans.) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills, &c., Tender (Ans.) 2308.

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T. Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 671, 816 (i).

Doukhobors, Homestead Entries, &c. (Ans.) 542.

——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Govt. Action, &c. (Ans.) 1031 (i).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3021; in Com. on B., 4682 (ii).

Enterprise Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Ernestown Station, Postmaster, Change, &c. (Ans.) 1034 (i).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour,' &c,

False Creek Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ans.) 2758 (ii).

Fast Atlantic Service: *See* 'Atlantic,' &c.

Govt. Business: *See* 'Business.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McIsaac*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii); in Com., 7836, 7877 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9751 (iv); in Com. on B., 10564, 10624, 11190, 11288, 11348 (v).
See 'Transportation,' &c.

Half-Breeds Claims Commission, on Inquiry for Ret., 3397 (ii).

Haanel, Dr., Duties as Supt. of Mines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13767 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 685.

House of Commons, Ventilation: *See* 'Ventilation'

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers (remarks) 1127 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Immigration into Can. Nationality, &c. (Ans.) 2310 (i).

——— Number refused admittance, &c. (Ans.). 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel (Ans.) 542 (i).

——— Medical Inspection, Appnmts. by Govt. (Ans.) 2757 (ii).

Immigration Office for Ireland, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 1032 (i).

Immigration for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ans.) 1593 (i).

Immigration, Provision for Settlers on C.P.R. Trains, &c. (remarks) 868 (i).

——— Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ans. 1035 (i).

Imperial Agency incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3170 (ii).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ans.) 819 (i).

Indian Medical Attendant, Kings, N.B. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Insurance Rates on Ocean Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7597 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 705 (i).

Interier, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14391 (vi).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Labour Commission, B.C., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1596 (i), 8116 (iv).

Labour Commission of 1886, Names, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

Labour Council, Toronto: *See* 'Toronto.'

Labour Disputes, Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 4003 (ii). *See* 'Ry. Labour Disputes,' 'Fair Wage.'

Labour Gazette Correspondents, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 7204 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 951 (i).

——— (Ans.) 1596 (i).

Lambton Postmistress, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) 6166 (ii), 14278, 14651, 14661 (vi).

Lands (Govt.) available for Settlers, in B.C., &c. (Ans.) 4836 (ii).

——— Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ans.) 2102 (i).

——— Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 1858 (i).

——— Subsidies to Rys. unearned (Ans.) 3797 (ii). *See* 'C.P.R.,' &c., 'Rys,' &c.

Latour, Mr., Absence from Dept. to canvass for *Le Canada* (remarks) 14002 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters in Que.'

Letter Carriers, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5672 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Lime Rock, N.S., Postmaster's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 1297 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2515 (ii).

Macleod, Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 8083 (iv).

McNulty: *See* 'Lambton.'

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14222 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Statement *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).

——— (remarks) 14540 (vi).

——— *See* 'Campaign.'

Mails carried by Rys., &c. (Ans.) 6268 (iii).

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).

Mail Cars, N.W.T., Insufficient Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).

Mail Clerks: *See* 'P.O. B. 208.'

Maps, Printing and Publishing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14273 (vi).

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5099 (ii).

Miller Bros. and P.O. Bank Deposits, Defalcation of Postmaster, 14274, 14655 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4483 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Enlargement of Building, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

——— Investigation *re* (Ans.) 3973 (ii).

Naturalization Act, Regulations, &c. Ans.) 2015 (i).

——— *See* 'Aliens,' &c.

Nelson Post Office, B.C., Claims of Labourers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii). *See* 'Cartierville.'

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14396 (vi).

Nesbitt P.O., Man., Postmaster Watson, as Lib. Candidate (Ans.) 1196 (i).

Newmarket Office Specialty Co. (personal explanation) 13256 (vi).

N.W.T., Postal Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14040 (vi). *See* 'Mail Cars, &c.'

Orleans Island Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 670 (i).

Ottawa Supply Co. *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Personal Explanation *re* Newmarket Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Picton Mail Service, Irregular Delivery, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Pneumatic Tube Service *re* Postal Service (remarks) 13993 (vi).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Portage, P.E.I., Opening of Post Office (remarks) 14008 (vi).

Postal Facilities *re* Parishes near Montreal (Ans.) 12498 (v).

Postal Newspaper Boxes, Manufacture, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Postal Service N.W.T. : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Postmasters' Association, Memorial *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i), 13263 ; (remarks) 14016 (vi).

Postmasters' Bonds and Insurance Fund (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

Postmasters, Country, Increases in Salaries (remarks) 6038 (iii) ; 14012 (vi).

Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 89 (i).
——— (remarks) 879 (i).

Postmasters in Man. and N.W.T., Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 129 (i) ; 13263 (vi).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents (remarks) 14672 (vi).
——— *See* 'Latour.'

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 208) 2° m., 5657 ; in Com., 5659 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (presented) 89 ; (remarks) 879 (i).

Post Office Employees, Holidays granted, &c. (Ans.) 4006 (ii).

Post Offices in Cities, Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 667 (i).

Post Office Insurance Fund, Rep. *re* (remarks) 14661 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Defalcations, in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— Statement *re* Progress, in Com. of Sup., 14012 (vi).

Préfontaine, Mr., Speech *re* G. T. P. Ry. : *See* 'Transportation.'

P.E.I. Coal Fields, &c. (Ans.) 2504 (ii).
——— *See* 'Winter Communication.'

Protective Tariff, Govt. Policy, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6689 (iii).

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (iv).

Racine Bros. : *See* 'Nelson,' &c.

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 7609, 8125 (iv).

Ry. Labour Disputes (B. 17) 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2580, 2923 ; 3° m., 3004, 3298 (ii) ; on Sen. Amts., 5654 (iii).

Ry. Land Subsidies in Man. N.W.T., reserved, &c. (Ans,) 2307 (i).
——— Unpatented (Ans.) 2583 (ii).
——— Subsidies voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection (Ans.) 4832 (ii).
See 'Saskatchewan,' 'Lands,' &c.

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Amt. B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— *See* 'P.O. Bill 208.' 'Supply,' &c.

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14349 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies granted to Provs. (remarks) 14485 (vi).

Ry. Transportation Policy : *See* 'Transportation.'

Rainy River Mail Service (remarks) 6890 (iii).

Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10881 ; in Com., 10924 ; (Norfolk) 11117 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12470 (v).

Robson, Michael, Dismissal from Ayr Post Office (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ronan, Mr., and Ottawa Supply Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (Ans.) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I. (remarks) 13806 (vi).
——— *See* Supply—'Post Office,' &c.

St. Boniface, Postal Facilities, &c. (Ans.) 1859 (i).

St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com., 7772 (iv).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sales, &c. (Ans.) 2502 (ii).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co.'s Property (Ans.) 2306 (i).

Scotch Iron Moulders and Toronto Strike (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7192 (iii).
See 'Can. Foundry.'

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7151 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Agricutture (exhibitions) 4624 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 272 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 234 (i).
Interior (salaries) 267 (i).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette* cors., Montreal) 7154, 7155 ; (salaries) 7151 ; (Thompson, Mr. P., remuneration) 7152 (iii).
See 'Labour Dept.'
Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13995 ; (mail clerks) 13997 ; (Smith, F. H., salary) 14000 (vi).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing, &c.) 14273 (vi).
Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5125 (ii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6689 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7772 ; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7784 (iv).
Justice, Administration of, Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14259 (vi).
Labour Dept. (B. C. Commissioners) 7198 ; (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).
See 'Civil Govt.,' 'Labour.'
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7597 ; (G. B. and Can.) 7728 (iv).
Miscellaneous (industrial disputes, royal commission) 6984 ; (Martineau defalcations) 6991 (iii) ; (Post office, Miller's claims *re* Savings Bank) 14274, 14655 (vi) ; (Petersen, Tate and Co.'s deposit) 6958, 6966 (iii).
Post Office (automobiles, &c.) 6050 ; (Barrie branch) 6063 ; (box rents) 6139 (iii) ; (cities, promotions) 14009 (vi) ; (country postmasters) 6038 ; (Dawson and Eagle City) 5923 ; (Halifax, salaries) 6004 (iii) ; (inspectors' salaries) 14001 (vi) ; (jubilee stamps) 6061 ; (letter carriers, increases) 6004 ; (letter carriers,

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Post Office—Con.

P.E.I.) 6058; (letter carriers, Toronto) 6005; (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6006; (mail bag repairs) 6139; (mail marking machines) 6159; (mail service) 6065 (iii); (outside service, additional salaries) 14010 (vi); (outside service, Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936; (outside service, salaries, &c.) 5925 (iii); (pneumatic tube service) 13998 (vi); (postal service, Inverness) 6051; (postmasters, arrears of salaries) 5921; (P.E.I. winter service) 5943; (ry. mail clerks) 5928, 6026 (iii); (ry. mail clerks, Man. and N.W.T.) 14041 (vi); (ry. mail transfer agents) 6136; (rural mail delivery) 6137 (iii); (statutory increases) 14006 (vi); (superannuation, letter carriers) 6013 (iii); (temporary employees, promotion) 14001; (Vancouver, inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, dead letter branch) 13995; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Dom. (furniture, &c.) 1007; (Orillia caretaker) 1017; (Ottawa, furniture, &c.) 978; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, **Ont.** (Port Arthur, dredging) 13021 (vi); **P.E.I.** (Gaspereaux harbour) 1156; **Que.** (Murray Bay wharf) 2270 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Ouelle River branch) 7527 (iii).

Tariff:—*See* 'Customs,' 'Protective,' &c.

Tarte, Mr., Reference to in Toronto *Star* (explanation) 6758 (iii).

Tatamagouche Post office, Insurance Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).

Telephone Co.'s B. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 700 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii); in Com., 9424 (iv).

——— (remarks) 5883 (iii).

Toronto and James Bay Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14358 (vi).

Toronto Labour Council, Tel. *re* Mechanics from Eng. (Ans.) 1855 (i).

See 'Labour,' 'Can. Foundry,' &c.

Transportation Commission, &c., Par in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Prefontaine (remarks) 858 (i).

Transportation Policy, *re* Speech from Throne (remarks) 6405 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4499.

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2826 (ii).

——— Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 3303 (ii).

——— Sec. 14, &c. (remarks) 4593 (ii).

Valleyfield Strike, 1900 (Ans.) 2760 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 6406 (iii).

Watson, Postmaster, and Man. Elections: *See* 'Nesbitt.'

Whitney Pier, N.S., Dismissal of Postmaster Carlin (Ans.) 130 (i).

——— Salary of Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 668 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm.—*Con.*

Winter Communication with P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 1045 (i).

Wood Alcohol, Contract with Standard Chemical Co., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 234 (i).

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 8116 (iv).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1011 (i); in Com. on B., 10552 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 767 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10792 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c. (M. for copies) 1299 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13362; (transportation commission) 13367 (vi).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *E. Hastings.*

Banff Coal Reserve, Lease for Mining, &c. (Ques.) 13026 (vi).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 3269 (ii).

Grain Standards, Samples, &c. (remarks) 11182.

G. T. Pacific Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9039 (iv); in Com. on B., 10419, 10658, 11191, 11353, 11856, 12198, 12261 (v); on M. for 3° (amt.) 12711 (vi).

Hetu, Rudolph, Pardon, &c. (Ques.) 7915 (iv).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3680 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 11407 (v).

Lt.-Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup., 123 (i).

Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 183 (i).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters.' Western Rys., 10522, 10534 (v).

Representation in the H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 2°, 1219 (i); in Com., 10987, 11542; (Brant) 11107 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (post offices) 517 (i).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4951 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4525 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3879 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Advocate, Prince Albert: *See* 'Supply.'

Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 1675 (i).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°*, 11176 (v).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Autonomy for N. W. T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13883 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7374 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order, 7309 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7437 (iii).

Budget, The, 1799, 1816 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4391, 4996 (ii); in Com. on B., 5803 (iii).

Canadian North-West Irrigation Co.'s (B. 143) 1°*, 2300 (i); in Com., 3226 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands and School Taxation (Ques.) 4006.

Cardiff Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 140) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4591 (ii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5488 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13586, 13593, 14427 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 446 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 1462 (i).

——— Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Frank, Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2106. 2238 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5162 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8805 (iv); in Com. on B., 11352, 11946, 12145 (v).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, &c., on M. for Sup., 6562 (iii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7961 (iv).

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4336 (ii).

Labour Day Adjournment (remarks) 10742 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8219 (iv).

Lumber Combine in N.W.T. and Man., Cor. read, &c., 1580 (i).

Lumber Combine Investigation, &c. (remarks) *re* B.C. Lumber Trade, 14767 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*, Haldimand) 5727 (iii).

Mulloy, Trooper in S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14592 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12316 (v).

Prince Albert *Advocate*, Printing: *See* 'Supply,' &c.

Provincial Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (fire-guards) 8187 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5522 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 2236 (i); in Com., 4588 (ii).

Snow Storms in N.W.T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11825 (v).

S.A. War, Cattle for S.A.: *See* 'Cattle.'

———Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8266 (iv).

———Pensions to disabled Soldiers (remarks) 14592 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (fire regulations) 6776; (tree culture) 6776 (iii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14268 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3479 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *W. Toronto.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen, Tate & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6972 (iii).

Campbell, D. J., Postmaster at Macleod, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation Co.'s (B. 54) in Com., 2303 (i).

Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4417 (ii).

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 595 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6649, 7492 (iii).

Defalcations in Deptl. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 623 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iii).

Fishing Industry, N.S., Accommodation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13163 (vi).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 12300 (v).

Goods imported direct into Can., Value of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9281 (iv); in Com. on B., 10600, 10650, 11279, 11320, 11972, 12038, 12062, 12161, 12286 (v); on M. for 3°, 12691; (amt.) 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12703 (vi).

———Customs Duties *re* Clause 17, Legal Opinions (read) in Com. on B., 11320 (v).
See 'Ry. Policy.'

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4293 (ii).

Judges' Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8094 (iv).

Letters signed by Minister, stamped, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2527 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., Independence of Parlt., &c., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8054 (iv).

Macleod, N. W. T., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 8082 (iv).

Martineau, Defalcation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).

Ministerial Changes, on Explanation, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 195 (i).

Moosonee Diocese Trust Funds (B. 148) 1°*, 2396 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of, Mr. Scott's Attack *re* Western Rys., 10497 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Memo of Mr. Kingsmill *re* Bonds, &c. (read), 14588 (vi).

——Ques. of Privilege, *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6321 (iii).

——Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2559 (ii).

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to adjn. Hse., 7125 (iii).

See 'Transportation.'

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. (Toronto) 11701; (York) 11671; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12462; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12437 (v).

Scotia, Str., Salvage Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7156 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7220 (iii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7024 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (wharfs, &c.) 7564 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 240; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); Labour Dept. (Thompson, P., remuneration) 7154 (iii).

Dom. Lands (Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys) 6939 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326; (medical attendance) 6409; Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409; Que. (medical attendance) 6408 (iii)

Legislation (voters' list) 5275 (iii).

Militia (Cooke *vs* Cole, costs) 6950; (Winnipeg barracks, paving streets) 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co's deposit) 6956 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 5043 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg, armoury) 640; (London, drill hall) 641; (Toronto Junction, post office) 651 (i).
Harbours and Rivers: N.S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13144; (Breton's Cove) 13163 (vi).
Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13342.
Telegraph Lines: (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2993; (Marconi stations) 2991; (Yukon) 2993 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Yukon (Middleton, T. W., defalcations) 6933 (iii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4929 (ii).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3490 (ii).

See 'Ry. Policy.'

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10157 (v).

Printing Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to conc., 5314 (iii).

——— 4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 5581 (iii).

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 460 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 5268 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (electric lighting) 988 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs) *N. Wentworth and Brant.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebates for 1901-2 (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

Aluminum, Oxide of, imported into Can., Ports of Entry, &c. (Ans.) 1035 (i).

Audit Act and C. S. Employees, 13990 (vi).

Bananas imported into Dom., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1198 (i).

Bauxite, Tons imported into Canada, 1902 (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7385 (iii).

Binder Twine, Quantity imported from U. S. (Ans.) 7566 (iv).

Bonded Warehouses, Rental, Closing, &c. (Ans.) 12074 (v).

Bonding Privileges with U. S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 543 (i).

Budget, The, 2176 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5061 (ii).

Chevrier, F. L., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Civil Servants and Guarantee Cos. (Ans.) 3233.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12507 (v); in Com. on B., 13826 (vi).

Coal imported in Ontario from June, 1901, to March, 1902, and June, 1902, to March, 1903 (Ans.) 669 (i).

Coasting Laws, U. S., and Bonding Privileges, &c. (remarks) 13135 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. (B. 174) Prop. Res., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; in Com. on B., 4010; 3°m., 4187 (ii).

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (Ans.) 5318.

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

Customs and Excise, *per capita* Revenue from 1896 to 1903 (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

Euxine, Scuttling of Sch., on M. (Mr. *McLennan*) for Cor., 699 (j).

German Surtax, Purchases previous to (Ans.) 3395 (ii).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Goods imported direct into Can., Value, &c. (Ans.) 12716 (vi).

Grain Receipts through Western Lake Ports (Ans.) 97 (i).

Grain Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 543 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10275; in Com. on B., 10549, 11360, 12025, 12170 (v); on M. for 3°, 12698, 12755 (vi).

Grant, J. G., Sureties *re* defaulting Customs Collections (Ans.) 5991 (iii).

Imports for 1903, Duty collected and Preferential Tariff, &c. (Ans.) 13935 (vi).

See 'Preferential,' &c.

Insurance Rates on Steamers *re* St. Lawrence Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7959, 7979 (iv).

'Jesse James' Stories, Importation Free of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 11426 (v).

King's Warehouse at Winnipeg (Ans.) 6268 (iii)

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8217 (iv).

Le Canada Newspaper: *See* 'Pelletier,' &c.

Markland, Schr., Seizure, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5994 (iii).

Montreal Customs Dept., Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8115 (iv).

Nova Scotia Bank, Customs Duty *re* Safe, &c. (remarks) 13988 (vi).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Preferential Tariff, Certificate of Origin (remarks) 3584 (ii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ans.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'Goods.'

Questions put by Members, Answer *re* (remarks) 544 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14375 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10918, 11489; (Brant) 11098, 11149; on Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) to M. for 3°, 12488 (v).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Sugar for Home Consumption, Quantity entered (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (coaling vessels) 7563 (iii); Welland (Dunnville dam) 7810 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 331; (salaries) 319 (i).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3897; (Dauphin port) 3898; (Gananoque port) 3897; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3949 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment for services) 13993 (vi); (linseed oil fraud) 3935; (locks, printing, &c.) 3962; (Montreal contingencies) 3785; (preferential tariff) 3921; (printing, &c.) 3962; (salaries, &c.) 3897 (ii); (salaries, overtime) 13980 (vi); (Yukon expenditure) 3968 (ii)

Electric Light (inspectors) 5409 (iii).

Inmigration (repatriation, &c.) 6710 (iii).

Indians: Ont. (medical attendance) 6345 (iii).

Justice, Administration of: Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3427 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7592 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4098 (ii).

Post Office: Outside service (ry. mail service) 5956; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5832.

Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

Tariff Charges, Free List, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).

Tobacco Duties collected for 1903 (Ans.) 12217.

Trade and Navigation Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Trade Commissioner in London, Appnmt., &c., (remarks) 3497 (ii).

U.S. Coasting Laws, &c., Regulations *re* (read) 13135 (vi).

Windsor Junction Accident, I.C.Ry., on Inquiry for Papers, 3496 (ii).

Wheat Shipments from Port Arthur and Fort William (Ans.) 284 (i).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Mr. Aylesworth, reported Interview (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4229 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5419, 5431 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5464; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

Chickens, 'Wringing Chickens' Necks': *See* 'Supply—Agriculture'

Immigrants, Provision for Settlers (remarks) 868.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. to Sup., 4341 (ii).

Latour, Mr., Leave of Absence and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Le Canada and Mr. Pelletier's Canvassing, &c. (remarks) 13980 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

Mail Clerks, Promotions, Salaries, &c. (remarks) 13997 (vi).

Pope, Mr. R. H.—*Con.*

Ministerial Changes, on Explanations, &c. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 191 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. E., and canvassing for *Le Canada* (remarks) 13980, 14002 (vi).

Postal Service in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).

Poultry Fattening: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Pulp Wood, Duty by U.S. (remarks) 4362 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) for Com. of Sup., 2484 (i).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., Reps., &c., Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Poultry Farming*) 7644.

Civil Govt.: Post Office (mail clerks, salaries) 13997 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Bennett, Mr., salary increase) 13967 (vi).

Excise (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650; (dog-fish pest) 13651 (vi).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6734 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 13640 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Alaskan boundary commission) 13963 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4064 (ii).

Post Office (dead letter branch, Winnipeg) 13995; (pneumatic tube service) 13998; (statutory increases) 14007; (Vancouver inspector) 14000; (Winnipeg, inspector's office) 14001 (vi).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Batiscan channel) 2280; (Chateauguay river) 2280; (Grande Vallee, pier) 1538; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie, ice piers) 2248; (Magdalen islands) 2265; (Maria, pier) 2265; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Orleans, wharf) 2290; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291; (St. Lawrence, lower) 2257; (Sorel, wharf) 2291; (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2298; (Touladie river) 2286 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2961 (ii).

Slides and Booms (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974; (salaries) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Yukon working expenditure) 14042 (vi).

Quarantine: (diseased immigrants) 5492 (iii).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *W. Hastings.*

Ashley, Harford Relief (B. 236) 1°*, 8115 (iv).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries, &c. (Ques.) 5588.

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9597.

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 775 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8092 (iv), 10786 (v).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8078 (iv).

Napanee and Deseronto Ry. Co.'s Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Services, &c. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5342 (iii).

Rathbun Co.'s Ry. Charter, &c. (Ques.) 8084 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11548 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (Belleville armoury) 969 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal, Rep. of W. McLeod, &c. (Ques.) 12716 (vi).

——— Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2334 (i).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Maisonneuve.*

Alaska, Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 6629 (iii).

Annandale Range Lights, Amount expended (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Bathurst Harbour Buoys (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, &c. (Ans.) 5586 (iii).

——— Reps. of Mr. Evans and others (read) in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).

Belleville Harbour Boundaries (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Bernier, Capt., Govt. Aid to Polar Expedition (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Bishop, Capt., Harbour Master, Albert, N.B. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

B. C. Fisheries, Rep. of Commissioners (remarks) 1199 (i).

C. P. R. to Brownsburg Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14458 (vi).

Coal Oil as Fuel on Steamers: *See* 'Steamboat Inspection Bill.'

Daly, M. T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B. (Ans.) 2919, 3630 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8259, 8360 (iv).

False Creek, Kelly & Burnett's Lease (Ans.) 7565 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3129 (ii), 5515, 6354 (iii).

Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 224) 1°m., 6538; in Com., 6896 (iii).

Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 90 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service, Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ans.) 9820 (iv).

Fishery Rights between Dom. and Provs. (M.) for Memorandum, 7923 (iv).
See 'Supply—Fisheries.'

Fishing Rights, James and Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 1194 (i).
See 'James.'

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.B. (remarks) 4179 (ii).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10813 (v).

Frozen Fish, Goods, &c., Claims for Damages (Ans.) 13373 (vi).

——— Losses, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3394 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 5890 (iii).

Govt. Fishery Steamers, Names of Commanders, &c. (Ans.) 446 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8325 (iv).

G. T. R. Transcontinental Line, Speech in Montreal *Herald* :*See* 'Transportation.'

Harrison, Capt., Reimbursement to *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10240 (v).

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

James Bay Fishing Rights, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).
See 'Fishing.'

Joliette and Lake Manan Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

Kelly & Burnett : *See* 'False Creek.'

Latour, L. J., Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Lighthouse Keepers, Pet. *re* Salaries (Ans.) 14666 (vi).

Macnee Fishing Licenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 4728 (ii).
See 'Fishing.'

Marine Deptl. Rep. (presented) 244 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) prop. Res., 6271 ; in Com. on Res., 6544 ; in Com. on B., 6917 (iii).

Mayrand, Denis, Petition *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 9082 (iv).

Mehan, Dr., Meteorological Service, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 3630 (ii).

Ménard, Denis, Lightkeeper, Charges against (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Meteorological Service, Removal to Ottawa, &c. (Ans.) 6435 (iii).

Midland Water Front (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
See 'Pratt.'

Minto, Govt. Steamer, Passengers carried (Ans.) 3632 (ii).

Miscou Lighthouse Keeper, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 3631 (ii).

Monterey, Str., Wreck, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 6803 (iii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4474 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 8084 (iv).

Montreal Northern Ry. and Ste. Agathe Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Moreau, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 8331 (iv).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Naval Reserve (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii) ; 13545 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. (B. 260) in Com. on Res., 12779 ; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

Navy Training Ships, Establishment, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5296 (iii), 13545 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nobles, Israel, Dismissal as Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

North Pole Expedition, Govt. Aid to, &c. (remarks) 12820 (vi).

Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle (Ans.) 1195 (i).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 6533 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 2920 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 2100 (i).

——— Montreal and Quebec Districts Amt. (B. 261) in Com. on Res., 12781 ; in Com., 13627 ; 3° m., 13937 (vi).

——— Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).

Pratt & Co., Water Frontage, Lease, Midland : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5294 (iii).
See 'Midland.'

P. E. I. Winter Communication, *re* Str. *Stanley* (Ans.) 4007 (ii).
See 'Winter,' 'Supply,' &c.

Quesnel Dam, B.C., Obstructions, &c. (Ans.) 11557 (v).

Quinté Bay Buoys, Payments for Service, &c. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Ry. Debts Bill : *See* 'Exchequer.'

Ry. Policy of Govt. : *See* 'Transportation.'

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14317, 14508 (vi).

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

St. Lawrence Gulf Fishermen, Pet., &c. (Ans.) 2917 (ii).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Rep. of Lloyds, &c. (read) 4138 (ii).
See 'Supply,' 'Lighthouses,' &c.

St. Lawrence River Pilots, &c. (Ans.) 2916 (ii).
See 'Pilotage Bill.'

Safety of Ships Act Amt. (B. 179) 1°m., 3298 (ii) ; in Com., 6918 (iii).

Salmon Canning Industry, B. C (remarks) 10241 (v).

——— Rep. (M.) 7109 (iii).

——— Complaints, &c. (remarks) 9974 (iv).

——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 12073 (v).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Shipping Casualties Act Amt. (B. 263) in Com. on Res., 12801, 12894 ; 3°m, 13560 (vi).

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Stanley and *Lansdowne*, Str., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

Stanley, *Minto*, Strs. in the Ice, Telegram read, 6 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3291 (ii).

——— (B. 225) prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; in Com. on B., 6915 (iii).

——— Amt. (B. 237) 1°m., 12494 (v); in Com., 12777 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii); (salaries) 13663 (vi).

Fisheries (*Acadia*, sale of) 13658 (vi); (Bance, Mr. promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5278 (iii); (Behring sea arbitratin) 13658 (vi); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4175 (ii); (close season, investigation, &c.) 13650 (vi); (fish-breeding establishments) 4175; (fish-ways) 4174; (hatcheries) 4174 (ii); 13660 (vi); (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123 (ii); 5283, 5306; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277 (iii); (lobster factories inspection) 5123 (iii); (Ottawa exhibit) 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (provincial claims) 5311; (steamers, construction) 5278; (U.S. licenses, expenses) 5309 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632 (vi); (aids to navigation) 5736; (*Bayfield*, reps. *re*) 5740; (Bronté lighthouse) 5756 (iii); (Canadian coast lighting 4164 (ii); (gas lights) 13633; (Halifax harbour buoy service) 13638 (vi); (light-keepers' salaries) 4132; (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (Lurcher's shoal lightship) 4173 (ii); (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi); (Montreal pilot commissioners) 4173 (ii); (St. Lawrence lights) 13632 (vi); (St. Lawrence, navigation, &c.) 4135 (ii); (sweeping boats) 13636; (telephone service, Port Atkinson and Vancouver) 13638; (wireless stations) 13639.

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 4116 (ii). 13543; (Couillard, Alfred, gratuity, 13546 (vi); (Dom. steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4041 (ii); 13518 (vi); (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4048 (ii); (life saving awards) 13543; (marine biological station) 13543; (master and mates examination) 13524; (vi); (meteorological service) 4118 (ii); (naval militia and school of navigation) 13545 (vi); (St. Lawrence, lighting, &c.) 4042; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4114 (ii); (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 13545 (vi); (wrecks, investigation) 4116 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Longueuil, P.O.) 13072; (St. Louis de Mile End, P.O.) 13080 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12848 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2267 (i).

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept., 2939 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (boiler inspectors) 13648.

Scientific Institutions (MacGregor, Capt., gratuity) 6993; (time ball, Halifax) 6993 (iii).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. (B. 262) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v); 12800; in Com. on B., 12993 (vi).

——— Prop. Res. withdn., 12492 (v).

Swinehammer, Geo., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 2312.

Préfontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*

Transportation Commission, &c., Par. in Montreal *Herald* (remarks) 855 (i).

Venoit, P. I., Absence from Duty, &c. (Ans.) 3629 (ii).

Yamaska to Lotbiniere, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).

Winter Communication, P.E.I., Construction of Str. (Ans.) 6896 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*) for Cor., 1055.

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4230 (ii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dymont*) in Com., 7145, 7400 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5808 (iii).

Cattle Guard Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 14686 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) 14136 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for Com. (M.) to refer back to Com. on Rys., &c., 4871; Neg. (Y. 55, N. 102) 4874 (ii); in Com., 5208 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10118 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13281 (vi).

See 'Transportation,' &c.

Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4309 (ii).

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14699, 14725 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14136 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 487. Que. (L'Assomption) 428 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3493 (ii).

Treadgold Concessions, on Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2842 (ii).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) in Com., 5588, 5960 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7324 (iii).

B. C. Labour Troubles, Appnmt. of Commission (Ques.) 1595 (i).

Budget, The, 2149 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5447 (iii).

Canada Foundry Co., Toronto, Strike, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7194 (iii).

See 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5108 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands in Man., Exemption from Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 610 (i).

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3181 (ii).

Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. (B. 95) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6643 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 13572 (vi).

Fair Wage Schedule on Govt. Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7159 (iii).

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9120 (iv); in Com. on B., 11281 (v).

Immigration, Accommodation for Settlers, 1126 (i).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6567 (iii).

——— Provision for Settlers on Trains, &c. (remarks) 866 (i).

Labour: *See* 'B. C.', 'Can. Foundry,' 'Conciliation,' 'Fair Wage,' 'Ry. Labour B., 'Supply, —Civil Govt.', 'Workmen,' &c.

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 950 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2509.

North Pole Expedition, Aid to Capt. Bernier, &c. (remarks) 12819 (vi).

Post Offices in Cities, Stmnt. of Revenue and Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 666 (i).

Preston, Mr., and Interference in Can. Labour Affairs: *See* 'Immigration, Inadequate Inspection.'

Public Printing and Stationery B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4207 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6263 (iii), 8136 (iv).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2549 (ii).

——— Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14380 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N.W.T., Car Shortage, &c., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2468 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 65 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com., 10900; (Dauphin) 11748; (Winnipeg) 11784 (v).

St. Andrews' Locks Contract, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 287 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Expiration of Contract (Ques.) 10490 (v).
See 'Supply.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 456 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 242 (i); Labour Department (*Gazette*) 7154 (iii).

Post Office (letter carriers, Winnipeg) 6066 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg, P. O.) 438 (i), 13127 (vi); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354; (snag boat) 2672 (ii).

Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5496 (iii).

Winnipeg and Assiniboine Water Power Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 3970 (ii).

Winnipeg P. O., Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 667 (i).

Workmen on G. T. P.Ry., Construction, Protection to, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 235, 11281 (v).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *S. Grenville.*

Alert, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).

Bank Failures since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Bonding Privileges with U.S., 12761 (vi).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5060 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 5112 (ii).

Cardinal Canal, Toll Collector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12336, 12546 (v).

Clergue Co., Reorganization and Govt. Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14098 (vi).

Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

——— Supt's Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4019 (ii).

Damages to Vessels at Govt. Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Electric Lighting, St. Lawrence Canals at Iroquois (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

Fiddler's Elbow, Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10821 (v).

Galops Rapids, Deepening, &c., Contract, &c., Cor. (read) on conc., 8375 (iv).

Galops Rapids, Dam. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (v).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12262 (v); on M. for 3°, 12699, 12743, 12761 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13277 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

I. C. R., Locomotive Contract: *See* 'Locomotives.'

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10759 (v).

Kingston and Brockville Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Tenders for I. C. R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Lachine Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14140 (vi).

Litigation Expenditure, Fees (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12916 (vi).

Locomotive Contracts *re* I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14091 (vi).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5419 (iii).

Montreal Locomotive Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

Morrison, Mrs., Claim *re* Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Transfer to Mr. Prefontaine, 2645 (ii).

Public Works let by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6208, 6296 (iii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 2924 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11487, 12295 (v).

Schell, Mr.: *See* 'Alexandria,' &c.

Stewart, Mr., Supt. of Murray Canal, 12927, 14146 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census enumerators) 4820 (ii).

Canals—**Chambly** (land damages) 12908; (landing wharfs) 12908; (tow paths) 12906; **Cornwall** (electrical equipment) 14134; (enlargement) 12896; **Farran's Point** (enlargement) 12898; **Galops** (dam) 12608 (vi); (deepening) conc., 8374 (iv); (enlargement) 12899, 14141; (north channel) 12899, 14142; **Generally** (operating expenses) 12924: (repairs. &c.) 12924; (salaries) 12934; (surveys, dredging, &c.) 12900: (toll collectors) 12929; **Grenville** (guide pier) 12909; **Lachine** (electrical equipment) 14142; (enlargement, &c.) 12903; (masonry walls) 12906: **Lake St. Francis** (dam) 14152; **Lake St. Louis** (hydrographic survey) 12904; **Miscellaneous** (engineers, &c., salaries) 12910; (litigation expenses) 12911; **Rapide Plat** (enlargement) 12898; **Sault Ste Marie** (construction) 12904; **Welland** (Port Colborne, entrance) 12902; **Williamsburg** (gate-lifter) 14149; (overseer's house) 14150; (scow) 14154 (vi).

Customs (salaries for overtime) 13984 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Banff, bath house) 13956 (vi).

Excise (salaries *re* C. S. Act) 13967; (salaries, Prescott) 13968 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii), 5281; (intelligence bureau reps.) 5277; (steamers, B.C.) 5278 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6332; (medical attendance) 6332 (iii).

Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364; (Keilty, Mr., Appnmt.) 5365, 5378 (iii).

Legislation (voter's lists) 5276 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4047, 4091, 5042 (ii).

Post Office (Doyle, Mr.) 5928; (Ottawa Supply Co.) 5936, 6153; (postmasters' arrears of salaries) 5923; (salaries) 5927 (iii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (post office), 530 (i).

Docks (Montreal dry dock) 2988 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers—Generally (dredges, repairs) 2626 (ii); **B.C.** (Columbia river) 1455; **Man.** (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); **N.B.** (Arsenault, Capt., damages to schooner) 13231; **Ont.** (Depot harbour, breakwater) 13239 (vi); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1442 (i); (Prescott, dredging) 5916 (iii); (transfer to Marine dept.) 2645 (ii); (Wolfe Island, dredging) 1442 (i), 13252; **P.E.I.** (dredging plant) 13319 (vi); **Que.** (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Sabrevois wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur wharf) 13479 (vi); (St. Louis river) 13475 (vi); (Valleyfield dredging) 5905 (iii).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys) 13344, 13347; (transportation commission) 13364 (vi).

Roads and Bridges (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 2977; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—**Mar. Provs.** (Deer Island and Eastport) 13325 (vi); **Que.** (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326 (vi); (Marconi stations) 2991 (ii).

Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5492; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5497 (iii); (small-pox) 5012 (ii); (trachoma epidemic) 5493 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridge strengthening) 3702 (ii); (Canso ferry service) 14094; (Connolly's claim, &c.) 14103; (general vote) 12874; (Grand Narrows bridge protection) 14095 (vi); (Levis accommodation) 3703 (ii); (New Glasgow, freight shed) 14096; (rolling stock) 14100; (*Scotia*, salvage) 14107; (steel rails) 14099; (Windsor station) 14097; P. E. I. (Hillsborough, bridge) 12839, 14108; (Murray Harbour branch) 12833, 14123 (vi).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4884 (ii).

Telephone Service in the H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13364 (vi).

Williamsburg Canal, Electric Light, &c. (remarks) 14136 (vi).

——— Collector's Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).

——— Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

Richardson, Mr. M. K., *S. Grey.*

Art Gallery, Can. Collection of Paintings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13513, 13517 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7378 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7465 (iii).

Richardson, Mr. M. K.—*Con.*

Budget, The, 1946 (i).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7504 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting), 14415 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 632 (i).

Flesherton Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10040 (iv); in Com. on B., 10625 (v); on M. for 3°, 12701 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs, and Elections, 13274 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6573 (iii).

Lands available for Settlers in B. C., &c. (Ques.) 4836 (ii).

Mint Building, Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).

Railway Accidents, Investigation into (remarks) 1339 (i).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).

——— General Policy, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11000, 11525 (v).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6472 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. Exhibit, Imp. Institute) 13509 (vi); (exhibitions) 4602; (Japan exhibition) 4635; (St. Louis exhibition) 4602 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Justice (salaries) 212 (i).

Dom. Lands (buffalo herd, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Fisheries (close season, investigation, &c.) 13649 (vi).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7776, 7778 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 13640 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13428 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4087 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, **Ont.** (Clinton P. O.) 521; (Durham) 506; (Ottawa, Rideau Hall, drainage) 647 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13122 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, **N. B.** (Caraquet, wharf) 1173; **N. S.** (Drumhead, breakwater) 1086; (Lunenburg, harbour) 1107 (i); **Que.** (Chateauguay river) 3210 (ii); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1534 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river surveys), 13350 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel, *W. Elgin.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4226 (ii).

Bananas imported into Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Budget, The, 1825 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5064 (ii); in Com. on B., 5426 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 384 (i).

Cattle Guard Commission Rep., Publishing, &c. (remarks) 14758 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6645 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3085 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 573 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 902 (i); in Com. (compulsory voting) 13582, 14415 (vi).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6439 (iii).

Elgin County Centenary Celebration (remarks) 3129 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., 13164 (vi).

Gates over Ry. Crossings, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Bill, 5775 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9228 (iv); in Com. on B., 12233 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 740 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., &c. (remarks), 1131 (i).

Immigrants for Ont., Govtl. Action (Ques.) 1593 (i).

I.C.R., General Expenditure, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3694 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7985 (iv).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10781 (v).

——— Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8069, 8372 (iv).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8198 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (read) 5362 (iii).

Mail Delivery, Free, Establishment, &c. (remarks) 14011 (vi).

——— *See* 'Rural.'

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6452 (iii).

Parliament, Delay in Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

See 'Sessions.'

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4176 (ii); in Com., 6459 (iii).

Robinson, Mr. Jabel.—*Con.*

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Printing Bureau and Indebtedness of Members (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Attendance in House (remarks) 2015 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guard) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 562 (i).

——— (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 258 (i); in Com., 4567 (ii), 5767, 6184, 6241, 6307 (iii), 8188 (iv); (telephones, &c.) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8346 (iv).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11523 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment of (Ques.) 285 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Post Office.'

——— *See* 'Mail.'

Seeds Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7224 (iii).

Session of the House, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 473 (i).

——— *See* 'Parliament.'

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7763 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas lights) 13636 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 7584; (Can. and S. Africa) 7752 (iv).

Post Office (free mail delivery) 14011 (vi).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1165 (i); N.S. (Breton's Cove) 13164 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14431 (vi).

Robinson, Mr. James, *Northumberland, N.B.*

Aluminum, Oxide of, Imports into Can. Ports, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).

Bauxite, Tons, Imports into Can. for 1902 (Ques.) 1678 (i).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract with Allans, &c. (Ques.) 7091 (iii).

——— Delay by Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14185 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6964 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7312 (iii).

Budget, The, 1891 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12358 (v); on M. for 3°, 13945 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Civil Servants and Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche*, Marquette) to Com. of Sup., 3197 (ii).

Fishing Industry in N.S., Accommodation, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13157 (vi).

——— *See* 'Privilege.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5194 (iii).

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9553 (iv).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6557 (iii).

Inverness Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7952 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* N.S. Fishermen on 'Outskirt of Civilization,' &c., 13373 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 13666 (vi).

Fisheries (dog-fish pest) 13650 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6667; (agents, &c.) 6835; (trachoma, inspection, &c.) 6667 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Sable Island, Marconi service) 13648 (vi).

Militia (pay and allowance) 13394 (vi).

Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6958 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—**Mar. Provs.** (dredging plant) 13319; **N.S.** (Breton's Cove) 13157; (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi).

Quarantine (small-pox), 5020 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements, Rebate for 1901-2 (Ques.) 3803 (ii).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 850 (i).

Autonomy to N.W.T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 13905 (vi).

——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 255.'

Budget, The, 1876 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4996, 5109 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 402 (i),

Civil Servants, Interference in Man. Elections (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii); (notice of motion) 3126 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Coal Lands, Applications, &c. (Ques.) 12217 (v).

Dom. Lands, Man. and N.W.T., Sale, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 816 (i).

Ewart, Mr., and Adress to Judge Perdue, 11071, (v).

Govt. Appnmts. of Members, &c. (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Grain Weighing Machines: *See* 'Automatic.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7844, 7875 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9727 (iv); in Com. on B., 10444, 12267 (v); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 12706; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 12734 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections 13278 (vi).

Immigrants, Accommodation for Settlers, Par. in Winnipeg *Telegram*, 1121 (i).

Jerome, Martin, M.P.P., and Man. Elections, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Jonasson, Mr. S., Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Land Sales, Winnipeg, Purchasers, &c. (Ques.) 1858 (i).

——— *See* 'Dom.', 'N.W.T. Grazing,' &c., 'Saskatchewan.'

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of, Grazing Lands, &c. (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

Man. and N.W.T. School Land, Sale, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 706 (i).

Man. Judgeship, Delay in Appnmt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).

Members appointed to Govt. Positions (M. for ret.*) 3805 (ii).

Members appointed to Offices, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 9582 (iv).

——— (Ques.) 3632 (ii).

Myers, Appnmt. as Judge in Man. (Ques.) 285 (i).

Nesbitt, Man., Postmaster Watson as Lib. Candidate (Ques.) 1196 (i).

N.W.T. Grazing Lands, Lease to Geo. McDonnell (Ques.) 8330 (iv).

N.W.T., Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12323 (v).

——— Senate Representation: *See* 'Senate.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Land Grants, &c. (M. for O.Cs., &c.*) 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4363 (ii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11032, 11743; (Dauphin) 11748; (Macdonald) 11781; (amt.) to M. for 3°, 12476 (v).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Property, &c. (Ques.) 2306 (i).

See 'Qu'Appelle.'

Senate Representation of N.W.T., B. 253 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12303 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (St. Louis exhibition) 4611; (Treadgold exhibits) 4621 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Justice (salaries) 214 (i).
Customs (Dauphin port) 3898 (ii).
Fisheries (inspectors, Man.) 5127 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg, immigration shed) 13127; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (dredging plant) 13311; (Mossy river, dredging) 13312 (vi).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11071 (v).

Watson, John, Lib. Candidate in Man. (Ans.), 1196 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 832 (i).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *N. Lanark.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4998 (ii).

City and County Bank of Can. incorp. (B. 172) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10752 (v).

Electric Lighting, Public Buildings, Ottawa, Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 3235 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com, 5234 (iii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11927, 12089 (v).

Herald Printing Co., Montreal, Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 8329 (iv).

Lobster Packing Factory in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13152 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11490, 11650; (Brant) 11106; (Toronto) 11723; on M. for 3° (amt.) 12492 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Big Harbour, wharf) 13146; (Breton Cove) 13152 (vi); Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3320; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 2684 (ii).

Ross. Mr. J. H., *Yukon Territory.*

Hydraulic Leases, Yukon, O. C's., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1323 (i).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria (N.S.)*

Allan SS. Service, Reduction in Sailings from St. John (remarks) 14080 (vi).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iii).

See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7327 (iii).

British Members of Parlt., Visit to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 2105 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5080 (ii); in Com. on B., 5435 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B., in Com. on Res., 4991 (ii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 396 (i).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res., (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock* in Com. on Res., 12504 (v); in Com. on B., 13825 (vi).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Civil Service Act (superannuation) Amt. B. 49, (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 594 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3065 ; in Com. on B., 4015 (ii).
Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 575 (i).
Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 309 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com,, 6897 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5198 (iii), 7884 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9583 (iv).
Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 772 (i).
Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6576 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7942 (iv).
Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8371 (iv).
Labour Troubles in B. C., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 955 (i).
Letter Carriers, &c., in Com. on Post Office B., 5660 (iii).
Markland, Schr., Seizure, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5994 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5660 (iii).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3736 (ii), 5351, 5573, 5778, 6311 ; (telephones) 5553 (iii) ; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Passenger Rates, to M. for 3°, 8358 (iv).
Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8123 (iv),
Schooley, Wm. Francis, Relief B. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com., 3225 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7221 (iii).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).
Steel Bounties : *See* 'Iron,' &c.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Poultry Farming*) 7656 (iv).
Civil Govt. : Customs (salaries) 325 (i).
Customs (contingent expenses) 3787 (iii).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 6817 (iii).
Inland Revenue (Inspectors, N.S.) 5409 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7783 (iv).
Justice : Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3521 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5881 (iii), 13679 (vi) ; (Can. and G. B.) 7595 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6983 (iii).

Ross, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies) 4081, 5043 ; (*Stanley*, repairs, &c.) 4055 (ii).
Post Office : Outside Service (P.E.I., winter service) 5945 (iii).
Public Works : Buildings—**Ont.** (rural mail delivery) 514 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally (hydraulic dredge) 2621, 2625 (ii) ; **N.S.** (Bridgewater dredging) 1075 ; (Campbellton wharf) 1143; (Green Cove harbour) 1100 ; (Neil's harbour) 1139 ; (Washabuck wharf) 1150 (i) ; **Que.** (Le Tableau wharf) 2255 (i) ; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3314 (ii).
Miscellaneous (architect's office) 2751 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 8273; (Stellarton, accommodation) 8301 (iii).
Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4926 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W., *S. Ontario.*

Budget, The, 2036 (i).
Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5433 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4369 (ii).
Clergue Steel Works, Sault Ste. Marie, Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques,) 13668 (vi).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6646, 7503 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (compulsory voting) 14420 (vi).
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 707 (i).
Immigration Statistics, Total Number, Origin, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1035 (i).
Inspection, General Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14312 (vi).
G. T. Pacific Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9927 (iv).
North-west Bank of Canada incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com., 2754 (ii).
Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 2609 (ii), 5349, 5771 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6468, 7228 (iii).
Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 477 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7613 (iv) ; (experimental farms) 4551 ; (Shutt's, Prof., report) 4559 (ii).
Excise (analysts, food, &c.) 5395 (iii).
Justice, Administration of—Yukon (living allowances) 3417 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Oshawa P.O.) 13111 (vi).

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*

Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 212) M. to receive Pet., &c,, 4958 (ii) ; 1°*, 5512 ; 2° m., 5585 ; in Com., 7470 (iii).

Russell, Mr. B.—*Con.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4385 (ii).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Chinese Immigration Restriction Act Amt. B., in Com. on Res., 608 (i).

Church Missionary Society of Canada incorp. (B. 202) 1°*, 4727 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Demers*) in Com., 8255 (iv).

Fire Guards on Ry. Lands: *See* 'Ry. Bill 21.'

Good Shepherd Reformatory B. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4841 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7869 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8907, 8919 (iv).

Harrison, Capt. of Str. *Grecian*, Reimbursement *re* Costs, &c. (remarks) 10239 (v).

Home Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 191) 1°*, 3970

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 2383 (i).

Loy, Geo. M., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. *re* Beauharnois P. O. Site, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7920 (iv).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4869 (ii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (tolls) 5576; (cattle guards) 6249; (2-cent rate) 6278; (fire guards) 6315 (iii).

Ry. Debts: *See* 'Exchequer.'

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9423 (iv).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Alexandria Wood Export Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12926 (vi).
See 'Privilege.'

Bell Telephone: *See* 'Dundonald, Earl.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7321 (iii).

Budget, The, 2025 (i).

C. A. R. Section-Men's Strike (remarks) 2303 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4401 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act (compulsory voting) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 14419 (vi).

Dundonald, Earl, Telephone Mess. *re* Scottish Demonstration (remarks) 10536, 10744 (v).

Glengarry Scottish Demonstration re Tel. Message to Lord Dundonald (remarks) 10536 (v).

Privilege (ques. of) *re* Govt. Purchases, 5416 (iii).
——— *See* 'Alexandria.'
——— *re* Mr. Stewart's Appointment, 14599 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Stewart, Mr., Appnmt. as Supt. of Williamsburg Canal, Ques. of Priv., 14599 (vi).

Schell, Mr. J. T.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:
Canals—Generally (operating, &c., expenses) 12926 (vi).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 488; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1518 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *W. Assiniboia.*

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 591 (i).

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Stewart*) for Ret., 880 (i).

Autonomy for N.W.T. Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13914 (vi).
——— Correction in Press (remarks) 14855 (vi).
——— *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7329, 7357 (iii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Mortgage Deed, Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).
——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.

Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Complaint, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4387, 5102 (ii); in Com. on B., 5786 (iii).

C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

C. P. R. (Kirkella and Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14497 (amt.) 14501 (vi).

C. P. R. (Medicine Hat) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. Res., 14504 (vi).

Century Life Ins. Co., B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5583, 6201; (amt.) 5360 (iii).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3164 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3056 (ii).

Dime Novels: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Engineers, Marine, Certificates to: *See* 'Masters and Mates.'

Fire Guards along Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Bills.'

Frank Disaster, N.W.T. (remarks) 2100 (i).

Freight Rates, Govt. Control: *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Fyfe, Mr.: *See* 'Grain Weighing, &c., 'Supply—Excise.'

German Goods, 'Teapot,' Importation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) 3056 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

Grain Blockade in the N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation,' &c.

Grain Weighing Scales in Man. and N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4202 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automatic.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10173; Grafters,' 10189; in Com. on B., 10710, 12276 (v).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Graves, Florence D., Relief (B. 214) 1° *, 5581 (iii).

Herchmer, Lt.-Col., Pension, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. (B. 137) 1° m., 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys., Areas, &c. (Ques.) 2101 (i); 3797 (ii).

——— *See* 'Rys.', &c.

Land Titles Amts. to N.W.T. Bill: *See* 'N.W.T. B. 259.'

Lumber Combines, N.W.T., Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 6168 (iii).

——— (remarks) 1579, 1589 (i).

MacLeod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1° *, 814 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints, &c. (remarks) 14220 (vi).

Mail Cars, overcrowding, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P.O. Bill, 5870 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).

See 'Supply—Post Office.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7994 (iv).

Man. and N.W. Volunteers, Land Scrip., &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Masters and Mates Certificates B. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6545 (iii).

Mounted Police Act (pensions) Amt. Bill, M. to introduce, 14280 (vi).

Northern Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 51) 1° *, 654 (i).

Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 69) 1° *, 813 (i).

N. W. T. Act Amt. B. 259 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com. (amts.) 13853, 14287 (vi).

N. W. T. Snow Storms, False Reps., &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

Novels, Dime: *See* 'Weekly Publications.'

Osler, Mr. E. B., Attack *re* Qu'Appelle Ry. Bonds, &c., Ques. of Priv., 14583 (vi).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle,' &c., 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament, Date of Convening (remarks) 14855 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. 5863, 5870 (iii).

Preference Tariff *re* German Goods (Ques.) 5322 (iii).

——— *See* 'German,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys., 10530, 10533 (v).

——— *See* 'Qu'Appelle.'

——— *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' &c., 14583.

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Contract, 'Grafters,' &c. (remarks) on G.T. Pacific Bill, 10189 (vi).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, &c., Mortgage, Regulations *re* Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 13024 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) 10500 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (fire-guards) 5782; (cattle-guards) 6242, 6321 (iii), 7610 (iv).

Ry. Act (fire guards) Amt. (B. 16) 2° m., 871 (i).

Rys. Land Grants in Man. and N.W.T. and rest of Can., Mileage, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— Man. and N.W.T., Area reserved and patented, &c. (Ques.) 2307 (i).

——— Area unpatented, &c. (Ques.) 2583 (ii).

——— Govtl. Action *re* Selection, &c. (Ques.) 4831 (ii).

See 'Lands,' &c. 'Railway Subsidies in Land,' &c.

Ry. Rates, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

Railway Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies in Land and Money in N.W.T. and Man. (Ques.) 1677 (i).

——— paid by Govt. since Confederation, &c. (Ques.) 1198 (i).

Ry. Transportation, N.W.T., Congestion (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).

Regina & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 43) 1°*, 591 (i).

Scrip to Volunteers: *See* 'Man. and N.W.T.' &c.

Snow Storms in N. W. T., False Reports, &c. (remarks) 11822 (v).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, &c.) 4643 (ii).
Dom. Lands (surveys, printing, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6781 (iii).
Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary, &c.) 5381; (grain weighing machine) 5381; (inspectors' salaries) 5381 (iii)
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6673: (agents, &c.) 6836; (Barr Colony) 6870; (diseased immigrants) 6858; (exodus to U.S.) 6876; (expenditure, &c.) 6867; (ques. of order) 6854; (Galicians) 6863, 6878; (U. S. agents, &c.) 6858 (iii).
Indians: Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6343 (iii).
Post Office (Moosejaw postmaster) 6048; (postmasters, salaries) 6048; (ry. mail service, N.W.T.) 5835, 6048 (iii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (St. Joseph wharf) 3384 (ii).
Tel. Lines (N.W.T.) 2715 (ii).

Tariff and Immigration into N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iii).

Textile Fabrics: *See* 'Inspection Act.'

Trant, Mr. (remarks) 3060, 3167 (ii).

Volunteers of Man. and N.W.T., Land Scrip, &c. (Ques.) 820 (i).

Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James Series', Customs Duty (Ques.) 11426 (v).

Weights and Measure Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4202 (iv).

Scott, Mr, W.—*Con.*

Wright, A. W., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 8116 (iv).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *N. Middlesex.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5463 (iii).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 393 (i).

Census Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13737 (vi).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 787 (i).

Parkhill Mail Contract, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Goderich, breakwater) 13242; (Grand Bend, pier) 13239 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3373; (St. Joseph's wharf) 3387 (ii).

Quarantine (hog cholera) 5506 (iii).

Railways: I. C. R. (Toronto stockyards) 8317 (iv).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford (Minister of the Interior) *Brandon.*

Alnwick Band, Mississaga Indians, Claims, &. (Ans.) 6895 (iii).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5965 (iii).

Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6355, 6375 (iii).

See 'Supply—Immigration,' &c.

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5606, 5793 (iii).

Dokis Indian Reserves, Complaints *re* trespassing (Ans.) 7915 (iv).

Dom. Lands Act. B. (M.) dropped, 13444 (vi).

Doukhobors, Loan to by Govt. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Estimates, Suppl. (remarks) *re* one-fifth Vote, 6408 (iii).

Fire Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8617 (iv).

Immigration Expenditure for 1902-3 (Ans.) 6269 (iii).

——— Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6603 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

Indian Boy, Sand: *See* 'Sand.'

Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 89 (i).

International Congress of Geology, Visit to Can. (Ans.) 8117 (iv).

McDonnell, Geo., Lease of Grazing Lands, &c. (Ans.) 8330 (iv).

Man. Grain Act (1900) Amt. (B. 232) 1° m., 7294; 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991 (iii); 9350 (iv).

Man. School Lands, on Inquiry for Ret., 6893 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

Moose Deer Point Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iii).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy, N.W.T., Further Cor., &c. (remarks) 7295 (iii).

——— Ret. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6947 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).

See 'Supply—Dom. Lands.'

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5784 (iii).

Saskatchewan Land Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 7108 (iii).

Sand, Indian Boy, adopted by Mr. Johnstone (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).

Scotch Labourers, Return to Old Country (remarks) 7206 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6790; (buffalo herd) 6790; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (half-breed schools, salaries) 6773; (homestead inspectors) 6766; (homestead lands) 6787; (inspector's expenses) 6766; (irrigation, &c.) 6764; (military asylum pensions) 6788; (roads, &c.) 6772; (Long Lake and Saskatchewan ry. surveys) 6940; (surveys, &c.) 6758, 6939; (swamp land expenditure) 6927; (Teulon road) 6927; (tree culture) 6774; (Winnipeg office) 6767; (Yoho Park roads, &c.) 6790 (iii).

Geological Survey (Bell, Dr., appnmt.) 6816; (coal, Sudbury) 6824; (geologist, international boundary survey) 6825; (instruments purchased) 6820; (plans, plottings, &c.) 6826; (surveys, exploration, &c.) 6815 (iii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6658; (Barr colonists) 6696; (Cory, W. W., &c.) 6854; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6732; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6615; (general expenses) 6827; (homestead entries) 6704; (Lake St. John Col. Co.) 6888; (mechanics, &c.) 6833; (medical inspection) 6695, 6851; (Murray, agent, Scotland, cor., &c.) 6827; (Ritchie, U.S. agent) 6849; (tents, &c.) 6849; (trachoma) 6695; (U. S. agents) 6848; (White, Mr. W. J., expenses) 6735, 6853 (iii).

Indians: B. C. (Clayoquot school) 7269; (fishing, &c., investigation *re*) 7265; (reserves, sale of, &c.) 7267; (salaries) 7257; schools, &c.) 7254, 7260; (Songhees, removal, &c.) 7258; (travelling expenses) 7262 (iii).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (chiefs' salaries) 6410; (general vote) 6425; (land fund) 6415; (legal expenses) 6416; (medical attendance) 6421; (Robinson treaty payments) 6410; (Stewart, E., extra expenses) 6416; (survey reserves) 6411 (iii.)

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6329, 6350 (iii).

See 'N.W.T.' &c.

Mar. Provs. (schools) 6409 (iii).

N. B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).

N. S. (seed grain relief) 6417 (iii).

N.W.T. (Elkhorn school) 6348; (supplies, &c.) 6422 (iii).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Con.

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6326, 6344; (medical attendance) 6409 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (blankets, clothing, &c.) 6409; (medical attendance) 6326; (schools) 6409 (iii).

Que. (medical attendance) 6408; (St. Regis lockup) 6415 (iii).

Yukon Ter. (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

Interior (Alaskan boundary commission) 6931; (Amos Barnes, claim) 6922; (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (astronomical work) 6790; (Banff museum) 6927; (Bow River, bridge) 6925; (Casca Transportation Co.) 6926; (Howie, F. W., legal expenses) 6795: (Keewatin, govt.) 6797; (Keewatin, lunatics) 6798; (Liard river, miners) 6926; (litigation expenses) 6794; (maps, engraving, &c., N.W.T.) 6800 (iii).

N.W.T. Govt. (additional grant, &c.) 6946; (general expenses) 6888 (iii).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher, expenditure) 6949, 7275; (govtl. expenses) 6802; (hospital grant) 7291; (Lithgow, Mr., controller) 7287; (Middleton, T. W., defalcations, &c.) 6931; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Treadgold Concessions, Corrected Answer, 6803 (iii).

——— Free Representations, &c. (Ans.) 5990 (iii).

——— Personnel of Commission *re* (remarks) 7297 (iii).

——— Telegram *re* Free Representations, 6427 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *S. Wentworth.*

Animals Contagious Diseases B. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4227 (ii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7364 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Butter, Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 5430 (iii).

Cattle purchased for S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5477 (iii).

Cold Storage: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4035 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. (B. 86) 1°*, 1023; 2° m., 2387 (i), 2788; on M. for 2°, 3807 (ii).

——— B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) 2° m., 3823 (ii).

Fruit Shipments in Cold Storage to Europe, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 3805 (ii).

——— Value, &c. (Ques.) 3232 (ii).

Garden Products, Readjustment of Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Mondays, 3708 (ii).

Permanent Corps, Qualification of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).

See 'Royal.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5857 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3550, 3714, 3850 (ii), 6208; (telephones) 5553 (iii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2469 (i).

Royal Canadian Regiment, Strength, &c. (Ques. 3801 (ii).

See 'Permanent.'

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7236 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (cold storage, &c.) 7086 (iii), 7610, 7655; (creameries, &c.) 7633 (iv); (fumigating stations) 4434 (ii).

See 'Mail Subsidies.'

Customs (receipts, &c.) 3923; (salaries, &c.) 3923 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff springs) 6789; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (irrigation, surveys, &c.) 6764; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6774 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Australia) 5880 (iii); (Can. and G. B.) 7573 7590 (iv).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John river) 5896; Ont. (Midland, dredging) 5911 (iii); (Port Colborne) 3373 (ii); Que. (Cacouna, wharf) 5900; (Hull, wharf) 5902 (iii).

Quarantine (small-pox) 5032 (ii).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Restriction Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2390 (i).

Canada Foundry Co.'s Strike, Representations to Dept. of Labour (remarks) 7205 (iii).

Labour Troubles in B.C., on M. for Com. of Sup (remarks) 945 (i).

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2512 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety (B. 77) 1°m., 872; 2°m. 2386, 2387 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock* on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) *Rouville.*

Address, The, Reply from His Ex. (read) 1204 (i).

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) Members remarks checked, 3282 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 665 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5315, 5427, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

Bills withdrawn, on M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep., on M. to suspend Rule (remarks) 13789 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan, &c., B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) ruling, 5989 (iii).

British Journalists and Members, Visit to Can. (remarks) 7488 (iii).

Brunet: *See* 'Order,' 'St. James,' &c.

Budget, The, Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 1735, 1742 (i).

Butter Adulteration Act (remarks) 4960 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Brockville and North-west Ry. Co. s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 ; (ruling) 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Appeal to Speaker (ruling) 7342 (iii).

——— Translation of Bill (remarks) 7468 ; (ruling) 7469 (iii).

Butter, Can., Mr. Preston's Interview, Members remarks checked, 10746 (v).

Campaign Literature and Sessional Messengers (Ans.) 14286 (vi).

——— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian Apples, Packing, &c., Members called to Order, 11185 (v).

Cattle Guard Commission, Members remarks checked, 3396 (ii).

Cigarette Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 3286 (ii).

Clerk of the House (notification of appnmt.) 1 (i).

Columbia River Improvement B. 150 (Mr. *Gallicher*) on Sen. Amts. (ruling) 6847 (iii).

Door-keeper of H. of C., Salary, &c. (remarks) 14115 (vi).

Dundonald, Lord, Telephone Message from Alexandria (ruling) 10536 (v).

Election Petitions, Judge's Reports (notification) 2 (i).

Elevator Accident in House (remarks) 5417 (iii).

Garden Products, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) Members remarks checked, 4768, 4779 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 4586 (ii).

——— on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 8058 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) and M. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise (ruling) 7832 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. *Wilmot*) Ruling, 8067 (iv).

G. T. Pacific B. 235, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) that Committee not properly constituted (ruling) 10634 (v).

——— on M. for 3°, Order, Ques. of, Ref. to previous Debate, 12742 (vi).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 7727 (iv) ; (ruling) 12774 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Irregularity of Proceeding, 13266 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, Member called to Order, 13271 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) *re* Affidavits being read (ruling) 14847 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Marcil*) 12941 (vi).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

G. T Pacific B. 235, onQues. of Order, Member reading Speech (ruling) 10250 (v).

——— Ruling, on M. to receive Pets., &c., 12715 (vi).

——— *re* Vote of Mr. Cargill (remarks) 10538 (v).

Insolvency Act Amt. B. 53 (ruling) on M. for 2°, 2787 (ii).

——— Members remarks checked, 3248 (ii).

Inspection Act (textile fabrics) Amt. B. 137, on M. for 2° (ruling) 3297 (ii).

Laval Electoral District, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

Library of Parlt., Rep. (presented) 6 (i).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, &c. (ruling) 110 (i).

Loy, Geo. M. and Election Com., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence (ruling) 7918 (iv).

McCraney, Mr. W., Letter *re* Legislation (ruling) 5363 (iii).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Member (Mr. *Taylor*) called to Order for ref. to past Debate, 14553 (vi).

——— Use of Rooms in H. of C. (stmnt.) 14565 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, on Mr. Taylor asking Question, 14684 (vi).

See 'Campaign.'

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 13624 (vi).

Members, New, Certificates of Election (notification) 3 (i).

Members rights to speak, &c. (ruling) 10536 (v).

Mess. from His Ex. (read) 4, 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4957 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).

Messengers of House and Mail Bags : *See* 'Campaign.'

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for 1°, 14281 (vi).

Mount Royal Savings Bank B. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to withdraw Bill, 10831 (v).

Mowat, Sir Oliver : *See* 'Lt. Gov.'

Ontario Electoral District, Certificate : Notification, 367 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3° (ruling) 4871 (ii).

Order of the House, &c., Remarks of Mr. Borden *re*, 12724 (vi).

Order, Ques. of *re* Brunet, Arthur, and Dom. Election (ruling) 108 (i).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Bennett*) Irrelevancy of Deb. *re* Mr. Oliver (ruling) 11564 (v).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Monk*) on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) ruling, 10505 (v).

Order, Questions of (Mr. *Ingram*) on ruling (remarks) 10537 (v).

See 'Privilege,' &c.

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c., Members remarks checked, 2398 (i).

Petitions presented, Rules, &c. (remarks) 6 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

Petitions received *re* G. T. P. Ry. (ruling) 12715 (vi).

Petitions *re* Subsidies, Rejected, 654 (i).
See 'Subsidies.'

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1° (ruling) 5241 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Rep., Distribution, &c. (remarks) 880 (i).

Press Gallery Representatives, Sessional Allowance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14243 (iv).

Preston, Mr., and Can. Butter : *See* 'Butter.'

Private Bills, Notice, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to revise Rules, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

——— Rules *re* presenting (remarks) 482 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Statement of member must be accepted, 10503 (v).

——— (Mr. *Clancy*) *re* member reading a letter from Hugh Sutherland, Ruling, 10530 (v).

——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 'Outskirts of Civilization,' on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
See 'Order,' &c.

Procedure, Ques. of, 5892 (iii).

Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 14844 (vi).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, (ruling) 8351 (iv).

——— Mess. from Senate *re* Conference on Amts., 14734 (vi).

——— on Conference with Senate *re* its Amts., Names of Managers (read) 14740 ; M. to suspend Sittings of Hse., 14740 (vi).

——— Procedure, Bourinot quoted, &c. 14760 (vi).

Railway Policy of Govt., Member (Mr. *Sproule*) must not refer to previous Debate, 7121 (iii).

Ry. Subsidies Act Amt. B. 2 (ruling) 548 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66, on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) Ruling, 12432, 12435 (v).

Royal Assent to Bills, Com. from His Ex. (read) 5315 (iii).
See 'Bills,' &c.

Rules of the House, on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend, 12216 (v), 13549 (vi).

Russell Electoral Division, Notification of Vacancy, 1023 (i).

St. James Division, Montreal, Judge's Certificates (notification) 1 (i).

——— Judgment of Supreme Court, (notification) 91 (i).

——— Vacancy (remarks) 410, 1023 (i).

Stock Exchange Speculations, Members remarks checked, 7044 (iii).

Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c. (ruling) 591 (i).
See 'Petitions.'

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Legislation : House of Commons (debates, &c.) 5265 (iii) ; (debates, amanuenses) 14243 (vi) ; (messengers) 5265 ; (printing, &c.) 5267 (iii) ; (salaries, increases) 14112 ; (sessional clerks) 14113, 14242 ; (sessional messengers) 14243 (vi) ; (voters' lists) 5274 ; Library of Parlt., 5267 ; Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Telephone Service in H. of C. (remarks) 5088 (ii).

Terrebonne Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7 (i).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 5555 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) Ruling reserved, 7727 (iv).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Two Mountains Ry. Facilities, Ques. of Order (ruling) 7571 (iv).

Vacancies, Notification, 2 (i).

Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B. 26 (remarks) 630-1 (i).

——— on M. to ref. to Private Bills Com. (ruling) 664 (i).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Members remarks checked, 7005 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. P. Macdonald) *E. Huron.*

Anglo-American Cable Co., Irrelevancy of Debate, 13338 (vi).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) on Amt. (Mr. *LaRivière*) ruling, 5559 (iii).

——— (ruling) *re* Notice of Amt., 5970 (iii).

Atlantic and Superior Ry. Co. (ruling) 852 (i).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1808 (i).

Binder Twine Bounties, Ques. of Order, Remarks checked, 7305 (iii).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) read, 7400 ; (ruling) 7401 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) Irregularity of Deb. in Com., 5616 (iii).

——— Members' remarks checked, 4991 (ii).

Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 2303 (i).

Century Life Ins. Co.'s B. 175, on Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) ruling, 5360 (iii).

——— on Amt. of Mr. Morrison (ruling) 6199 (iii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

Civil Servants, Interference in Elections, on Ques. of Order, 3167 (ii).

Civil Service B. 257, on Com. on Res., Members' remarks checked, 12338, 12561 (v).

Conciliation Act Amt. B. 95, Irrelevancy of Debate, 3262 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

Customs Act Amt., Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 3058 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3, in Com. (ruling) 910 (i).
——— (remarks) 13569 (vi).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Campbell*) ruled out of order, 14424 (vi).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) (remarks) 1062 (i).
Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3578 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 64, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5170 (iii).
——— in Com., Members' remarks checked, 7825; (ruling) 7814, 7826 (iv).
——— on Remarks *re* Par. in *Globe* (Mr. *Haggart*), Irrelevancy of Deb. (ruling) 5894 (iii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Members' remarks checked, 10622, 10640, 11292, 11980, 11987, 12231, 12250 (v).
——— (amt.) read, 11834 (v).
——— Two-cent rate (ruling) 12235 (v).
Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., Ques. of Order, ref. to past Debate, 8212; (ruling) 8214 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (estimates, suppl.) 12869 (vi).
New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr *Lemieux*) 2° m., 1328 (i).
N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256, Members' remarks checked, 12326 (v).
Order, Ques. of, (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Criminal Code Amt., 318 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5868 (iii).
Ry. Act B. 21 (ruling) on Amts., 6220, 6272, 6311 (iii) 8143 (iv).
——— Com. from Senate insisting on its Amts., 14519 (vi).
——— Discussion *re* Private Bill (ruling) 6106 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* Telephones (ruling) 5548 (iii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 5167 (iii).
Ry. Act (govt. supplies) B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., Members' remarks checked 12982 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies B. 2 (ruling) 551 (i).
Representation in H. of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12293 (v).
——— Irrelevancy of Debate, 10966 (v).
——— Members' remarks checked, 11617 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 11470, 11474 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Lennox*) 11710 (v).
St. Chrysostôme Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Brown*) in Com. (remarks) 7771 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection B. 200, Members' remarks checked, 6478 (iii).
——— (remarks) 7215, 7218 (iii).
Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi)

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Justice (ruling) 209 (i); Public Works (remarks) 5824 (iii).
Fisheries: Members' remarks checked, 5294, 5296 (iii).
Immigration (observance of rules) 6862; (quoting from speeches) Ruling, 6870-6874; Remarks *re* Discussion, 6708, 6724, 6854 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) Members' Remarks checked, 7778 (iv).
Interior (Liard River miners) remarks, 6926 (iii).
Militia (stores branch) Amt., 3609 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (members' remarks checked) 4043 (ii).
Post Office (irrelevancy of debate) 5954 (iii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (ruling) 516 (i). N.B. (Campbellton) Members' Remarks checked, 13043, 13052; Ont. (ventilation of Chamber) 13010; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120 (vi). Harbours and Rivers: Generally (irrelevancy of debate) 2638, 2669 (ii). N. S. Members' Remarks checked, 13171 (vi). Ont. (Bayfield, pier) 1189 (i). Que. (irrelevancy of debate) 2270 (i). Members' Remarks checked, 3367 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. Ry. (M.) to reduce Vote, 7539 (iii).
Sydney Harbour Commission B., in Com. on Res. (ruling) 12306 (v).
Telegraphic Systems, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., Members' Remarks checked, 13330 (vi).
Toronto and James Bay Ry., on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) (ruling) 14360 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Irregularity of Debate (ruling) 3470 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *E. Grey.*

Adjournment of Hse., Procedure *re* (remarks) 6630 (iii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission, Refusal of Can. Commissioners to sign the award (remarks) 14402 (vi).
Alien (restriction) Labour Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2388 (i).
Allan Line Steamers, Rate of Speed (remarks) 13672 (vi).
Alliance Bank of Canada incorp. B. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) in Com., 7473 (iii).
Anthrax in Cattle, Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 10102 (v).
Assiniboine River and Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 6846 (iii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Delay of Govt., &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Hfx.) to Com. of Sup., 14178 (vi).
See 'Supply—Mail Subsidies.'
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) on M. for 2°, 664, 1509 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) in Com., 1806 (i).
Auditor General and Treasury Board, &c. (remarks) 11553 (v).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T. (remarks) 885 (i).
Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Barr Colony and Mr. Haultain's Speech, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6394, 6400 (iii).

Bass River (N.S.) Light (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7314, 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties, &c., on Ques. of Order, 7307 (iii).

Binder Twine Inspector's Rep. (M.) for Distribution, 13789 (vi).

Binder Twine, 8th Rep. of Com. on Ag., on M. to conc., 14043 (vi).

——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* Mr. Haycock's Powers, 14047 (vi).

See 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

British Cable News Service B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 236 (iv).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 7400; on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 7343, 7469, (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14437 (vi).

Budget, The, 1740 (i).

Business of the Hse. (remarks) 871, 2501 (i).

——— Govt. Legislation, &c. (remarks) 1350 (i); 6352 (iii).

——— on M. to take in Mondays, 3711 (ii).

——— Ry. Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 11422 (v).

See 'Govt.'

Butter Adulterations, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5054; in Com., 5422; (amt.) 5430 (iii).

Campaign Literature: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Can. Associated Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

Canadian Bridge Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5596, 5616 (iii).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14501 (vi).

Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., 7484 (iii).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5555 (iii).

Canals, Tonnage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 874 (i).

Casey, Mr., and Archives, 13505 (vi).

Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 376 (i).

——— Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).

Cattle purchased in S. Africa, on Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5473 (iii).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c., on M. for Ret., 290 (i).

See 'Pub. Accts.'

Census Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13710, 13721 (vi).

See 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5360, 5584 (iii).

Chateauguay and Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Cigarettes, Prohibition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 843 (i).

——— *See* 'Criminal Code B. 215.'

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12368 (v); in Com. on B., 13813, 13834; on M. for 3°, 13946 (vi).

Clergue Contract with Govt. for Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Collingwood Dry Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks.'

Country Postmasters, Salary, &c., in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5678 (iii).

Cricket Playing on Parlt. Grounds: *See* 'Parliament,' &c.

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7491, 7501 (iii); (cigarettes) 10748 (v).

Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 4010 (ii).

Debates, Official, 6th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 9350 (iv).

Discriminating Freight Rates *re* Ocean Vessels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13688 (vi).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 894 (i); in Com., 13584 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3010, 3026 (ii).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Embargo on Cattle: *See* 'Cattle.'

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s incorp. B. 134 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 3226, 3580, 3751 (ii).

Ewart, Mr., Address to Judge *re* Treadgold Commission, &c. (remarks) 11072 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 296 (i).

Fast Atlantic: *See* 'Atlantic.'

Fitzgerald, W. W., Homestead Pre-emption (M. for cor.) 289 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 10811; in Com. on B., 12299 (v).

Franking of Provincial Documents, 14036 (vi).

Freight Rates: *See* 'Rys.,' 'Discriminating,' &c.

Geological Survey, Maps: *See* 'Maps.'

Germans in Canada, Recruiting for Naval Service (remarks) 8717 (iv).

German Tariff Cor., Papers laid on Table (remarks) 1460 (i).

Govt. Business, &c. (remarks) 13547 (vi).

——— Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.--*Con.*

Govt. Business, &c. *See* 'Business of the House,' &c.

Grain Blockade in N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grain Weighers: *See* 'Inspection.'

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 3°, 8057 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 8746 (iv); in Com. on B., 10424, 10635, 11307, 11390, 11393, 11967, 11975, 12064, 12111, 12206, 12235 (v); on M. for 3°, 12657 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order, *re* Irregularity of Introduction of B., Speaker's ruling asked for, 7726 (iv), 12774 (vi).

——— 'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

——— (M.) that Com. rise, 10633 (v).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13268, 13273 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets., Ques. of Order, 13266 (vi).

——— *See* 'Ry. Policy.'

G. T. P. Bill 235, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8919 (iv).

Halifax Elevator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).

'Hansard' Reporters not reporting Com., Mr. Speaker's ruling asked for, 10633 (v).

Haycock, Mr., Inspector of Binder Twine, Authority to Inflict Penalties, Opinion of Min. of Jus., 14044 (vi).

Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt., Amount paid by Can., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 679 (i).

Hides Inspection, Tel. from W. F. Maclean, M.P. (read) 3969 (ii).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 742 (i).

Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 1642 (i).

Immigration, Inadequate Inspection, on M. for Sup., 6590 (iii).

——— *See* 'Barr.'

Imperial Defences, and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery (remarks) 410 (i).

Insolvency B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 2°, 3249 (ii).

Inspection, General, Act (weighmasters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 14311 (vi).

Intercolonial Conference, Cor. *re* (remarks) 8230 (iv).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10799 (v).

Joint High Commission, Letter *re* Reciprocity (read) 14053 (vi).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 10788; in Com. on B., 11418 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (Quebec) 12301 (v).

——— Retiring Allowances B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103, 8371 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 14290 (vi).

Kingston Penitentiary, Contracts *re* Groceries, &c. (Ques.) 10100 (v).

——— *See* 'Supply—Justice, Penitentiaries.'

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res, 14490 (vi).

Lake St. John Ry. to La Tuque, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8201 (iv).

Librarians of Parlt. B. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 13832; in Com. on B., 14299 (vi).

Lt. Governor of Ont., Appnmt. of Administrator, on M. for Com. of Sup,, 121 (i).

——— (remarks) 663, 1206 (i).

Loan Companies, Extension of Powers B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2351 (i).

Lumber Combine in N. W. T. (remarks) 1587 (i).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, Complaints *re* (remarks) 14225 (vi).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Maps, Printing for Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Geological.'

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5097 (ii), 5359 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Lighthouse,' &c,

Martineau, Inquiry for Papers, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Militia.'

Matane and Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com on Res., 14484 (vi).

Meaford, Ry. to Wharf, &c. (remarks) 14507 (vi).

Midway to Vernon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Militia Force, Condition, &c., on M. (Mr. *Thompson*) 5715 (iii)

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *F. W. Borden*) on M. for 1°, 872; in Com., 2240 (i).

Milk Cans B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 282 (i).

Montreal and Atlantic and South Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal *Herald* and Mr. Fisher: *See* 'Privilege.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5418 (iii).

Mowat, Sir Oliver: *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'

Mulloy, Trooper of S. A. Contingent, Pension by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14593 (vi).

Nationality of Mr. Gallery, 13506 (vi).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

New Canadian Co.'s B. 83 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 1512 (i).

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Newspaper Postage: *See* 'Post Office B. 208.'

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B., on M. to receive Pet., 5511 (iii).

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Ry. and Coal Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

Nicolet River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Nova Scotia and Eastern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).

N. W. T. Govt. Subsidy B. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 12310 (v).

Ottawa Buildings, Govt. Offices rented, leased, &c. (M. for ret.) 588 (i).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1314 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6270; in Com. on B., 6806 (iii).

Ottawa Northern and C. P. Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 2° m., 1511 (i).

Parliamentary Documents, Postage *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).

Parliament Grounds, Mutilation, &c. (remarks) 2398, 2421 (i).

Paspebiac to Gaspé Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10825 (v).

Penny Banks Establishment B. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10797 (v).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec Districts) Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12782; in Com., 13630 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 5241; in Com., 5667 (iii).

Post Office Revenue, Increase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup,, 14033 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks B. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6814 (iii).

Preferential Trade, Offer of Can. Govt. to G.B. (remarks) 3219 (ii).

Press Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British,' &c.

Prime Minister, Congratulations *re* twenty-five years as Member (remarks) 11690 (v).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (remarks) 2396 (i); 4958 (ii); 10490 (v).

——— Notices, &c., on M. (Mr. *Demers*) to amend Rules; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13548 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors to Corridors, 11563 (v).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10503, 10513 (v).

Procedure *re* Adjournment of Hse. (remarks) 6630 (iii).

Provincial Autonomy to N.W.T.: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Public Accounts Com., producing Census Schedules (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Quebec Bridge Resolutions (remarks) 14042, 14280, 14402 (vi).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 563 (i).

Ry. Commissioners Salaries (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8122 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 264 (i); in Com., 3542, 3716, 3834, 3856, 3883, 3991 (ii), 5250, 5568, 5688, 6121, 6174, 6203, 6279 (iii), 8194 (iv); (telephones) 5519 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to M. for 3°, 8352 (iv); on Sen. Amts., 13835 (vi).

——— on M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com. *re* Senate Amts., 14520 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order *re* (Mr. *Campbell*) 6105 (iii).

——— Labour Disputes B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2557 (ii).

Railway Appropriations voted by Parlt., Transferred to other Appropriations, 14060 (vi).

Railways constructed without Govt. Aid, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 8487 (iv).

Ry. Mail Clerks, in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5667 (iii).

Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt. (remarks) 6426 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7118 (iii).

Ry. Rates, Control by Govt., Sec. 6 of Res. (remarks) 14502 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies by Provs., Amounts to each Prov., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14484 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies, General Policy (remarks) in Com. on Res., 14363 (vi).

——— (inquiry) 11422 (v).

——— Payments of, &c. (remarks) 14513 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14320, 14431; (cost of ry. bridges) 14512; auditing books by Aud. Gen., 14516 (vi).

Ry. Transportation in N.W.T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2496 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. and Joint High Commission, Letter from an M.P. (read) 14053 (vi). *See* 'Joint.'

Red Deer Valley Ry. & Coal Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 1813 (i).

Representation in the House of Commons, B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°, 713; on M. for 2°, 1282; (amt.) 1284; neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1292 (i); in Com., 10944; 10958, 11057, 11470, 11511, 11584, 11628, 12294; (Brant) 11105; on Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) to M. for 3°, 12433 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Representation in the House of Commons, Evidence, Papers, &c. (remarks) 11424 (v).

Representation in H. of C. from Ont., Cor., &c. (M. for copies *) 2337 (i).

Rosebery and Imperial Defence : *See* 'Imperial.'

St. Francis River Ry. Bridge Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).

Salmon Industry, B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9979 (iv).

San José Scale *re* Nursery Stock (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13502 (vi).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) in Com., 3225 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); in Com. 6481, 7212 (iii).

Senate Amts. to Money Bills, Unconstitutionalty of (remarks) 14290 (vi).

Settlers' Claims *re* Rebellion of 1885, on M. for Sup., 13950 (vi).

Shipping Federation of Canada incorp. B. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 2° m., 1328 (i).

South African Medals, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8267, 8320 (iv).

See 'Hay,' &c.

South-eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c., on M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 457 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission, Names, Progress, &c. (Ques.) 1029 (i).

Statutes, Revised, Publication Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 634 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 6542 (iii).

Steel Rails, Clergue's Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7046 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Bill 218 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 6171 (iii).

——— (remarks) *re* one-fifth vote, 6408 (iii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 13506; (archives) 13503; (Can. exhibit at Imp. Institute) 13511 (vi); (census schedules) 7054; (census, total cost) 7053; (cold storage) 7637; (creameries) 7636 (iv); (fumigating stations) 13502; (Toronto industrial exhibition) 13051; (tuberculosis, aid to Can. association) 13517 (vi).

Canals (Galops rapids, deepening, &c.) 8396 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (coaling facilities) 7561; (construction) 7560 (iii).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes, printing) 14252; (public debt) 14254 (vi).

Civil Govt. : Aud. General (promotions) 14256 (vi); Customs (salaries) 319 (i); Geological Survey (Low, Mr., salary) 13771; (salaries) 13770, 13771 (vi); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 13772 (vi); Indian Affairs (salaries) 282 (i); 13760 (vi); Interior (salaries) 13762; (Mines branch, salaries) 13764 (vi); Labour Dept. (salaries) 7151 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342 (i); (salaries) 13663 (vi); N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 13761 (vi); Public Works (architect's salary) 13499 (salaries) 13500 (vi); Railways and Canals (2nd class clerk) 14055 (vi); (salaries) 333 (i); Sec. of State (clerks' salaries) 14254 (vi).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3782, 3787, 3901; (inspectors, preventive service, &c.) 3952; (preferential tariff) 3932; (stationery, &c.) 3964 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Banff, roads and bridges) 6788; (boundary delimitations) 6791; (commissioner's salary) 6765; (inspectors' expenses) 6766 (iii); (maps, printing, &c.) 14272; (salaries, outside service) 13772 (vi); (surveys, &c.) 6759 (iii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 13777 (vi); (tree culture) 6779 (iii).

Excise (analysts, &c.) 5393; (inspectors' salaries) 5381; (liquor analysis) 5396 (iii).

Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5279, 5293 (iii); (fish hatcheries) 13660 (vi); (salaries) conc., 6069; (steamers, construction, &c.) 5296 (iii); (steamers, new) 13659 (vi); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Geological Survey (coal discovery, Sudbury) 6824; (exploration, &c.) 6822 (iii); (maps, lithographing, &c.) 13778 (vi); (plans, plottings, &c.) 6827 (iii).

Govt. of N. W. T. (registrars, &c.) 13787 (vi).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6658; (Ellis, Dr., inspector) 6702; (expenditure) 6616 (iii); (general expenses) 2300 (i); (trachoma, &c.) 6843 (iii).

Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 13785 (vi); (schools, medical attendance) 7255 (iii); (steam launch) 13787 (vi).

Generally (agency inspectors) 6425; (general vote) 6425; (legal expenses) 6418 (iii).

Man., &c. (agricultural implements, &c.) 6422; (medical attendance) 6351 (iii); (agricultural implements) 13782; (industrial schools) 13784; (medical attendance, Dr. West) 13784; (surveys) 13784; (triennial clothing) 13783 (vi).

N. W. T. (supplies) 6422 (iii).

N. S. (medical attendance and medicines) 6421; (seed grain, relief, &c.) 6417, 6420 (iii).

Ont. (Dr. Secord) 6327 (iii).

Ont. and Que. (Doncaster reserve road) 13780 (vi); (medical attendance) 6327 (iii); (Rama indians, roads, &c.) 13781; (roads, repairs) 13779 (vi).

Que. (St. Regis lockup) 6416 (iii).

Yukon (relief, medical attendance, &c.) 7270 (iii).

Inland Revenue (Bourassa, Mr., guarantee policy) 5407; (Ferguson, Mr., legal services) 5412 (iii).

Interior (assay office, Vancouver) 6799; (astronomical observatory) 6791; (Keewatin govt.) 6797; (Keewatin lunatics) 6798; (litigation expenses) 6794; (telescope for observatory) 6792 (iii).

Justice, Administration of: B. C. (Judges' travelling allowance) 3400 (ii).

Exchequer Court (salaries) 3406 (ii).

Generally (executions, expenditure) 3401 (ii).

N.W.T. (Supreme Court judge) 14258 (vi).

Ont. (Nipissing judgeship) 14258 (vi).

Supreme Court (library) 3404 (ii).

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414 (ii); (law library) 14267 (vi); (living allowance, judges) 3411; (living allowances, officials) 3411 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.
Penitentiaries (binder twine) 3513; (Kingston) 3511; (Manitoba) 3534; (St. Vincent de Paul) 3534 (ii).
Labour Dept. (*Gazette*, printing, &c.) 7197 (iii).
Legislation: House of Commons (*Advocate*, Prince Albert, printing) 14269 (vi); (messengers, &c.) 5265 (iii), 14243 (vi); (printing, advertising, &c.) 5268 (iii); (salaries, increases) 14112 (vi); (voters' lists) 5274 (iii).
Library of Parlt., 5267 (iii).
Senate (contingencies) 5264 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agency, Montreal) 13632; (gas lights) 13635; (Halifax harbour, buoys) 13639; (Marconi stations) 13640; (St. Lawrence lights) 13632; (sweeping boats) 13636 (vi).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 13678 (vi); (freight rates, &c.) 7586 (iii); (G.B. and Can.) 13672; (Magdalen islands) 13676 (vi); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv); (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 13674; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 13677; (Victoria and Vancouver) 13694; (wrecking plant) 13698 (vi).
Militia (annual drill) 3606, 5005; (cadet training) 3773 (ii); (Dom. arsenal) 7089 (iii); (Esquimalt defences) 3778; (G.O.C.) 3780; (grants to associations) 3773; (Martineau investigation) 3752; (pay and allowance) 3601; (Valleyfield strike) 3753 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Perkins, Wm., Lisgar election petition) 14251 (vi); (tobacco commission) 8268 (iv); Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).
N.W. Mounted Police (compensation for injuries) 5264 (iii); (Yukon) 5003 (ii); (Yukon, salaries) 5263 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (life-saving awards) 13544 (vi); (masters and mates examination) 13525 (vi); (St. Lawrence transportation) 4046 (ii); (surveys, northern coast) 13760; (wrecks, investigation) 13545 (vi).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 972 (i).
N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (St. John quarantine water service) 415 (i).
N.S. (Halifax) 411 (i).
Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 494; (Bowmanville) 510; (Clinton P.O.) 523; (Cobourg armoury) 640; (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 636; (Guelph P.O.) 638; (Kingston military stables) 639; (London, drill hall) 645; (Toronto, custom house) 649; (Toronto, post office) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i).
Ottawa (additional land) 353; (astronomical observatory) 342; (electric lighting) 988; (furniture, &c.) 980; (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647 (i); (Rideau Hall grounds) 5006 (ii); (Royal Mint) 348; (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
Que. (hospital for trachoma) 14246 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).
Docks (repairs, &c.) 2978, 2979 (ii).
Dredging (dredge vessels) 2612; (new dredges) 2673 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Arrow Lakes) 13305; (Columbia River) 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Williams Head, wharf) 13306;

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
(general vote) 13308 (vi).
Generally (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2650 (ii).
Man. (Dauphin Lake) 1448; (Gull Harbour) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Manitoba Lake) 1449 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3356; (snag boat) 2672 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).
Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2669 (ii); (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi).
Ont. (Bowmanville, pier) 1353; (Depot Harbour) 1359 (i); (dredging plant) 2672 (ii); (general repairs) 1372; (Goderich harbour) 1368; (Lake Temiscamingue, wharf) 1376; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442, 1447 (i); (Port Arthur) 3348 (ii); (Point au Baril route) 1365; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope, pier) 1425; (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (St. Joseph's wharf) 3385 (ii); (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431; (Southampton, harbour) 1428; (Thornbury, harbour) 1432 (i); 13450 (vi); (Wendover, wharf) 1438 (i).
P. E. I. (dredging plant) 13314 (vi).
Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446; (Caplan, breakwater) 13449; (Chambord, wharf) 13454; (Chateau Richer) 13456; (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278 (i); (Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallée, pier) 1514, 1523; (Grosse Isle) 425; (Kamouraska, pier) 13458 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2247; (Le Tableau, wharf) 2256 (i); (Lotbinière wharf) 13460; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2269; (Newport, breakwater) 2277; (Nicolet River) 2278; (Pointe St. Pierre) 2279; (repairs, improvements) 2241; (Rivière aux Renards) 2280; (St. Francis, ice pier) 2284 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3310 (ii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258; (St. Maurice, dredging) 2286 (i); (Seven Islands, wharf) 13483; (Sorel, wharf) 12856, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs) 2297 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 13363 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, N.W.T. (Peace River, pack trail) 13324; (Pelly River bridge) 13368; Ottawa (Dufferin, &c.) 13321 (vi).
Slides and Booms (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2975 (ii).
Telegraph Lines—B.C. (working expenses) 13368 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325 (vi).
Que. (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13325 (vi).
Yukon (generally) 2994 (ii); (Yukon, working expenses) 14041 (vi).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 5503; hog cholera) 5505 (iii); (public health) 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii); (small-pox) 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
Railways—G.T.R. (rental) 12887 (vi).
I.C.R. (Connolly's claims) 14105 (vi); (draw bars, exchange) 8289; (Halifax, accommodation) 8316 (iv); 12825; (general vote) 12877 (vi); (Moncton work shops) 8313; (Pintsch gas equipment) 8292; (rolling stock) 8294

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—Con.

(iv); 14100; (St. John accommodation) 12823; (sidings, additional) 14055 (vi); (steel rails, &c.) 5006 (ii); 14097 (vi); (Toronto stock yards) 8317 (iv).

P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 12829, 12838, 14117 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi); (Eldorado Gusher) 7277; (hospital grants) 7291; (roads and bridges) 7283 (iii).

Supreme Court Registrar B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14308, 14403 (vi).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304 (v).

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4908 (ii).

Tilsonburg and Lake Erie Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14385 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14430 (vi).

Tobin Co. and Trois Pistoles Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 14462 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 9425 (iv).

Transcontinental Ry. B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for 1°; Ques. of Order, 7726 (iv).

——— *See* 'G.T.P. B. 235.'

Transportation Commission, in Com. of Sup., 13363 (vi).

——— Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (ii).

——— Par. in Montreal *Herald re* Mr. Préfontaine's Speech (remarks) 865 (i).

——— *See* Rys.,' &c.

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson newspapers (remarks) 11070 (v).

——— (remarks) 13792 (vi).

Trent Canal, Surveys, &c., on M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Ret., 2331 (i).

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2343 (i).

Westminster Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) on M. to receive Pet., 10744 (v).

Winnipeg Beach to Icelandic River, Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14339 (vi).

York and Carleton Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act (approval of regulations) in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Yukon, Regulations *re* Dom. Lands, in Com. on Res., 13792 (vi).

Stephens, Mr. G., *Kent (O)*.

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 2675 (ii).

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 841 (i).

Stephens, Mr. G.—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9963 (iv).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8103 (iv).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11005; (Kent) 11576 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6183 (iii); (drainage) 4751 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7213, 7235 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4097 (ii).

Stewart, Mr. D. A., *Lisgar*.

Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c. (M. for ret.) 847 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan & Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 157) in Com., 5985 (iii).

Grain Weighing in Man. and N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. on B. 188, 4194 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10235 (v).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co. (B. 124) 1°*, 1764 (i).

Morden Board of Trade, Res. *re* Wheat Freight Rates (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sessions of the Hse., Date of Meeting, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 469 (i).

SUPPLY:

Excise (Fyfe, Mr., salary) 5384 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (scales) Amt. B. 188 (Mr. *Bernier*) in Com., 4194 (ii).

Wheat Freight Rates, Res. of Morden Board of Trade (Ques.) 12074 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James (Minister of Public Works) *N. Oxford*.

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Reported Interview of Mr. Aylesworth (remarks) 13961 (vi).

Amherst, Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1591 (i).

Anglo-American Tel. Co. and P. E. I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13338 (vi).

Annandale ier, P. E. I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2921 (ii).

Armouries Construction: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Generally.'

Arsenault, Capt., Compensation for Damages to Schooner (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

Art Gallery, Expenditure on Paintings, &c. (Ans.) 12717 (vi).

Assiniboine and Red Rivers Navigation, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

——— Rep. of Board of Trade, Winnipeg (Ans.) 1860 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5888, 5961, 6846 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11171 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Representation and Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7103 (iii).

Blind River Wharf, Contracts, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 1298 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6656 (iii).

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14439 (vi).

C. P. R. car 001, Improvements to, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

C. P. R. (Kirkella to Elkhorn) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14498 (vi).

Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s incorp. B. 176 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 5885 (iii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12502 (v).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3537 (ii).

Digby Port, Wharf Extension, &c. (Ans.) 2101 (i).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Dredges, New, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 1856 (i).

Dunnville Dredging: *See* 'Grand River.'

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

Electric Lighting of Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 3235 (ii).

Electric Lighting of Chamber, Change of Lamps, &c. (Ans.) 816 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Emerson Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

Eureka, Str., Loaned by Govt. (Ans.) 14285 (vi).

——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

Fielding, Dredge, Plans for Construction, &c. (Ans.) 14283 (vi).

Fishing Industry in N. S., Accommodation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13156 (vi).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c. (Ans.) 666 (i).

Fuel Contracts, Interest on unpaid Accounts (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Gananoque and Brockville Channel, Dredging, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13320 (vi).

Geological Museum, Construction (Ans.) 11188 (i).

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Bldgs., Ottawa.'

Georgian Bay Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13345 (vi).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 941 (i).

Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

Grand River, Dredging at Dunnville, &c. (Ans.) 12498 (v), 13027 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5154, 5233 (iii), 7856 (iv).

——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Maclean*) 7815 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10593, 11202 (v).

Harrison, Mr., Resignation as Inspector of Fisheries (Ans.) 288 (i).

Immigrants at Quebec, Medical Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 5318 (iii).

Imperial Building, Ottawa, Govt. Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 3803 (ii).

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 258.'

International Dredge Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 12218 (v).

Isle of Orleans, Cable: *See* 'Submarine.'

James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi).

Jerome, Martin, and Man. Elections, &c. (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

King Edward VII., Portrait: *See* 'Portrait.'

Lake Superior Ry. (Peninsula Harbour) Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14505 (vi).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Charges against (Ans.) 2922 (ii).

L'Assomption Post Office, Site, &c. (Ans.) 3230 (ii).

Le Canada and L. J. Latour *re* Circular issued, &c. (Ans.) 1033 (i).

Listowel Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Lobster Packing Factory in N. S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).

Loy: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).

Mara, Rama, &c., Flooding of Lands, on M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2764 (ii).

Marine Engineers B.: *See* 'Steamboat,' &c.

Martineau Commission Report, and Fire Protection: *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.

Medical Examiner at Quebec of Immigrants (Ans.) 3536 (ii).

Midland Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5751 (iii).

Mint Building, Establishment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 14244 (vi).

Mint, Canadian, Erection of (Ans.) 10955 (v).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4457 (ii).

Montreal Harbour Sheds, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 14282 (vi).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1594 (i).

Nepean Point, Ottawa, Improvement, &c. (Ans.) 11829 (v).

Nepigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Ottawa Buildings, Leases and Rentals for Govt. Offices, on M. (Mr. *Sproule*) for Ret. *re*, 589 (i).

——— Fire Protection, Rep. *re* Martineau Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 4674 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial,' 'Woods,' &c.

Owen Sound Harbour, Water Lot, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (iii).

Parliament Buildings, Lighting: *See* 'Electric.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i), 13119 (vi).

Portrait of King Edward, Painting, &c., by Canadian Artists (Ans.) 13026 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. (B. 208) 1°m., 5240 (iii).

P. E. I. Telegraph System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Tel. Lines,' &c.

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters' and Western Rys., 10511 (v).

Public Works Act Amt. (B. 193) 1°m., 3970; in Com., 4221 (ii).

Public Works, Deptl. Report (presented) 6 (i).

Public Works Employees, Dismissals, Promotions, &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1058 (i).

Public Works, Amount expended by Govt. in Provs. (Ans.) 1197 (i).

Quebec Harbour Pier, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 3972 (ii).

——— Construction of, &c. (remarks) 2238 (i).

Racette, Vital, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 3231 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3559 (ii),

——— supplies for I. C. R. Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12959 (vi).

Ry. Subsidies B. 270 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14382, 14428, 14505 (vi).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., on Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2489 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10964, 11436, 11462, 11572, 11622; (Brant) 11109; (Dauphin) 11748; (Portage la Prairie) 11781; (Toronto) 11693; (Waterloo) 11647; (York) 11665; on M. for 3°, 12395; on Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) to M. for 3°, 12458; on Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) to M. for 3°, 12468 (v).

——— Printing of Evidence *re* (remarks) 11423 (v).

Richelieu River Inundations, &c. (Ans.) 10496 (v).

Roseau River Reserve, Sale of Lots (Ans.) 5320 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment (Ans.) 285 (i).

St. Andrews Rapids, Bridge Construction (Ans.) 14284 (vi).

——— Contract, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 288 (i).

——— Expiration of Contract (Ans.) 10490 (v).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

St. Boniface, Money Order Branch, Closing (Ans.) 5321 (iii).

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Gananoque,' 'Supply—Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4590 (ii).

St. Mary's River Ry. (Galt Road) Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ans.) 5587 (iii).

Skinner's Pond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

Sorel Wharf, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for Papers, 2302 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbonrs and Rivers, Quebec.'

Springhill, N.S., Explosion in Dom. Building, Report *re* (read) 13257 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 3293 (ii).

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7027 (iii).

Sturgeon Falls Pulp and Lumber Co. (remarks) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14428 (vi).

Submarine Cable to Isle of Orleans (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Summerside, P.E.I., Breakwater, Completion of Work, &c. (Ans.) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Welland (Dunnville, dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.: Customs (contingencies) 332 (i).
Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 239 (i).
Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 342; (salaries) 341 (i).
Public Works (architect's salary) 13498 (vi); (contingencies) 5824 (iii); (Hunter, J. B., salary) 13499; (salaries) 333 (i), 13500 (vi).

Fisheries (Hurley, J. M., inspector) 5129 (ii).

Justice, Administration of: Supreme Court (library) 3403 (ii).

Legislation: Elections (*Advocate*, Prince Albert printing) 14271 (vi).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Pratt & Co.'s lease of water front) 5751 (iii); (St. Lawrence navigation) 4148 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 13676 (vi).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4071; (meteorological service) 4118 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, B.C. (Nelson P. O.) 13131; (Rossland, armoury) 13133; (Rossland P. O.) 13131; (Vancouver P. O.) 13132 (vi).
Dom. (architect's office) 961; (caretakers) 1021; (electric power) 1067; (furniture) 1006; (heating, &c.) 1065; (lighting, &c.) 1067; (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (rents, &c.) 13133 (vi); (water supply) 1067 (i).
Generally (armouries) 965; (clerks of works) 963; (experimental farms) 972 (i); (immigrant buildings) 14247 (vi).
Man. (immigration, hospitals, &c.) 5845 (iii); (Winnipeg, immigration station) 13126; (Winnipeg, military buildings) 13127; (Winnipeg, military stores) 13126; (Winnipeg P.O.) 13127 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 422 (i).

N.B. (Campbellton P.O.) 13037 (vi); Dom. buildings) 421 (i); (Fredericton, military buildings) 13041 (vi); (Marysville) 5841 (iii); (Moncton P.O.) 13038; (Newcastle, improvements) 13038 (vi); (Richibucto) 412 (i); (St. John, drill hall) 13042 (vi); (St. John, immigrant shed, &c.) 412 (i), 13040 (vi); (St. John, quarantine water service) 414, 486 (i), 13041; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13038; (Woodstock, armoury) 13039; (Woodstock P. O.) 13041 (vi).

N. S. (Antigonish, post office) 13034 (vi); (Arichat) 5827 (iii); (Digby) 13034 (vi); (Guysborough) 5830 (iii); (Halifax, building) 411 (i); (Halifax, custom house) 13031; (Halifax, immigration shed) 13033 (vi); (Lawlor's Island, quarantine station) 412 (i); (Middleton, armoury) 5841 (iii); (North Sydney, post office) 13035; (Springhill, repairs) 14247; (Sydney Mines) 13028; (Sydney, post office) 13035 (vi).

N.W.T. (court-houses, &c.) 958 (i); (Edmonton jail) 13129 (vi); (Macleod, court-house) 959 (i); (Moosejaw P.O.) 13130; (Prince Albert court-house) 13129 (vi); (Red Deer, court-house) 960; (renewals, &c.) 959 (i); (Strathcona Horse barracks) 13130 (vi); (Yorkton, court-house) 961 (i).

Ont. (Alexandria P.O.) 487; (architects) 524 (i); (Belleville, armoury) 13082 (vi); (Bowmanville) 508 (i); (Brantford, drill hall) 13108; (Bridgeburg, P.O.) 13113 (vi); (Clinton P. O.) 518; (Cobourg armoury) 640 (i); (Cobourg, P.O.) 13118 (vi); (Deseronto) 5842 (iii); (Deseronto, P.O.) 13112 (vi); (Dom. buildings, renewals) 636 (i); (Fort William) 636 (i); (Guelph, armoury) 13083 (vi); (Guelph P.O.) 637 (i); (Hamilton, building) 13113 (Hawkesbury, P.O.) 13119; (Kingston, barracks) 13118 (vi); (Kingston military stables) 638 (i); (Kingston, military school) 5842 (iii), 13094; (Kingston, military college stables) 13117 (vi); (London drill hall) 641 (i); (London, magazine) 13115 (vi); (Orillia, caretaker) 1016 (i); (Oshawa, P.O.) 13110; (Picton, P.O.) 13113; (St. Catherines, drill hall) 13106; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107; (Sarnia, P. O.) 13118; (Stratford, armoury) 13125; (vi); (Toronto, branch post office) 5920 (iii); (Toronto custom-house) 648, 958 (i); (Toronto, drill hall) 13115; (Toronto examining warehouse) 13118: (Toronto, military buildings) 13086, 13115 (vi); (Toronto, post office) 956 (i), 5842 (iii); (Toronto P.O., addition) 13096; (Toronto postal station) 13112 (vi); (Toronto, rec. gen.'s office, vault) 5842 (iii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 956; (Toronto Junction, post office) 650 (i); (Windsor, P.O.) 13113; (Wingham, P.O.) 13120; (Woodstock, armoury) 13125; (Woodstock, P. O.) 13108 (vi).

Ottawa (additional land) 353 (i); (additional rooms, H. of C.) 13096 (vi); (astronomical observatory) 342 (i); (bacteriological laboratory) 5842 (iii); (census building) 991 (i); (coal sheds) 13115 (vi);

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con*

Public Works—Con.

Buildings—*Con.*

Ottawa—*Con.*

(electric lighting) 988 (i); (electric light; ing, transformers) 5843 (iii); (elevators-1012 (i), 13115 (vi); (furniture, &c.) 973; (geological museum) 352; (grounds) 1015; (heating, &c.) 1008; (light, maintenance) 974, 1012; (Major's Hill park) 1015 (i); (paving, tar macadam) 13119 (vi); (post-office, elevator) 5844 (iii); (post office, improvements) 13117 (vi); (rentals, &c.) 989; (Rideau Hall, drainage) 647; (Rideau Hall, light, &c.) 1005; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 995 (i); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 13087 (vi); (Royal Mint) 344 (i); (steel shelving) 13087 (vi); (telephones) 1013 (i); (ventilation of chamber) 13011 (vi); (Victoria museum) 365 (i), 14243; (Western Block, heating) 13087 (vi).

P. E. I. (Charlottetown, armoury) 13035; (Charlottetown, Dom. building) 13036 (vi).

Que. (Acton Vale P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Grosse Isle) 425; (L'Assomption) 427; (Lévis) 431 (i); (Lévis, P.O.) 13053, 13055; (Longueuil, P.O.) 13070; (Magog, P.O.) 13081 (vi); (Montmagny) 5841 (iii); (Montmagny, P.O.) 13066; (Montreal, barracks) 13076 (vi); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 433 (i), 13058; (Montreal, P.O.) 13067; (Montreal, postal station) 13081 (vi); (Montreal, renewals, &c.) 437 (i); (Quebec, citadel) 13053; (Quebec, citadel drill shed) 13056; (Quebec, drill hall addition) 13077; (Quebec, hospital for trachoma) 14245; (Quebec, marine stores) 13053; (Quebec, military buildings) 13054; (Quebec, military iron foundry) 14247 (vi); (Quebec, renewals, &c.) 422; (St. Hyacinthe) 439 (i); (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 13067; (St. John's examining warehouse) 13069; (St. John's P.O.) 13059; (St. Louis de Mile-End, P.O.) 13080; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 13079; (Terrebonne, P.O.) 13059 (vi); (Thetford Mines) 441 (i); (Three Rivers, custom house), 13080; (Three Rivers, heating, &c.) 13069 (vi); (Valleyfield, P.O.) 443 (i).

Yukon (White Horse, P.O.) 13133 (vi).

Docks (commission's rep.) 2983 (ii); (Kingston graving dock) 13023 (vi); (Lévis graving dock) 2979 (ii).

Dredging (vessels repairs) 2612; (dredges, new, Que.) 2674; (Ont. and Que. dredging plant) 2671 (ii).

Generally (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Anderson Lake) 1451 (i); (Arrow Lakes) 13304 (vi); (Columbia river) 1451 (i), 13304; (dredging plant, &c.) 13311 (vi); (Esquimalt, graving dock) 5919 (iii); (Fraser river, improvements) 13305; (Hardy Bay, wharf) 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi); (Mr. Sinclair's dismissal) 1451; (Quatsino, wharf) 13305; (Victoria Harbour, dredging) 13306; (Williams Head quarantine wharf) 13306 (vi).

Generally, 13308 (vi); (new dredges) 2673; (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii), 13024 (vi).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Man. (Dauphin lake) 1448 (i); (dredging) 2665 (ii); (dredging plant) 13311 (vi); (Gimli, wharf) 1450; (Gull Harbour, wharf) 1448; (Hnausa, wharf) 1448; (Lake Francis outlet) 1449 (i); (*Manitoba*, dredge) 13311 (vi); (Manitoba Lake) 1449; (repairs, &c.) 1448 (i); (St. Andrews Rapids) 3354 (ii); (Selkirk, wharf) 1450 (i); (snag boat) 2673 (ii); (White Mud, dredging) 1450 (i).

Mar. Provs. (dredging plant) 2665 (ii); (dredging, &c., salaries) 13309 (vi); (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi); (repairs, &c.) 1185 (i).

N. B. (Alma Pier) 1184; (Anderson's Hollow) 1163 (i); (Arsenault, Capt., damages, &c.) 13231 (vi); (Bay du Vin) 1164 (i); (Black Brook) 13228 (vi); (Campbellton, wharf) 1164 (i); 13005, 13229; (Campobello, breakwater) 13228; (Cape Tormentine) 13228 (vi); (Caraquet wharf) 1173 (i); (Chatham, lightship) 13231; (Cocagne wharf, damages, &c.) 13231; (Dalhousie wharf) 13233; (Dipper Harbour, breakwater) 13233; (Grand Manan, breakwater) 13234 (vi); (Great Salmon River) 1177 (i); (Hopewell Cape, wharf) 13233 (vi); (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177 (i); (Miscou, wharf) 13234 (vi); (Negro Point breakwater) 1181; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181 (i); (Petit Rocher) 13234; (Pointe du Chêne) 13235 (vi); (Richibucto wharf) 1177 (i); 13235 (vi); (St. Andrews wharf) 5894 (iii); (St. John harbour) 1183; (St. John river wharfs) 1178; (St. John tributaries) 1177 (i); (Shippegan harbour) 1183 (i).

N. S. (Abbot's Harbour) 13141; (Abram's wharf) 13141 (vi); (Amagandus wharf) 1068 (i); (Arichat) 13217 (vi); (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072 (i); (Baxter's, breakwater) 13142; (Bayfield, wharf) 13141; (Benoit's Cove) 13143; (Berlin, breakwater) 13180; (Big Harbour, wharf) 13143 (vi); (Big Pond, wharf) 1072, 1073 (i); (Breton Cove) 13151 (vi); (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (Cariboo island, causeway) 13179; (Chegoggin, pier) 13179; (Chéticamp, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Cheverie breakwater) 1078 (i); (Chezzetcook, breakwater) 13217 (vi); (Church Point, breakwater) 1078 (i); (Cow Bay, breakwater) 1078 (i); 13178 (vi); (Digby pier) 1083 (i); (Donald's Head, breakwater) 13179 (vi); (Drumhead, breakwater) 1083 (i); 13179; (Duncan's Cove, wharf) 13179; (East Bay, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Economy, wharf) 1087 (i); (Finlay Point) 13181; (Five Islands, wharf) 13180 (vi); (Fort Lawrence, pier) 1087 (i); 13181; (Freeport, pier) 13182 (vi); (Friar's Head, harbour) 1087 (i); (Frudes Point, wharf) 13180; (Gabarouse, breakwater) 13182; (Georgeville, wharf) 13198 (vi); (Glace Bay) 1087 (i); (Glace Bay, wharf) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang, entrance) 1095; (Grand Narrows, wharf) 1094 (i), 13198 (vi); (Grand River, entrance) 1094 (i); (Granite Village, pier) 13182 (vi); (Green Cove, harbour) 1100 (i); (Hall's harbour) 13198 (vi); (Hawk Point Inlet, channel) 1102; (Herring Cove, breakwater) 1102 (i); (Indian harbour, wharf) 13199; (Iona, harbour) 13200 (vi); (Janvrin's Island, wharf) 1102 (i); (Jeddore, wharf) 13179 (vi); (Judique, breakwater) 1103 (i); (Ketch, harbour) 13202 (vi); (Kingsport, pier) 1103 (i), 13202; (L'Ardoise, breakwater) 13201 (vi); (Larry's River, breakwater) 1104; (Lingan Beach) 1105 (i); (Livingstone Cove) 13200; (McKay's Point, wharf) 13201; (McNutt's Island, beach) 13201; (Main-à-Dieu) 13201; (Malagawatch, channel) 13203; (Malignant Cove) 13201 (vi); (Margaree, wharf) 1133 (i); (Margaretsville, breakwater) 13202; (Melbourne, wharf) 13203 (vi); (Meteghan Cove) 1133 (i); (Middle river, dam) 13202; (Morrison's point, wharf) 13203; (Musquodoboit, harbour) 13202; (Necum Teuch, wharf) 1137 (i), 13203 (vi); (Neil's Harbour) 1139; (New Campbellton, wharf) 1142; (New Harbour) 1144 (i); (Noel, wharf) 13204; (Ogden's Pond) 13204; (Oyster Pond) 13204; (Parrsborough, landing) 13205; (Pembroke, breakwater) 13205 (vi); (Petit du Grat, dredging) 1146 (i); (Pickett's, pier) 13205 (vi); (Pictou, light beach) 13205 (vi); (Poirierville, wharf) 1146 (i), 13205; (Porter's channel) 13206 (vi); (Port George, breakwater) 1146 (i), 13210; (Port Greville, breakwater) 13210 (vi); (Port Hastings, wharf) 1146; (Port Hawkesbury) 1146 (i); (Port Hood, pier) 13206; (Port Howe, wharf) 13210; (Port Latour, breakwater) 13210; (Port Maitland) 13211; (Port au Pique, wharf) 13211; (Prospect, wharf) 13205; (Pugwash, landing) 13205; (St. Ann, wharf) 13203; (Sable Island, East End) 13180 (vi); (Sandy Cove, breakwater) 1149 (i); (Scott's Bay) 13211 (vi); (Short Beach) 1149 (i); (Skinner's Cove) 13213 (vi); (South Ingonish, wharf) 1149 (i); (Spry Bay) 13213; (Summerville, wharf) 13213; (Swim's Point, wharf) 13211; (Sydney, quarantine wharf) 13213; (Tenecape, breakwater) 13213 (vi); (Tiverton, breakwater) 1150 (i); (Victoria, beach wharf) 13213; (Wallace, harbour) 13216 (vi); (Washabuck Centre, wharf) 1150 (i); (Wedge Point) 13217; (Wentworth, wharf) 13216 (vi); (West Baccaro, channel) 1150 (i); (West Bay, wharf) 13217; (White's Cove, breakwater) 13217; (Windsor Harbour, sheer dam) 14248; (Wolfville, wharf) 13217; (Yarmouth, bar) 13218 (vi).

N.W.T. (repairs, &c.) 1450 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i) 13235 (vi); (Barrie wharf) 1187 (i); (Barry's Bay) 13236 (vi); (Bayfield pier) 1188; (Belle Rivière) 1192 (i); (Blind River, wharf) 13235 (vi); (Bowmanville pier) 1352 (i); (Bracebridge, wharf) 13236 (vi); (Bronte, harbour) 1354 (i); (Bronte improvements) 13236 (vi); (Bruce Mines) 5911 (iii); (Burk's Falls) 1358; (Burlington channel) 1359 (i), 13237 (vi); (Cobourg, repairs) 5909 (iii); (Collingwood improve-

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ont.—*Con.*

ments) 13239; (Couchiching, Lake Simcoe) 13252; (Cumberland wharf) 13238; (vi); (Depot harbour) 1359 (i), 13239 (vi); (general repairs) 1369; (Goderich harbour) 1365 (i), 13240; (Gore's wharf) 13244; (Grand Bend, pier), 13239 (vi); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Kingsville) 13244 (vi); (Lake Temiscamingue wharf)1376(i); (Leamington, wharf) 13246; (Little Bear Creek) 13245; (Little Current) 13245 (vi); (Midland, dredging) 5909 (iii); (Midland, harbour) 1376 (i), 13246 (Oakville pier) 1376; (Orillia wharf) 1377 (i); (Ottawa River) 13251 (vi); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Parry Sound wharf) 13248; (Petewawa narrows) 1425, 1442 (i), 13251 (vi); (Pickering harbour) 1377; (Point au Baril route) 1365 (i); (Point Edward) 13249 (vi); (Port Arthur) 3341 (ii), 13012; (Port Burwell) 13249 (vi); (Port Colborne) 3368 (ii); (Point Edward, dredging) 1377; (Port Elgin, dredging) 1424; (Port Hope pier) 1425 (i); (Port Perry) 13249; (Port Stanley) 13249 (vi); (Prescott, dredging) 5915 (iii); (Rivière aux Puces) 1425; (Rondeau harbour) 1427 (i); (Rosedale, wharf) 13250 (vi); (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 13253 (vi); (Southampton harbour), 1428; (Sturgeon Falls, wharf) 1431 (i); (Sydenham river) 13250; (Thessalon, breakwater) 13254 (vi); (Thornbury harbour) 1432; (Toronto harbour) 1433 (i); (Toronto, Magann & Phinn claim) 13255, (Toronto, pier) 13255 (vi); (Trenton, dredging) 1434 (i); (Victoria harbour) 13255 (vi); (Wendover wharf) 1434 (i); (Wiarton wharf) 13256 (vi); (Wolfe Island dredging) 1443 (i), 13252 (vi).

P.E.I. (Aitken's wharf) 1159 (i); (Beach point) 13218 (vi); (Belfast, pier) 1153 (i); (Canoe Cove) 13218; (Cape Traverse, survey) 13219 (vi); (Cascumpec, harbour) 1153 (i); (Cove Head, channel) 13222 (vi); (Cove Head, harbour) 1155; (creosoted timber) 1155 (i); (dredging) 13310; (dredging plant) 13313 (vi); (Gaspereaux, harbour) 1155; (Higgin's shore pier) 1159 (i), 13222; (Lewis point, pier) 13223; (North Cardigan) 13223 (vi); (New London) 1160 (i); (New London, channel) 13223 (vi); (piers, repairs, &c.) 1161 (i); (Point Prim, wharf) 13223; (Richmond Bay) 13223; (Skinner's Pond) 13309 (vi); (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i); (Summerside, breakwater) 13224 (vi); (Summerside, harbour) 3367 (ii); (Tignish breakwater) 1162 (i).

Que. (Anse aux Gascons wharf) 13445; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 13445; (Anse St. Jean wharf) 13445; (Barachois de Malbaie breakwater) 13445 (vi); (Batiscan channel) 2280 (i); (Bois Brulé pier) 13448; (Bonaventure East, breakwater) 13446 (vi); (Cacouna wharf) 5896 (iii), 13442; (Caplan, breakwater) 13448; (Chambord, wharf) 13454 (vi); (Chateauguay river) 2280 (i), 3208 (ii); (Chateau Richer) 13455 (vi); (Crane Island, wharf) 1513; (Cross

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

Point pier) 1512 (i); (Desjardins, Allumette wharf) 13457 (vi); (Doucet's Landing) 5907 (iii); (Douglastown, isolated block) 13457 (vi); (Esquimaux Point) 2278; (Father Point, pier) 1513 (i); (Gatineau River, C. P. R. bridge) 13457; (Grande Rivière, wharf) 13457 (vi); (Grande Vallee, pier) 1514-72 (i); (Hull wharf) 5901 (iii); (Isle aux Coudres wharf) 2242 (i); (Isle Grosbois) 5902 (iii); (Kamouraska, pier) 13457; (Lake St. John, dredging) 13459 (vi); (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248 (i), 13460 (vi); (Le Tableau, wharf) 2249; (L'Ile d'Alma) 2257 (i); (Lotbinière, wharf) 13460 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2264 (i); (Maguasha, pier) 13461 (vi); (Maria pier) 2265 (i); (Mistook, wharf) 13461; (Mont Louis, wharf) 13461 (vi); (Montreal harbour) 3365 (ii); (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Newport breakwater) 2277 (i), 13462; (New Richmond breakwater) 13463 (vi); (Nicolet river) 2278 (i); (Nominingue Lake, wharfs) 13460; (Notre Dame du Portage) 13463; (Paspebiac landing pier) 13464; (Percé pier) 13467; (Pierreville, wharf) 13468; (Pointe Fortune, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Pointe St. Pierre) 2278 (i); (Pointe aux Trembles, wharf) 13468; (Port Daniel, wharf) 13468 (vi); (Quebec, harbour) 3336 (ii); (repairs, improvements) 2241 (i); (Repentigny, wharf) 13468; (Rimouski, pier, &c.) 13468 (vi); (river and bridge works) 5907 (iii); (Rivière Jesus, dredging) 13470; (Rivière du Loup, harbour) 13476 (vi); (Rivière du Loup, wharf) 2281 (i); (Rivière du Nord) 5907 (iii); (Rivière aux Renards) 2279 (i); (Rivière Verte) 13470 (vi); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289 (i); (St. Alphonse, Ha-Ha Bay) 13489 (vi); (St. André de Kamouraska, pier) 2290 (i); (Ste. Anne de la Pérade, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 13489; (Ste. Anne de Saguenay, wharf) 13488; (Ste. Anne de Sorel) 13489; (Ste. Famille, pier) 13488; (St. Fidèle, wharf) 13493 (vi); (St. Francis, ice pier) 2282; St. François, Orleans) 2290 (i); (St. Fulgence, wharf) 13491; (St. Gédéon Islands, wharf) 13491; (St. Godfroi de Nouvelle, breakwater) 13489 (vi); (St. Irénée, wharf) 2291 (i); (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13495 (vi); (St. Jerome, wharf) 2291 (i), 5909 (iii); (St. Laurent, wharf) 5906 (iii); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2257 (i); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 3218, 3304 (ii); (St. Louis river) 13473 (vi); (St. Maurice, Grandes Piles) 2286 (i); (St. Maurice River) 5904 (iii); (St. Maurice River, dam) 13491; (St. Michel de Bellechasse) 13494 (vi); (St. Nicholas, pier) 5905 (iii); (St. Simeon, wharf) 13493; (Sabrevois, wharf) 13485; (Sacré-Cœur, wharf) 13478; (Saguenay, dredging) 13472; (Seven Islands, wharf) 13479; (Shegawake, harbour) 13479 (vi); (Sorel, wharf) 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12848, 12869 (vi); (Three Rivers, wharfs)

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Que.—*Con.*

2296; (Touladie River) 2286 (i); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2298 (i), 5905 (iii); (Ville Marie, wharf) 14248; (Yamaska lock, dredging) 13498 (vi).

Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13306 (vi).

Miscellaneous: (architect's office) 2747 (ii); (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi); (art gallery) 2725; (clerical assistance) 2753 (ii); (Ottawa river, surveys) 13340 (vi); (salaries, engineers, &c.) 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi); (surveys, inspections, &c.) 2715, 2720 (ii); (transportation commission) 13362 (vi).

Roads and Bridges: Generally (Bryson, approaches) 13321 (vi); (Dom. traffic, bridges) 2701 (ii); (Edmonton, flooring) 13323; (Moisie Post road) 13322; (Peace River, pack trail) 13323 (vi).

N.W.T. (Pelly river bridge) 13367 (vi).

Ottawa, 2700 (ii); (Ottawa, Dufferin, &c.) 13321; (Union bridges, Ottawa) 13321; Quebec (Bryson) 13321 (vi); (Portage du Fort) 2690 (ii).

Yukon (Trading and Exploring Co.) 5826 (iii).

Slides and Booms (Gagner, Mr., salary) 2976; (Gatineau) 2977; (generally) 2690 (repairs, &c.) 2978; (St. Maurice slides) 2676; (salaries) 2974; (Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.) 2974 (ii).

Telegraph Lines—B.C., 2992 (ii); (Alberni-Clayoquot) 5918 (iii); (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992 (ii); (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337 (vi); (Quesnel-Atlin branch) 5826 (iii); (Vancouver Island to Salt Springs) 13337; (working expenses) 13368 (vi).

Mar. Provs. (Chatham to Tracadie) 13325; (Deer Island to Eastport) 13325 (vi); (land and cable, Mar. Provs.) 2701 (ii).

N.W.T., 2991 (ii); (Alexander, Indian agency) 5918 (iii); (Edmonton and Athabasca) 13335; (Edmonton, Indian agency) 13334; (Victoria to Andrews) 13335; (Wood Mountain Post) 13335 (vi).

P.E.I. (Marconi system) 13326 (vi); (P.E.I. and mainland) 2988 (ii), 5918 (iii).

Que. (Anticosti, &c.) 5917 (iii) 13325 (vi); (Belle Isle) 2712, 2989 (ii); (Bersimis to Godbout) 13332; (Chicoutimi, St. Charles) 13333 (vi); (Magdalen Islands) 2714 (ii); (Marconi, Chateau Bay) 13326; (Murray Bay, &c.) 13326; (Orleans Island) 13330; (Petite Rivière, St. Agnes) 13334 (vi); (Quebec, repairs, &c.) 2711 (ii); (Ste. Anne du Saguenay) 13331 (vi).

Yukon (working expenses) 14041 (vi).

Yukon Govt. (administration, &c.) 13367 (vi).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14381, 14511 (vi).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 270, 14737 (vi).

Timagami Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) M. to ref. back to Com., 7813 iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*

Toronto Island, Damage by Storms, &c. (Ans.) 5589 (iii).

Toronto to Lindsay, &c., Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

Toronto Post Office, Contract of Mr. Coleman (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13099 (vi).

Toronto Public Works Employees, Delay of Payment, &c. (Ans.) 5588 (iii).

Translators, Debates, Rent of Office, &c. (Ans.) 2311 (i), 3799 (ii).

Transportation Com., in Com. of Sup., 12854, 13362 (vi).

——— Instructions, &c. (remarks) 4120 (ii).

——— Meetings, Business transacted, &c. (Ans.) 13027 (vi).

——— N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'

See 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours, Que., Sorel,'

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11074 (v).

——— Rep. *re* (remarks) 13134, 13258 (vi).

Valleyfield P.O., Site, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 98 (i).

——— Tenders *re* (Ans.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii) 13011 (vi).

Wharfs, Govt. Policy *re* Construction, 13156 (vi).

Winnipeg City Water B.: *See* 'Assiniboine.'

Woods, J. W., Rental of Buildings, &c. (Ans.) 5764 (iii).

Woodstock, N. B., P. O., Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 672 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4563 (ii).

Yukon Telegraph Line, Management, &c., Complaints *re*, 7004 (iii).

See: 'Supply—Public Works — Telegraph Lines, Yukon.'

Sutherland, Mr. R. F., *N. Essex.*

Box Freight Cars, Ladders, &c.: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Budget, The, 1860 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Ry. B. 21.'

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to refer back to Com., 5959 (iii).

Drainage on Rys.: *See* Ry. B. 21.'

G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9447 (iv).

Osler, Mr. and 'Grafters.': *See* 'Privileges.'

Privileges and Elections, Sel. Com., 1st Rep. *re* Mr. Schell (presented) 5511 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry., Subsidy, 10520 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (box-cars, safety appliances, amt.) 6325; (cattle guards, amt.) 6220 (iii); in Com. (drainage) 4754 (ii).

Schell, J. T., M.P., 1st Rep. of Priv. and Elections Com. *re* (presented) 5511 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).

Customs (salaries, &c.) 3909 (ii).

Windsor, Ont., Customs Officers, Overtime, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7370 (iii).
Campaign Literature and Mail Bags, Govt. Ownership (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Campaign Literature, Employment of Sessional Messengers (Ques.) 14286 (vi).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12340, 12521 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5150 (iii), 7909 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9472 (iv); in Com. on B., 11951 (v); on M. for 3°, 12736 (vi).
——— Pets. *re*, Authenticity of, (M.) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——— Pets., Irregularities, &c., Par. in Montreal *Star*, (M.) to adjn., Affidavits, &c., 14845 (vi).
——— Pets. *re* (remarks) 12944 (vi).
——— *See* 'Petitions,' &c.
G. T. Ry. Co., Loans by Govt. (Ques.) 2920 (ii).
——— Terminal Facilities: *See* 'Transportation.'
Hagar, Miss, Emplymt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 5316 (iii).
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 144) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Isle of Orleans, Submarine Cable, &c. (M. for ret.*) 11301 (v).
——— *See* 'Submarine.'
McCraney, W., Letter *re* Legislation (ques. of order) 5362 (iii).
Mail Bags: *See* 'Campaign.'
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 814 (i).
Petitions *re* G. T. P. Ry. Co., Responsibility of Members, &c. (remarks) 12715 (vi).
——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12786; on M. for 3°, 13939 (vi).
——— Statement of Mr. L. E. Morin (read) 12786 (vi).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co.'s (B. 145) 1°*, 2396 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14454 (vi).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14454, 14495 (vi).
Ry. Subsidies for Man., &c. (remarks) 14495 (vi).
Saunders, Mr. C. E,, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 1676 (i).
Submarine Cable to Island of Orleans, &c. (Ques.) 11186 (v).
——— *See* 'Isle of Orleans.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (exhibitions) 4623 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (Levis) 431 (i); (Montmagny, P. O.) 13067 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers: Generally (dredges, repairs, &c.) 2627 (ii); Que. (Grande Vallee pier) 1547 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways: I. C. R. (Amqui, accommodation) 12601 (v).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*), (M.) to adjn. deb., 4868 (ii).
Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3469 (ii).
Treadgold Commission, Par. in Dawson Newspapers (remarks) 11082 (v).
Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 161) 1°*, 2582 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel, *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission Award, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14818 (vi).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen & Co.'s Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iii).
Beauharnois Electoral District, Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, on M. to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7104 (iii), 8025 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7303, 7322, 7353 (iii).
Blair, Hon. A. G., Resignation, Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ministerial.'
Budget, The, 1619 (i).
Cabinet Changes: *See* 'Ministerial.'
Cable News with G. B. and Can. B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8235 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5602 (iii).
Can. Northern Ry., Cor. between Govt. and Mackenzie & Mann (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
C. P. R. and Car Shortage in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup., 392 (i).
Chignecto Marine Ry., Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4419 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 842 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7519 (iii).
Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3098 (ii).
Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6447 (iii).
Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3006 (ii).
Eureka, Str., Personal Explanation, 14687 (vi).
Georgian Bay Canal: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Grain Blockade in N. W. T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation.'
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9644 (iv); in Com. on B., 10420, 10467 (v).
G. T. R. Transcontinental Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties B, 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7937 (iv).
Iron and Steel Industry, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. on Sup., 4322 (ii).
Le Canada and Mr. Latour: *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal (remarks) 2504, 2521 (ii).

——— Settlement, &c., Tel. (read) 2677 (ii).

Loy, Geo. M., and Violation of Independence of Parlt. Act, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elections, on M. to conc., 8025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Beauharnois.'

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 7998 (iv).

Ministerial Changes (explanation) 136 (i).

——— Par. in Toronto *News* (remarks) 6751 (iii).

Montreal Dry Dock, Site, &c. (M. for O. Cs. cor., &c.*) 706 (i).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Docks.'

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4452 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co., O. Cs. Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 705 (i).

Newspaper Agents and Quebec Postmasters (M.) to adjn. Hse., 14669 (vi.)

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineer, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1309 (i).

Petersen-Tate Deposit: *See* 'Supply—Miscellaneous.'

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14669 (vi).

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4211 (ii).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Harbours and Rivers, Quebec.'

Quebec Bridge Subsidy B. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 14721 (vi).

Quebec Harbour Improvements, Reps. to Council, &c. (M. for copies*) 706 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 3337 (ii).

Racine Bros., Claims against Contractors of Nelson, P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 254 (i); in Com., 6103 (iii).

Ry. Commissioners' Salaries B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8121 (iv).

Ry. Labour Dispute B. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 2579 (ii).

Ry. Transportation from N. W. T., and Freight Blockade, Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) to Com. of Sup., 2445 (i).

Reciprocity Negatiations, Emissaries from Can. (remarks) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14819 (vi).

Resignation as Minister: *See* 'Ministerial,' &c.

St. Lawrence Channel: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Que.'

Sorel Wharf: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Que.'

South-Eastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety, &c. (M. for cor.) 451 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

South Shore Ry., Working, &c. (M. for cor.) 448 (i).

Steel Bounties: *See* 'Iron.'

Stock Exchange Speculations, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7051 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 7560; (transportation facilities) 7562; Soulanges (construction) 7550; Trent (construction) 7552; (Corry & Laverdure, contract, &c.) 7559 (iii).

Civil Govt.: Interior (salaries) 269 (i); Labour Dept. (Racine Bros. claims) 7168 (iii).

Customs (Montreal port) 3901 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries) 6679 (iii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7576, 7584 (iv).

Miscellaneous (industrial disputes royal commission) 6985; (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6981 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 4046; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4067; (hydrographic surveys) 4118; (meteorological service) 4118; (steamboat inspection) 4119; (tidal surveys) 4116; (wrecks, investigation, &c.) 4116 (ii)

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (St. John immigration) 413; (quarantine station, St. John) 487; (St. John quarantine water service) 414 (i).

Ont. (architects) 524 (i).

Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 342; (geological museum) 352; (Royal Mint) 344; (ventilation, &c.) 488; (Victoria Museum) 365 (i).

Que. (Thetford Mines) 441; (Valleyfield P.O.) 444 (i).

Docks (Montreal) 2981; (rep. of commission) 2981 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers: B.C. (Columbia River) 1457 (i).

Generally (dredge vessels, repairs,) 2612; (hydraulic dredge) 2612 (ii).

Man. (dredging) 2665; (St. Andrews Rapids) 3355 (ii).

N. B. (Campbellton wharf) 1168; (Caraquet wharf) 1176; (St. John River wharfs) 1178 (i).

N. S. (Bridgewater, dredging) 1075; (Cow Bay) 1081; (Glace Bay) 1090; (Grand Etang, bridge works) 1097; (Lunenburg Harbour) 1109 (i).

Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 1185 (i); (dredging plant) 2671 (ii); (Petawawa narrows) 1444 (i); (Port Arthur) 3341; (Port Colborne) 3369; (St. Joseph, wharf) 3382 (ii); (St. Lawrence, dredging) 1444 (i).

Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1537; (Lake St. John, wharf) 2243; (Lake Temiscamingue, dredging) 2246; (Laprairie ice piers) 2248; (Le Tableau wharf) 2249; (Magdalen islands) 2264; (Maria, pier) 2266 (i); (Montreal, harbour) 3365; (Murray Bay, wharf) 2266; (Que. harbour) 3336 (ii); (St. Alexis Bay) 2289; (St. André de Kamouraska) 2290; (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i); (St. Lawrence, ship channel) 3365 (ii); (Sorel, deep water wharf) 2292 (i), 3377 (ii); (Three Rivers wharfs) 2297; (Touladie river) 2286 (i); (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2945; (transportation facilities) 3365 (ii); (Valleyfield, dredging) 2299 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. Israel—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Miscellaneous (transfer to Marine Dept.) 2633, 2 45 (ii).

Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft-Dawson) 2992; (Belleisle station) 2989; (Marconi stations) 2989; (Yukon) 2992 (ii).

Tariff, Govt. Policy (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875 (ii); (Neg. Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4263 (ii).

Tariff Revision, Inquiry for Cor., &c., 3003 (ii).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co. (M. for cor.) 672 (i).

Transcontinental Ry., G. T. Pac. Ry. (M. for cor.) 447 (i).

——— *See* 'G. T. P. Ry.'

Transportation Commission, O.C., Cor., &c. *re* Appnmts. (M. for copies) 1324 (i).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2633, 2926, 3305, 3369, 3451 (ii), 7562 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works,' &c.

Treadgold Concessions, Appnmt. of Special Com., on Amt. (Mr *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4522 (ii).

Valleyfield, P. O. Site: *See* 'Beauharnois.'

——— *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings.'

Yukon Supplies, Tenders, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4071 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Alien Restriction Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 3283 (ii).

Anderson, Mr. J. G., Allegations *re* Inspection of Fruit (remarks) 13508 (vi).

Auditor General and Finance Dept. (remarks) 11423 (v).

Aud. Gen. and Payment of Members (remarks) 11552 (v).

Auditor General and Treasury Board, Circular (read) 11552 (v).

Bayfield, Str., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7302, 7323; in Com. on B., 7384 (iii).

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14049 (vi).

Bonding Privileges with U.S.: *See* 'Coasting,' &c.

Boyd, Sir John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5990 (iii).

Brockville and North-western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. *Calvert*) on M. for 1°, 1193 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) in Com., 6655, 7137, 7430 (iii).

——— on Order for resuming adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

——— (M.) that com. rise, 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, 7339 (iii).

——— on M. for 3° (amt.) 7469 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co., (M.) to reprint Bill, 7467 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1° *, 813 (i).

Budget, The, 1974 (i).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5055, 5066 (ii); in Com. on B., 5422, 5461 (iii).

Campaign Literature, *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Canadian (3rd) Mounted Rifles, Medals, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).

Census of 1901, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 203 (i).

——— (M. for ret.) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 479, 544 (i).

——— (remarks) 204 (i).

Chickens, Killing of: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Cigarettes, Prohibition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 836 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition B. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. for 1°, 2014 (i).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12493, 12571 (v).

Clergue Contract for Steel Rails, Quality, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

Coasting Privileges *re* U.S. (remarks) 12714, 12756 (vi).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6638; in Com., 7491 (iii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3048; in Com. on B., 4011 (ii).

See 'Masters,' &c.

Customs Employees, Transfers, &c. (M.) for Ret., 5318 (iii).

Election Pamphlets: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

Ferry Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

France and Can. SS. Service B. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 11422 (v).

Grain in Bond: *See* 'Coasting.'

Grain Inspection Act (weigh masters) Amt. B. 266 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. of Res., 13807 (vi).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10485, 10555, 10562, 11290, 11982, 12252 (v); on M. for 3°, 12697, 12770; (amt.) 12750 (vi).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13270, 13301 (vi).

Haycock, Jos., Inspector of Binder Twine, &c. (Ques.) 4960 (ii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection,' &c.

Howe Island Ferry: *See* 'Navigable,' &c., 'Wolfe,' &c.

Hurley: *See* 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service,' &c.

I. C. R. Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. B. 258.'

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 225 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 12301 (v).

Le Canada: *See* 'Pelletier.'

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Cor. *re* Mr. Mullen, &c.) 5757 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Mails carried *via* New York (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7729 (iv).

Mail Bags and Campaign Literature, &c. (remarks) 14549 (vi).

——— Campaign Literature, Statement *re* Special Trains, 14681 (vi).

——— Refund of Express Charges (remarks) 14684 (vi).

Masters of Vessels, Instructions *re* Postage, &c., in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5664 (iii).

Militia Estimates (remarks) 13369 (vi)

Militia Tents, Rush Ordér, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

See 'N. W. M. P.'

Milk Cans Bill: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4484 (ii); in Com. on B., 5418 (iii).

Napanee Post Office, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1594 (i).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12780; in Com. on B., 12984 (vi).

N. W. Mounted Police Tents, Wood & Co.'s Tender, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii).

——— Remarks, 6850 (iii).

Officers Mess, Fisheries Protection Service, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Parliament Buildings, Ottawa: *See* 'Supply—Pub. Works, Buildings,' 'Ventilation.'

Parliament Grounds, Dust Nuisance (remarks) 2104 (i).

Pelletier, Mr. H. L., and *Le Canada*, Canvass (remarks) 13982 (vi).

——— Salary, &c. (remarks) 13992 (vi).

——— *See* 'Postmasters,' &c.

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10829 (v).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12791 (vi).

Postal Newspaper Boxes for Streets, Manufacture, &c. (Ques.) 14283 (vi).

Postmasters in Quebec and Newspaper Agents, &c. (remarks) 14671 (vi).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5064 (iii).

Poultry, Fattening, &c.: *See* Supply—'Agriculture.'

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Osler*) M. to adjn. Hse., 10535 (v).

Public Works Dept. and Mr. Préfontaine: *See* 'Pilotage Bill.'

Quadra, Str., Officers Mess, Regulations *re* (Ques.) 9819 (iv).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 3750, 3896 (ii); 6299 (iii).

——— Suggestions *re* Sel. Com. (remarks) 5313.

Ry. Act (supplies for I.C.R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12950 (vi).

Ry. Commission: *See* 'Supply—Rys.'

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Railway Policy of Govt., on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7129 (iii).

Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11014, 11483; on M. for 3°, 12478 (v).

Rideau Canal Employees, Payment of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 13302 (vi).

St. Lawrence Islands, Improvements, &c., in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 7215, 7242 (iii).

Sessions of the Hse, Date of Meetings, on M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 475 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 13503 (vi); (census enumerators, Gananoque) 4823; (patent branch, salaries) 4351 (ii); (*Poultry Farming*) 7640; ('wringing chickens' necks') 7640 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (electric lighting) 14139 (vi); (Galops, deepening, &c.) 8400; (enlargement) 7804 (iv).

Gene. ally (toll collectors) 12932 (vi).

Grenville (Tucker, Henry, investigation *re* Supt.) 14157 (vi).

Lachine (electrical appliances) 7806 (iv).

Murray (Supt.'s duties and expenses) 14146; (wire fencing) 14150 (vi).

Rideau (Brasses' Point bridge) 7808 (iv); (swing bridge, Concession St., Ottawa) 14150 (vi).

Soulanges (bank repairs) 14153 (vi); (construction) 7550 (iii); (Goodwin's claim) 14143; (J. & M. O'Leary's claims) 14651 (vi).

Welland (Dunnville dam) 7811 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Inland Rev. (wood alcohol) 237; Justice (salaries) 212 (i); (marine contingencies) 5033 (ii); Militia (salaries) 2 2 (i); Post Office (junior 2nd-class clerks) 13996 (vi).

Culling Timber (salaries) 7798 (iv).

Customs (contingent expenses) 3897; (contingent expenses, Montreal) 3784; (Gananoque port) 3897 (ii); (Kilroy, Mr., payment to) 13994 (vi); (locks, instruments, &c.) 3962; (preferential ta iff) 3932; (preventive service) 3949; (printing, &c.) 3962 (ii); (salaries, extra) 13980 (vi).

Dom. Lands (Teulon, North, road) 6927; (tree culture) 6773 (iii); (tree planting) 13775 (vi).

Excise (inspectors salaries) 13978 (vi); (tobacco stamps) 5373; (travelling expenses, &c.) 5373 (iii).

Fisheries (Bance, Mr., promotion) 5277; (*Bayfield*, str.) 5280, 5292 (iii); (Canadian fishery exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (fish-breeding stations) 4174; (fishery officers) 5050; (fishways) 4174; (Hurley, J. M., inspector, &c.) 5123, (ii); 5280, 5305; (intelligence bureau) 5277; (Ottawa exhibit) 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii); (protection service, B.C.) 4174 (ii); (U. S. licenses, &c.) 5309 (iii).

Immigration (Ques. of order) 6855; (tents, &c.) 6850 (iii).

Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7773; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7763 (iv).

Justice, Administration of — Penitentiaries (binder twine circular) 3512 (ii).

Supreme Court (contingencies) 3404; (reporter) 3402 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Yukon (Eilbeck, sheriff) 3414; (Eilbeck, allowances, &c.) 3509; (police magistrates) 3415; (Taylor, Geo. L.) 3415 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (messengers, &c.) 5265; (printing, &c.) 5267; (senate contingencies) 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4173 (ii); (Hurley, J. M.) 5740 (iii); (lighthouse supplies) 4168; (lightkeepers' salaries) 4132; (wharfs, repairs) 4174 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7729; (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).

Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 5033 (ii).

Militia (military college) 3778 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 12590 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 13543 (vi); (Dominion steamers, repairs) 5034; (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4084 (ii); masters and mates examination) 13528 (vi); (meteorological service) 4118; (steamer supplies, Drolet, F.X.) 5036 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings, Generally (armouries) 970; (Gananoque armoury) 970 (i).

Man. (military buildings) 13128 (vi).

N. B. (St. John quarantine station) 486.

N. W. T. (Moose Jaw, P.O.) 13130 (vi).; (Prince Albert, court house) 13129 (ii).

Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 503 (i); (Kingston military college, stables) 13117, 13128; (Wingham, P.O.) 13123 (vi).

Ottawa (coal sheds) 13116; (elevator, west Block) 13115 (vi).

Docks (commissioner's rep.) 2983 (ii).

Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Anderson's Hollow) 1163; (Campbellton, wharf) 1166; (Caraquet, wharf) 1175 (i).

N. S. (Amagandus wharf) 1068; (Bailey's Brook, wharf) 1072; (Big Pond, wharf) 1071; (Bridgewater, dredging) 1074 (i); (cement, piers, &c.) 13184 (vi); (Grand Etang bridge works) 1098; (Kingsport Pier) 1103 (i).

Ont. (Bronte, harbour) 1354; (Gananoque, harbour) 1371 (i)

P.E.I. (Souris Knight's Point) 1162 (i).

Que. (St. Jean des Chaillons, wharf) 13494 (vi); (St. Lawrence, removal of rocks) 2258 (i).

Miscellaneous (Ottawa river, surveys) 13344 (vi).

Slides and Booms (Ottawa river staff) 2980 (ii).

Tèlegraph Lines—B.C. (Kamloops, Nicola line) 13337; N.W.T. (Wood Mountain, &c.) 13336 (vi).

Quarantine (cattle) 5504; (Dr. Couture) 5504; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5496 (iii); (public health, small-pox) 5008 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (Clergue's rails) 14097; Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese immigration Act) 7759; (iron and steel bounties, legal expenses) 7797 (iv).

Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7282; (roads and bridges) 7284; (supplies purchased, &c.) 6930 (iii).

Swing Bridges Bill: *See* 'Navigable,' &c.

Tariff, Govt. Policy, on Ques. of Order (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Mr. Tarte, 4843 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Thousand Islands, Improvement: *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

Trois Pistoles River Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14464 (vi).

Tyerman, P. D., Payments to, by Govt. (Ques.) 286 (i).

U. S. Coasting Privileges: *See* 'Coasting.'

Valleyfield Post office, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 11187 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber, Fans, &c. (remarks) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2344 (i); on M. to ref. to Special Com., 3247 (ii).

Williamsburg Canal, Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 12935 (vi).

Wolfe Island and Howe Island wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13498 (iii).

Woods, J. W., Amount paid for Tents, &c. (Ques.) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

——— Rental of Buildings to Govt. (Ques.) 5764 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex's Speech (moved) 7 (i).

Budget, The, 1994 (i).

C. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 872 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 13583 (vi).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, Deb. adjourned, 1065 (i).

G.O.C., Lord Dundonald's Speech at Hamilton, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2415 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 12206 (v).

Hides Bill: *See* 'General Inspection B.'

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 1204.

Loan Companies Extension (B. 24) 1°m., 284; 2°m., 2349; in Com., 2350 (i).

Mexican Light and Power Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 1853 (i).

Militia Force, Condition, Pay, &c., on M. for Sup. (remarks) 5702 (iii).

Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. 57 (Mr. *German*) in Com., 1811 (i).

Ry. Act (subsidies) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1059 (i).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11635, 11659 (v).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3606 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13430 (vi).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Alexandria P. O.) 499; (Cayuga) 499 (i).

United Empire Life Ins. Co.'s (B. 163) 1°*, 2582; in Com., 3796, 3983 (ii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I., *N. Grey.*

Balaclava and Owen Sound Mail Contract (Ques.) 13263 (vi).

Bayfield, Str., Sale, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5586 (iii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5743 (iii).

See 'Supply—Fisheries,' 'Lighthouse Service.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7359, 7372; in Com. on B., 7383, 7391 (iii).

See 'Supply—Inspection.'

Cement in Buildings: *See* 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa.'

Census: *See* 'Supply—Agriculture.'

Commercial Agencies, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4360 (ii).

Dredges at Midland, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3011 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9573 (iv).

——— Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections) 13277 (vi).

Grey County, Public Buildings wanted, &c., List read, in Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).

Indians: *See* 'Supply—Indians.'

I. C. R. Supplies B.: *See* 'Ry. Act.'

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8226 (iv).

Meaford Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

Owen Sound, Dock: *See* 'Dry Docks B.'

——— Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13063 (vi).

——— Water Lot, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (iii).

See 'Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ont.'

Public Works, Contracts awarded, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (iv).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Public Buildings, 5831 (iii).

Ry Act (stores of I. C. R.) Amt. B. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 12967 (vi).

Representation in H of C. B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10999, 11528 (v).

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Dredge, Sinking in Lake Ont. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).

Small-pox: *See* 'Supply—Quarantine.'

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (census, Grey counties) 4826 (ii).
Excise (Standard Chemical Co.) 5380 (iii); (wood alcohol) 5380 (iii).
Fisheries (str. *Bayfield*) 5278 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (salaries) 7257; (schools, &c.) 7257; (travelling expenses) 7262; Yukon (expenses, generally) 7272 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7775; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7775 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (*Bayfield*, str. reps. *re*) 5743; (*Bayfield*, str., sale, &c.) 5763 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4096 (ii).

Thomson, Mr. T. I.—*Con.*

SUPPLY.—*Con.*

Post Office (Chatsworth, vacancy) 6057; (postmasters' salaries, arrears) 5924; (postmasters, &c.) 6057 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5831; (Guysborough) 5840 (iii).
Ont. (Bridgeburg, P. O.) 13113; (Guelph, armoury) 13083; (Oshawa, P. O.) 13111 (vi); (Owen Sound) 439, 533 (i), 13063; (Picton, P.O.) 13114; (St. Mary's, P.O.) 13109; (Sault Ste. Marie, P. O.) 13107 (vi); (Toronto Junction post office) 652 (i); (Wingham, P. O.) 13120; (Woodstock, P.O.) 13108 (vi).
Ottawa (coal sheds) 13115 (vi).
Que. (Longueuil, P. O.) 13070 (vi)
Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (dredging, plant, &c.) 13311; (Fraser river, improvement) 13305 (vi).
Mar. Provs. (dredging) 13309; (hydraulic dredge) 13312 (vi); (dredging, repairs) 2639 (ii).
Ont. (general repairs) 1370 (i); (Kaministiquia river) 5825 (iii); (Owen Sound, harbour) 1377 (i); (Port Arthur, dredging) 13013 (vi).
P.E.I. (dredging plant) 13313 (vi).
Que. (Grande Vallee, pier) 1515 (i).
Yukon (Lewes and Yukon river) 13307 (vi).
Quarantine (small-pox) 5011 (ii).
Yukon Govt. (Eldorado Gusher) 7276 (iii).

Wood Alcohol: *See* 'Supply—Excise.'

Tisdale, Hon. David, *S. Norfolk.*

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) in Com., 5968 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 157 (Mr. *Stewart*) on Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5989 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s Loan B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. on Res., 4378, 4962 (ii).

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 3229 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Ry. Settlement, &c. (remarks) 4422 (ii).

Criminal Code (cruelty to animals) B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) in Com., 1327 (i), 3243 (ii).

Divorce Court, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 576 (i).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6438 (iii).

Dry Docks Construction Act Amt. B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 3012 (ii).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 613 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5168 (iii).

Indian Agents, Brant Reserve, Leases, &c. (M. for copies*) 1322 (i).

Indian Agents, Guardians, &c. (Ques.) 819 (i).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) in Com., 1117 (v).

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 3°, 4870 (ii).

Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 135 (Mr. *Logan*) in Com., 5982 (iii).

Tisdale, Hon. David—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for Com., 2586; in Com., 2593, 3721, 3835, 3882 (ii), 6075 (iii).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10960, 10911; (Brant) 11087; (Norfolk) 11117, 11427; on M. for 3°, 12372 (v).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 3603; (association grants) 3767: (defence scheme) 3763; (G.O.C.) 3779; (Martineau investigation) 3584, 3752; (military college) 3778; (pay and allowance, 3584 (ii); (pay and allowance, general statement) 13405 (vi); (stores branch) 3608; (Valleyfield strike) 3591, 3756 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (St. John, drill hall) 13043 (vi).

Treadgold Commission, Par. in Manitoba Newspapers *re* Judges (remarks) 11082 (v).

Wilson, Stephen Relief B. 228 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for Com., 9150 (iv).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 1575 (i).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies) 4090 (ii).

Tolmie, Mr. J., *W. Bruce.*

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10944 (v).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John City, (N.B).*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5186 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, supplies, &c.) 5043 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*

Alaskan Boundary Commission, Award, &c. (remarks) 14280 (vi).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 316 (i).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 303, 628 (i).

Hay and Oats bought by Can., for S. A. War, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 682 (i).

Inverness and Richmond Ry. Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 872 (i).

Juvenile Offenders Act Amt. (B. 10) in Com., 314 (i).

Judges of High Court, B.C., Salaries, &c. (remarks) 14305 (vi).

Minister of Mines, Appnmt. of, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Ministers, Reduction in Number, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 276 (i).

Pensions to S. A. Veterans by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 14599 (vi).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, Defalcations of Postmasters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14275 (vi).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert—*Con.*

Railway Subsidies, General Policy, &c., 14368 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. Interior (salaries) 269 (i).

Miscellaneous—Yukon (Canadian Bank of Commerce) 14274 (vi).

Supreme Court Registrar's B. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 14305 (vi).

Yukon Ter. Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 314 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Leprosy at Tracadie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).

SUPPLY;

Public Works: Buildings—N. B. (Tracadie Lazaretto) 13039 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally (dredges, repairs) 2631 (ii); N. B. (Caraquet wharf) 1176; (Shippegan harbour) 1184 (i).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *S. Victoria (O.)*

Budget, The, 1832 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10102 (v).

Representation in H. of C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 11500, 11658 (v).

Pigeon Lake Island, Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 6412 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Indians (survey, reserves) 6412 (iii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Seven Islands, wharf) 13484 (vi).

Quarantine (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5501 (iii); (small-pox) 5025 (ii); (trachoma epidemic) 5496 (iii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*

Beauharnois Electoral District: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

Binder Twine Bounties B. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7336, 7371 (iii).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 7492 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (railway debts) Amt. B. 155 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 8245, 8361 (iv).

Fisheries Act Amt. B. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6909 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Henderson*) on M. for 2°, 3819, 3829 (ii).

G. T Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5174, 5199 (iii), 7859 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9820 (iv).

Judges' Retiring Allowance B. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8100, 8371 (iv).

Loy, Geo. M., Violation of Independence of Parlt., &c., Rep. of Privs. and Elections Com. (presented) 7916 (iv).

——— (M.) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 8008 (iv).

McDermid, Ellen, Relief (B. 229) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Wade, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*

Marconi Wireless Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*) in Com., 5094 (ii), 5359 (iii).
Mills, Mr., Claims against (Ques.) 6167 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4469 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4868 (ii).
Postage Rates for Books, &c. (remarks) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5869 (iii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com., 5869 (iii).
Privileges and Elections Com., Rep. of Com. *re* Geo. M. Loy, M.P. (M.) to conc., 8008 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8034 (iv).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 7916 (iv).
Ry. Act (consolidation Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4581, 4702 (ii), 6115, 6192, 6209, 6291 (iii).
Ry. Debts Bill : *See* 'Exchequer.'

SUPPLY :

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Furness-Withy Co.) 7734; (St. John and London) 7734 (iv).
Public Works : Buildings, N.S. (Arichat) 5835 (iii).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief (B. 228) 1°*, 7922 (iv).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *E. Durham.*

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 10010 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Cricket Playing (remarks) 2423 (i).

SUPPLY :

Militia (annual drill) 3603 ; (military property) 3621 (ii); (pay and allowance) 13425 (vi) ; (properties)3612 ; (Valleyfield strike) 3599 (ii).
Trent Canal, Hastings and Trenton, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).
——— Surveys at Rice Lake, (M for reps.) 2313, 2333 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's.* (*N.B.*)

Bathurst Harbour Buoys, &c., (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Bourgeois, M. E., Sub-Collector of Customs at Tracadie, N.B., Dismissal (Ques.) 543 (i).
Census, Sunbury, N.B., Religious Classification, &c, (Ques.) 4005 (ii).
Daly, Michael, Harbour Master, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Dry Docks Construction B. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4687 (ii).
Gagetown, N.B., Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1676 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 7902 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 8067 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9980 (iv).
Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation (Ques.) 288 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D.—*Con.*

Hatchey, Nazaire, Appnmt. as Harbour Master, (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
McMonagle, Miles, Dismissal from Beacon Light, N.B. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Mehan, Dr., Meterological Service, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 3630 (ii).
Oromocto Shoals, N.B., Dismissal of Miles McMonagle, &c. (Ques.) 1194 (i).
Railway Subsidies B. 270, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).
Rivers, Robert, Dismissal from Miscou Lighthouse (Ques.) 3631 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14323 (vi).

SUPPLY :

Agriculture (census, N.B., religions) 4821 (ii).
Indians: N.B. (St. John river, pet., &c.) 6352 (iii).
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Bay du Vin) 1164 ; (Lord's Cove, wharf) 1177 ; (Great Salmon River) 1177 ; (Negro Point, breakwater) 1182 ; (Oromocto, wharf) 1181 ; (St. John, harbour) 1183 ; (St. John river, tributaries) 1177 (i).
Tracadie Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 543 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Contract with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 2759 (ii).
Venoit, P. I., Customs Collector at Bathurst, Absence, &c. (Ques.) 3629 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Petersen's Deposit (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6969 (iii).
Audit Act Amt. B. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 11169 (v).
Binder Twine Inspector, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4959 (ii).
——— Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 5588 (iii).
——— Penalties *re* Inspection (remarks) 14048 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection.'
Bridges over Canals, Maintenance by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5617 (iii).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries, &c. (Ques.) 541 (i).
——— Loans to by Govt. (Ques.) 5587 (iii).
——— Pilgrimage, Expenses, Losses, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).
Ernestown Station Postmaster, Changes, &c. (Ques.) 1034 (i).
False Creek, B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly (Ques.) 2758, 2919 (ii).
Grain carried by C. P. R. to St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on M. for Com. on Res., 9367 (iv) ; in Com. on B., 10697 (v).
G. T. Pacific Bill, Distribution to Members (remarks) 8918 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Haycock, Jos., Appnmt. as Inspector of Binder Twine (Ques.) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

——— *See* 'Supply—Inspection of Staples.'

Immigrants at Quebec, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (iii).

Immigration Expenditure, 1902 to 1903 (Ques.) 6269 (iii).

Immigration, Inspection, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546 (iii).

——— Notice of M., 6522 (iii).

——— Nationality, &c., (Ques.) 2310 (i).

Immigration into Man., Houses and Fuel, &c. (Ques.) 542 (i).

Immigration refused Admission, &c. (Ques.) 2310 (i), 2502 (ii).

Iron and Steel, Bounties B. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7925, 7929, 7986 (iv).

Iron and Steel, Bounty Payments (Ques.) 6435 (iii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8088 (iv), 10763 (v).

Lead Bounties B. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 8206, 8228 (iv).

Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 10828 (v).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) on Sen. Amts., 13846 (vi).

Ry. Carriage of Mails, &c. (Ques.) 6268 (iii).

Railway Subsidies, Amounts paid from 1900 to 1903 (Ques.) 13370 (vi).

——— Interest payable, &c. (Ques.) 3970 (ii).

——— voted for 1900, 1901, 1902 (Ques.) 12842, 13027, 13259, 13934 (vi).

——— voted and paid by Govt. 1901-3 (Ques.) 2306 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Service *re* (Ques.) 13259 (vi).

SUPPLY:

Agriculture (experimental farms) 4549 (ii).
Canals: Beauharnois (dykes) 14152; Generally (lockmen, &c., increased wages) 14157 (vi).
Civil Govt.: Finance (contingencies) 227 (i); Finance (insurance) 12587 (v); Sec. of State (printing, &c.) 223; (salaries) 223 (i).
Customs (Napanee collector, salary) 3919 (ii).
Dom. Lands (Banff Hot springs, baths) 6789; (Stewart, inspector of forests) 6774; (tree culture) 6774 (iii).
Fisheries (*Bayfield*, str.) 5283 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6660; (Devlin, Mr., successor) 6731; (expenditures) 6615; (White, Mr., expenses) 6732 (iii).
Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 7254 (iii).
Inland Revenue (excise inspections) 5364 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (binder twine) 7766; (Haycock, Mr., appnmt.) 7766 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 5878 (iii); (St. John and Belfast) 7731 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Paris agency) 12589 (v); (Petersen, Tate & Co.'s deposit) 6969 (iii); (Printing Bureau, plant) 12587 (v).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, supplies, &c.) 4104 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Dom. renewals, &c.) 636; (Ft. William) 637 (i).
Ottawa (additional rooms) 13012 (vi); (Rideau Hall, grounds, &c.) 5006 (ii); (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 993 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Glace Bay) 1094 (i).
Ont. (Port Arthur, dredging) 13019 (vi).
Miscellaneous (arbitrations and awards) 13339 (vi).
Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 2701; (Portage du Fort) 2699 (ii).
Slides and Booms (St. Maurice slides) 2678 (ii).
Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence) 5007 (ii).
Quarantine (diseased immigrants) 5494; (Grosse Isle, supplies) 5499 (iii); (small-pox) 5029 (ii); (trachoma disease) 5494 (iii).
Railways: I.C.R. (G. T. R. rental) 12888 (vi); (Rivière du Loup engine houses, &c.) 12593 (v); Miscellaneous (Ry. commission, salaries) 14155 (vi).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *S. Renfrew.*

Binder Twine, Inspection and Penalties (remarks) 14052 (vi).

British Cable News Service between Can. and G. B., B. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 10735 (v).

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com. on Res., 5076 (ii); in Com. on B., 5424 (iii).

Can. Central and O. & B. Ry., Compensation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee B. 209 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 5622 (iii).

C. P. R. Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 9455 (iv).

Criminal Code Amt. B. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. (cigarettes) 10754 (v).

Customs Act (surtax) Amt. B. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. on Res., 3054 (ii).

Dom. Notes Security, in Com. on Res., 6446 (iii).

Electric Lighting in Renfrew, 14137 (vi).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 300 (i).

France and Can. SS. Subsidy (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 10817 (v).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Subsidy B. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 10483 (v).

Home Rule for Ireland, on Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com, of Sup., 772 (i).

Irondale, Bancroft and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 14392 (vi).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 8095 (iv).

K. and P. Ry. (remarks) 5622 (iii).

Milk Can B.: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Newspaper Despatches from G.B.: *See* 'British.'

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Rep. of Engineers, &c., on M. (Mr. *Murray*) for Copies, 1307 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (telegraph poles) 5350 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 6480, 7225, 7228 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 7629 ; (creameries) 7633 (iv).

Canals : Cornwall (electric lighting) 14137 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G. B.) 7593 (iv).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works : Buildings, Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie, P.O.) 13108 (vi).

Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Sorel, deep water wharf) 12858 (vi).

Transportation Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3455 (ii)

Weights and Measure Act (milk cans) Amt. B. (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. for 2°, 2346 (i).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ABRAM'S RIVER, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

——— *See* 'Agriculture, Arts.'

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

'ACADIAN,' SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

——— *See* 'Marine.'

ACETYLENE, GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: moved (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 18 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 23; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 40; (Mr. *Monk*) 55; (Mr. *Charlton*) 67; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 75 (i).

ADDRESS, THE, REPLY FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1204 (i).

AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS:

ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

DOMINION DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).

EASTER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

LABOUR DAY, DELAYING SESSION, &C. (remarks) 10742 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*) 6630 (iii).

THANKSGIVING DAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1**, 4; *pro forma.*

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

ADVERTISING (GOVT.) IN NEWSPAPERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267-5274 (iii).

'ADVOCATE,' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTION PROCLAMATION: in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

——— *See* 'Prince Albert.'

AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N. W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION SEL. COM.: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).

——— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: *See* 'Binder Twine,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

ACADEMY OF ARTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).

AGRICULTURE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4429, 4548, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii),

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).

——— SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4349 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).

——— Remarks *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).

ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).

APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).

ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).

——— RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

——— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii), 12589 (v).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).
BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).
CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'
CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712, 10745 (v).
CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Imperial.'
CANADIAN TRADE WITH JAPAN: *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).
——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 14054 (vi).
——— Papers laid on Table, 591 (i).
CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal *Gazette* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415.
CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; (Neg. Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).
CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
CENSUS: in Com. of Sup., 4594 (ii).
——— CARLETON, &C., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).
——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).
——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 13368 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).
——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).
——— LAND VALUES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).
——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).
——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425 (v).
——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).
——— SCHEDULES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4635.
——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).
——— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
——— TOTAL COST TO DATE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
——— TOTAL COST, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289, 479, 544 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).
CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CLASSIFYING RECORD: in Com. of Sup., 12592.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632.
CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
DAIRYING BRANCH, AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— COLD STORAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).
DEPUTY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Amount paid to (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 7055 (iii).
EXHIBITION FURNITURE, &C., AT PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).
EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).
——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).
FOOD ANALYSIS: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
FRUIT INSPECTORS BUYING APPLES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
——— *See* 'Anderson.'
FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).
——— VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).
FUMIGATION STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
GAUDET, COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE, SUPPLIES *re* QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
HAGAR, MISS, APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
See 'Census.'
HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii). *See* 'Public Health.'
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).
JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii),
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv.)
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes. Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'St. Louis.'
MINING EXHIBIT.: *See* 'Can. Exhibit,' &c.

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
See 'Arts,' &c.
O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).
ONSLOW, LORD, *re* CATTLE EMBARGO; *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
PATENTS, CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton,' &c.
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
See 'Health.'
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
QUARANTINE, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i) 13030 (vi).
QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).
——— LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4237 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
SAN JOSE SCALE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii).
SAUNDERS, DR. C. E., APPNMT. AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 1676 (i).
SHUTT, PROF., REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SMALL-POX, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5491 (iii).
SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 534 (i), 13501 (vi).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii).
TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).
VETERINARY CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).
VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

AIDS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).

ALASKAN BOUNDARY AWARD, &C., TEL. FROM LONDON *re* LORD ALVERSTONE'S REFERENCE TO CANADIAN CRITICISM: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13963 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13957 (vi).
——— ALLEGED INTERVIEW WITH MR. AYLESWORTH, VERIFICATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13667 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 14287 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 14280 (vi).
See 'Interview.'
——— Official Information, Inquiry for Cor., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*. *Halifax*) 14521 (vi).
——— BOND-HAY TREATY, &C.: Inquiry for Papers *re* (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 878 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
——— COMMISSION, CABLEGRAM FROM LORD ALVERSTONE: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13806 (vi).
——— Cor. *re*, Laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14688 (vi).
——— CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on Alaska Award, 14521 (vi).
——— COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (ii).
——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
——— GOVT. RESPONSIBILITY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14791 (vi).
——— HISTORY OF CASE, &C.: Recapitulation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 14773 (vi).
——— JUDGMENT, &C.: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (Mr. *Bell*) 13671 (vi).
——— Notice *re* proposed Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
——— REFUSAL OF CAN. COMMISSIONERS TO SIGN AWARD: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14402 (vi).
——— SUMMARY PUBLISHED: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10536 (v).
——— TEL. FROM MR. SIFTON: Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14529 (vi).
——— TREATY, CONVENTION RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 480 (i).

'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).

ALBANY STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
——— *See* 'B.C.'

Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 75.)

Alberta Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 76.)

ALBERT COUNTY, HARBOUR-MASTER, DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALBERTON, P.E.I., RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ALERT,' STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE TO: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
Algoma Ry.: *See* 'Bruce.'
Algonquin Lumber and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Gould*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 77.)
ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).
Aliens: *See* 'Naturalization.'
ALLANS' CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICES, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
——— *See* 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937 (vi).
——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'C.P.R. Steamers,' &c.
Allan, William, Relief B. No. 196 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)
Alliance Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 212 (Mr. *Russell*) M to receive Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2°m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTS INTO CAN., PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).
ALVERSTONE, LORD: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
Amalgamated Engineers: *See* 'Dom. Institute,' &c.
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AMHERST, N.S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell* 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR 'SCOTIA': in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY LAKE: in Com. of Sup. 1451 (i).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup, 1163 (i).
ANDERSON, MR. J. G., APPNMT. AS FRUIT INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
Animals Contagious Diseases B. No. 194 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 4003; 2°m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
——— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii)
ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS: in Com of Sup., 5005 (ii).
ANNUAL DRILL OF MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3603 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTHRAX IN CATTLE, PAR. IN NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 10102 (v).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
APPLES, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S STATEMENT *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS, *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT S (CHIEF) OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECTS STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
ARCHIVES, CANADIAN, REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 5417 (iii).
——— DEPT., RE-ORGANIZATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13503 (vi).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).
ARICHAT, N S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARMOURIES, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
ARMOURIES, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

ARSENALS, DOM., CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

ARSENAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

ART GALLERY, ENCOURAGEMENT TO CANADIAN ARTISTS: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE ON PAINTINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12717 (vi).

—— NATIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 2725 (ii).

—— *See* 'Portrait.'

ASCENSION ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3127 (ii).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).

Ashley, Harford, Relief B. No. 236 (Mr. *Porter*) 1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 80).

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii); 13779, 13965 (vi).

ASSENT, ROYAL: *See* 'Bills.'

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).

Assiniboine River Water Power Co.'s B. No. 192 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 203).

ASTRONOMICAL, DEMARCATION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i); 6791 (iii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. *Ball*) 1°*, 446; on order for 2°, 631, 664, 852; 2° m., 1505 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4007 (ii).

—— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

Debate: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 14171; (Mr. *Sproule*) 14178; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 14185; (Mr. *Bell*) 14193; (Mr. *Logan*) 14203; (Mr. *Gourley*) 14204; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 14215; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14216 (vi).

—— TENDERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3882, 4120 (ii).

—— INQUIRY (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).

—— TENDERS RECEIVED: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4727 (ii).

—— ALLAN'S CONTRACT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv); 13672 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax* 7091 (iii).

—— ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN, REDUCTION IN NUMBER: Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13948 (vi).

—— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Audit Act Amt. B. No. 251 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 11159 (v); Order dschgd., 13444 (vi).

Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13990 (vi).

—— GOVTL., INTENTION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258 (vi).

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

—— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 11427 (v).

—— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (iv).

—— *See* 'Audit Act,' &c.

AURORA FOUNDRY, MANUFACTURE OF POST BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).

AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).

AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS IN N.W.T., REP. OF INSPECTORS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).

AUTOMOBILES FOR P.O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).

AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T., Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13856; (Mr. *Oliver*) 13883 (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13894; (Mr. *Davis*) 13896; (Mr. *McCreary*) 13897; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 13905; (Mr. *Scott*) 13914 (vi).

—— *See* 'Provincial'.

AYLESWORTH, MR.: *See* 'Alaskan Boundary.'

AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com of Sup., 1072 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASS'T COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).

BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).

BALSAM LAKE LOCKS : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

——— *See* 'Trent.'

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

BANFF, BATH HOUSE, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).

——— COAL RESERVE, LEASES BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

——— ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 234 (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°, 7565 (iv).

BANKERS' ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i).

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

Bank of Montreal B. No. 72 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 82).

Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 940 ; 2°*, 1026 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 83).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES : Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

——— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

——— *See* 'Alliance,' 'Citizens, &c.', 'City and County,' 'Crown,' 'Home,' 'Mount Royal,' 'Northern,' 'Sterling.'

BAPTISTS, N.B., CENSUS ENUMERATION, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. 4801 (ii).

BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).

BARNES, AMOS, CLAIMS FOR LAND, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).

BARR COLONY, MR. HAULTAIN'S SPEECH, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).

Debate : (Mr. *Sifton*) 6355, 6375 ; (Mr. *Lennox*) 6358 ; (Mr. *Bell*) 6360 ; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx*) 6365 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 6369 ; (Mr. *Scott*) 6371 ; (Sir *William Mulock*) 6383 ; (Mr. *Fowler*) 6384 ; (Mr. *Davis*) 6391 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6394, 6400 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 6404 (iii).

BARR COLONY AND IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

——— NUMBER, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

BARRIE, WHARF, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup , 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).

——— P. O., BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).

BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR : *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902 : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).

BAYFIELD HARBOUR WORKS, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).

BAYFIELD, ONT., EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).

'BAYFIELD,' STR., REPAIRS AND SALE, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).

——— SALE, REPAIRS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5586 (iii).

——— in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans Reps., &c. : Read (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 5742, 5763 (iii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY : in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14435 (vi).

BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT : (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi.).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING : in Com. of Sup 1153 (i).

BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Remarks *re*, in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup. 2712, 2989 (ii).

BELLE RIVIERE, SHEET PILING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C. P. R. AGREEMENT, &c : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ry. B. 21,' 'Telephones,' &c.

BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup.. 969 (i), 13082 (vi).

—— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14154

BENNETT, MR., INCREASE IN SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13967 (vi).

BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Clare*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 84).

BERNIER, CAPT., GOVT. AID TO, *re* POLAR EXPEDITION: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 12805 (vi).

BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).

BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).

BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).

BILLS, PRIVATE, DELAY IN TRANSLATION AND PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

BILLS, ROYAL ASSENT, 5427, 6388 (iii), 8655 (iv), 14858 (vi).

—— COMS. FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5315, 6353 (iii), 8642 (iv), 14844 (vi).

BILLS WITHDRAWN: M. (Mr. *Hyman*) 7203 (iii).

—— *See* 'Business,' &c.

BILLS:

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1°*, 4; *pro formâ*.

BILL (No. 2) To amend Chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1900, authorizing the granting of Railway Subsidies.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 545; in Com., 550; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700; in Com., 1059; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 56).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 885; in Com., 902, 1200 (i). M to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., 13560, 14405; wthdn., 14769 (vi).

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Maclean*).
1° m., 92; 2° m., 701 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Lancaster*).
1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y., 99; N., 53) 565 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 7) To amend Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes with respect to retiring allowances of Judges.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; wthdn., 634 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Expropriation Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 22).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2° m., 313; in Com., 313; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 10) To amend the Act relating to the Custody of Juvenile Offenders in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 30).

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Act respecting the Publication of the Statutes.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 65).

BILL (No. 12) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 13).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 95; 2° and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 12).

BILL (No. 14) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Law*).
1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062 (i).

BILL (No. 15) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 19).

BILL (No. 16) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 114; 2°, 871 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 17) To aid in the Settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—(Sir *William Mulock*).
1°*, 114; 2° m., 2535 (ii); in Com., 2923; 3°*, 3298 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 55).

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; negatived, 939 (i).

BILL (No. 19) Respecting Drainage on and across the property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 20) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1° m., 203; 2° m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).

BILL (No. 21) To amend and consolidate the Law respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Blair*).
1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591 (i), 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 58).
—— Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com. on Res., 8119 (iv).

BILL (No. 22) To amend the Supreme Court and Exchequer Court Acts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).

BILL (No. 23) To indemnify those who suffered damages in consequence of Fires caused by Railways.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1° m., 283 (i); 2° m., 2780 (ii); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 24) To extend the power of Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1° m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).

BILL (No. 25) Respecting the Eastern Townships Bank.—(Mr. *McIntosh*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. *Costigan*).
1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 27) Respecting the Canada National Railway and Transport Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 92).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; M. for Com., 1804; in Com., 1806; M. for 3°, 1810, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 81).

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 121).

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Federal Oil Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 120).

BILL (No. 31) Repecting the Canadian Order of the Woodmen of the World.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., 1854; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 141).

BILL (No. 34) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 446; 2°*, 632 (i).

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 446; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

BILL (No. 36) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ball*).
1°*, 446; on Order for 2°, 631, 664, 852; 2° m., 1505 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6617 (iii).

BILL (No. 37) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Champagne*).
1°*, 540; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 173).

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 541; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 124).

BILL (No. 39) To make further provision for the prevention of cruelty to Animals, and to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 541; 2°*, 1324; in Com., 1324 (i); 2779, 3237 (ii)

BILL (No. 40) To confer on the Commisssioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the International Railway Appliance Company.—(Mr. *Brock*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 133).

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Kootenay Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 142).

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 75).

BILL (No. 43) To incorporate the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 852 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i).

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 89).

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Harty*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 976 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 139).

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Nipissing and Pontiac Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool*).
1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166).

BILL (No. 48) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1° m., 592; 2° m., 1065 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

BILL (No. 49) To amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B., 597; 2°, 1116; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

BILL (No. 50) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway (Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 654; 2°*, 853; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 87).

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Northern Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *McCreary*).
1°*, 654; 2°*, 853 (i); in Com., 2753; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 168).

BILL (No. 52) To incorporate the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bazinet*).
1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 135).

BILL (No. 53) Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1° m., 654; 2° m., 2373 (i); on Order for 2°, 2787; 2° m., 3248; neg. (Y., 41; N., 74), 3256 (ii).

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, and to change its name to the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2303; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 94).

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 56) To incorporate the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 179).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Niagara Grand Island Bridge Company.—(Mr *German*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 1811; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 161).

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Edmonton Street Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Monk*).
1°*, 707; on Order for 2°, 977; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i); M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y., 51; N., 87), 6537 (iii).

BILL (No. 60) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ross, Ontario*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 1327; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 130).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 61) Respecting the Winnipeg Western Land Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 204).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 169).

BILL (No. 63) Respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McGugan*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 145).

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com., 5139 (iii) 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 122).

BILL (No. 65) Respecting the Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada (Mr. *Bruce*).
1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 159).

BILL (No. 66) To Readjust the Representation in the House of Commons.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); Rep. of Sel. Com. (presented) 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 60).

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Brockville and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*).
1°*, 813 (i).

BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Charlton*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 146).

BILL (No. 69) To incorporate the North-west Coal and Coke Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 167).

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 147).

BILL (No. 71) To incorporate the Imperial Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 132).

BILL (No. 72) Respecting the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 82).

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Power Co.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3° m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 170).

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1° m., 814 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).

BILL (No. 75) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 98).

BILL (No. 76) To enable the City of Vancouver to acquire certain lands and interests adjoining Vancouver Harbour.—(Mr. *Macpherson*).
1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 77) To promote the Safety of Railway Employees.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*).
1°* m., 872; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2387 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 78) To amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901.—(Sir *Frederick W. Borden*).
1°* m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 35).

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026; in Com. and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 83).

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Canada North-west Land Company, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 93).

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Brandon and South-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*).
1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 82) Respecting and restricting Chinese Immigration.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°-4 of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 8).

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the New Canadian Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 160.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1338; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 176.)

BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Berlin, Waterloo, Wellesley and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Clare.*)
1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 86) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Smith, Wentworth.*)
1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°*, 2387 (i); 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

BILL (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Macpherson.*)
1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 199.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company, of the City of Montreal, and to change its name to the 'Montreal Fire Insurance Company.'—(Mr. *LaRivière.*)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 158.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Brockville and North-western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company, Limited; and to change its name to the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 163.)

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Dominion Gas Improvement Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 114.)

BILL (No. 92) Respecting the Dominion Burglary Guarantee Company, Limited; and to change its name to the 'Dominion Guarantee Company, Limited.'—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)

BILLS--*Con.*

BILL (No. 92)--*Con.*
1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 93) To incorporate the Shipping Federation of Canada.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 190.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting Incorporated Companies.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

BILL (No. 95) To amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Puttee.*)
1° m., 1193 (i); 2° m., 2790; 2° m., and in Com., 3259, 3260 (ii).

BILL (No. 96) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

BILL (No. 97) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

BILL (No. 98) Respecting the Bruce Mines and Algoma Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 194.)

BILL (No. 101) To Incorporate the London Loan Company of Canada.--(Mr. *McGugan.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).

BILL (No. 102) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.--(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°m., 1812; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 181.)

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Royal Trust Company.--(Mr. *Casgrain.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 185.)

BILL (No. 104) To incorporate the Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.--(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3°m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88).

BILL (No. 105) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Standard Car Truck Company.--(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 192.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°m., 1295; 2°m., 2387 (i), 3282 (ii).

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Empire Accident and Surety Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c* 118).

BILL (No. 108) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 171.)

BILL (No. 109) To correct a clerical error in the Act to incorporate the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 18.)

BILLS--*Con.*

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 111) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 116.)

BILL (No. 112) To incorporate the Canada Industrials Corporation, Limited.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 188.)

BILL (No. 114) Respecting the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 165.)

BILL (No. 115) To incorporate the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Tobin.*)
1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816; in Com., 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 83).

BILL (No. 116) Respecting the Restigouche Boom Company, and to change its name to 'The Restigouche Boom and Log Driving Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1816 (i).

BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 128).

BILL (No. 118) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 90).

BILL (No. 119) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., 3582; in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 143.)

BILL (No. 121) To incorporate the Consolidated Trust Corporation.—(Mr. *McColl.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 110).

BILL (No. 122) Respecting the Rathbun Company.—(Mr. *Harty.*)
1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 180).

BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 131).

BILL (No. 124) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Stewart.*)
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3752 (ii (3 *Edward VII, c.* 129).

BILL (No. 125 To incorporate the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 125).

BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 127) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 112).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Schooley.—(Mr. *Boyd*).
1°*, 2100; 2° m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 189).

BILL (No. 129) Respecting the Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Guthrie*).
1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2756 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 111).

BILL (No. 130) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°*, 1936 (i); 2° m., 3285, 3823 (ii).

BILL (No. 131) To incorporate the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149).

BILL (No. 132) To incorporate the Père Marquette International Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 175).

BILL (No. 133) To prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of Cigarettes.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1° m., 2014 (i); 2° m., 3286 (ii).

BILL (No. 134) To incorporate the Erie, Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).

BILL (No. 135) To incorporate the Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 178).

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *McCarthy*).
1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

BILL (No. 137) To regulate the sale and provide for the inspection of Textile Fabrics.—(Mr. *Scott*).
1°, 2101 (i); 2° m., 3294 (ii).

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).

BILL (No. 139) Respecting the St. Mary's River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 187).

BILL (No. 140) To incorporate the Cardiff Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 103).

BILL (No. 141) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c,* 152).

BILL (No. 142) Respecting the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fowler*).
1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117).

BILL (No. 143) Respecting the Canadian Northwest Irrigation Company.—(Mr. *Oliver*).
1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 96).

BILL (No. 144) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).
1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 145) Respecting the Quebec Bridge Company; and to change its name to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.—(*Mr. Power*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4586; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 177).

BILL (No. 146) Respecting the Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Railway Company.—(Mr. *Vrooman*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 144).

BILL (No. 147) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4672; order for Com., 4868 (ii); 5555 (remarks), 5882, 6198 (iii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812; in Com., 9419; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 196).

BILL (No. 148) respecting certain Trust Funds of the Diocese of Moosonee.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in. Com. and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

BILL (No. 149) To incorporate the Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Company. (Mr. *Cowan*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 126).

BILL (No. 150) To incorporate the Columbia River Improvement Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 109).

BILL (No. 151) To incorporate the St. Joseph Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

BILL (No. 152) To incorporate the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riley*).
1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 191).

BILL (No. 153) To incorporate the Mount Royal Savings Bank.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

BILL (No. 154) To incorporate the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—(Mr. *German*).
1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4592; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 162).

BILL (No. 155) Respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*).
1°*, 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).

BILL (No. 156) To incorporate the Longueuil Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 156).

BILL (No. 157) To incorporate the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

BILL (No. 158) To incorporate the St. Chrysostôme Railway Company.—(Mr. *Brown*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); ref. back to Sel. Com., 7399 (iii); in Com., 7771; 3°*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 186).

BILL (No. 159) To incorporate the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).
1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

BILL (No. 160) To incorporate the Stewart River Development Company.—(Mr. *Davis*).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 160)—*Con.*

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 195).

BILL (No. 161) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Woolf Valve Gear Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).

BILL (No. 162) Respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, and to change its name to the "Jordan Light, Heat and Power Company."—(Mr. *German*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 136).

BILL (No. 163) Respecting the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Thompson*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 198).

BILL (No. 164) To incorporate the Pacific Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Galliher*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 174).

BILL (No. 165) To incorporate the Algonquin Lumber and Power Company.—(Mr. *Gould*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., 5361; 3°*, 5361 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 77).

BILL (No. 166) To incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gauvreau*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891.

BILL (No. 167) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to "The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company."—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 168) To incorporate the Chicoutimi and North Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Girard*).

1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

BILL (No. 169) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of James Sinclair McDougall.—(Mr. *Gallery*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).

BILL (No. 170) To incorporate the Nepigon Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.)

M. to rec. Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

BILL (No. 171) To incorporate the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company—(Mr. *Stephens*).

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 195).

BILL (No. 172) To incorporate the City and County Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Rosamond*.)

1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 107).

BILL (No. 173) To change the name of Hudson's Bay.—(Mr. *Maclean*.)

1°m., 2794 (ii).

BILL (No. 174) To amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson*.)

Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; 3°m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 14).

BILL (No. 175) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 104).

BILL (No. 176) To incorporate the Canadian Transportation and Storage Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 176)—*Con.*

1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).

BILL (No. 177) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *McIsaac*.)

M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 140).

BILL (No. 178) Respecting the encouragement of the construction of Dry Docks.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)

Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii); 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 17).

BILL (No. 179) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*.)

1°m., 3298 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6918; 3°*, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII c.* 63).

BILL (No. 180) To incorporate the Prince Edward Island Ferry Company.—(Mr. *Emmerson*.)

1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

BILL (No. 181) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°m., 3391 (ii).

BILL (No. 182) To amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 50).

BILL (No. 183) Respecting the Desjardins Canal.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

1°m., 3393; 2°*, 4213; in Com., and 3°*, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 16).

BILL (No. 184) To amend the Patent Act.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)

1°m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com., 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 46).

BILL (No. 185) Respecting the Canadian Steel Company.—(Mr. *German*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 3797; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).

BILL (No. 186) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 26).

BILL (No. 187) To amend the Electric Light Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 20).

BILL (No. 188) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Bernier*.)

1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 72).

BILL (No. 189) To incorporate the Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Birkett*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3°m., 7485; agreed to (Y., 57; N., 9); 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).

BILL (No. 190) Respecting Queen's College, Kingston.—(Mr. *Harty*.)

1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

BILL (No. 191, from the Senate) To incorporate the Home Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 127).

BILL (No. 192) To enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr *Puttee*.)

1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii); in Com., 5558, 5584, 5887, 5960, 6845; 3°*, 6845 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 203).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 193) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford.*)
1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 194) Respecting infectious or contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. *Fisher*).
1°*, 4003; 2° m., 4224; in Com., 4225, 4690; 3°*, 4691 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 195, from the Senate) For the Relief of James Reid Steele.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 193.)

BILL (No. 196, from the Senate) For the Relief of William Allen.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 4179; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 197, from the Senate) Respecting the Rocky Mountains Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Costigan.*)
1°*, 4262; 2°*, 4404 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 184.)

BILL (No. 198) Respecting Penny Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 47.)

BILL (No. 199) Respecting the Good Shepherd Reformatory in the City of St. John, N.B.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 200) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2°*, and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn., 12493 (v.)

BILL (No. 201) To provide for further Advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop. 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B., 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°, m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 202, from the Senate) To incorporate the Missionary Society of the Church of England in Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
1 *, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 155.)

BILL (No. 203) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4261; 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 197.)

BILL (No. 204, from the Senate) To amend the Act relating to Naturalization and Aliens.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 5137; 2°, and in Com., 5872; 3° m., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 205, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 5238. 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 200.)

BILL (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 207) To prohibit the importation, manufacture or sale of adulterated, process or renovated Butter, Oleomargarine, Butterine or other substitute for Butter; and to prevent the improper marking of Butter.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 207)—*Con.*
Res. prop., 4960; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii); 1° of B., 5240; 2°, and in Com., 5419, 5430, 5845; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 208) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)
1° m., 5240; 2° m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853; 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 209) Respecting certain Aid for the Extension of the Canadian Northern Railway.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*, 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 210) Respecting the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCool.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).

BILL (No. 211) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 164.)

BILL (No. 212) To incorporate the Alliance Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Russell.*)
M. to rec. Pet., 4958 (ii); 1°*, 5512; 2° m., 5585; in Com., 7470; 3°*, 7478 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 213) To incorporate the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°*, 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 214) For the Relief of Florence D. Graves.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 5581; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 215) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 216) Respecting the Midway and Vernon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher*).
1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154.)

BILL (No. 217) Respecting Penitentiaries.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 5763 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dschgd, 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 218) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1903, and the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 219, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting the punishment of Fradulent Debtors.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 220) Respecting Government and Post Office Savings Banks.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
1°, 6353; 2°*, and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 221) Further to amend the Act respecting Public and Reformatory Prisons.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3°*, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 51).

BILL (No. 222) Respecting Dominion Notes.—(Mr. *Fielding*)
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 43).

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 223) To amend the Act of 1899, respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6269; in Com. on Res., 6448; 1°*, of B., 6456; 2°*, and in Com., 6806; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 45).

BILL (No. 224) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*, 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 225) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 226) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*. 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 227, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act, 1902.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 228, from the Senate) For the relief of Stephen Wilson.—(Mr. *Wade*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com. and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202.)

BILL (No. 229, from the Senate) For the relief of Ellen McDermid.—(Mr. *Birkett*).
1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150.)

BILL (No. 230, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Offences connected with Trade and Breaches of Contract.
(This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons).

BILL (No. 231) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of the Keller Heater Company of Canada, Limited.—(Mr. *McIsaac*).
M. to rec. Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

BILL (No. 232) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Sifton*).
1° m., 7294 (iii); 2° m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 233) Respecting the Manufacture of Binder Twine in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*, 2°*. 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 234) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. *Henderson*).
1°, 7565 (iv).

BILL (No. 235) To provide for the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*).
1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8487, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv), 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B., 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 236, from the Senate) For the relief of Harford Ashley.—(Mr. *Porter*).
1°*, 8115; 2°*, 9431 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 12146 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 80.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 237, from the Senate) Further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Préfontaine*).
1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 238) To amend chapter 8 of the Statutes of 1899, respecting the Bounties on Steel and Iron, and to provide for the payment of Bounties on certain articles manufactured from Steel.—(Mr. *Fielding*).
Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°* of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 239) To provide for the payment of Bounties on Lead contained in Lead-bearing Ores mined in Canada.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 6169 (iii), in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 240) To assist in establishing and maintaining an independent and efficient service of telegraphic news from Great Britain, for publication in the Canadian Press.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
Res. prop., 8118; in Com. on Res., 8231; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv); 2°m., 10715; in Com., 10718; 3°*, 10741 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 241) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding*.)
1°*; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 242) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)
1° m., 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 243) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, the Exchequer Court Act, and the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
Res. prop. 203 (i); withdn., 2582; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087; in Com. on Res., 8369; 1°*; 2°* of B.; in Com. and 3°*, 8372 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 29).

BILL (No. 244) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com. and 3°*, 10903 (v).—(3 *Edward VII, c.* 201).

BILL (No. 245) To further amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *Wm. Mulock*.)
1° m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop., 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

BILL (No. 246, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, respecting Freedom of Labour.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 247, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 248, from the Senate) Respecting the incorporation of Mining Companies.
[This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BILL (No. 249) To incorporate the Westminster Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Morrison*.)
M. to rec. Pet., 10489; 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).

BILL (No. 250) Respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 250) - *Con.*

Prop. Res., 10102; in Com. on Res., 10759; 1°*; 2°*; and in Com., 10792, 11406; 3°*, 11422 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 251) To amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

1° m., 11159 (v); Order dischd., 13444 (vi).

BILL (No. 252) To amend the Act relating to Ocean Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 253) To increase the Representation of the North-west Territories in the Senate.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11691; 2°*, and in Com., 12302; 3°*, 12304 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 42.)

BILL (No. 254) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 11692; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 255) To provide for the Appointment of an Additional Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Res. prop., 11426; in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° of Res., 11833; 1°* of B. 11833; 2°*, and in Com., 12301; 3°*, 12302 (v).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 256) To provide for Advances to the Government of the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 10102; in Com. on Res., 12306; 1°* of B., 12330 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12843; 3°*, 12845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 41.)

BILL (No. 257) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Sir *William Mulock.*)

Res. prop., 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3° m., 13942; Sen, Amts., 14845 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 9.)

BILL (No. 258) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Res. prop., 8332 (iv); Res. wthdn., 10715; Res. prop., 11189; in Com. on Res., 12574; 1°* of B., 12584 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12944; 3°*, 12983 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 259) To amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 12610; 2°, and in Com., 13853; 14287; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 260) To amend the Act respecting certain Works constructed in or over Navigable Waters.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

BILL (No. 261) Respecting the Pilotage District of Montreal, and the Port and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B. 12800; 2° m., 12984; 2°, and in Com. 13627; 3° m., 13937 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 48.)

BILL (No. 262) To amend the Act respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

In Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°* of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 263) To amend the Shipping Casualties Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)

BILLS—*Con.*

BILL (No. 263)—*Con.*

In Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3°, 13560 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 264) Respecting the Ottawa Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ethier.*)

1°*; 2°*; and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 172.)

BILL (No. 265) Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1°, 13667; 2°*, and in Com., 14297; 3°*, 14299 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 61.)

BILL (No. 266) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)

Prop. Res., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 24.)

BILL (No. 267) Respecting the Librarians of Parliament.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)

BILL (No. 268) Respecting the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

Prop. Res., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 269) Respecting the Management and Control of Public and other Works.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)

1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 270) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the Construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 13549; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428; 1°*, 14519; 2°, and in Com., 14735, 14740; 3°*, 14741 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 271) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1904.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 4.)

BILL (No. 272) To authorize aid to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company towards the completion of its undertaking, and to confirm an Agreement between His Majesty and the said Company, with respect to such aid.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

Prop. Res., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734; in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 54.)

BILL (No. 273) To amend the Customs Tariff Act, 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)

In Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14758 (vi).—(3 *Edward VII*, c. 15.)

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF MANILLA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7566 (v).

BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE OF SISAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).

Binder Twine Bounties B. No. 233 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6436; in Com. on Res., 7300, 7353; 1°*; 2°*, 7382; in Com., 7383 (iii), 7728 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 5.)

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305, 7353 (iii).

BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3512 (ii).

—— CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4180 (ii).

—— COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 447 (i).

—— INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).

—— INSPECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii).

—— INSPECTION, METHOD OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).

—— INSPECTOR HAYCOCK, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).

—— INSPECTOR'S REP.: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c., 13788, 14043 (vi).

—— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3798 (ii).

—— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 203 (i).

—— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1590 (i).

—— QUANTITY, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2311 (i).

—— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).

—— REP. OF AG. COM., DISTRIBUTION OF COPIES: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).

—— RESIDENCES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4182 (ii).

BIRKETT, MR. T., M.P., LEASE OF LANDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL, 12218 (v).

BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLANKETS, CLOTHING, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

BLANKETS, WEBCLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

—— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).

BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N.B., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

Boards of Trade Incorp. B. (No. 247, from the Senate). [This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.]

BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

BONAVENTURE EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).

BOND-HAY TREATY: *See* 'Finance-German.'

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U. S.: *See* 'Coasting, &c.'

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BOOK-KEEPING *re* I.C.R. EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877

BOOTS FOR MAIL CARRIERS: *See* 'Post Office, &c.'

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790.

Bounties, &c.: *See* 'Lead, &c.', 'Steel and Iron'

BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).

—— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).

BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5990 (iii).

—— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4185 (ii).

BRACEBRIDGE, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960

—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).

—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).

BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 157 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. to ref. back to sel. com., 5238; in Com., 5985; 3°*, 5989 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 86).

Brandon and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 940; 2°* 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5585 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 85).

BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).

BRANTFORD ELECTORAL DISTRICT: in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10919 (v).

——*See* 'Representation B. 66.

BRANT INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P.E.I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

BRIDGES OVER CANALS, GOVERNMENT MAINTENANCE OF, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 14152 (vi).

BRIDGES OF I.C.R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).

BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

British Cable News Service, G. B. and Can. B. No. 240 (Mr. *Fielding*). Res. prop., 8118 ; in Com. on Res., 8231 ; 1°* of B., 8243 (iv) ; 2°m., 10715 ; in Com., 10718 ; 3°*, 10741 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 70).

——Remarks *re* (Mr. *Gourley*) 1396 (vi).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 654 ; 2°*, 853 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 87).

BRITISH COLUMBIA :

ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup. 13304 (vi).

ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).

ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

ASSAY OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii), 13965 13779 (vi).

ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

BURRARD, CENSUS COMMISSIONERS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

CANNING INDUSTRY : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Fraser,' 'Salmon,' &c.

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO., *re* LIARD RIVER MINERS : in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL : in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

——*See* 'Indians.'

COLUMBIA RIVER, ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— OPENING CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).

—— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).

CROW'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

DREDGING PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

——GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

FALSE CREEK, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

——LEASE TO KELLY & BURNETT : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

——Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

FISHERIES PROTECTIVE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

FISHERIES STEAMERS, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

FLAGSHIP, BRITISH, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

FRASER RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNER'S ASSOCIATION TEL.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

——*See* 'Salmon,' &c.

HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).

HARDY BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).

HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT : in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

INDIANS : in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii).

——FISHING RIGHTS *re* INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

——MEDICAL ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS : in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).

——STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, ROYAL COMMISSION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).

JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——*See* 'False Creek.'

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

——CORRECTION, &C : in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION, REP. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

—— REP. *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 7198 (iii).

—— COMMISSIONERS, APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

LABOUR TROUBLES, ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, B.C.*) 945 (i).

—— *See* 'Industrial.'

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

LUMBER TRADE, TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS : Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).

MCCRANEY, MR. W., EX-M.P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION : Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MILITARY RESERVE AT PORT MOODY : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS : in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

—— *See* 'Racine.'

NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14337 (vi).

NICOLA-KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

OFFICERS' MESS., STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B.C. SALMON : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS'

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

'QUADRA' STR.—*Con.*

MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

QUATSINO CITY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

QUESNEL DAM, OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 11557 (v).

RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7162 (iii).

——— Letters read from Dep. Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).

ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).

SALMON COMMISSIONERS: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).

SALMON INDUSTRY, FRASER RIVER, TELS. FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, &C.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——— INCREASED CAPACITY OF HATCHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

SALMON SHIPPED TO FRANCE FROM B.C., TARIFF *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.C's., &c.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 706 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).

SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).

——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).

UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

——— INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).

VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER ISLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).

VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

WILLIAMS HEAD, QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

BRITISH JOURNALISTS' AND MEMBERS' VISIT TO CAN., RECEPTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 7488 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 2105 (i).

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11065 (v).

——— *See* 'Treadgold.'

BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

Brockville and North-Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1° m., 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i).

Brockville and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., 6655; on Order for Com., 6846, 7137, 7339; in Com., 7339, 7400; 3° m., 7468 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 88.)

——— M. (Mr. *Galliher*) for Com., 7339 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7339 (iii).

——— Appeal to Speaker from Dep. Speaker's Ruling (Mr. *Taylor*) 7342 (iii).

——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Taylor*) 7401 (iii); M. (Mr. *Speaker*) for 3°, Agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii); 3° m. (Mr. *Galliher*) 7468; Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7469 (iii).

——— on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 6847 (iii).

Brockville and Western Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 67 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 813 (i).

BRONTE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).

BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755, 5757 (iii).

BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

BRUCE COUNTY, REPRESENTATION IN PARLT.: in Com. on Representation B. 66, 10940 (v).

——— *See* 'Representation B. 66.'

Bruce Mines and Algoma Ry. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i).

BRUCE MINES AND ALGOMA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14436 (vi).

BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com of Sup., 5911 (iii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT: M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).

——— *See* 'St. James,' &c.

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378, 1743 (i).

——— Reply (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1462, 2192 (i).

Debate: (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1596; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1619; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1643; (Mr. *Gourley*) 1657; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1681; (Mr. *Davis*) 1715; (Mr. *Speaker*, irrelevancy of debate, Ruling) 1735, 1742; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1740; (Mr. *Fielding*) on Ques. of Order, 1743; (Mr. *Reid*) 1764; (Mr. *Blain*) 1785; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1799, 1816; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1825; (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1832; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1860; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1876; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 1891; (Mr. *Bell*) 1907; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 1937; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1946; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1953; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1974; (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1994; (Mr. *Hackett*) 2017; (Mr. *Schell*) 2025; (Mr. *Morin*) 2034; (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 2036; (Mr. *Kemp*) 2050; (Mr. *Galliher*) 2063; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2076; (Mr. *Grant*) 2109; (Mr. *Broder*) 2119; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2131; (Mr. *Puttee*) 2149; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2167; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2176; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Remarks, *re* Winnipeg Speech, 2192; (Mr. *Clarke*) 2206; (Mr. *Ball*) 2234 (i).

BUDGET, AMT. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Negatived (Y. 54 ; N. 107) 2235 (i).

BUDGET, THE: (Remarks) 1114 (i).

—— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).

BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).

—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

—— N.W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).

—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).

—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).

—— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i), 5841 (iii), 13053, 14245 (vi).

—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

—— *See* 'Dom. Buildings.'

Burglary Guarantee: *See* 'Dom. Guarantee.

BURK'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).

BURLINGTON CHANNEL, PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup , 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).

BURRARD, B.C., CENSUS COMMISSIONERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7079 (iii).

BUSINESS OF THE HSE., COMPLAINTS, &c.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

—— DELAY IN PRINTING BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 482 (i).

—— INACCURACY OF STATEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4347 (ii).

—— LATE SITTINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3207 (ii).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Victoria Day Adjournment, 3127 (ii).

—— ON M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) TO TAKE IN MONDAYS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3708 (ii).

—— PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

—— PUBLIC BILLS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2300 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2386 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1110 (i), 3794, 5051 (ii), 5581, 5959, 7090 (iii), 7728, 7812 (iv).

—— *re* SUPPL. ESTIMATES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4957 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 2394 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 871 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'

Butter Adulteration, Prevention B. No. 207 (Mr. *Fisher*) Res. prop., 4960 ; in Com. on Res., 5052 (ii) ; 1° of B., 5240 ; 2°, and in Com , 5419, 5430, 5845 ; 3°*, 5853 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BUTTER ADULTERATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Blain*) *re* Irish Butter in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).

BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING, REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 5414 (iii).

BUTTER, CANADIAN, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10745 (v).

—— *See* 'Canadian.'

BUTTER MADE AT EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593, 1857 (i).

CABINET CHANGES: *See* 'Ministerial Changes.'

CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

Cable News Service between G. B. and Can: *See* 'British Cable.'

CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591 ; 2°*, 665 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 89).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).

'CAMPANA,' INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE AND MAIL BAGS, AUTHORITY TO USE: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).

—— *See* 'Mail Bags.'

CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, EMPLYMT. OF SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 14286 (vi).

—— *See* 'Franking.'

CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).

CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

—— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).

—— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).

CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

—— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

Canada Atlantic Railway Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1642 ; 2°*, 1816 (i) ; in Com., and 3ˣ, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 90).

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTION MEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

Canada Bank: *See* 'Sterling Bank of Canada.'

Canada Central Railway Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1294; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 91).

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii), 7728 (iv).

Canada Industrial Corporation, Limited, Incorp. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 95).

CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).

—— REPRESENTATIONS TO MIN. OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).

Canada National Railway and Transport Co.'s B. No. 27 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1025 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 92).

Canada North-west Land Company, Limited, Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 940; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 93).

Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2303; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 94).

CAN. AND SOUTH AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).

CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Law*) 1°*, 113; 2° m., 1061; in Com., 1062.

CANADIAN APPLES: *See* 'Apples.'

CANADIAN ARTISTS AND ART GALLERY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 13513 (vi).

—— *See* 'Art,' &c.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION, GOVT. AID *re* TUBERCULOSIS: in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i)

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CANADIAN BUTTER, MR. PRESTON'S INTERVIEW: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).

—— *See* 'Butter.'

CANADIAN CATTLE EMBARGO IN G. B.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

—— *See* 'Cattle.'

CAN. CENTRAL AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

CANADIAN COMPANY (NEW) INCORP. B. No. 83 (MR. LEMIEUX): M. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2753 (ii).

—— *See* 'New.'

CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU, SUIT AGAINST W. T. R. PRESTON: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).

CANADIAN EXHIBITS AT IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).

CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

—— *See* 'Fisheries.'

CANADIAN FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).

—— O. C. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (vi).

—— *See* 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).

—— *See* 'Ottawa.'

CANADIAN MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

—— *See* 'Militia.'

Canadian, New Co.: *See* 'New Canadian.'

Canadian Northern Railway Co.'s B. No. 110 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 97).

—— **Aid B. No. 209** (Mr. *Blair*) Res. prop., 4185; in Com. on Res., 4363, 4961, 5089, 5100 (ii); 1°* of B., 5358; 2°, and in Com., 5589, 5786; 3°*., 5824 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 7).

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

—— Ret. *re* Estimate of Cost laid on Table, 5052.

Canadian North-west Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2300 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 3226, 3582, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 96).

Canadian Order of Woodmen: *See* 'Woodmen.'

Canadian Pacific Railway Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 98).

C. P. R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— CAR SHORTAGE AND FREIGHT CONGESTION IN N.W.T.: *See* 'Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.'

—— ELKHORN BRANCH SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).

—— EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

—— EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH SUBSIDY: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).

—— AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— LANDS AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).

—— LANDS IN MAN., TAX EXEMPTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i).

C.P.R., Private Car No. 001, Improvements, &c., Payment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).
—— Steamers leaving St. John: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup. 14076 (vi).
—— *See* 'Allan Line.'
—— Transcontinental Trains, Water Supply: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).
Can. Press Despatches: *See* 'British Cable, &c.'
Canadian Steel Co.'s B. No. 185 (Mr. *German*) 1°, 3708; 2°, 3797; in Com., and 3°, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 99).
Canadian Telephone and Telegraph Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 3864; 2°, 4132 (ii); in Com., 7479; 3° m., 7485; agreed to (Y. 57; N. 9) 7486 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 100).
—— in Com.: Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479 (iii). Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).
Canadian Trade with Japan: *See* 'Japan Exhibition.'
Canadian Transportation and Storage Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 176 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5584, 5883; 3°*, 5887 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 101).
Canadian Yukon Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 159 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 102).

CANALS:

'Alert,' Str., Canal Surveys: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi.)
Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
—— Locks: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
Beauharnois Canal, Flooding Lands, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 7803, 8268 (iv); 12895, 14134 (vi).
—— Conc., 8374 (iv).
Canal Collectors, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12933 (vi).
—— Employees, Increases of Wages: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 2303 (i).
—— in Ont. and Quebec, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
—— Miscellaneous Vote: in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
—— Operating Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 12920 (vi).
—— Tolls, Collectors Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12929 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
—— Tonnage Dues, Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 874 (i).
Casselman, Lockmaster, Williamsburg Canal, Superannuation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
Chambly, Collector of Tolls, Salary: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— Dismissal of Jules Quesnel: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
—— *See* 'Moreau.'
—— Electric Station By-Wash: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

CANALS—*Con.*

Chambly, Land Damages: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— Macadamizing Tow Path: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electrical Equipment for Lock Gates: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
—— Lighting, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii), 12895 (vi).
—— Supt.'s Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
Corry Award, 7557 (iii).
Engineers Salaries *re* Canals: in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
—— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
—— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
—— surveys, lifting boulders: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
—— Dam: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (vi).
—— Rapids Channel, Deepening, &c.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
—— deepening, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
—— *See* 'Farrans,' 'North Channel,' 'Williamsburg,' &c.
Grenville, Guide Piers at Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
—— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigation: in Com. of Sup., 14166 (vi).
Gibault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Howie, F. W., Legal Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).
Iroquois Canals, Electric Lighting: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901.
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
—— Enlargement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
—— Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
—— Lighting: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).
—— Lock Gate Protection: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
—— Masonry Wall, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
Lockmen, &c., on Canals: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Mill Street, Paving, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Moreau, Mr. H., Collector on Chambly Canal: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— *See* 'Chambly—Dismissal,' &c.
Morrison, Mrs., Claims *re* Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).
Murray, Purchase of Mr. Johnson's House: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
—— Goodrich, Mr., Removal: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
—— Wire Fencing: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
North Channel and Dam, Galops Rapids: in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
—— Completion: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
—— *See* 'Farrans,' 'Galops,' &c.

CANALS—*Con.*

NORTH CHANNEL CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv).
O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS; in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPORTS: M. for copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
PETERBOROUGH CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PRIVILEGE, Ques. of (Mr. *Schell*) *re* appmnt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).
QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland'.
RAPIDE PLAT ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— BIRKETT, Mr. T., M.P., LEASE OF LAND, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 12217 (v).
——— CONCESSION ST. BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE, EQUIPMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 12845–7 (vi).
ST. OURS, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— STOP LOGS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iii).
——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii)., 12904 (vi).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &c.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEORGE GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— PAYMENT OF O'LEARYS' CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
STEWART, Mr., APPNMT AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRENT, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii)., 14645 (vi).
——— DODDS, THOS., PAYMENT TO: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).
——— MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— *See* 'Corry'.
——— PETERBOROUCH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— *See* 'Peterborough'.

CANALS—*Con.*

TRENT, REP. OF ENGINEER MCLEOD, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPORTS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for copies, 2313 (i).
See 'Simcoe.'
TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
WELLAND, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM & BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12900, 14148 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv)., 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT: *See* 'Ramy's Point.'
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— TOWNSEND VALVE, 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, O.Cs., *re*., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE, ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
WILLIAMSBURG, APPNMT. OF SUPT., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSLEMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— *See* 'Murray.'
YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).

CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

Cardiff Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com., 4591; 3°*, 4592 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 103).

CARETAKERS, DOM. BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i).

CARETAKERS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13061 (vi).

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CARLETON, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— *See* 'Census.'

CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).

CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).

CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).

See 'I.C.R.'

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &C.: (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CARVER *vs.* KING, COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

CASCA TRANSPORTATION CO. AND LIARD RIVER MINERS: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).

CASEY, GEO. E., EX-M.P., AND ARCHIVES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 13504 (vi).

CASSELMAN, LOCKMASTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).

——— *See* 'Canals.'

CATTLE EMBARGO IN G.B.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bell*) 368 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 375; (Mr. *Sproule*) 376; (Mr. *Maclean*) 381; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 384; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 385; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 388; (Mr. *Tarte*) 392; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 393; (Mr. *Cargill*) 395; (Mr. *Ross*) 396; (Mr. *McGowan*) 396; (Mr. *Boyd*) 397; (Mr. *Clancy*) 398; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 400; (Mr. *Ingram*) 401; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 402; (Mr. *Hackett*) 405; (Mr. *Haggart*) 408 (i).

CATTLE EMBARGO in G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 267 (i).

——— LORD ONSLOW'S DECLARATION: Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 14054 (vi).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— papers laid on Table, 591 (i).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Lennox*) 3396 (ii).

——— NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

——— REP., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i).

——— REP.: Inquiry (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

——— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

——— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

Cattle Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'

CATTLE INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

——— ON STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

CATTLE PURCHASED BY BRITISH GOVT.: Par. in Montreal 'Gazette' (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5415 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y., 48; N., 78) 5489 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 5467; (Mr. *Henderson*) 5468; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5469; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5473; (Mr. *Logan*) 5475; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 5477; (Mr. *Broder*) 5478; (Sir *William Mulock*) 5480; (Mr *Lennox*) 5484; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 5487; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5488 (iii).

CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).

CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

CENSUS, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

——— CARLETON, &C., N.B., RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— CIRCULAR OF MR. COTE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).

——— COST, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 204 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4800 (ii).

——— EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y., 35; N., 69) 13759 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Fisher*) 13707; (Mr. *Clarke*) 13708; (Mr. *Sproule*) 13721; (Mr. *Heyd*) 13724; (Mr. *Henderson*) 13730; (Mr. *Holmes*) 13733; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 13737; (Mr. *Bell*) 13740; (Mr. *McEwen*) 13753; (Mr. *Clancy*) 13755 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13672 (vi).

——— EXPENDITURE: Notice of Motion (Mr. *Monk*) 12368 (vi).

——— GRAND MANAN, N.B., RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— LAND VALUES: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).

——— N.B., RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 286 (i).

——— SCHEDULES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4635 (ii), 7054 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, HALTON, PEEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6894 (iii).

——— SCHEDULES, 1891, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7054 (iii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

CENSUS SCHEDULES, *re* HALTON AND CARDWELL: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 11425 (v).

——— STAFF EMPLOYED *re* ALTERATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13935 (vi).

——— TOTAL COST, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 289; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 289 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 479, 544 (i).

CENSUS BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 203 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1593 (i).
—— TOTAL COST: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iii).
—— VOTE: in Com. of Sup, 4594 (ii).

Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 175 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3126; 2°*, 3583 (ii); in Com., 5360, 5555, 5583, 5960, 6199; 3°*, 6202 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 104).

Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i).

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).

CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET AND GOV. GEN'S SPEECH: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).
—— SPEECH *re* PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, 13375 (vi).

CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
—— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL, Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
—— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
—— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).

CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).

CHAPMAN DOUBLE BALLBEARING CO., LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
—— REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iii).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
—— *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARLOTTETOWN ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
—— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
—— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHARTERED BANKS, LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14510 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).

CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).

CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 171 (Mr. *Stephens*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 105).

CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).

CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHÉTICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).

CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).

Chicoutimi and North Eastern Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 168 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 3172 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii).

CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).

Chinese Restriction Immigration B. No. 82 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Res. prop., 265; in Com. on Res., 597; 1°* of B., 945; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2398; 3°*, 2399 (i); Sen Amts., 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 8).

Church Missionary Society of Canada Incorp. B. No. 202 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 4727 (ii); 2°*, 5139; in Com., and 3°*, 6846. (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 155).

CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CIGARETTES, LEGISLATION *re*, in Com. on Criminal Code, 10748 (v).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Holmes*) 824; (Mr. *Barker*) 830; (Mr. *Lennox*) 831; (Mr. *Roddick*) 832; (Mr. *Logan*) 833; (Mr. *Taylor*) 836; (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 837; (Mr. *Bureau*) 838; (Mr. *Heyd*) 838; (Mr. *Broder*) 839; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 839; (Mr. *Stephens*) 841; (Mr. *Ross*, *Victoria*) 841; (Mr. *Tarte*) 842; (Mr. *Sproule*) 843; (Mr. *Macdonald*) 843; (Mr. *Brock*) 844; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 845 (i).

Cigarettes Prohibition Sale B. No. 133 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°m., 2014 (i); 2°m, 3286; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3286 (ii).

CIRCULARS TO CURÉS, P.Q. *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).

Citizens' Bank of Canada B. No. 213 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5990; in Com., 7478; 3°* 7479 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 106).

City and County Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 172 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3795; 3°*, 3797 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 107).

CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).

CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 207, 267, 319 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND GUARANTEE COMPANIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3233 (ii).

CIVIL SERVANTS IN MAN., AND INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3141; Neg. (N. 71; Y. 22) 3206 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *McCreary*) 3152; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3158; (Mr. *Scott*) 3164; (Mr. *Ingram*) 3167, 3183; Ques. of Order, 3167; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ruling, 3167; (Mr. *Blain*) 3169; (Mr. *Boyd*) 3172; (Sir *William Mulock*) 3176, 3185; (Mr. *Davis*) 3179; (Mr. *Puttee*) 3181; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3189 (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3191; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 3197; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3198 (ii)

——— Notice of Amt., 3126 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 245 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 9079 (iv); Res. prop. 10410; wthdn., 11301 (v).

——— **B. No. 257** (Sir *William Mulock*) Res. prop. 10410, 11829; in Com. on Res., 12330; M. for Com., 12493; in Com. on Res., 12500; 1°* of B., 12574 (v); 2°*, and in Com., 13808, 13833; 3°m., 13942; Sen. Amts., 14845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 9).

See 'Post Office Bill'.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. B. 257 (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. on Res., 12330; Amts. (Mr. *Birkett*) 12349, 12370, 12510 (v).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND TECHNICAL OFFICERS, &C.; Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13771 (vi).

CIVIL SERVICE, DECORATIONS: *See* 'Imperial Service'

——— EMPLOYEES CLASSIFICATION, SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 9681 (iv).

——— EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

——— EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).

Civil Service Superannuation Act Amt. B. No. 49 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 204; in Com. on Res., 593; 1°* of B., 597; 2°m., 1116; in Com., and 3°*, 1116 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 10).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

CLASSIFYING RECORDS: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, ABROGATION, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 109 (i).

CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Alaskan Boundary Award, 14521 (vi).

CLAYTON, &C., Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7297 (iii).

See 'Alaskan.'

CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).

CLERGUE'S CONTRACT WITH I. C. R. FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

See 'Steel Rails.'

CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717, (vi).

——— *See* 'Sault Ste. Marie.

CLERGUE RY. SYNDICATE, SUBSIDIES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 13668 (vi).

CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).

See 'Public Works.'

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker* 1 (i).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER, PATENT *re* I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

CLINTON, ONT., CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).

CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).

CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).

COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. on Sup., 1065 (i).

COAL FIELDS, SURVEY, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE, 1901, TO MARCH, 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COALING ACCOMMODATION *re* SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

COAL LANDS IN CROW'S NEST PASS APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).

COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).

COAL RATES, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).

COAL SHEDS, OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S., REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

Coast Yukon Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 108).

COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).

——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).

——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS; in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

COCAGNE, WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

COCHRANE, HON. SEN., TEL. *re* HEALTH (Mr. *Fielding*) 3000 (ii).

COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii), 7086 (iii), 7610 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENTS *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 9683 (iv).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).
COLONIAL CONFERENCE, BOND HAY TREATY AND ALASKA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 853 (i).
——— MEMORANDUM OF CAN. MINISTERS: in Budget Speech, 1404 (i).
——— REP. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3632 (ii).
COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 12218 (v).
——— *See* 'German.'
COLUMBIA RIVER, B. C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
Columbia River Improvement Company Limited, Incorp. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., 5559; in Com., and 3°*, 5585; Sen. Amts., 6847, 6894 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 109).
COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson*, Grey) 4360 (ii).
COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).
COMMISSIONER, ASS'T., CUSTOMS: *See* 'Customs Act Surtax.'
COMMITTEES:
COMMITTEES, SEL. STANDING: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
——— STANDING: Lists presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 197 (i).
——— M. to meet during Sittings of Hse. (Mr. *Hyman*) 8405 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 8333 (iv).
AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION: M. to add Name (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5679 (iii).
——— REP. *re* BINDER TWINE: M. to conc., 13788, 14043 (vi).
DEBATES: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).
ELECTION LAWS: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY: M. for Com., 91 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
COMMITTEES:—*Con.*
PRINTING, JOINT: List presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
——— M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. (Mr. *Parmelee*) 5314 (iii).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS, 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*) 5511 (iii).
——— M. to employ stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*) 7202 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS, MEETING CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
——— Motion to add Name (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 3431 (ii).
——— M. *re* Pub. Accts. (Mr. *Fraser*): 67 (i).
——— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).
COMMUTATION OF CARVER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 13303 (vi).
Companies Act (1902) Amt. B. No. 227, (from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.
Compulsory Voting: *See* 'Dom. Elections B. 3.'
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1°m., 1193 (i); 2°m., 2790, 3259; in Com., 3260 (ii).
CONCILIATION BOARD, REGISTRATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3628 (ii).
CONCILIATORS, SETTLEMENT OF LABOUR DISPUTES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.
Consolidated Revenue, &c.; *See* 'Audit Act.'
Consolidated Trust Corporation Incorp. B. No. 121 (Mr. *McColl*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3223 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 110).
CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'
Contagious Diseases: *See* 'Animals.'
Contracts, Public Works: *See* 'Public Works Act.'
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
Controverted Elections Bill: *See* 'Dominion Election Bills.'
COOKE VS. COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).
CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT, ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
——— LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, Grenville) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).

CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).

—— COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).

COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).

COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATIONS OF WATER: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).

COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 5582 (iii).

—— APPOINTMENTS., RETIREMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 4960 (ii).

COUNTRY POSTMASTERS: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).

—— SALARIES: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).

—— SALARY INCREASES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).

Court of Appeal, Yukon: *See* 'Yukon B. 254.'

COURTS, YUKON, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).

See 'Yukon.'

COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).

COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).

COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).

COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).

CRANDALL, BRAKESMAN, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).

—— *See* 'Belmont.'

CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).

CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

CRICKET PLAYING ON PARLIAMENT GROUNDS: Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).

Criminal Code (immoral entertainments) Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°*, 316; in Com., 316; 3° m., 592 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 13.)

Criminal Code, 1892 (cruelty to animals) Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 541; 2°*, 1324; in Com., 1324 (i), 2779, 3237 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. B. No. 215 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 5581; 2°*, 6638; M. for Com., 6638; in Com., 6639, 7490 (iii), 10746 (v); wthdn., 14768 (vi).

Criminal Code (fraudulent debtors) B. (No. 219, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1902) Act (trades and contracts) Amt. B. (No. 230, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (freedom of labour) B. (No. 246, from the Senate). This Bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

CRISIS IN ONT: *See* 'Lt. Governor.'

CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada B. No. 129 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1936; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2756 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 111.)

CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P.O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).

CROWS NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 12217 (v).

Cruelty to Animals: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).

CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14506 (vi).

CUMBERLAND WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).

Currency Amt.: *See* 'Dom. Notes.'

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr. *Paterson*) Res. prop., 2922; in Com. on Res., 3044; 1°* of B., 3126; 2°*, 4010; in Com., 4010; 3° m., 4187; 3°*, 4674 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 14.)

—— **(German Surtax) Amt. B. No. 273** (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 14758 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 15.)

CUSTOMS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, REBATE FOR 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3803 (ii).

ALUMINUM, OXIDE OF, IMPORTATION INTO CANADA, PORTS OF ENTRY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1035 (i).

BAIN, MR., ASST. COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Customs Act Amt. B., 4010 (ii).

BANANAS IMPORTED, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) 1198 (i).

BATHURST CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

BAUXITE, TONS IMPORTED IN 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson*, *N.B.*) 1678 (i).

BONDED WAREHOUSES, P.E.I., RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

BONDING PRIVILEGES WITH U.S.: *See* 'Coasting.'

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

CAMPBELLFORD PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATIONS *re* CUSTOMS EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. on Customs Bill, 4016 (ii).

COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).

COASTING LAWS AND BONDING PRIVILEGES OF U. S.: Regulations (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

COMMISSIONER, ASST.: *See* 'Customs Act, B. 174.

CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR, TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

CORN DUTIES, ABOLITION OF BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 1681 (i).

CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, PER CAPITA REVENUE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Per Capita.'

CUSTOMS CLAUSE G. T. P. BILL, LEGAL OPINIONS: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).

CUSTOMS DEPT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 331 (i), 3782, 3897 (ii).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 319 (i).
——— PORTS OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3697 (ii).
——— OVERTIME OF OFFICERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13980 (vi).
——— TRANSFERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5318 (iii).
——— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
——— TEMPORARY CLERKS. APPNMT., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Customs Bill, 4012 (ii).

DAUPHIN, PORT OF ENTRY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

DIME NOVELS: *See* 'Jesse James.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

GANANOQUE PORT OF ENTRY, COLLECTIONS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3791, 3897 (ii).

GERMAN GOODS ('TEAPOTS, &c.') IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TEAPOT AND MR. BLAIN: *See* 'German Goods.'

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 12716 (vi).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF, CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U. S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT, PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).

LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).

LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup. 3962 (ii).

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup. 5992 (iii).

MIDLAND PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

MONTREAL PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
——— SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv)

NAPANEE, COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

OXIDE OF ALUMINUM IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N. B.*) 1035 (i).

PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).

PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13935 (vi).
——— *See* 'Customs.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— *See* 'German Goods.'
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE, OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).

PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).

REVENUE COLLECTED FOR 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715 (vi).

S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt.,* 3236 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES, FREE LIST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).
See 'Tariff.'

TOBACCO (CANADIAN) SALE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, AMOUNTS PAID TO MR. BLAISE DUGAS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2103 (i), 12217 (v).
——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 446 (i).

TORONTO, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Supply., 3906 (ii).

TRACADIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
U. S. Coasting Laws, Bonding Privileges, &c.: Regulations *re* (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi). *See* 'Coasting.'
Vegetables imported from U. S., Duty collected at Toronto and Montreal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1058 (i).
Veniot, P.I., Customs Collector at Bathurst: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
Walpole Customs House: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
Warehouse at Winnipeg, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavière*) 6268 (iii).
Weekly Publications, 'Jesse James' Series, Customs Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).
Wheat, Export Freight Rate per Hundred Pounds: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
Windsor, Customs Port of Entry, Salaries, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii). *See* 'Kilroy.'

Cutler and Gore Bay Mail Contract, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

Cutler, Gore Bay Mail Service; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Cutler, Spanish Mills Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).

Dairying Branch, Agriculture: in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
——— Cold Storage, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4671 (ii).

Dalhousie Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

Daly, M.T., Harbour Master at Bathurst, N.B., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

Dauphin, Lake, Lowering: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— Port of Entry, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3898 (ii).

Dawson Board of Trade, Memorial *re* Treadgold Concessions: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1024 (i). *See* 'Treadgold.'

Dawson City to Stewart River, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Dawson Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

Debates, Amanuenses, Increase of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 5 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 654 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 814 (i).
——— 2nd Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 939 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1111 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1461 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1764 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1674 (i).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 1936 (i).
——— 5th Rep.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to ref. back to Com., 7399 (iii).

Debates, 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 7658 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 7922, 9349 (iv).
——— 7th and 8th Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. *Champagne*) 14053 (vi).
——— 8th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 12216 (v).

Debates Translators, Rental of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2311 (i).

Debert Coal Mines Ry. Subsidy: in Com. of Res., 14328 (vi).

Debt of Can.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

Deer Island to Eastport, Me., Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

Defalcations, &c.: *See* 'Post Office.'

Defaulting Postmasters *re* Saving Banks Deposits: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

Defence Scheme *re* Militia: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii). *See* 'Militia.'

Delegates from Chambers of Commerce, Treatment by U. S. Immigration Officers: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

Demurrage Regulations, I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

Departments, Reorganisation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 112).

Depot Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).

Deputy Minister of Agriculture: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

Deseronto Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

Deschambault, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Allumette Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

Desjardins, Camille, Appnmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).

Desjardins Canal B. No. 183 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3393; 2°, 4213; in Com., and 3°, 4213 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 16.)

DesRoches, Fishery Guardian, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Detroit River, &c., International Waters, U. S. Govt. Work: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.,* 2778 (ii).

Devlin, Mr., Successor of, as Immigration Agent, Ireland: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iii).

Digby, Pier, Renewal, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension, Improvement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).

Diocese of Moosonee: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

DIPPER HARBOUR, N. B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO. BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DISCRIMINATING FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS: *See* 'Freight Rates.'

DISTILLERIES, &C., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13974 (vi).

DIVISIONS:

ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 14158; Neg. (Y. 20; N. 58) 14218 (vi).

BROCKVILLE AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 104 (Mr. *Dyment*) Amt. (Mr. *Taylor*) neg. (Y. 26; N. 44) 7467; M. for 3°, agreed to (Y. 64; N. 35) 7468 (iii).

BUDGET, THE: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Neg. (Y. 54; N. 107) 2235 (i).

CANADIAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 189 (Mr. *Birkett*) in Com., Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7479; Neg. (Y. 9; N. 57) 7486 (iii).

CATTLE PURCHASED FOR S. AFRICA: Amt. (Mr. *Pope*) to Com. of Sup., 5463; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 78) 5489 (iii).

CENSUS EXPENDITURE, 1881, 1891 AND 1901, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) to Com. of Sup., 13699; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 69) 13759 (vi).

CIGARETTES, PROHIBITION OF: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 820; Agreed to (Y. 103; N. 48) 847 (i).

CIVIL SERVANTS AND POLITICAL INTERFERENCE, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) to Com. of Sup., 3151; Neg. (Y. 22; N. 71) 3206 (ii).

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y. 30; N. 68) 14642 (vi).

G.T. PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) M. for Com., 4871: Amt. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4871; Neg. (Y. 55; N. 102) 4874 (ii).

G.T.P. B. No. 235: Amt. (Mr. *Borden*) Alternative Route, to M. for 3°, 12642 (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Osler*) Customs Duties, &c., 12693; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Alcorn*) Capital Stock, 12704; Neg. (Y. 25; N. 75) 12705 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Rates, &c., Neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709 (vi).

——Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) to M. for Com. on Res., 9148; Neg. (Y, 50; N. 135) 10404 (v).

——Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076 (iv); Neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10404 (v).

——Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 10405; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10407 (v).

——3° of Bill; Agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

——Reporting Debates, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) Speaker's Ruling sustained (Y. 52; N. 50) 0634 (v).

HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY IMP. GOVT., AMOUNT PAID BY CAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 6) 690 (i).

INSOLVENCY ACT AMT. B. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 2°m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Leonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4799 (ii).

OTTAWA VALLEY RY. CO.'S B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 6523; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 87) 6537 (iii).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM. *re* MR. LOY, M.P.: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918; M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008, 8069; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 105) 8080, (iv).

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63) 13932 (vi).

RY. ACT (cattle guards) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2°m., 552; M. (Mr. *Blair*) to ref. to Com. on Rys..; Agreed to (Y. 99; N. 53) 565 (i).

RY. ACT (consolidation) Amt. B. 21 (Mr. *Blair*) 3°m., 8334; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* two cent rate, 8334; Neg. (Y. 34; N. 45) 8359 (iv).

REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C., B. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2°m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) to M. for 2°, Neg. (Y. 37; N. 72) 1284, 1292 (i).

——Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to recommit to Com. of Whole Hse., Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65) 12430 (v).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95) 2914 (ii).

——INSTRUCTION TO COMMISSIONS, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

Divorce: *See* 'Allan, William.'

——*See* 'Ashley.'

——*See* 'Graves, Florence.'

——*See* 'McDermid, Ellen.'

——*See* 'Schooley.'

——*See* 'Steele, James Reid.'

——*See* 'Wilson, Stephen.'

DIXON, F. A. PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726–2753 (ii).

——COR., &C. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii). *See* 'Public Works.'

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DODDS, MR. THOS., PAYMENT TO *re* TRENT CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).

DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi)

DOKIS INDIAN RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 7914 (iv.)

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOMINION ARSENAL: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO. (WOLFVILLE) SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

——N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).

DOMINION BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
—— *See* 'Buildings.'
DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL CO.'S ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
—— *See* 'Glace Bay.'
Dominion Controverted Elections Act (trials) Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 95; 2°, and in Com., 635; on Order for Com., 945, 1115, 2239; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 12).
DOM. CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., Objection (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 945 (i).
DOM. DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5589 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 885, in Com., 902, 1200 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 13373; in Com., (compulsory voting) 13560; wthdn.. 14769 (vi).
DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Sel. Com., 3001 (ii); 6734 (iii).
DOM. ELECTIONS ACT AMT. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*): Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12720 (vi).
Dominion Elections Act (intimidation) Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Clancy*) 1°*, 114; 2° m., 704 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3237 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 19).
DOM. EXHIBITION, TORONTO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 534 (i).
—— *See* 'Agriculture.'
Dominion Gas Improvement Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 91 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1193; 2°* 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 114).
Dominion (burglary) Guarantee Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 113).
Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineers Incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632 (i).
DOM. LANDS ACT AMT. B. (Mr. *Sifton*). Motion dropped, 13444 (vi).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
—— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
—— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
—— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
—— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
—— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).
—— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
DOM. LANDS, SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
DOM. LANDS *re* YUKON REGULATIONS: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
Dominion Notes B. No. 222 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6437; 1°* of B., 6448; 2°, and in Com., 6913; 3°*, 6915 (iii). (3 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 43).
DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii) 14252 (vi).
DOM. NOTES SECURITY: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6270 (iii).
DOMINION POLICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'
DOM. STEAMERS, REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).
DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCREASE, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
DOM. TRAFFIC BRIDGES THROUGH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
—— *See* 'I.C.R.'
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
—— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
—— PILGRIMAGE, AND GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
—— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
Drainage across Railway Property B. No. 19 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° m., 202; 2°*, 916 (i); wthdn., 7203 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
DRAINAGE CLAUSE IN B. 21, RAILWAY ACT AMT.: 5774 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4729, 4735 (ii).
DRAKE, MR., N.W.M.P., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
DRAW-BARS, EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520, (iii), 8288 (iv).
DREDGES AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

DREDGES, NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).

DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).

DREDGING PLANT, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).

DREDGING PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).

—— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).

—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).

DREDGING VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'

DRESDEN CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).

DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13643 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).

—— QUEBEC, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).

—— ST. JOHN'S, QUE., CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).

—— WOODSTOCK, N.B., PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Hale*) 3236 (ii).

DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).

DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE RY. SIDING, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

Dry Docks Construction B. No. 178 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 2237 (i); in Com. on Res., 3004; 1°* of B., 3298; 2°, and in Com., 4678 (ii), 5871; 3°*, 5872 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 17.)

DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 286 (i).

DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, YUKON TER., REFUND TO DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNT PAID TO, FOR TRIP IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES *re* SALE OF CANADIAN TOBACCO: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).

DUNCAN, ARCHIBALD, FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

DUNDONALD, LORD, AND FRAUDULENT TELEPHONE MESSAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 10536, 10744 (v).
See 'G. O. C.'

DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
See 'Grand River.'

DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).

EARNINGS, &C, I.C.R., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques., (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1115 (i).

EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION CO., CONCESSIONS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

—— FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).

Eastern Townships Bank B. No. 25 (Mr. *McIntosh*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 1853 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 115).

ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 446; 2°*, 632 (i).

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co. (correction) B. No. 109 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 1378 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2581 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 18.)

EDMONTON BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).

EDMONTON INDIAN AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

EDMONTON N.W.T., JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Edmonton Street Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 707, 2°*, 977 (i).

Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 111 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 116.)

EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

EDMUNDSTON, N.B., INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).

EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).

EEL RIVER, I. C. R. STATION AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, YUKON, FEES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3414, 3507 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

Election Bills: *See* 'Dom. Elections, &c.'

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ELECTION LAWS COMMITTEE: M. (Mr. *Fielding*) to add Name, 6734 (iii).

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS : *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENTS OF SUPREME COURT : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 91 (i).

ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS, PRINTING : *See* 'Saskatchewan Elections.'

ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).

ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 288 (i).

—— N.S., PRINTING, &C., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).

Electric Light Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 187 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2° m., 4007; in Com., and 3°*, 4007 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 20).

ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).

ELECTRIC LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).

—— TRANSFORMERS : in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).

—— CORNWALL CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).

—— WELLAND CANAL : in Com of Sup., 14148 (vi). *See* 'Canals.'

ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi). *See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'

ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (v). *See* 'Grain.'

ELGIN COUNTY CENTENARY CELEBRATION : Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).

ELGIN COUNTY REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii).

Elgin and Havelock Railway Co.'s B. No. 142 (Mr. *Fowler*) 2°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544; in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 117.)

ELKHORN AND MOOSOMIN RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).

ELKHORN INDIAN SCHOOL, N. W. TER., AVERAGE ATTENDANCE : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii). *See* 'Indians.'

ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).

ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).

EMERSON MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).

Empire Accident and Surety Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1378; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 2755; 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 118.)

EMPLOYEES, PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

Employees on Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Employees.'

Engineers, Marine : *See* 'Steamboat Inspection.'

ENGINEERS' OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).

—— *See* 'Pub. Works.'

ENGINEERS SALARIES *re* CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 12910 (vi).

Engineers : *See* 'Dom. Institute.'

ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum read, 14008 (vi).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 134 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2100; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 3226, 3578, 3751, 3982; 3°*, 3982 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 119).

ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

—— GRAVING DOCK : in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

—— NAVAL STATION, REMOVAL OF FLAGSHIP : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

ESTIMATES 1902-3 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).

—— SUPPL., 1903 : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i); 4956 (ii).

—— (1904) : Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii). *See* 'Supply.'

"EUREKA," STR., LOAN BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).

—— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Tarte*) 14687 (vi).

"EUXINE," SCHR., SCUTTLING OF : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).

EWART, MR., ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).

Exchequer Court (railway debts) B. No. 155 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m., 2501 (ii); 2° m., 8243; in Com., 8244, 8360; 3°*, 8369 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14769 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 21).

—— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to place on Govt. Orders, 8115 (iv).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGES TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE : in Com of Sup., 3407 (ii).

—— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXCISE INSPECTORS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

—— OFFICERS, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).

—— TAXATION, PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi). *See* 'Customs,' &c.

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

EXHIBITION, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4603 (ii).

EXHIBITIONS, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 4548 (ii).

——— REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

——— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1937 (i).

EXPORT FREIGHT RATES ON WHEAT TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).

Expropriation Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 93; 2°*, 291; in Com., 291, 612, 632; 3°*, 945 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 22).

FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re*: Par. in *Star*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).

——— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).

FAIR WAGES SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
See 'Labour.'

FALSE CREEK, B.C., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND B.C.: M. (Mr. *Earle*) for Copies*, 2337 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Earle*) 3129 (ii), 5513, 6354 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2758, 2919 (ii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FARRAN'S POINT CANAL, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).

——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii); 14150 (vi).

FAST ATLANTIC SS. LINE: *See* 'Atlantic.'

FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).

Federal Oil Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 120).

FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).

FERRIES, CONTROL OF: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13696 (vi).

Ferries Bill: *See* 'Navigable.'

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13936 (vi).

"FIELDING, W. S.", DREDGE, PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).

FINANCE:

ASSAY OFFICE, B.C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779, 13965 (vi).

AUDIT ACT AMT. BILL, GOVTL. INTENTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11692 (v), 13258.

AUDITING DEPTL. FINANCES: Remarks *re* Martineau Investigation, 6933 (iii).

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD, PAYMENTS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 10956 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

AUDITOR GENERAL AND TREASURY BOARD: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11427 (v).

——— CIRCULAR FROM AUD. GEN.: Read (Mr. *Taylor*) 11552 (v).

AUD. GENERAL AUDITING BOOKS OF RY. COS., *Re* SUBSIDIES: in Com. on Res., 14516 (vi).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

——— OFFICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
See 'Audit.' &c.

BANKERS ASSOCIATION, INSPECTION DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 819 (i)

BANKERS, PRIVATE, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 285 (i).

BANK FAILURES SINCE CONFEDERATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 6435 (iii).

BANKING BUSINESS: M. (Mr. *Russell*) to receive Pet., 4958 (ii).

BANKS, UNCLAIMED BALANCES: Rep. presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (ii).

BARTON, SIR EDMUND, EXPENDITURE *re* CAN. VISIT: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

BLACK, A. W., ENGLISH M.P., STATEMENTS *re* COR. BETWEEN CAN. AND GERMAN CONSUL: 12218 (v).

BOPP, GERMAN CONSUL, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

B.N.A. BANK NOTE CO. *vs.* THE KING, EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14279 (vi).

BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1378 (i).

——— REP. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 410 (i).
See 'Financial Review.'

CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMPENSATION TO: in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

CANADIAN-GERMAN FISCAL POLICY, COR. WITH DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

CANADIAN MINT, ERECTION OF BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 10955 (v).
See 'Mint.'.

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
See 'Dom. Notes.'

CHARTERED BANKS, REP. *re*: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1575 (i).

COLONIAL OFFICE AND CAN. PRIME MINISTER, COR. *re* GERMAN FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

DEBT OF CAN.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRTION, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 12590 (v).

DOM. NOTES, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii), 14252 (vi).
See 'Charges,' &c.

DOM. SUBSIDIES TO PROVINCES, INCEASE, &c.; M. for Cor., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

ESTIMATES, 1902-3: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90.

ESTIMATES *re* ONE-FIFTH VOTE: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

——— SUPPL., 1903; Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 707 (i), 4956 (ii).

——— SUPPL., 1904: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).

——— *See* 'Supply,' &c.

FIELDING, HON. MR., PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME: Par in Montreol *Star*, 13936 (vi).

FINANCE DEPT., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i).

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601 (vi).
See 'Budget, &c.'

GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

GERMAN TARIFF, COR. &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).

——— LORD STRATHCONA'S LETTER: in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).

——— MR. FIELDING'S MEMORANDUM *re* MR. BOPP: in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).

——— PAPERS *re*: laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).

INSOLVENCY ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).

INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).

INSURANCE, REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).

——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

——— LEGAL EXPENSES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).

——— PAID FOR 1890-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v)

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

——— AMT.: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 3864, 4040 (ii).

LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).

LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'

MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).

MINT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi)
See 'Can. Mint.'

NORTH-WEST TER., ADVANCE ACCOUNT, &C.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 10102 (v).

——— INCREASED SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
See general heading.

N. S. AND DOM. OF CAN. FINANCIAL TERMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF AND S. A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE, MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE: in Financial Statement, 1402 (i).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Mr. Fielding's pledges *re* Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, 13936 (vi).

PRIVATE BANKERS: *See* 'Bankers.'

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c., (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux* 5764 (iii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).

PUBLIC DEBT, DECREASE OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).

PUBLIC DEBT CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).

RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 13370 (vi).

STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).

SUPPLY: Remarks *re* one-fifth vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).

——— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
See general heading.

TARIFF AND TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. on Immigration, 6861 (iii),

——— NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).

——— POLICY OF GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263, 4843, 4875 (ii).

——— CORRESPONDENCE, *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).

——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine, B. 233, Remarks (Mr. *Maclean* &c.) 7304, 7392 (iii).

——— REVISION, CORRESPONDENCE *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*) 3003 (ii).

TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'

WAYS AND MEANS—GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).

——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).

——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).

——— FOR DEBATE: *See* 'Budget.'

FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).

FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N.S. AND CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).

FINANCIAL REVIEW: Amt. (Mr. *Bell*) to Com. of Sup., 14601; Neg. (Y., 30; N., 68) 14642 (vi).

FIRE AT MORTIMER & Co., GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).

Fire Damages: *See* 'Railway Act.'

Fire Guards: *See* 'Railway Act.'

FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).

FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).

FIRE, SECURITY FROM, IN PARLT. BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).

Fisheries Act Amt., B. No. 224 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 1° m., 6538; 2°, and in Com., 6896; 3°*., 6913 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 23).

FISHERIES:

BANCE, MR., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

BATHURST FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

CANADIAN FISHERY EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).

CANNING INDUSTRY IN B.C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

COLLINS, MR., PAYMENT *re* FISHERY INSPECTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5129 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

DesRoches, Fishery Guard, Alleged Frauds: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Dog Fish Nuisance, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).

Duncan, Archibald, Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

False Creek B.C., Lease to Burnett & Kelly: *See* 'B.C.'

Fish Breeding Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Fish Breeding and Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, Compiling Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (iii).

Fisheries Protective Service, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* Officers Mess: Que. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

Fisheries, Salaries: Conc., 6069 (iii).

——— Steamers in B.C., Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (iii).

Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization': Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 13373 (vi).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).

Fishery Exhibit, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii), 5278 (iii).

Fishery Officers, Inspections, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Fishery Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).

Fishery Overseer, Bathurst, N.B., Complaints, *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).

Fishery Rights of Dom. and Provs.: M. to bring down Papers (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 7923 (iv).

Fishermen's Indemnity from U. S. Govt.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3236 (ii).

Fishing Bounties, Guardian DesRoches, Alleged Fraud: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).

Fishing Industry, Mar. Provs., Wharf, Building, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).

Fishing Licenses to U.S. Vessels, Collectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5309 (iii).

Fishing Rights *re* Indians, B.C., Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7264 (iii).

Fishing within Three Mile Limit, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).

Fish Inspection, Investigations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Fish Shippers, Loss, &c., by Govt. Strs.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
See 'Frozen.'

Fishways, Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).

Fraser River Salmon Industry, Complaints from Canners Ass'n.: Tel. read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Frozen Fish, &c., P.E.I.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

——— Shippers, Losses, &c., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (iii), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fish Shippers.'

Harrison, Mr., Inspector of Fisheries, N.B., Resignation: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).

Hurley, J. M., Appnmt., Duties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).

——— Rep., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
See 'Mullen.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

James and Hudson Bay Fishing Rights: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

James and Hudson Bays, Fishing Rights, Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

Larkin, Capt. W. S., Complaint *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).

Lobster Factory Inspection, Halifax: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).

Lobster Hatcheries: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

——— Industry, Inspection *re:* in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151, 13660 (vi).

Lunenburg Fish Hatchery: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

Mullen, Cornelius: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

——— Letter *re* Hurley, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

Oyster Fishing, P.E.I., Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).

Oyster, Herring, &c., Fish Inspection, Investigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*), *re* Fishermen of N.S., 13373 (vi).
See 'Fishermen of N.S.'

Rivière du Nord Fish Ladders, &c.: M. for Copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v).

Salmon Commissioners, B.C.: M. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii).

Salmon Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).

Shepherd, B., Fishery Inspector: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).

Sills, E. H., Payment *re* Storage of Fish Nets: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).

Trap Nets in Gulf St. Lawrence, Pet. *re:* Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

U. S. Indemnity to Fishermen, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.* 3236 (ii).

Five Islands, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

Flagship, Removal from Esquimalt: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

Flesherton Armoury: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

Flint, T. B., Clerk of Hse., Appnmt.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

Floating Lighthouses, Applications from Captains, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

Food Analysis: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue,' 'Customs,' &c.

Forrest, E., Reimbursement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).

Fort Dufferin, Extension Wharf, River St. John: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).

FORT LAWRENCE LANDING PIER, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).

FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 636 (i). *See* 'Public Works,' &c.

FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE : Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

FRANCE AND CAN. STEAMSHIP SERVICE SUBSIDY : Prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 10410 (v). *See* 'Ocean SS. Subsidies Bill.'

FRANK DISASTER, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi). *See* 'Turtle.'

—— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106 ; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106 (i).

—— TEL. TO DEP. MIN. OF INT. : Read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2238 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi). *See* 'Campaign.'

FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).

FRASER RIVER SALMON INDUSTRY, COMPLAINTS FROM CANNERS' ASSOCIATION, TEL. : Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).

—— SALMON INDUSTRY : Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v). *See* 'Fisheries.'

Fraudulent Debtors : *See* 'Criminal.'

FRAUDULENT MARKING ACT, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).

FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).

FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

FREE LIST, CHANGES IN TARIFF, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

FREE PASSES, I.C.R. : M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337.

FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

FREIGHT CARS OF I.C.R. ON CONNECTING LINES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).

FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), O.Cs,' &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B. : (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R., CLASSES 1-10 : M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.*, 2338 (i).

FREIGHT RATES ON COMMODITIES TO G.B. : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).

—— DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U.S. FREIGHT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).

—— PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION : (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).

FRENCH CANADIAN REPATRIATION : in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

FROZEN FISH, &C., P.E.I. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).

FROZEN FISH SHIPPERS, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).

—— LOSSES, &C., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).

FRUDES POINT, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).

FRUIT INSPECTORS, BUYING APPLES, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13508 (vi). *See* 'Anderson.'

FRUIT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE TO EUROPE, &C. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3805 (ii).

—— VALUE, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3232 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (1901) Amt. B. No. 86 (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1°*, 1023 ; on Order for 2°, 2387 (i) ; 2° m., 2788, 3257, 3807 (ii).

—— **B. No. 130** (Mr. *Henderson*) 1°*, 1936 (i) ; 2° m.; 3285, 3823 (ii).

FUEL CONTRACT, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).

FUMIGATING STATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).

FURNESS-WITHY CO., SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE : Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).

GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).

GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).

GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS *re* N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).

GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).

—— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS : in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).

—— DAM : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12608 (v).

—— RAPIDS CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &C. : M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) agreed to (Y., 36 ; N., 14) 8403 (iv).

—— COMPLETION OF CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).

GANANOQUE ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 970(i).

—— CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).

—— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).

GARDEN PRODUCTS, READJUSTMENT OF DUTY, &C. : Amt. (Mr. *Léonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766 ; Neg. (Y., 51 ; N., 100) 4799 (ii).

Debate : (Mr. *Speaker*) Members' remarks checked, 4768, 4779 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4768 ; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4770 ; (Mr. *Holmes*) 4771 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 4772 ; (Mr. *Ethier*) 4777 ; (Mr. *Speaker* members' remarks checked, 4779 ; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4782 ; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4784 ; (Mr.

GARDEN PRODUCTS—*Con.*
Debate—*Con.*
Fielding) 4785; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4789; (Mr. *Campbell*) 4792; (Mr. *Broder*) 4796; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 4798 (ii).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
See 'Marine.'

Gas, Dom., Improvement Bill: *See* 'Dom. Gas.'

GASPE AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).

Gaspe and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 166 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5890; 3°*, 5891 (iii).

GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GATE LIFTER, WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).

GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C. P. R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup. 13457 (vi).

GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

GAYNOR & GREENE EXTRADITION: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. No. 48 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 592; 2° m., 1065 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 2786 (ii).

——— **(Weigh Masters) Amt. B. No. 266** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) Res. prop., 13264; in Com. on Res., 13807; 1°* of B., 13808; 2°, and in Com., 14311; 3°*, 14313 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 24).

GENERAL STATEMENT, I. C. R.: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'

GENERAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH AT HAMILTON: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 2399 (i).

——— REP. *re* DEFENCE SCHEME: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

——— REP., &C., PUBLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
See 'Militia Act Amt.'

GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).

GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 6824 (iii).

——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

——— EXPLORATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).

——— REP.: Presented (Sir. *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi

GEO. M. DEPEW: *See* 'Depew.'

GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com of Sup., 13198 (vi).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 13340 (vi).
See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup. 6410 (iii).

GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).

GERMAN CONSUL BOPP, COR. WITH CAN. GOVT. *re* FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).
See 'German Tariff.'

GERMAN GOODS (TEAPOT) IMPORTED UNDER PREFERENTIAL TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on Customs Act, 3056 (ii).

GERMANS RECRUITED IN CANADA FOR NAVAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

German Surtax Bill: *See* 'Customs.'

GERMAN SURTAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 14755 (vi).

GERMAN SURTAX, PURCHASES PREVIOUS TO IMPOSITION: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3394 (ii).

GERMAN TARIFF, COR., &C.: Papers laid on Table, 1460 (i).

——— DISCRIMINATION AND BOND-HAY TREATY: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 1324 (i).

——— Lord Strathcona's Letter in Budget Speech, 1413 (i).

——— Mr. Fielding's Memorandum *re* Mr. Bopp in Budget Speech, 1414 (i).

'Gerrymander' Bill: *See* 'Representation.'

GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).

GLASS FACTORY, PICTOU: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii).

GLENGARRY SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION: *See* 'Dundonald, Lord.'

GLOCKLING, MR. ROBERT, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iii).

GODERICH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).

——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
See 'Yukon.'

GOLD NUGGETS, EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL FROM MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).

Good Shepherd Reformatory St. John, N.B., B. No. 199 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 4178; 2°, and in Com., 4840; 3°*, 4842 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 25).

GOODS IMPORTED DIRECT INTO CAN., VALUE OF DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 12716 (vi).

GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

GORDON HIGHLANDERS' TROPHY: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).

GORE'S LANDING WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

GOVT. BUSINESS FURTHER LEGISLATION: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13559 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 13547 (vi).

——— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3708 (ii).

——— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1114 (i).

——— PRECEDENCE ON THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 940 (i).

——— PRIVATE MEMBERS' DAY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1343 (i).

——— REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 204 (i).
See 'Business of the Hse.'

GOVT. CONTRACTS TENDERS *re*: Par. in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

GOVT. LANDS: *See* 'Lands.'

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works Transfer.'

GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED BY FIRE: *See* 'Mortimer & Co.'

GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
See 'G. T. P. R.'

Govt. Rys., Supplies to: *See* 'Railway Act.'

Govt. Savings Bank: *See* 'Post office.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

GOVT. STEAMER TO REPLACE 'ACADIA,' &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).

GOV. GEN'S OFFICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SPEECH AT CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE BANQUET: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 10100 (v).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain Act,' 'General Inspection B. 266.'

GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).

GRAIN INSPECTION *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).

——— OFFICIAL GRAIN WEIGHERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12535 (v).

Grain Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 188.'

GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).

GRAIN STANDARD WEIGHING MACHINES: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).

GRAIN TRAFFIC FROM N.W.T.: *See* Ry. Transportation from N.W.T.

GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
See 'Automatic.'

GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).

GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).

GRANDE RIVIÈRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).

GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514–1574 (i); Conc., 6070 (iii).

GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).

——— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).

——— WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND PILES, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).

GRAND RIVER, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

GRAND RIVER WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); M. for Com., 4132; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 4441, 4586; M. for Com., 4871 (ii); in Com, 5139 (iii); 7814; 3° m., 8055, 8321 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 122).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 3° m., 8055, 8321; amt. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8055, 8321; Amt. (Mr. *Kemp*) 8066; Amt. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8065; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 8067; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8324; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 8326 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Subsidy B. No. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; Res. prop., 7915; M. for Com. on Res., 8406, 8488, 8559, 8617, 8656, 8718, 8808, 8918, 9082, 9152, 9218, 9351, 9431, 9459, 9582, 9683, 9820, 9980 (iv); 10102, 10243; agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10408; in Com. on Res., 10411; 2°, and in Com. on B. 10412, 10538, 11190, 11302, 11833, 11959, 12074, 12146, 12221 (v); 3° m., 12612, 12720 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 71).

—— AGREEMENT B. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*): Remarks, 8086 (iv).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY CO.'S SUBSIDY B. NO. 235 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1° m., 7658; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7697; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726; Ruling reserved (Mr. *Speaker*) 7727 (iv).

Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 7915; (M.) for Com. on Res., 8406 (iv).

Debate: (Mr. *Blair*) 8406; (Mr. *Charlton*) 8467, 8489; (Mr. *Monk*) 8526; (Mr. *Fielding*) 8546; (Mr. *Barker*) 8593; (Mr. *Sifton*) 8617; (Mr. *Haggart*) 8680; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 8706, 8718; (Mr. *Sproule*) 8746; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8776; (Mr. *Oliver*) 8805; (Mr. *Lennox*) 8808; (Mr. *Morrison*) 8859; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8874; (Mr. *Russell*) 8907. 8919; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 8961; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 9006; (Mr. *Northrup*) 9039; (Mr. *Costigan*) 9064; (Mr. *Guthrie*) 9082; (Mr. *Puttee*) 9120; (Mr. *Kemp*) 9152; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 9183; (Mr. *Bennett*) 9198; (Mr. *Macpherson*) 9218; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 9228; (Mr. *Logan*) 9238; (Mr. *Osler*) 9281; (Mr. *Heyd*) 9305; (Mr. *Ganong*) 9327; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 9351; (Mr. *Wilson*) 9367; (Mr. *Broder*) 9394; (Mr. *Mackie*) 9414; (Mr. *Lavell*) 9431; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 9447; (Mr. *Hackett*) 9459; (Mr. *Talbot*) 9472; (Mr. *Blain*) 9495; (Mr. *Fisher*) 9512; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 9529; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 9553; (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 9573; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 9583; (Mr. *Porter*) 9597; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 9622; (Mr. *Tarte*) 9640; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 9666; (Mr. *Clancy*) 9683; (Mr. *German*) 9708; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9727; (Sir *William Mulock*) 9751; (Mr. *Bell*) 9784; (Mr. *Wade*) 9820; (Mr. *Brock*) 9871; (Mr. *Malouin*) 9882; (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) 9898; (Mr. *Bureau*) 9906; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 9909; (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 9927; (Mr. *Henderson*) 9942; (Mr. *Stephens*) 9963; (Mr. *Wilmot*) 9980; (Mr. *Girard*) 9992; (Mr. *Ward*) 10010; (Mr. *Davis*) 10019; (Mr. *Richardson*) 10040; (Mr. *Holmes*) 10049; (Mr. *Clare*) 10060; (Mr. *Archambault*) 10071; (Mr. *Boyd*) 10076; (Mr. *Johnston, Lambton*) 10096 (iv); (Mr. *Vrooman*) 10102; (Mr. *Murray*) 10111; (Mr. *Pringle*) 10118; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 10139; (Mr. *Henry Cargill*) 10146; (Mr. *Parmelee*) 10157; (Mr. *Ball*) 10165; (Mr. *Scott*) 10173; (Mr. *Birkett*) 10216; (Mr. *Beland*) 10224; (Mr. *Stewart*) 10235; (Mr. *Fowler*) 10243; (Mr. *Paterson*) 10275; (Mr. *Clarke*) 10308, 10317; (Mr. *Angers*) 10349; (Mr. *Gourley*) 10353 (v).

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC, &C.—*Con.*

Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax.*) by (Mr. *Monk*) 10315; Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) neg. (Y. 68; N. 119) 10403; Amt. (Mr. *Puttee*) neg. (Y. 50; N. 135) 10404; Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) neg. (Y. 70; N. 117) 10406; M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) agreed to (Y. 117; N. 71) 10407 (v).

3° m., 12612, 12644 (vi).

Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12612; (amt.) 12642; neg. (Y. 37; N. 75) 12690; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12644; (Mr. *Sproule*) 12657; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12676; (Mr. *Osler*) Amt., 12691; (Mr. *Fielding*) 12694; (Mr. *Broder*) 12695; (Mr. *Taylor*) 12697; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12698; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12699; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 12700; (Mr. *Richardson*) 12701; neg. (Y. 39; N. 78) 12702; (Mr. *Alcorn*) Amt., 12703; neg. (Y. 35; N. 75) 12705; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) Amt., 12706; neg. (Y. 34; N. 74) 12709; (Mr. *Fowler*) Amt., 12709; (Mr. *Northrup*) Amt., 12711; (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12720, Amt., 12721; (Mr. *Blain*) Amt., 12724; (Mr. *Kemp*) 12729; (Mr. *Emmerson*) 12731; (Mr. *Hale*) 12733; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12734; (Mr. *Talbot*) 12736; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12736; (Mr. *Hackett*) 12740; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12743; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12743; (Mr. *Fowler*) 12744; (Mr. *Taylor*) Amt., 12750; (Mr. *Paterson*) 12755; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12755; (Mr. *Haggart*) 12757; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12758; (Mr. *Bennett*) 12761; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 12761; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 12762; (Mr. *Bennett*) Amt., 12767; (Mr. *Barker*) Amt., 12768; (Mr. *Charlton*) 12770; (Mr. *Henderson*) Amt., 12770; (Mr. *Bell*) Amt., 12772; (Mr. *Morin*) Amt., 12774 (vi).

Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Sproule*) Irregularity of Introduction of Bill, 7726 (iv), 12774; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12744 (vi).

G. T. P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

—— COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

—— CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).

—— DISTRIBUTION OF BILL TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).

—— FRENCH TRANSLATION OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Léonard*) 8118 (iv).

—— GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).

—— M. (Mr. *Lennox*) to adjn. Debate, 8806 (iv).

—— M. (Mr. *Tarte*) for Cor., 447 (i).

—— MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

—— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).

—— PETS. *re* IRREGULARITIES, AFFIDAVITS, &C.: Par. in Montreal *Star* (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).

—— PETS. *re*: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).

—— PETS. *re*, MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).

—— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).

G. T. P. Ry. Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) Member reading Speech, 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 10250 (v).
——— Subsidies : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 671, 1031 (i).
——— Subsidy : Par. in Ottawa *Journal* (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).
——— Par. in Toronto *Globe re* Details (Mr. *Haggart*) 5892 (iii).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
——— Mr. Hays Statement *re*, Par. in Montreal *Star*, 14648 (vi).
——— Surveys, 'Business System,' &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
——— Surveys, Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
——— Surveys, Reps. of Surveyors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14765 (vi).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. *Fielding*) 14765 (vi).
——— Two-Cent Rate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 10462 (iv).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.R.'
——— Par. in Toronto *Globe*, 5892 (iii).
——— and Trans Canada, Sale, &c.: Par. in Toronto *News*: Read (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 631; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*; *c.* 121).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. R. Fiscal Policy : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Co., Discriminating Rates between Canadians and Americans : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).
——— Loans by Fed. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 2920 (ii).
——— Rentals from I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
——— Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
——— Terminals at St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
——— Two-Cent Rate, Repeal of Clause in Charter : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11556, 11828 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Granite Village, N.S., Mooring Pier : in Com. of Sup., (vi).
Grant, J. G., Barrie Customs Collector, Default, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).

Graves, Florence D. Relief B. No. 214 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 5581; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 123).

Grazing Lands, N.W.T., Lease to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).

G.B. and Can. Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
See 'Can. and G. B.'
Great North-West Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

Great North West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 541; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 124).

Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
'Grecian,' Str., Reimbursement to Capt. Harrison *re* Suspension of Certificate, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
Green Cove Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
Grenville Canal, Guide Pier at Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— Payment to Henry Tucker *re* Investigations: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
Grey Counties, Census Enumerators : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
Grey County, List of Public Buildings wanted : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
——— Supplies *re* Quarantine Service : in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
Guay, Mr. A., Compensation for Loss of Horse : in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).

Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 125).

Guelph, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
Guilbault, Mr. Edward, Gratuity to Widow : in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
Gull Habbour, St. George's Bay, Man., Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
Guns ordered by British Army : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Guysborough, N.S., Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
Haanel, Dr., Supt. of Mines, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
Hagar, Miss, Appnmt. at Experimental Farm : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 5316 (iii).
Haldimand, Census Enumerator : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
Half-Breed Claims, Commissions, Applications for Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
——— Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).

HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
See 'Can. and G. B.,' 'Mail Subsidies,' &c.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
—— AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).
—— COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
—— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
—— DEEP-WATER TERMINUS, I.C.R., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825 (vi).
—— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
—— HARBOUR LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
—— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 12874, 14080 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
—— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
—— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) in Com of Sup., 13032 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
—— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
—— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
—— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
—— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HALTON, PEEL AND CARDWELL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
Hamilton, &c., Power Co.: *See* 'Jordan Light, &c.'
Hamilton, Berlin and Collingwood Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 149 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4587; 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 126.)
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
—— ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER CO., RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3803 (ii).
—— GRIMSBY ELECTRIC RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6084 (iii).
HAMILTON INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
—— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, MONTREAL, LOAN B. NO. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 5417 (iii).
See 'Montreal.'
HARBOUR AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
See 'Public Works.'
—— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
—— MAR. PROVS., GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
—— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
—— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
—— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. *Grecian*, COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, N.B., RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY., SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELDS POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HAWK POINT INLET, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup, 13119 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14343 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAY AND OATS BOUGHT BY CAN. GOVT. FOR IMPERIAL GOVT.: M. for Ret. (Mr *Monk*) 676, 688; Neg. (Y. 35; N. 66) 690 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) for Ret., 1057 (i).
HAYCOCK, MR. J., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4960 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).

HAZELTON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

HEALTH ACT, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4440 (ii).

HEATH, GEO., COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

'HERALD' PRINTING CO., MONTREAL, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 8329 (vi); Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

HERCHMER, MR. L. W., PENSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).

HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

HÊTU, RUDOLPH, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).

Hides Inspection Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'

HIDES INSPECTION, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M.P.: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 3969 (ii).

HIDES INSPECTION AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).

HIGGINS SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup, 12585 (v).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).

——— CONTRACTORS AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).

——— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

——— PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD, PAINTING OF PORTRAIT BY CANADIAN ARTIST: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).

HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).

HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).

——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

See 'Cattle Guard Comn.'

Home Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 191 (Mr. *Russell*) 1°*, 3970; 2°*, 4132 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 127.)

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND: Amt. (Mr. *Costigan*) to Com. of Sup., 720 (i).

HOME RULE FOR IRELAND—*Con.*

Debate: (Mr. *Hackett*) 731; (Mr. *Charleton*) 734; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 740; (Mr. *Sproule*) 742; (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 751; (Mr. *Broder*) 754; (Mr. *Belcourt*) 758; (Mr. *Richardson*) 761; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 763; (Mr. *Kemp*) 766; (Mr. *Murray*) 767; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 769; (Mr. *Wright*) 772; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 772; (Mr. *Porter*) 775; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 778; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 782; (Mr. *Sherritt*) 787; (Mr. *Reid*) 787; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 788; (Mr. *Clarke* 794; (Mr. *Ingram*) 809 (i).

——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 871 (i).

——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to present Address to His Maj., 1193 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13894 (vi).

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).

——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).

——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).

——— LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).

See 'Immigration.'

HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).

HOSPITALS FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).

See 'Trachoma.'

HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).

'HOT AIR LINE' RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14490 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: *See* 'Rooms,' &c.

BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).

——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, PRIVATE BILLS PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).

——— *See* general heading.

CARGILL, HENRY, LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12937 (vi).

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Notification of Appnmt. (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

CONSERVATIVE LITERATURE: *See* 'Mail Bags,' &c.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, CERTIFICATES, &C.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

DOOR-KEEPER'S SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi)

ELECTION LAW, LEGISLATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12218 (v).

ELECTION PAMPHLETS, FRANKING, &C.: *See* 'Mail Bags.'

ELECTION PETITIONS, JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 91 (i).

ELECTIONS OF 1878, CONGRATULATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

ELEVATOR ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 5417 (iii).

FARQUHARSON, MR., late M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).

FLINT, T. B., CLERK OF HSE., APPNMT.: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

FRANKING PRIVILEGE *re* CAMPAIGN LITERATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 14286 (vi).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

FRANKING PRIVILEGES: *See* 'Mail Bags.'
GOVT. APPOINTMENTS OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
HOUSE OF COMMONS, BETTER ACCOMMODATION *re* ROOMS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13007 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii), 14112 (vi).
——— LOCKED P.O. BOXES: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Vic.*) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'
——— *See* 'Schell, J. T.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
See general heading.
LOY, GEO. M., INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT, &C.: on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
——— REP. OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*, *Bonaventure*) 14219 (vi).
See general heading.
MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3805 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 3632 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 9582 (iv).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED: 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).
——— CERTIFICATES OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3, 367 (i).
MEMBERS' RIGHTS TO SPEAK *re* MR. SPEAKER'S RULING: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).
MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— *See* 'House.'
MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90, 707 (i). 4956 (ii), 12868, 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14042, 14662 (vi).
——— Read (*Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ORDER, QUES. OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
OTTAWA PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
——— PLAYING CRICKET: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO, *re* LISGAR ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
PETITIONS REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86: (Mr. *Speaker*) 654 (i).
PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).
PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER: (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PRINTING: *See* general heading.
PRIVATE BILLS: M. (Mr. *Morrison*) to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. to suspend Rule (Mr. *Russell*) 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re*: M. (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) *re* Rep. of Joint. Com., 13547 (vi).
——— *See* 'Rules.'
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5138 (iii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* VISITORS IN CORRIDORS, 11557 (v).
——— *See* 'Visitors.'
——— (Mr. *Robinson*, *Elgin*) *re* ATTENDANCE IN HOUSE, 2015 (i).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
——— *See* 'Parliamentary Documents.'
QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I. REPRESENTATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).
——— *See* 'House,' &c.
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &C. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
——— *See* 'Private Bills.'
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 102? (i).
ST. JAMES (MONTREAL) ELECTORAL DIVISION, JUDGMENT OF SUP. COURT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— ISSUE OF WARRANT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 13303 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii), 13376 (vi).
——— NOTIFICATION OF VACANCY: (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— *See* 'Brunet.'
SCHELL, J. T., M.P., 1ST REP. OF PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS COM. *re*: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*) 5511 (iii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 14242 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).
——— MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See 'Messengers.'
SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING: M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
SITTINGS OF HOUSE: *See* 'Govt. Business.'
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).
VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1023 (i).
VENTILATION IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 975 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13007 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).
VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11557 (v).
VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL: Introduced, 1642 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

Hudson's Bay, Change of Name B. No. 173 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 2794 (ii).

Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Co.'s B. No. 124 (Mr. *Stewart*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3752 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 129.)

Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Haggart*) 1°*, 1642; 2°*, 1816 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 128.)
See 'James Bay.'

HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

HULL WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).

HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).

HUNTER, J. B., PROMOTION: in Com. of Sup., 13499 (vi).

HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (iii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 13744 (vi).

HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Huron, Erie and Buffalo Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1764; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4588 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 131.)

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 60 (Mr. *Ross, Ontario*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 1327; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 130.)

HUTTON, MAJ.-GEN., INQUIRY FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).

HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii), 13312 (vi).

HYDRAULIC LEASES, YUKON TER.: M. for Cor.*, (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
——— O.C.'s &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*) 1323 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

IMMIGRATION, &C., INADEQUATE INSPECTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6546; (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 6557; (Mr. *Oliver*) 6562: (Mr. *Puttee*) 6567; (Mr. *Richardson*) 6573; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 6576; (Mr. *Bell*) 6577; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6590; (Mr. *Davis*) 6596; (Mr. *Sifton*) 6603 (iii).

IMMIGRATION:

ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
AGENCIES IN OLD COUNTRY: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iii).
AGENCIES, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6615, 6658 (iii).
BARR COLONY, IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— NUMBER, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

BARR COLONY, BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'general heading.'
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE DELEGATES, TREATMENT BY U.S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).
DEVLIN, MR., SUCCESSOR OF, AS IMMIGRATION AGENT, IRELAND: in Com of Sup., 6731 (iii).
DISEASED IMMIGRANTS, INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5492 (iii).
DOUKHOBORS, HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
——— PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— AND GOVTL., ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
ELLIS, DR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6702.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
EXPENDITURE, 1902–3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
FABER, DR., ILLEGAL PRACTICE, CHARGES *re* PAR. IN 'SIAR': Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6662 (iii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6850 (iii).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, *re* N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 2299 (i), 6827 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6269 (iii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
HAZLETON HOSPITAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FREE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704.
——— IMMIGRATION AGENTS, PRE-EMPTION: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
HOSPITALS OF ISOLATION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).
HUNGARIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iii).
IMMIGRANTS, LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6522 (iii).
——— *See* general heading.
——— PROVISION FOR NEW SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— REFUSED ADMISSION INTO CANADA, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i), 2501 (ii).
IMMIGRATION INTO MAN., HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER *re* DISCUSSION: in Com. of Sup, 6854 (iii).
——— *re* observance of Rules, 6862 (iii).
——— *re* quoting of Speeches, 6870–74 (iii).
——— STATISTICS, TOTAL NUMBER, ORIGIN, EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 1035 (i).
IRELAND, IMMIGRATION OFFICE, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1031 (i).
See 'Devlin.'
LAKE ST. JOHN COL. CO., EXPENDITURE *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).
See 'Homestead' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

MAR. PROVS., IMMIGRANTS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1855 (i).
MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, GOVT. APPNMTS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2756 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).
MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).
NATIONALITIES, &C., IMMIGRATION, 1902-3: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2310 (i).
N.S. EXODUS TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
ONT. AND QUEBEC, IMMIGRATION FOR, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1593 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
P.E.I. AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
REPATRIATION AGENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6674, 6700 (iii).
RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TRACHOMA EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
——— MEDICAL INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6696, 6843 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).
U.S. IMMIGRATION EXODUS TO: in Com. of Sup., 6727, 6874 (iii).
WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).
See 'Interior', 'Indians,' &c.

Immoral Intertainments: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

Imperial Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 2956, 3170 (ii). (3 *Edward VII., c.* 132).

'IMPERIAL' BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, COR., &C., CAN. GOVT'S., REFUSAL TO PUBLISH: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 9457 (iv).
——— Papers *re* laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— *See* 'Colonial.'
IMPERIAL DEFENCE AND PROP. RES. OF LORD ROSEBERY: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Reserve,' &c.
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE, CANADIAN EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION, NAMES OF OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12715, 13936 (vi).
IMPERIAL SERVICE DECORATION SYSTEM *re* SELECTION OF CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13669 (vi).
IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, &C., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 13935 (vi).
See 'Preferential,' 'Tariff,' &c., 'Customs,'&c.

Incorporated Companies B. No. 94 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1193 (i); 2° m., 3257 (ii).

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT: *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.', 'Schell, J. T.'

INDIANS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS FOR N.W. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ALEXANDER INDIAN AGENCY TELEPHONE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
BLANKETS, CLOTHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
BRANT, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
CLAYOQUOT INDIAN SCHOOL, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7269 (iii).
CLOTHING FOR INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
DOKIS RESERVE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST TRESPASSERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 7914 (iv).
DONCASTER RESERVE, SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*), 288 (i).
EDMONTON AGENCY, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
EDMUNDSTON RESERVE, N.B., FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
ELKHORN SCHOOL, N.W.T.. AVERAGE ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSION *re* APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*), 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HALF-BREED SCHOOLS, SALARIES PAID, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 13760 (vi).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 272 (i).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
INDIAN AGENTS, B.C., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7257 (iii)
——— GUARDIANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Tisdale*), 819 (i).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
INDIANS, BRANT RESERVE, LEASE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*), 1322 (i).
INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INDIANS, CHIEFS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
——— LAND MANAGEMENT FUND: in Com, of Sup., 6415 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KINGS, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2501 (ii).
——— N.B., SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.S., PURCHASE OF RESERVE LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
——— N.W.T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).

INDIANS--*Con.*

INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— N.W.T., LIVE STOCK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
——— RESERVES, RE-ALLOTMENT, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7262 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— SUPPLIES, N.W.T., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
——— SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii),
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— B.C.: in Com of Sup., 13785 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
ROBINSON TREATY, PAYMENTS *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*), 5319 (iii).
ST. JOHN'S RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SAND, INDIAN BOY ADOPTED BY MR. JOHNSTON: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii).
SCHOOLS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii), 13786 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
SEED GRAIN, RELIEF: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. Reserves, &c., 6350 (iii).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 7258 (iii).
STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).
SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
TERREBONNE INDIAN RESERVE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— *See* 'Doncaster.'
VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
YUKON INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).
——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7270 (iii)
See 'Immigration' 'Interior,' &c.

INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B. C., ROYAL COMMISSION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour,' &c.
INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS FOR INDIANS, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii).
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14345 (vi).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 186 (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4007; in Com., 4007; 3°*, 4009 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 26).

INLAND REVENUE:

ALCOHOL: *See* 'Wood.'
ANALYSTS, PUBLIC: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (iii).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS in N.W.T., REP. OF INSPECTOR, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*) 847, 880 (i).
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUÉBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
CHEVRIER FAMILY, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12498 (v), 12716 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13971 (vi).
CLEMENT, JULES, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13664 (vi).
CULLING TIMBER, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
DISTILLERIES, &c., INSPECTORS' SALARIES: in Com., of Sup., 13974 (vi).
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5407 (iii).
EXCISE OFFICERS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
——— SALARIES *re* C. S. ACT AMT.: in Com. of Sup., 13967 (vi).
——— TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (vi).
EXCISE TAXATION PER CAPITA FOR 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
FERGUSON, J. M., LEGAL EXPENSES *re* ADULTERATION ACT: in Com. of Sup., 5412 (iii).
FORREST, E., REIMBURSEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
FYFE, MR., REP. *re* GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GRAIN INSPECTION, COST PER CAR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4837 (ii).
——— *re* STANDARD SAMPLES, RES. OF TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
GRAIN WEIGHING MACHINE: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
INLAND REVENUE DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— INSPECTORS, &c.: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5363 (iii).
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

INLAND EEVENUE—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 5405 (iii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191,-4203 (ii).
MAN. GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
——— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
MONTREAL INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY STOLEN: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
PRESCOTT, INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
STANDARD CHEMICAL COMPANY, PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL: in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
TOBACCO EXCISE DUTIES: PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5701 (iii).
TOBACCO STAMPS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, MANUFACTURED AT LONGFORD, OUTPUT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
——— *See* 'Standard.'
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i), 5373 (iii).

Insolvency B. No. 53 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 654; 2° m., 2373 (i); on Order for 2°, 2787; 2° m., 3248; Neg. (Y. 42; N. 74) 3256 (ii).

INSOLVENT ACT, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 818 (i).

Inspection Act: *See* 'General.'
——— *See* 'Textile Fabrics.'

INSPECTION OF CUSTOMS SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS. *See* 'Immigration.'
INSPECTION OF STAPLES: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
INSURANCE COS. OF CANADA, ABSTRACT OF STATEMENT: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 1025 (i).
INSURANCE FUND, P. Q., REP., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
INSURANCE RATES *re* MARINE SHIPPING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13697 (vi).
INSURANCE, ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
——— REPORT OF SUPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 9350 (iv).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12586 (v).
INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8230 (iv).
——— *See* 'Imperial Preference.'
——— CONFIDENTIAL REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7923 (iv).
I. C. R., Supplies Bill: *See* 'Ry. Act, B. 258.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
ADDITIONAL SIDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 14055(vi).
——— *See* 'Sidings.'
AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
BOOK-KEEPING *re* EXPENDITURE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8270 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 12877 (vi).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
BROWN, MRS., GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
CAR SHOPS, NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
——— *See* 'Machinery,' 'Moncton,' &c.
'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com of Sup., 8283 (iv).
——— LETTER *re*: Read (Mr. *Haggart*) in Com. of Sup., 7524 (iii).
——— *See* 'Muhlfeld.'
CHAUDIERE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT FOR STEEL RAILS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).
COAL RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 6167 (iii).
DEMURRAGE ON CARS, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).
DOUBLE TRACKING: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).
DRAW BARS ON FREIGHT CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
DRUMMONDVILLE SIDING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
EARNINGS, &C., DATE OF INTERIM REPS.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4444 (ii).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FREIGHT CARS ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Haggart*) 2805 (ii).
——— FREIGHT RATES, CLASSES 1-10: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.* 2338 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic.'
——— RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
——— *See* 'Traffic Arrangements,' &c.
GENERAL STATEMENT: on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Blair*) 3633 (ii).
——— INQUIRY FOR PAPERS *re* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3537 (ii).
GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
HALIFAX DEEP WATER TERMINUS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT., &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12593 (v), 12823 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONSTRUCTION FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

LEVIS, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
——— LAND PURCHASE, PAYMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., PURCHASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR LOCOMOTIVE AND CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
MONCTON, INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS, I. C. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
OFFICIAL GUIDE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3535 (ii).
OPERATING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
PASSES: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv).
PENSION SYSTEM, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PINTSH GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
PRIVATE CARS, PURCHASE BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2309 (i).
See 'Haulage.'
RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1857 (i).
REP. OF MR. POTTINGER *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).
RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, FIRE PROTECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
RHODES, CURRY & CO., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 8314 (iv).
——— SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gouvreau*) 12497 (v).
RIVER OUELLE BRANCH, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).
'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
——— Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).
SIDINGS AND INCREASED FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See 'Additional.'
STEEL RAILS, FASTENINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).
——— CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
——— CONTRACT, PRICES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 285 (i).
SUPPLIES ENTERED DUTY FREE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Fowler*) 916 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

SUSSEX, N.B., ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
SYDNEY JUNCTION TO NORTH SYDNEY EXTENSION: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 447 (i).
TARIFF RATES, INQUIRY FOR PAPERS: (Mr. *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
See 'Freight.'
TERMINAL FACILITIES AT BONAVENTURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
TIES IMPORTED FOR GOVT. RYS., COST, QUANTITY, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1679 (i).
——— PURCHASED, USED, &C.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
TRACKMEN ON I. C. R., INCREASE OF WAGES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. on B. 257 (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12558 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH G. T. R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 2759 (ii).
VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, EVIDENCE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3301, 3398 (ii).
WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
See 'Railways.'

INTERIOR:

ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER: in Com. of Sup., 6799 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL DEMARCATION, WORKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i) 6791 (iii).
BACTERIOLOGICAL LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
BANFF SPRINGS, BATHS: in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii) 13955 (vi).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
——— ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
BELL, DR., APPNMT. AS DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
BOUNDARY DELIMITATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
BUFFALO HERD IN BANFF PARK: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
C. P. R. LANDS, AND SCHOOL TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
CANE BROS., GRANTS FOR TIMBER LICENSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
COAL MINING IN BANFF RESERVE, LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
CORY, W. W., SALARY, DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
COTTEE, HERBERT, SALARY AND RE-APPOINTMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3610 (ii).
CROWS'S NEST PASS COAL LANDS, APPLICATIONS, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12217 (v).
DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— COMMISSIONER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iii).
——— INSPECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 816 (i).
——— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— SALE, LOCATION, PURCHASERS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 670 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

DOM. LANDS SURVEYORS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13772 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 6939 (iii).
——— YUKON REGULATIONS *re*: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).
GEOLOGICAL CONGRESS, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, VICTORIA MEMORIAL: in Com. of Sup., 352 (i), 14243 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11188 (v).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
——— EXPLORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).
——— PLOTS, PLANS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6826 (iii).
——— REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v), 13769 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).
GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T., LEASE TO GEO. MCDONNELL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
GUAY, MR. A., COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF HORSE: in Com. of Sup., 5406 (iii).
HAANEL, DR., SUPT. OF MINES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13764, 13774 (vi).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
INTERIOR, DEPTL. EMPLOYEES, DATE OF APPNMT., SALARIES, &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Ret.,* 23 8 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
——— COMPLAINTS *re* ILLUSTRATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3972 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6922 (iii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGISTS REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).
——— CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).
IRRIGATION, N.W.T., SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).
LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1858 (i).
LAND SLIDES: *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
MCDONALD, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS, PAYMENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

MAN. AND N.W.T., SCHOOL LANDS, SALES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &C., INFORMATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
METALLURGISTS AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MINES BRANCH, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).
MINING INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACT WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13372 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13667, 13933 (vi).
N. W. TERS., MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
P. E. I. COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.*, 2338.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (*W. J. Roche*) 4363 (ii).
——— SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6820 (iii)
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY; in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).
——— PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13775 14272 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).
VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See 'Geological.'
WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
See 'Immigration', 'Indians', &c.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMITTEE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) for Com., 91 (i).

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, GEOLOGIST'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iii).

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF GEOLOGY, VISIT TO CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 8116 (iv).

'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*) 12218 (v).

International Railway Appliance Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 40 (Mr. *Brock*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 133.)

INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N. B., RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14320 (vi).

INTERNATIONAL TARIFF CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 125; on Order for 2°, 566, 705; 2° m., 916; neg., 939 (i).

Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 144 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2395 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 134.)

INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).
See 'James Bay.'

INTERVIEW WITH N. Y. REPORTERS *re* ALASKAN BOUNDARY: Denial (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13962 (vi).

INVERNESS MINES, N. S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).

INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).

INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.'S RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14336 (vi).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).

IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).

Iron and Steel Bounties Act Amt. B.: *See* 'Steel,' &c.

IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).

—— LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7795 (iv).

—— PAYMENTS FOR 1890–1903: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 11556 (v).

—— PAYMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6435 (iii).

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4263; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 91) 4346 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Fielding*) 4278; (Mr. *Bell*) 4279; (Mr. *Kendall*) 4288; (Mr. *Osler*) 4293; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4297; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4300; (Mr. *Pringle*) 4309; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4322; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4329 (Mr. *Oliver*) 4336; (Mr. *Heyd*) 4338; (Mr. *Pope*) 4341 (ii).

—— TARIFF PROTECTION: Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3864 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) *re* Notice of Motion, 4040 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. to adjn., 4260 (ii).

IROQUOIS CANAL, ELECTRIC LIGHTING: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).

IRRIGATION, N. W. T., SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).

ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).

ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).

ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).

—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JAMES AND HUDSON'S BAYS, FISHING RIGHTS, APPLICATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6893 (iii).

JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14443 (vi).

James Bay Ry.: *See* 'Interprovincial.'

JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).

JAPAN EXHIBITION, GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, INFLUX OF: Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 3713 (ii).

JAPANESE TARIFF *re* U.S. PRODUCTS: Ques. (Mr *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

JAPAN TRADE WITH CAN., CUSTOMS DUTIES *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8617 (iv).

JEDDORE EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 5321 (iii).

'JESSE JAMES' SERIES OF PUBLICATIONS, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).

JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

JOGGINS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14329 (vi).

JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).

JOINT HIGH COMMISSION AND RECIPROCITY WITH U.S.: Par. in Toronto *World* (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See 'Alaskan,' 'Colonial,' &c.

—— COR. WITH SENATOR FAIRBANKS: in Budget Speech, 1407 (i).

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Co.'s Incorp, B. No. 52 (Mr. *Bazinet*) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 135.)

JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1198 (i).

JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

Jordan Light, Heat and Power Co.'s B. No. 162 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2582: 2°*, 2756; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 136.)

JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).

Judges of the N. W. Ters. Act Amt. B. No. 259 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 12609 (v); 2°, in Com., 13853, 14287; 3°*, 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 250 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 10102; in Com on Res., 10759; 1°*; 2°*, and in Com., 10792, 11406; 3°*, 11422 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)

Judges Retiring Allowance B. No. 7 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1° m., 93; wthdn., 634 (i).

Judges Retiring Allowances B. No. 243 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 203 (i); wthdn., 2582; Res. prop., 3431, 4262 (ii), 5241 (iii), 8087; in Com. on Res., 8369; 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., and 3°*, 8372 (iv); Sen. Amts., 14289 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 29.)

Judges of Superior Court (Quebec) Act Amt. B. No. 255 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), Res. prop., 11426; in Com. on Res., 11821; 2° m., 11833; 1°* of B, 11833; 2°*, and in Com., 12301; 3°*, 12302 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 28.)

JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURT, RETIRING ALLOWANCES B.: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 3431 (ii).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

——— N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

——— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 95 (i).

JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*), 14665 (vi).

JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).

JUSTICE:

AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

ADMIRALTY COURT, ACCOMMODATION FOR SITTINGS: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

BEHRING SEA ARBITRATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

BINDER TWINE, COST IN 1901-2: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 447 (i)

——— NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3798 (ii).

——— PRICES FOR CURRENT YEAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 203 (i).

——— PRICES FIXED FOR PENITENTIARY SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 1595 (i).

——— *See* 'Sisal.'

B.C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE OF, &C.: M. for O.Cs., &c* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 706 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

B. C. STATUTES, DISALLOWANCE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2016 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print, 2675 (ii).

BRUNET, ARTHUR, AND DOM. ELECTION ACT: M. for Pets., O.Cs., &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 101 (i).

CLARKE, DUNCAN, EX. COURT: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

COMMUTATION OF CARVER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 13303 (vi.)

CONSOLIDATION OF STATUTES: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

COUNTY COURTS, APPOINTMENTS FROM LOCAL BARS: Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*), 5582 (iii).

——— APPNMTS., RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*), 4960 (ii).
See 'Judges.'

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, N.B., SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).

DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

DOM. STATUTES CONSOLIDATION: *See* 'Revision of Statutes.'

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*), 10102 (v).

EXCHEQUER COURT, JUDGE'S TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— REGISTRAR, EDITING REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3406 (ii).

EXECUTIONS, EXPENDITURES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).

GAYNOR & GREENE, EXTRADITION: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 109 (i).

GENELLE *vs.* THE KING, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

GRAHAM *vs.* KING, CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES *re* PUBLIC WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13471 (vi).

HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).

HETU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*), 7915 (iv).

HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

HOWIE, F. W., LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6795 (iii).

JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), 11072 (v).

JUDGES APPOINTED FROM LOCAL BAR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
See 'County.'

——— QUES. OF ORDER *re*: Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*), 209 (i).

JUDGES, B.C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, HURON COUNTY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

——— MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

JUDGESHIP, MANITOBA, DELAY IN APPNMT.; Remarks in Com of Sup., 212 (i).

JUDGE, N.W.TERS. SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

JUDGES, N.S., INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).

JUDGES, QUEBEC, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

——— JUDGESHIP, OFFER TO CONSERVATIVE POLITICIAN: Par. in Montreal *Star*, 13805 (vi).

——— SALARIES, COUNTY COURTS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3628 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

JUDGES, QUE., SALARIES, LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 95 (i).
——— YUKON, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com of Sup., 3409 (ii).
JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).
——— DEP. REPT.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 90 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14255 (vi).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*), 10100 (v).
See 'Binder Twine.'
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G.T.P. CLAUSE, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
MANITOBA PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).
MYERS, JUDGE OF MAN., REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
N.W. TER. MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
PARDONS, PREROGATIVE OF HIS EX., O. Cs., &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
PENITENTIARY, CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
——— GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).
——— REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).
ROBERT *vs.* KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. REGIS LOCKUP: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— HOSPITAL: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— WARDEN'S RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 286 (i).
——— ACTING WARDEN, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 10831 (v).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 8085 (iv).
——— *See* 'Binder.'
STEWART *vs.* KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

SUPREME COURT, CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).
——— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).
——— REPORTER, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).
——— REPORTS, BINDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).
——— SALARY OF MR. TASCHEREAU: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
——— TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
TOBACCO COMMISSION EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).
WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).
YUKON TER. GOVT., ADMINISTRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

Juvenile Offenders (N.B.) Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 314; in Com., 314; 3°*, 316 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 30.)

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).

Keller Heater Co. of Can. Patent Relief B. No. 231 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 7091; 1°*, 7294; 2°*, 7487 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 137.)

KELLY, ASST. INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KELLY & BURNETT, LEASE OF FALSE CREEK: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 7565 (iv).
——— *See* 'False Creek.'
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KENSINGTON, STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KETCH, N.S., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

Kettle River Valley Railway Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 138.)

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14490 (vi).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGS, N.B., INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 976 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 139.)

KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).

King's Printer B.: *See* 'Public Printing.'

KING'S S.A. MEDALS PET., *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).

KINGSTON BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).

KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).

KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).

——— GROCERY CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).

KINGSTON ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).

——— STABLE: in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).

KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).

KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 6268 (iii).

——— *See* 'Customs.'

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).

Klondike Mines Railway Co.'s B. No. 177 (Mr. *McIsaac*) M. to receive Pet., 2778; 1°*, 3219; 2°*, 3583; in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 140).

KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 33 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 141).

Kootenay Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 142).

KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

——— CORRECTION, &c.: in Com., 14519 (vi).

LABOUR COMMISSION 1886, NAMES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 8083 (iv).

LABOUR COMMISSION, B.C., APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 1595 (i).

——— REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 8116 (iv).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7198 (iii).

LABOUR DAY ADJOURNMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10489 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 10712 (v).

——— DELAYING SESSION, &c.: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10742 (v).

LABOUR DEPARTMENT, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7151 (iii).

LABOUR DISPUTES, SETTLEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4003 (ii).

Labour Disputes Settlement: *See* 'Railway Labour.'

'LABOUR GAZETTE,' CORS., REMUNERATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7154 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7203 (iii).

LABOUR TROUBLES IN B.C.: on M. for Com. of Sup. Remarks (Mr. *Smith*, *B.C.*) 945 (i).

——— *See* 'Nelson P. O.', 'Racine Bros.' &c., 'Longshoremen, &c.

LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).

LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).

——— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).

——— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).

——— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

——— LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

——— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).

LADY LAFONTAINE, PENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14252 (vi).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Co.'s B. No. 120 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1675; 2°*, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 143).

LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).

LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).

LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).

LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).

——— PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).

LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULAR HARBOUR SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).

——— *See* 'Temiscamingue.'

LAMBTON POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278, 14661 (vi).

LANDS AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS IN B.C., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 4836 (ii).

Land Company Bills: *See* 'Canada Northwest,' 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle.'

LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i), 3797 (ii).

——— VOTED BY PARLT., AREA &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

——— *See* 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T.', &c.

LAND GUIDES, *re* SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6768 (iii).

LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1858 (i).

LAND SCRIP, MAN. AND N. W. T. VOLUNTEERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
LAND SLIDE: *See* 'Turtle Mountain,' 'Frank Disaster.'
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— UNEARNED, &C., Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
——— P O., RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for Copies*, 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* 'LE CANADA': Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
——— *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
LAW LIBRARY IN ENGLAND, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: M. for Copies of Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 98 (i).
Lead Bounties Payment B. No. 239 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6169 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8195; 1°* of B., 8230 (iv); 2° and in Com., 10798; 3°*, 10799 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 31).
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA,' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &C.. Ques. (Mr. *Lèonard*) 1032 (i).
——— *See* 'Newspaper Agents,' &c., 'Latour,' &c.
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* GOVT. CASES: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
——— *re* INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iii).
——— *re* RYS. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
——— *See* 'Justice.'
LEGAL OPINIONS *re* G. T. P. RY., CLAUSE 17, CUSTOMS DUTIES: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 11320 (v).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 14112 (vi).
——— PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
LEPROSY IN CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— *See* 'Tracadie.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— LOCKED BOXES IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6026 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER CARRIERS, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LEVIS, ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii), 7529 (iii).
——— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
——— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs. &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING; in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
——— *See* 'Yukon.'
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIARD RIVER MINERS, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iii).
Librarians of Parliament B. No. 267 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14299; 3°*, 14300 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 32.)
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
——— COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 244 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
LT. GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO AND APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks, on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i). *See* 'Mowat.'
LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).
——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).
——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C. FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE, KEEPERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).
—— KEEPERS, INCREASE OF SALARY, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
—— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa Buildings.'
L'ILE D'ALMA. REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
Lindsay, Bobcaygeon and Pontypool Ry. Co.'s B. No. 146 (Mr. *Vrooman*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 144.)
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LINSEED OIL, DEPUTATION *re* IMPORTATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii).
LIQUOR INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5393 (iii).
See 'Inland Revenue.'
LISGAR ELECTION TRIAL: *See* 'Perkins.'
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES *re* INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 6794 (iii).
See 'Justice,' &c., 'Legal,' &c.
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE METIS: *See* 'Metis.'
LIVE STOCK EXHIBIT, ST. LOUIS EXHIBITION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4602 (ii).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133–38 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'St. Lawrence Route,' &c.'
Loan Companies, Extension of Power B. No. 24 (Mr. *Thompson, Haldimand*) 1°, m., 284; 2°*, 1025; in Com., 2349 (i); 3°*, 2756 (ii); Sen. Amts., 14763 (vi).
LOANS, GOVT., &C.: *See* 'Public Debt.'
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOBSTER INDUSTRY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
—— INDUSTRY, N. S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
—— INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
LOBSTER INSPECTION, HALIFAX: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
LOCKMEN, &C., ON CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
LOCKS FOR CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &C., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.'
London and Port Stanley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 63 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4593 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, c. 145).
LONDON DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
London Loan Co. of Canada Incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. *McGugan*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1815 (i).
LONDON MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGFORD: *See* 'Wood Alcohol.'
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &C.: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
—— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
—— SETTLEMENT, &C.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 2676–7 (ii).
LONGUEUIL BRIDGE: *See* 'Montreal and Longueuil B.'
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com, of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
'LORD STRATHCONA' WRECKING PLANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOW, A. P., TECHNICAL OFFICER, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13770 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LOY, GEO. M., M. P. FOR BEAUHARNOIS, VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT ACT, REPORT OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Wade*) 7916 (iv).
—— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 7918, 7922 (iv)
—— on M. to Conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elections, 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
—— REP. *re* STENOGRAPHER: Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 7203 (iii).
—— *See* 'Beauharnois Electoral District.'
LUMBER COMBINE IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579–1590 (i).
—— N. W. T., COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
Lumbermen's Fire Insurance Co's. Incorp. B. No. 68 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 813; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 146).

LUMBER TRADE IN B. C., TEL. FROM MANUFACTURERS: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14766 (vi).
LUNENBURG FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MACGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14467 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co's. Incorp. B. No. 70. (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 814; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 147).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
MACLEOD, N. W. T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MACRAE, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
MCCRANEY, MR. W., ex-M. P., LETTER *re* LEGISLATION: Read (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5362 (iii).
McDermid, Ellen, Relief B. No. 229 (Mr. *Birkett*) 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9148; in Com., and 3°*, 9149 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 150).
MCDONNELL, GEO., LEASE OF GRAZING LANDS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
McDougall, James Sinclair, Patent Relief B. No. 169 (Mr. *Gallery*) M. to receive Pet., 2397 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 151).
MCKAY'S POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, N. S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on RES., 14326 (vi).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS *re* TORONTO HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
—— LAND TEL. LINES, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
—— *See* 'Fyfe.'
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup, 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS AND CAMPAIGN LITERATURE, BLOCKING CORRIDORS: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil*) 14219 (vi).
—— *See* 'Campaign.'
—— REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
—— REFUSAL TO ACCEPT IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14550 (vi).
—— SPECIAL TRAINS, ACCOMMODATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 14680, 14688 (vi).
—— STATEMENT *re* CONFERENCE (Sir *William Mulock*) 14681 (vi).
—— STATEMENT (Sir *William Mulock*) read *re* Threats to Express Cos., 14851 (vi).
—— USE OF ROOMS IN H. OF C., &C.: Remarks (Mr, *Borden, Halifax*) M. to adjn. Hse., 14530 (vi).
—— STATEMENT *re*: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14565 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAILS CARRIED VIA NEW YORK, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
MAIL CARS, N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
—— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL-MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P.E.I.: IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
—— *See* 'Trade and Commerce.'
MAIN A DIEU, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
MALAGAWATCH, N.S., BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, N.S., HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALLON, A.D., RETIREMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE: *See* 'Railw

MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7745 (iv).

Manitoba Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 232 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°m., 7294 (iii); 2°m., 7988; in Com., 7991, 9350 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13623 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 33).

Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co's. B. No. 44 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i).

MANITOBA:

ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Larivière*) 1859 (i).
AUTOMATIC GRAIN WEIGHERS, &c., 847, 880 (i).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
BARNES, AMOS, CLAIM FOR LAND, &c.: in Com, of Sup., 6922 (iii).
BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
CORY, W. W. SALARY, DUTIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6853 (iii).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
——— PORT OF ENTRY, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).
DOM. LANDS, MAN. AND N.W.T., SALE, PRICES PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 816.
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c.
DOUKHOBORS HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 541 (i).
——— LOANS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5587 (iii).
———PILGRIMAGE, EXPENSES, LOSSES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
ELEVATOR RATES, ADVANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Douglas*) 11062 (vi).
EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
EWART, JOHN A., ADDRESS PRESENTED TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
FYFE, MR., INSPECTION REP. *re* GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks *re*, 4192 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain.'
GRAIN ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF ACT: in Com. of Sup., 7762 (iv).
——— INSPECTION *re*, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7798 (iv).
——— WEIGHING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*, &c.) in Com. on B. 188, 4187 (ii).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HALF-BREED CLAIMS, COMMISSIONS, APPLICATIONS FOR SCRIP, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2016 (i), 3397 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
HNAUSA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOMESTEAD ENTRIES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iii).
HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6766 (iii).
HOMESTEAD LANDS, AVAILABLE FOR SETTLERS: Statement read (Mr. *Sifton*) 6787 (iii).
IMMIGRATION BUILDING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION FOR SETTLERS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Puttee*) 866 (i).
——— HOUSES AND FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i).
JEROME, MARTIN, M.P.P., AND MAN. ELECTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 5321 (iii).
JONASSON, MR. S., FOREST RANGER IN MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1198 (i).
JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
JUDGES APPOINTED AS COMMISSIONERS, ALLUSION IN MR. EWART'S ADDRESS TO JUDGE PERDUE: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 11072 (v).
JUDGES' TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
KEEWATIN GOVT., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6797 (iii).
KING'S WAREHOUSE AT WINNIPEG: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLET *via* FAIRFORD RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAND SUBSIDIES TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W. TERS.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
——— AREAS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
——— AREA UNPATENTED: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LAND SALES, WINNIPEG, PURCHASERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1858 (i).
——— *See* 'Dom. Lands.'
MAGNESS, MR., AND GRAIN THRESHING SCALE: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. on B. 188, 4191-4203 (ii).
——— *See* 'Grain,' &c.
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
MYERS, JUDGE, REP. IN HANSARD: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 285 (i).
NATURALIZATION ACT, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1196 (i).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &c.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
PERKINS, WM., PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
POSTMASTERS' ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 125 (i), 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— Stmnt. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
PRENDERGAST AND MAN. JUDGESHIP, DELAY IN APPNMT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— *See* 'Supply,' 'Public Works.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. MAIL CLERKS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
REPRESENTATION OF MAN. AND N.W.T. IN THE SENATE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1854 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, MAN. AND N. W. T., SALE, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'Lands,' &c., 'Dom.', &c.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6893 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 6169 (iii).
SELKIRK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1297 (i).
——— *See* 'N. W. T., B. 254.'
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND SCRIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
WATSON, JOHN, PRES'DT. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).
WHEAT FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS WAREHOUSE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6268 (iii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
——— Dixon, Mr. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).
——— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 666 (i).
WINNIPEGOSIS CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
See 'N.W.T.,' 'Immigration,' 'Interior,' &c.

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. *Dyment*), 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 148.)

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14397 (vi).
MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re* TARIFF: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 265 (i).
MAPS, LITHOGRAPHING AND PRINTING: in Com. of Sup., 6800 (iii), 13778 (vi).
——— PRINTING, INFORMATION *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).

Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada, Limited, Incorp. B. No. 131 (Mr. *McIsaac*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2305 (i); in Com., 5093, 5359; 3°*, 5360 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 149.)

MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— SUCCESS OF SYSTEM: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— TELEGRAPH STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
MARGAREE, N.S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).

Marine Engineers Bill: *See* 'Steamboat Bill.'

MARINE:
"ACADIA", SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13658 (vi).
——— STEAMER TO REPLACE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13659 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
ACETYLENE GAS, &C., IN LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
AIDS TO NAVIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
——— CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5736 (iii).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
ALBERT CO., N.B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
ANCHOR LINE SALVAGE COMPENSATION FOR "SCOTIA": in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
ANNANDALE RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 2921 (ii).
ANTICOSTI LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
ARSENEAULT, CAPT., COMPENSATION *re* DAMAGES TO SCHR.: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
BASS RIVER PERMANENT LIGHT: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BATHURST HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).
——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).
"BAYFIELD", REPAIRS AND SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5278, 5282, 5762 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 5586; in Com. of Sup., Mr. Evans' Reps., &c.: read (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 5742, 5763 (iii).
BIOLOGICAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).
BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOUR MASTER FROM ALBERT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
BRONTE LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Henderson*), 5757 (iii).
"CAMPANA", INVESTIGATION *re* WRECK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
CANADIAN COAST LIGHTING: Quotation (Mr. *Préfontaine*), from English paper, in Com. of Sup., 4164 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 2015 (i).

COMMANDERS OF GOVT. STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, N.B., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2919 (ii).

DALY, MICHAEL, HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

"EUXINE", SCUTTLING OF SCHR.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*), 699 (i).

GAS BUOYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi). *See* 'Acetylene.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMANDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 446 (i).

——— REPAIRS, SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4047, 5033 (ii).

"GRECIAN", STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HALIFAX HARBOUR, BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).

——— MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*), 14279 (iii).

HARRISON, CAPT., STR. "GRECIAN", COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*), 10239 (v).

HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 3630 (ii).

HATFIELD S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720, 4118 (ii).

INSURANCE RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv), 13697 (vi).

LIFE-SAVING AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi.).

LIFE-SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13543 (vi).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii), 5735, 5751 (iii), 13632 (vi).

——— AGENCIES, RENTS, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5312 (iii).

——— FLOATING LIGHTHOUSES, APPLICATIONS, &C., FROM CAPTAINS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 665 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).

——— KEEPERS SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4132 (ii).

——— SUPPLIES, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4168 (ii).

LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'

LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MCGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOALS LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

MARCONI STATIONS: *See* general heading.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, DEPT. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5033 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 244 (i).

——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 341 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

MARINE, DEPTL. SALARIES, INCREASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13663 (vi).

——— AND TRANSFER OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works.'

MARINE SIGNAL SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS, INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY' STRS., INFORMATION *re* TELEGRAM: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).

'MINTO' GOVT. STR., PASSENGERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).

MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

MONTREAL PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).

MONTREAL SHIPPING INTERESTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).

'MONTEREY' STR. WRECK, PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Memo read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).

NAVAL RESERVE: *See* 'Schools.'

NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P. E. I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

OFFICERS MESS, STR. 'QUADRA,' REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).

PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) for Copies*, 2338 (i).

PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

'PETREL,' REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).

PICTOU LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

P. E. I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: M. for Copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE GULF FISHING, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——— LIGHTHOUSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——— AND LLOYDS, COR. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

——— *See* 'Can. Coasts.'

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, NAVIGATION OBSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*

ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE, REP. *re*: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).

——— PILOTAGE, *re*, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132, 4168 (ii).

——— RETIREMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).

——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

ST. LOUIS LAKE, HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. of Sup., 13535 (vi).

SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

'SCOTIA,' STR., SALVAGE CLAIMS, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 7150 (iii).

——— SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7206 (iii).

'STANLEY,' STR., MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).

——— REPAIRS TO 'STANLEY' AND 'LANSDOWNE': in Com. of Sup., 13518 (vi).

——— AND P. E. I., WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

See 'Govt. Steamers,' 'Winter,' &c.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

——— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).

SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

WINTER NAVIGATION, P.E.I., CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).

——— COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I., COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).

——— M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).

WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).

See 'Marconi.'

WRECKING PLANT 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii), 6803 (iii), 13524, 13544 (vi).

MAR. PROVS., BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup,, 422 (i).

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: Amt. (Mr. *Lèonard*) to Com. of Sup., 4766; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 100) 4799 (ii).

See 'Vegetables,' &c.

'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).

MARTINEAU, ARTHUR, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).

——— EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).

——— AND REPORT *re* FIRE SECURITY: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).

——— REP. *re* AUD. GENERAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 6933 (iii).

MARTINEAU DEFALCATIONS, INQUIRY FOR REP. OF INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 3898 (ii).

MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).

MARYSVILLE N. B., POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 226 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6271; in Com. on Res., 6543; 1°* of B., 6545; 2°, and in Com., 6917; 3°*, 6918 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

MASTERS AND MATES EXAMINATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 13524 (vi).

MASTERS OF VESSELS FROM FOREIGN PORTS AND CUSTOMS DEPT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* POSTAGE: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

MATANE AND GASPE RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

MATHURIN, JCS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGE'S REP. &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).

MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).

MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).

MECHANICS FROM ENG., AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

MEDALS FOR THIRD CAN. MOUNTED RIFLES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

See 'Militia.'

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

——— INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).

——— INDIANS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

——— INDIANS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).

——— INDIANS, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF IMMIGRANTS: in Com. of Sup., 6695, 6851 (iii).

See 'Immigration.'

Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2237 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 152.)

MEDICINE HAT RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).

MEHAN, DR., METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

MELBOURNE, N.S., WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

MEMBERS APPOINTED TO GOVT. POSITIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3632 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 9582 (iv).

MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 3, 7, 283, 1642 (i).

——— NEW, CERTITICATES OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

MEMBERS RIGHTS TO SPEAK, MR. SPEAKER'S RULINGS: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 10535 (v).

See 'H. of C.'

MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3526 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 707 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1204 (i).

——— Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 90, 707, 1204 (i), 4956 (ii), 14662 (vi).

——— Read (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 12869 (vi).

MESSENGERS OF THE H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
See 'H. of C.'

METALLURGIST AND PETROGRAPHERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13778 (vi).

METAPEDIA, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).

——— REMOVAL FROM TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

METHYLATED SPIRITS, SUPPLIED TO MANUFACTURERS: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).

Mexican Light and Power Co., Limited, Co.'s B. No. 126 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1853; 2°*, 2050 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 153.)

MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).

MIDDLE RIVER, N.S., SHEAR DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).

MIDDLETON ARMOURY, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).

MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14330 (vi).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MIDLAND DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).

MIDLAND HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii).

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).

MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO., RENT OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

——— PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).

MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

MIDLAND WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii), 13247 (vi).

Midway and Vernon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 216 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; in Com., and 3°*, 6658 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 154).

MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

MILITARY ASYLUM, PENSIONS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

——— BUILDINGS, QUE., IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
See 'Militia.'

——— COLLEGE, KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
See 'Royal Military,' 'Kingston,' &c.

MILITIA ACT AMT. AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SUGGESTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

MILITIA FORCE, CONDITIONS, PAY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5702 (iii).

DEB.: (Mr. *Sproule*) 5715; (Mr. *Gourley*) 5717; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5719; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5720; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5722; (Mr. *Ingram*) 5725; (Mr. *Morin*) 5726; (Mr. *Oliver*) 5727; (Mr. *Clarke*) 5729; (Mr. *Johnson, Cardwell*) 5732; (Mr. *Kemp*) 5733 (iii).

Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. No. 78 (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 1°m., 872; 2°*, 1116; in Com., 1116, 2240; 3°*, 2240 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 35.)

MILITIA:

ANNUAL DRILL, CAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

ARMOURIES, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).

ARSENAL, DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (iii).

——— CONSTRUCTION IN CAN.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).

BLANKETS, WEB, CLOTH, PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*) 10102, 10410, 10714, 10954 (v).

CADET TRAINING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3773 (ii).

CAMPS FOR MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 3603, 5005 (ii).

CANADIAN BEEF SUPPLIED TO BRITISH TROOPS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 483 (i).

——— MOUNTED RIFLES, MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).

CARTOONS IN 'MILITARY GAZETTE,' &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2103 (i).

CHAMBERLAIN, HON. MR., SUGGESTIONS *re* MILITIA ACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 6540 (iii).

COLDSTREAM GUARDS BAND, ARRANGEMENT *re* VISIT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9683 (iv).

COOKE *vs.* COLE, LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

CORONATION CONTINGENT, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6950 (iii).

DEFENCE SCHEME *re* MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).

DIXON, CAPT., DUTIES IN S. AFRICA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7914 (iv).

DUNDONALD, LORD: *See* 'G. O. C.'

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).

FLAGSHIP, REMOVAL FROM ESQUIMALT: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10957 (v).

G. O. C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3779 (ii).

——— LORD DUNDONALD'S SPEECH IN HAMILTON: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup. 2399 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

G. O. C., Rep. *re* Defence Scheme : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3763 (ii).
——— Rep., &c., Publishing of : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
German Recruiting in Canada for Naval Service : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (vi).
Gordon Highlanders Trophy : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7253 (iii).
Guns ordered by British Army : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Hay and Oats bought by Imp. Govt. : on M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for Ret., Remarks, 1057 (i).
See general heading.
Hutton, Maj. Gen.: Inquiry for Ret., Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 206 (i).
Imperial Defence and prop. Res. of Lord Rosebery : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 410 (i).
See 'Naval Reserve'
King's S. A. Medals, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
See 'S. A. War.'
Kingston Barracks, R. C. Field Artillery : in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
——— Military College : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— drill hall ; in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
Longshoremen's Strike, Montreal, Pay of Militia : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— Strike, Montreal, Govtl. Action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2504 (ii).
Martineau, Arthur, Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3802 (ii).
——— Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 6934 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep. of Investigation ; in Com. of Sup., 3752, 3898 (ii).
——— Investigation, Rep. *re* Aud. General : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iii).
Medals for Third Can. Mounted Rifles : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1675 (i).
——— *See* 'S.A.', &c.
Middleton Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 969 (i).
Military Asylum, Pensions, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Military College : *See* 'Kingston.'
Military Properties, Care and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 3611 (ii).
Military Reserve at Port Moody : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Military Riding School, St. John d'Iberville, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
Military Stores Branch, Reorganization : in Com. of Sup., 3608 (ii).
Militia : in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii), 7089 (iii).
Militia Bill, Date of Introduction : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 669 (i).
Militia, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).
——— Dept., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
——— Estimates : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13368 (vi).
——— Expenditures : in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
Montreal Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
Montreal Longshoremen's Strike, Payment of Militia : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
——— *See* 'Longshoremen.'
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Naval Defence : Par. in Toronto 'Globe.' (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).
Naval Militia and School of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 13545 (vi).
Naval Recruiting in Can. for German Navy : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).
Naval Reserve, &c., in Can., Cor. between G.B. and Can. : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
Niagara Militia Camp, Annual Drill : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Ninety-Fourth Regiment, Senior and Junior Majors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
Pay and Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
——— General Statement (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 13379 (vi).
Permanent Force, Increase, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— Increase of Pay : Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
——— Qualifications of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
See 'Royal,' &c.
Plains of Abraham and Military Parades &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).
Port Moody, Military Reserve : Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).
Quebec Military Buildings, Iron Foundry : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
'Ragging' in the British Army : Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).
Rebellion of 1885, Claims of Settlers : Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
Rifle Associations, Grants to : in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).
Ross Rifle, Examination by Experts : Ques. (Mr *Morin*) 2758 (ii).
Ross Rifle Factory, Establishment at Quebec: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).
——— Imperfect Return : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).
Ross Rifle, Manufacture of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).
Royal Canadian Regiment, Numerical Strength, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Labour Trouble : Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) 12939 (vi).
Settlers Claims *re* Rebellion, 1885 : Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
S. A. Constabulary, Information *re* Grievances, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
——— Purchase of Discharge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
S. A. Contingents, Employees reinstated, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
——— Pensions to by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— Pensions from Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
S.A., Medals presented by King, Pet. *re* from Non-Com. Officers : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
——— Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
——— Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
——— Memorial Association Grant : in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

S. A., SADDLES AND BRIDLES CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
——— SUPPLIES PURCHASED FOR IMP. GOVT.: M. *Borden, Halifax*) for Copies of O. Cs., &c., 2760 (ii).
STUART, CAPT. D. C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).
SUSSEX, N. B., ARMOURY CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— BRIGADE CAMP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).
TARGET PRACTICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).
TENTS, RUSH ORDER, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
See 'Woods.'
TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES: in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD STRIKE, PAY OF MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).
VETERANS, CANADIAN, PET. *re* MILITARY SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).
VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N. W. T., LAND SCRIP, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).
WEST POINT, U.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
WOODS, J. W., AMOUNT PAID FOR TENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures, B. 20.'

MILLS, MR., ANNAPOLIS, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).

MILLS, HON. MR. JUSTICE, DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2794 (ii).

MILL STREET PAVING, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).

MINES BRANCH, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 13762 (vi).

Mining Companies Incorp. B. (No. 248 from the Senate). This bill was not introduced in the House of Commons.

MINING COMPANIES INCORPORATION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14850 (vi).

MINING INSTITUTE: in Com. of Sup., 12591 (v), 13508 (vi).

MINISTERIAL CHANGES, EXPLANATION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 90 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 110 (i).
——— EXPLANATION *re* MR. TARTE, &C. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 130, 159 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 90 (i).
——— EXPLANATION *re* MR. BLAIR, &C. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

MINISTERS, REDUCTION IN NUMBERS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 274 (i).

MINT, ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com. of Sup., 14244 (vi).
——— *See* 'Royal.'

'MINTO' AND 'STANLEY' STRS., INFORMATION *re* TELEGRAM: Read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6 (i).
'MINTO' GOVT. STR., PASSENGERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3631 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

MIRAMICHI BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'

MISCOU HARBOUR, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

Missionary Society of Can.: *See* 'Church Missionary.'

MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).

MISTOOK (DELISLE) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

MOIRA RIVER, FLOODING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

MOISIE POINT ROAD, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).

MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).

MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RYS., I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
See 'Subsidies,' &c., 'Rys.,' &c.

MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

'MONTEREY' STR., WRECK, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Star*: Memo. read (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 6803 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

MONTFORT AND GATINEAU COLONIZATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14316 (vi).

MONT LOUIS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).

MONTMAGNY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).

MONTREAL AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

Montreal Bank: *See* 'Bank.'

MONTREAL BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
——— *See* 'Militia.'

Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 167 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii).

MONTREAL, BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of of Sup., 436 (i).
——— CUSTOMS DEPT., SALARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
——— CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
——— DRY DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMISSION *re* SITE: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).

MONTREAL DRY DOCK, SITE, &c.: M. FOR O. CS., COR., &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— *See* 'Harbour.'
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i), 13058 (vi).

Montreal Fire Insurance Co.'s Change of Name Bill No. 88 (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1512 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 158).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan Bill No. 201 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 4262; in Com. on Res., 4445; 1°* of B. 4486 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5417; 3°m., 5657 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 36).

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
——— HARBOUR, DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANS PREPARED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).

MONTREAL 'HERALD' CO., &c.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Fisher*) 5314 (iii).

MONTREAL, INLAND REVENUE OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
——— 'LABOUR GAZETTE,' COR.: in Com. of Sup., 7155 (iii).
——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'

Montreal and Longueuil Bridge Co's. Incorp. B. No. 156. (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956 (ii); in Com., 5558; 3°*, 5558 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 156).

MONTREAL, NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
See 'Pilotage.' 'Shipping Casualties Bills.'
——— POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).
——— SUBWAY CO., O. CS., COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).

MONTREAL TURNPIKE: *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'

MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).

MOOSEJAW POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

Moosonee Diocese: *See* 'Trust Funds.'

MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).

MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331 (iv).
——— AT CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).

MOREAU, MR. H., COLLECTOR ON CHAMBLY CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 8333 (iv).

MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup. 492 (i).

MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

MORRISON'S POINT, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup. 13203 (vi).

Mortgage, &c.: *See* 'Canada Permanent..

MORTIMER & CO'S. FIRE, GOVT. PROPERTY DESTROYED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 4836 (ii).

Mounted Police: *See* 'N. W. Mounted.'

Mount Royal Savings Bank Incorp. B. No. 153. (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2720 (ii); wthdn., 10831 (v).

MOUNT ROYAL SAVINGS BANK INCORP. B. NO. 153 (Mr. *Campbell*): M. to withdraw Bill and refund fees, 10831 (v).

MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup. 7530 (iii).

MOWAT, SIR OLIVER, LT.-GOV. OF ONTARIO. DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1575 (i).
See 'Lt.-Governor.'

MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'

MULGRAVE AND PETIT DE GRAT S.S. SERVICE: *See* 'Petit de Grat.'

MULLENS, CORNELIUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5280 (iii).

MULLENS' LETTER *re* HURLEY, J. M., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5757, 5761 (iii).

MULLOY, TROOPER, PENSION TO BY THE DOM. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).

MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CANADA CENTRAL AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY CO'S., &c.: Remarks in Com. on Railway Bill, 6081 (iii).

MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSTON'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup. 14150 (vi).

MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530, (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 4108, 14115 (vi).

MURRAY, IMMIGRATION AGENT, SCOTLAND: in Com. of Sup., 6827 (iii).

MUSEUM AT HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).

MUSQUODOBOIT, N. S., WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

Mutual Fire Ins.: *See* 'Montreal Fire.'

Mutual Life Assurance Co. of Canada B. No. 65. (Mr. *Bruce*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 2304; 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 159.)

MYERS, JUDGE, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 285 (i).

NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).

NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).

NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).

See 'Art, &c.

National Ry. and Transport Co.: *See* 'Canada.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'

NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii).

——— REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2015 (i).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 204 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 5137; 2°; and in Com., 5872; 3°IL., 5991 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 38).

See 'Aliens.'

NAVAL DEFENCE, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 944 (i).

——— GREAT LAKES, NUCLEUS OF: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5295 (iii).

NAVAL MILITIA RESERVE AND SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).

NAVAL RECRUITING IN CANADA FOR GERMAN VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 8718 (iv).

NAVAL RESERVE, &C., IN CAN., COR. BETWEEN G.B. AND CAN.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 110 (i).

——— Inquiry for papers (Mr. *Bourassa*) 7298 (iii).

Navigable Waters Act (swing bridges) Amt. B. No. 260 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12779; 1°* of B., 12781; 2°, and in Com., 12984; wthdn., 14768 (vi).

NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).

NEGRO POINT BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).

NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

NELSON POST OFFICE, B. C., RACINE BROS., CLAIMS AGAINST CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).

NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).

NEPIGON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14395 (vi).

NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON, AND EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1196 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK:

ACADIANS, HISTORICAL DATA: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).

ALBERT CO., N. B., DISMISSAL OF CAPT. BISHOP: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS, WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).

ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).

BATHURST, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

——— FISHERY INSPECTOR: *See* 'Fishery Overseer.'

——— HARBOUR BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

——— HARBOUR MASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

BAY OF FUNDY FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

BISHOP, CAPT., DISMISSAL AS HARBOURMASTER FROM ALBERT CO., N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).

BLACK BROOK, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).

BLOOMFIELD, POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).

BOURGEOIS, M. E., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT TRACADIE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).

BRIGADE CAMP, SUSSEX: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 3235 (ii).

BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 412, 421, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).

CAMPBELLTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).

——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).

CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).

See 'Allan.'

CAPE TORMENTINE, PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).

CAPE TORMENTINE RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com. on Res., 14470 (vi).

CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).

CHATHAM, LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CHATHAM TO TRACADIE, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

CENSUS, BAPTISTS ENUMERATION, &C., RELIGIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— CARLETON, &C., CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 4004 (ii).

——— GRAND MANAN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3801 (ii).

——— RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4801 (ii).

——— ST. JOHN, RELIGIOUS ENUMERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 3800 (ii).

COCAGNE WHARF, COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).

CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENT FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

DALY, M. T., HARBOUR MASTER AT BATHURST, DISMISSAL, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2919 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).

DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

DIPPER HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13233 (vi).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

DIVORCE AND MATRIMONIAL COURTS, SALARY OF JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3400 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, CONTRACT *re* FUEL: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 10102 (v).
EDMUNDSTON INDIAN RESERVE, FIRE DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
FISHERY OVERSEER, BATHURST, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14686 (vi).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).
GAUDET, MR., COMPILATION OF ACADIAN HISTORY: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND MANAN, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
See 'Census,' &c.
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
HARRISON, MR., INSPECTOR OF FISHERIES, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 288 (i).
HATCHEY, NAZAIRE, APPNMT. AS HARBOUR MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3630 (ii).
HATFIELD'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
HISTORICAL DATA *re* ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13505 (vi).
HOPEWELL CAPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
INDIAN MEDICAL ATTENDANT, KING'S: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2502 (ii).
INDIANS, N.B., SALARY TO AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
KARS, CENSUS ENUMERATION, COR., &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Fowler*) 3804 (ii).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N.B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
MCMONAGLE, MILES, DISMISSAL FROM OROMOCTO SHOAL LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
MARYSVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MISCOU HARBOUR, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 6896 (iii).
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
POINTE DU CHÊNE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*

RICHIBUCTO, HARBOUR, PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
ST. JOHN, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
——— LONG WHARF: *See* 'Long Wharf.'
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE, WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
——— WINTER SERVICE: *See* 'Allan.'
ST. JOHN RIVER AND ST. MARY'S RIVER INDIANS, PET. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SMALL-POX PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
SUNBURY, CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 8331 (iv).
——— STATION GROUNDS, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
VENIOT, P. I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4563, 4593 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
See 'N. S.,' 'P. E. I.'

NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).

New Canadian Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1023; on Order for 2°, 1328; 2° m., 1512, 2241; in Com., 2241 (i), 2720; ref. back to Com., 2753; in Com., 3221; 3°*, 3222 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 160.)

NEWCASTLE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).

NEWFOUNDLAND, AIDS TO NAVIGATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13647 (vi).

NEWFOUNDLAND COAST WRECKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).

NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).

NEW LONDON, P.E.I., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
—— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
—— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
NEW RICHMOND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
NEWSPAPER AGENTS AND POSTMASTERS IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 14669 (vi).
—— *See* 'Latour.'
NEWSPAPER, CABLE NEWS: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5856 (iii).
NEWSPAPERS IN UNITED KINGDOM, U. S., &C.: AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.,* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
Niagara Grand Island Bridge Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977; in Com., 1811; 3°*, 1812 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 161.)
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 154 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 2501; 2°*, 2756; in Com., 4582; 3°*, 4593 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 162.)
Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1193; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3230 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 163.)
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Co.'s B. No. 211 (Mr. *Galliher*) M. to receive Pet., 5511; 1°*, 5512; 2°*, 5585; in Com., 6428 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 164.)
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14337 (vi).
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS, TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
NICOLET RIVER, BRIDGE SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14507 (vi).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*), 9080 (iv).
Nipigon Iron Range Ry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 170 (Mr. *Dyment*), M. to receive Pet., 2396 (i); 1°*, 2675; 2°*, 2956 (ii).
Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. *McCool*), 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 165.)
Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 210 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 5679; 2°*, 5989; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Nipissing and Pontiac Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *McCool*): 1°*, 591; 2°*, 665 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 166.)
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY: in Com. o Sup., 14258 (vi).
NOBLES, ISRAEL, DISMISSAL FROM HATFIELD LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 6896 (iii).
NOEL WHARF, N.S., REPAIRS: in Com of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NOMININGUE LAKE, WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING CO., CONTRACTS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 13372 (vi).
NORTH ATLANTIC TRANSPORTATION CO.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*), 13667, 13933 (vi).
Northern Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 654; 2°*, 853 (i); in Com., 2753; 3°*, 2755 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 168.)
NORTH CARDIGAN, P.E.I., PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL AND DAM, GALOPS RAPIDS: in Com. of Sup., 12899 (vi).
—— CONSTRUCTION OF DAM: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 14142 (vi).
NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3536 (ii).
NORTH POLE EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
—— STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
See 'I.C.R.', &c., 'Sydney', &c.
North Sydney Harbour Commission: *See* 'Sydney', &c.
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, P.E.I., WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).
See 'Winter Navigation.'
North-West Central: *See* 'Great N.W. Central.'
North-west Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 69 (Mr. *Scott*), 1°*, 813; 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2050 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 167.)
N.W. Mounted Police (1894) Act Amt. B. No. 242 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1°, 8321 (iv); 2°, and in Com., 10741; 3°*, 10742 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 37.)
N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*), 2921 (ii).
—— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).
—— PAY OF FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).
—— PENSIONS ACT AMT.: M. to introduce B. (Mr. *Scott*), 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 14281 (vi).
—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i); 13760 (vi).
—— TENTS, WOOD & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 3804 (ii).
—— YUKON: in Com. of Sup.. 5003 (ii).

N.W. Provincial Autonomy, Imperfect Ret. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
See 'Provincial Autonomy,' &c.

N.W. Ters. Govt., Additional Subsidies B. No. 256 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 10102 ; in Com. on Res., 12306 ; 1°* of B., 12330 (v) ; 2°, and in Com. 12843 ; 3°*, 12845 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

N.W.T., Senate Representation B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 1°m., 11691 ; 2°*, and in Com., 12302 ; 3°*, 12304 (v), (3 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES :
"Advocate, Prince Albert," Payments for Printing *re* Election Proclamation : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Aid to Agricultural Societies, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 4432 (ii).
Alexander Indian Agency, Telephone : in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
Automatic Grain Weighers in N.W.T., Rep. of Inspector, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Stewart*), 847, 880 (i).
See 'Automatic.'
Autonomy for N.W.T., Amt. : (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), on M. for Sup., 13856 ; Neg. (Y. 29 ; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
Banff Springs, Baths : in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iii), 13955 (vi).
——— Museum Building, Addition, &c.: in Com. of Sup , 6927 (iii).
——— Roads and Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).
Barr Colony, Mr. Haultain's Speech, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 6354 (iii).
——— and Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
——— Number, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6696 (iii).
Bennett, Mr., Increase in Salary : Remarks (Mr. *Pope*), 13967 (vi).
Bow River Bridge, Canmore, Protection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
Buffalo Herd in Banff Park : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958, 959 (i), 13129 (vi).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Regulations *re* Mortgage Deeds : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
C.P. Ry., Elkhorn Branch Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14497 (vi).
——— lands exempt from taxes in Man. and N.W.T. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 916 (i).
——— Land and School Taxation : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Lands.'
Coal Mining in Banff Reserve, Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 13026 (vi).
Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Doukhobors Pilgrimage and Govtl. Action : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1030 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 542 (i), 5587 (iii).
Drake, Mr., N.W.M.P., Increase of Salary : in Com. of Sup., 13761 (vi).
Edmonton and Athabasca Landing, Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
——— Bridge, Saskatchewan River, Flooring : in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— Indian Agency, Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
——— Jail : in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con-*
Elections in Saskatchewan, Payments to Prince Albert 'Advocate' : in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
Elkhorn Indian School, Average Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 6348 (iii).
Elkhorn and Moosomin Ry. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 14497 (vi).
Fire Regulations . Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
Frank Disaster, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 2100 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 2106 ; Tels. read (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2106, 2238 (i).
——— Investigation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
Gallician Immigrants *re* N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iii).
Grain Blockade : *See* 'Ry. Traffic.'
Grazing Lands leased to Geo. McDonnell, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 8330 (iv).
Great North-west Central Ry. and C. P. Ry. Co.'s Agreement : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).
Half-Breed Schools, Salaries paid, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii).
Herchmer, Mr. L. W., Pension, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5321 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Free : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13966 (vi).
Immigration Agents, Homestead Pre-emption : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Sproule*) 289 (i).
Immigration and Settlers' Effects, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
Indians : in Com. of Sup., 13782 (vi).
——— Agricultural Implements : in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii), 13782 (vi).
——— Blankets, Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
——— Clothing : in Com. of Sup., 13783 (vi).
——— Land Management Fund : in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii)
——— Live Stock, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iii).
——— Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Schools : in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
——— Seed Grain, Relief : in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii)
——— Supplies &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iii).
Irrigation, Surveys, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys., Man. and N. W. T. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
See general heading.
Land Slides : *See* 'Turtle Mountain.'
——— *See* 'Frank Disaster.'
Lumber Combines, Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 1579-1590 (i).
Macleod Court House : in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
——— Dismissal of Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
Macrae, Mr., Indian Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
Mail Cars, Overcrowding, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
See 'Postal,' 'Ry. Mail,' &c.
Maintenance of Prisoners : in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
Medicine Hat Ry. Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14503 (vi).
Military Asylum, Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
—— POST OFFICE; in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
MOUNTED POLICE, APPNMTS. AND PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2921 (ii).
—— COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 5264 (iii).
—— M. to introduce Pension Bill (Mr. *Scott*) 14280; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 14281 (vi).
—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
—— TENTS, WOODS & CO.'S TENDER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
See 'Militia.'
N. W. T., GOVTL. EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iii).
—— ADDITIONAL GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
—— MAINTENANCE OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
—— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
—— NATURALIZATION RETURNS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3804 (ii).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
—— BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
POSTAL SERVICE IN N. W. TERS.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
See 'Mail.'
PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
—— CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
—— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 13856; Neg. (Y. 29 N. 63) 13932 (vi).
—— LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1296 (i).
—— O. CS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) for copies,* 2778 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5088 (ii).
—— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
—— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
—— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6891 (iii).
—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. 6946 (iii).
—— FURTHER COR., &C.; Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 7295 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RYS.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY.: Bonds, Attack on Mr. E. B. Osler, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi). Memorandum from Mr. Kingsmill: Read, 14588 (vi).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. CO.'S LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
—— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. MORTGAGE, DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
RY. LANDS VOTED, &C., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N. W. T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
See 'Mail, &c.'

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

RY. TRAFFIC IN N.W.T., BLOCKADE, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2424 (i).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 5135 (ii).
REGINA, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY, SURVEYS OF RESERVED LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
REPRESENTATION *re* SENATE: *See* 'N.W.T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
See 'Senate.'
ROADS AND BRIDGES CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION, PROCLAMATION IN PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.'S SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO., SECTIONS ACQUIRED, &C.: M. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) for Cor.* 2338 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 4363 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2306 (i).
SENATE REPRESENTATION: *See* 'N. W. T. Senate Representation B. 254.'
SETTLERS CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
SNOW STORMS, REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOMINION LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
STEWART, MR., FOREST INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6774 (iii).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
SUPREME COURT, ADDITIONAL JUDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).
TELEPHONE LINES: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).
TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
TREE CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii), 13775 (vi).
TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'
VICTORIA TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi)
YOHO PARK, ROADS CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
See 'B.C.', 'Man.', &c.
NOTES, DOM.: *See* 'Dom. Notes, &c.'
NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA :

ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
AMAGANDUS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERST POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).
AMQUI STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE : in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANTIGONISH, POST OFFICE, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARICHAT PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
BAILEY'S BROOK, BREAKWATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BASS RIVER, PERMANENT LIGHT : in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i).
——— HARBOUR WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEAVER RIVER FISH HATCHERY, ESTABLISHMENT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
BEERSVILLE COAL AND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14487 (vi).
BELMONT DISASTER, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
BENOIT'S COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BRETON COVE, BOAT LANDING : in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
BROAD COVE, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS. : in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CANADA STEEL CO., RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14479 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, HARBOUR OF REFUGE : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLIN, MR., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY, SALARY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHETICAMP, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEZZETCOOK, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
COW BAY BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13178 (vi).
COW BAY (POINT MORIEN) BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
DALHOUSIE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DIGBY, PIER RENEWAL, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

DIGBY, POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
DODD, MR. JUSTICE, INCREASE OF SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
DOG FISH NUISANCE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13650 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DREDGING, MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, APPROACH TO WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
EAST BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup.. 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, HARBOUR ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EMIGRATION TO U. S. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
'EUXINE', SCUTTLING OF SCHR. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *McLennan*) 699 (i).
FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN N. S. AND CAN. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
FINLAY POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHERMEN OF N. S., 'OUTSKIRTS OF CIVILIZATION' : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13316 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) 13373 (vi).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13374 (vi).
FISHING INDUSTRY, MAR. PROVS., WHARF, BUILDING, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Lobsters,' &c.
FISHING WITHIN THREE MILE LIMIT : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 4179 (ii).
FIVE ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FORT LAWRENCE, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FREEPORT, LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup. 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
GABAROUSE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GLACE BAY, DOM. COAL, IRON AND STEEL COS., ACCOMMODATION AT GLACE BAY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
——— SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND NARROWS, BRIDGE PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, WHARF REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

GRANITE VILLAGE, MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
'GRECIAN', STR., REIMBURSEMENT TO CAPT. HARRISON, *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX COTTON CO., LOAN OF RAILS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
——— ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BUOY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4165 (ii).
——— *See* 'Peggy's Cove,' &c.
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HALIFAX, LOBSTER FACTORIES, INSPECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 5122 (ii).
——— MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
——— POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— AND SOUTH-WESTERN, CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
——— TIME BALL: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
HARRISON, CAPT., STR. 'GRECIAN,' COSTS *re* SUSPENSION OF CERTIFICATE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 10239 (v).
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. on Res., 14471 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HENRY, MR. JUSTICE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 14662 (vi).
HERRING COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 6409, 6414 (iii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

INVERNESS MINES, BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
——— POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
IONA, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JUDGES, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14259 (vi).
See 'Henry.'
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KETCH HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
LAWLOR'S ISLAND, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— *See* 'Halifax,' &c.
LIME ROCK, POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1105 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— PACKING INDUSTRY, N.S.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
——— *See* 'Fishing,' 'Halifax,' &c.
LORD'S COVE (DEER ISLAND) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
LUNENBURG, FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
LURCHER'S SHOAL LIGHTSHIP, CREW AND MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
MAGGREGOR, CAPT., STR. 'BAYFIELD,' GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
MCKAY'S POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MCNUTT'S ISLAND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MAHONE BAY POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIN A DIEU, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MALAGAWATCH, BOAT CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MALIGNANT COVE, HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
MARGAREE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MARGARETVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT., HALIFAX, REMOVAL, &C., RES. FROM HALIFAX BOARD OF TRADE: Read (Mr. *Bell*) 14279 (vi).
'MARKLAND,' SCHR., SEIZURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5992 (iii).
MELBOURNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

METEGHAN COVE BREAKWATER, RESTORATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
MIDDLE RIVER, SHEAR DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
MIDDLETON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
MILLS, MR., ANNAPOLIS, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wade*) 6167 (iii).
MOISIE POINT ROAD, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
MORRISON'S POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
MUSQUODOBOIT, WHARF APPROACHES: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
NAPPAN, EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
NECUM TEUCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
NEGRO POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
NEIL'S HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
NEW CAMPBELLTON, BALLAST WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER, PROTECTION SLOPES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
NOEL WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Sydney,' &c.
N.S. AND DOM. OF CAN., FINANCIAL TERMS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 3001 (ii).
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14327 (vi).
N.S. EMIGRATION TO U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iii).
NOVA SCOTIA STEEL AND COAL CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
OYSTER POND, BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PEMBROKE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &c.: in Com. of Sup.. 1146 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTOU GLASS FACTORY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iii)
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
——— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).
PLEASANT BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINT TUPPER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
——— DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTER'S CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

PORT GREVILLE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOWE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PROSPECT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUGWASH, LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
RY. SUBSIDIES FOR PARRSBORO DISTRICT, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).
ST. ANN'S NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
SANDY COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
SCOTT'S BAY, BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHORT BEACH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SKINNER'S COVE, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).
STUART, CAPT. D. C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4353 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SWIM'S POINT, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2312 (i).
SYDNEY, ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
——— *See* 'North.'
——— POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SYDNEY MINES, POST OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
——— *See* 'North.'
TENECAPE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TIVERTON, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
VICTORIA BEACH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
WALLACE HARBOUR, FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEDGE POINT, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENTWORTH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, SHEER DAM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR, NEW STATION, I. C. R., RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3713 (ii).
WOLFVILLE, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com of Sup.. 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
See 'N.B.,' 'P.E.I.,' &c.

OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).

Oaths of Office: *See* 'Administration."

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4041, 5033 (ii).

Ocean Steamship Subsidies Act (France and Canada) Amt. B. No. 252 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*); Res. prop., 10410; in Com. on Res., 10802; 1°* of B., 11422; 2°*, and in Com., 12295; 3°*, 12500 (v). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

OFFICERS' MESS, STR. "QUADRA", REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 9819 (iv).

OFFICIAL GUIDE, I.C.R., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3535 (ii).

OGDEN'S POND CHANNEL, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).

O'HALLORAN, GEO. F., DEP. MIN. OF AGRICULTURE: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4356 (ii).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).

O'LEARY, J. & M.. CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY. BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).

O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

Oleomargarine Bill: *See* 'Butter B. 207.'

ONSLOW, LORD, SPEECH *re* CATTLE EMBARGO: *See* 'Cattle Embargo.'

ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS NUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).

ONTARIO, NORTH ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 367 (i).

Ontario and Qu'Appelle Land Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *McCarthy*), 1°*, 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., 2716; 3°*, 2720 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 169.)

Ontario and Quebec Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *Belcourt*), 1°*, 814; 2°*, 1026 (i); in Com., 4868; 3°m., 4869; 3°*, 5100 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 170.)

ONTARIO:

"ALERT", STR., *re* CANAL SURVEYS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALEXANDRIA WOOD EXPORT CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12924 (vi).
See 'Privilege', &c.
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALNWICK BAND, MISSISSAGA INDIANS, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*), 6895 (iii).
AMHERSTBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup , 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*), 1195 (i).
BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thompson, Grey*), 13263 (vi).
BALSAM LAKE AND LAKE SIMCOE: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iii).
BARRIE P.O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).
——— WHARF, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i).
——— DOM. AID, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5588 (iii).
BLIND RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*), 1298 (i).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOYD, SIR JOHN, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*), 5990 (iii).
——— RELATIVES IN GOVT. EMPLOY: Ques. (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*), 4185 (ii).
BRACEBRIDGE CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
——— INDIAN RESERVE, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1322 (i).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) in Com. of Sup., 5757 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
BURKS FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PORT OF ENTRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3913 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAN. CENTRAL RY. AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
CANADA FOUNDRY, TORONTO, STRIKE, &C., REPRESENTATIONS TO MINISTER OF LABOUR: Remarks (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 7205 (iii).
See 'Scotch Iron,' &c.
CANALS IN ONT. AND QUE., AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CHATHAM DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).
CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT *re* RAILS FOR GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Ont.*) 13668 (vi).
See 'Sault.'
CLINTON, CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
See 'Macpherson.'
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL IMPORTED INTO ONT. FROM JUNE 1901 TO MARCH 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 669 (i).
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii), 13084 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD, DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
CORNWALL CANAL, LIGHTING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FOR LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 14134 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12895 (vi).
——— SUPT'S. DUTIES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12896 (vi).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).
CUMBERLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup, 13239 (vi).
CUTLER, GORE BAY MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 2308 (i).
——— AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

CUTLER, SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
DEPOT HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound,' 'Grain,' &c.
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
DETROIT RIVER, &C., INTERNATIONAL WATERS, U. S. GOVT. WORK: M. (Mr. *Cowan*) for Cor.* 2778 (ii).
DREDGING PLANT FOR ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii).
DRESDEN CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3960 (ii).
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EDVILLE POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).
ELGIN COUNTY, CENTENARY CELEBRATION: Remarks (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 3129 (ii).
——— REDISTRIBUTION, PAR. IN 'TORONTO GLOBE': Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 6540 (iii),
ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).
ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT, ACETYLENE GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iii), 14150 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
See 'Grain,' 'Kaministiqua.'
GALOPS CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14141 (vi).
——— SURVEYS, LIFTING BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— DAM: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12608 (vi).
——— RAPIDS, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 8268 (iv), 14644 (vi).
——— M. to conc. (Mr. *Fielding*) Agreed to (Y. 36; N. 14) 8403 (iv).
See 'North Channel.'
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4823 (ii).
——— CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3791, 3897 (ii).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
——— *See* 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
GERALD, MR., INLAND REV. DEPT., PRESCOTT, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968, 13978 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GOODERICH, MR., REMOVAL, MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) in Com. of Sup., 14144 (vi).
GORE'S LANDING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13244.
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi),

ONTARIO—*Con.*

GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN LAKE PORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 97 (i).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i). *See* 'Wheat,' &c.
GRAND BEND, BREAKWATER PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE : Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRANT, J. G., BARRIE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFAULT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5991 (iii).
GREY COUNTIES, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
HALDIMAND, CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4822 (ii).
HALTON, CARDWELL AND PEEL, CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436, 6894 (iii), 11425. (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Calvert*) 7092 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7056 (iii).
HAMILTON, DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND : in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— ELEVATOR WORKS : Remarks (Mr. *Bruce*) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424 (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAYCOCK, J., MR., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772(iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HOG CHOLERA, OUTBREAK IN BRUCE : in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
——— OUTBREAK IN YARMOUTH, ONT.: M. for Cor., &c.* (Nr. *Ingram*) 1058 (i).
HOLT, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE OF HURON COUNTY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
HUDSON'S BAY : *See* 'James.'
HURLEY, J. M., APPNMT., DUTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5123 (ii), 5280 (iii).
——— REP., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5740 (iii).
HURON COUNTY JUDGESHIP : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
INDIANS ONT., AND QUEBEC, ROAD REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
INDIAN SCHOOLS, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii). *See* general heading.
IROQUOIS CANALS, ELECTRIC LIGHTING : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12901 (vi).
JACKSON, MR., APPNMT. AS JUDGE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
JAMES AND HUDSON BAY FISHING RIGHTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3806 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii), 6893 (iii).
——— Ques: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1194 (i).
JOHNSON, MR., PURCHASE OF HOUSE BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
——— *See* 'Port Arthur.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

KEILTY, MR., INSPECTOR AT PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5365 (iii).
KELLY, WM., CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR N. HASTINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7080 (iii).
KELLY, ASST. CUSTOMS INSPECTOR, REFUND, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
KILROY, ACTING CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, WINDSOR, ONT., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
KINGSTON, BARRACKS, R. C. FIELD ARTILLERY : in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
——— GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
——— MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii), 5842 (iii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
——— MILITARY STABLES : in Com. of Sup., 638 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— PENITENTIARY : in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
KINGSVILLE, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAMBTON, POSTMISTRESS, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278, 14661 (vi).
LEAMINGTON WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup , 5929 (iii).
LT.-GOVERNOR OF ONTARIO, &C.: on M. for Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
——— APPNMT. OF ADMINISTRATOR : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 110, 655, 1204 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Decease, 1575 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
MACNEE FISHING LICENSES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4727 (ii).
——— *See* 'James.'
MACPHERSON, D. F., CENSUS ENUMERATOR, CLINTON : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4820 (ii).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PETS. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi). *See* 'Lambton.'
MARA, RAMA, &C., FLOODING OF LANDS : M. (Mr. *Grant*) for copies of Rep., &c., 2762 (ii).
MEAFORD POST OFFICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13069, 13124 (vi).
MECHANICS FROM ENG. AND TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE, REMOVAL FROM TORONTO : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6435 (iii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— DREDGES, &C., CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— PORT OF ENTRY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3912 (ii).
MIDLAND MERCANTILE CO.'S RENTAL OF BUILDINGS ON DOCK, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13427 (vi).
MIDLAND, POSTOFFICE BUILDING : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— WATER FRONT, LEASE TO PRATT & Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MILITARY COLLEGE : *See* 'Kingston.'
MISSISSAGA INDIANS, ALNWICK BAND, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McColl*) 6895 (iii).
MOIRA RIVER FLOODING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
MOOSE DEER POINT, SALE OF ISLANDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).
MORRISBURG PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
MOWAT, SIR OLIVER : *See* 'Lt.-Gov.'
MURRAY CANAL, PURCHASE OF MR. JOHNSON'S HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 14143 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., INSPECTOR : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).
——— WIRE FENCING: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
NAPANEE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3919 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY. CHARTER, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
NEPEAN POINT, IMPROVEMENT BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
NEWMARKET, OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NIAGARA MILITIA CAMP, ANNUAL DRILL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3604 (ii).
NINETY-FOURTH REGIMENT, SENIOR AND JUNIOR MAJORS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 9080 (iv).
NIPISSING, JR. JUDGESHIP, SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 14258 (vi).
NORTH CHANNEL, CONSTRUCTION OF DAM : in Com. of Sup., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
See 'Galops.'
OAKVILLE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
ONTARIO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, CERTIFICATE : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 367 (i).
ONTARIO, NORTH, CENSUS ENUMERATORS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4826 (ii).
ORILLIA, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER : in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA, BRIDGE OVER CONCESSION STREET : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— BRIDGES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii), 13321 (vi).
——— BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
——— VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM : in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
See general heading.
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian,' 'Point au Baril,' &c.
OTTAWA RIVER, PETEWAWA NARROWS : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
——— SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110, 13122 (vi).

PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PARRY SOUND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETERROUGH ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK : in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
PETEWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE : in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICTON, MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS : in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
POINT AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
See 'Georgian,' &c.
POINT EDWARD DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Kaministiquia.'
PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT : in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— *See* 'Welland.'
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT PERRY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5749 (iii).
See 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT. : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 898, 908 (i).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5587 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY. CHARTER, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE, TORONTO, ADDITIONAL VAULT : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &C. : *See* 'Can. Central.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
——— CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 13302 (vi).
——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— *See* 'Trent.'
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: *See* 'Kingston.'
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
SARNIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
——— COALING ACCOMMODATION *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii).
——— CLERGUE SYNDICATE, LABOUR DISTURBANCES: Remarks, 12610, 12717 (vi).
——— PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR' *re* MILITIA: Remarks (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 12939 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S. STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Can. Foundry.'
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*) for Reps., 2762 (ii).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
——— N. W. T. RESERVES, &C., 6350 (iii).
SMITH, WM., LATE, M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).
——— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 13648 (vi).
STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).
SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).
SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO, JUDGES' SALARIES: Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 10102 (v).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

SYDNENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
THESSALON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE' COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2757 (ii).
TORONTO, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— (LETTER READ): in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 11177 (v).
——— CANADA IRON FOUNDRY, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
——— *See* 'Scotch,' &c.
——— CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).
——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, &C., TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
——— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).
——— BALSAM LAKE LOCKS: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— CORRY & LAVERDURE, COMPENSATION *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii), 14651 (vi).
——— EMPLYMT. OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8117 (iv).
——— HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 129 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

TRENT CANAL, PAYMENTS TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 8118 (iv).
——— PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
——— REP. OF W. MCLEOD: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 12716 (vi).
——— ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
——— SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*) for Copies, 2313 (i).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WALLACEBURG, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALPOLE, CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— DUNNVILLE DAM AND BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7809 (iv).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
——— RAMY'S POINT, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— 'TOWNSEND' VALVE *re* LOCK GATES: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
——— O. CS., *re*, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— *See* 'Pt. Colborne,' &c.
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSIONERS' REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6168 (iii).
——— JURY'S VERDICT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
WHEAT EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.
WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).
WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— LOCKMASTER CASSELMAN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14272 (vi).
——— MORRISON, MRS., CLAIMS *re* LANDS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14104 (vi).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, OVERSEER'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— STEWART, MR., APPNMT. AS SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*) 14599 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
WINDSOR, CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.: REMARKS in Com. of Sup., 3907 (ii).
See 'Kilroy,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOODSTOCK ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
OPERATING EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7811 (iv).
ORDER, QUES. OF, IN COM. ON CRIMINAL CODE B.: Ruling (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 318 (i).
ORDER IN THE HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12723 (vi).
ORDER, QUESTIONS OF: Mr. Speaker's Rulings (Mr. *Ingram*) 10537 (v).
ORDER, QUES OF, *re* BRUNET AND DOM. ELECTIONS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 108 (i).
——— *See* 'H. of C.'
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO'S. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14459 (vi).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3698 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
ORILLIA, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i).
——— remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, REMOVAL OF CARETAKER: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
See 'Island of Orleans.'
OROMOCTO SHOALS, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1194 (i).
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSAKA EXHIBITION: *See* 'Japan.'
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, ENGINEER'S REPS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
——— ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ROOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).

OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS, CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
——— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
——— COAL SHED : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
——— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
——— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973, 1006 (i).
——— GOVT. OFFICES, RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
——— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— CRICKET PLAYING : Objection (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— LIGHTING &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
——— NEW ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
——— WESTERN BLOCK, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES, APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
OTTAWA, CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

Ottawa City Improvement Commission Act Amt. B. No. 223 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 6269 ; in Com. on Res., 6448 ; 1°* of B., 6456 ; 2°*, and in Com., 6806 ; 3°*, 6814 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 45).

Ottawa Electric Railway Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1378 ; 2°*, 1815 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 171).

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL ENGINEER'S REP.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Murray*) 1299 (i).
See 'Georgian.'

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 540 ; 2°*, 665 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 173).

OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 14319 (vi).
——— *See* 'Waltham.'
OTTAWA POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
——— ELEVATOR : in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OTTAWA VALLEY FIRE SUFFERERS AND GOVTL. ASSISTANCE : Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3133 (ii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *Monk*) 1°*, 707 ; on Order for 2°, 977 ; 2° m., 1327, 1511 (i) ; M. *re* Ry. Com., 6523 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 87), 6537 (iii).

Ottawa Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 264 (Mr. *Ethier*) 1°* ; 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 12993 ; in Com., and 3°*, 13330 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 172).

OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).
OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, BUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13122 (vi).
——— HARBOUR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
——— HARBOUR SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13110 (vi).
OXIDE OF ALUMINUM, IMPORTS INTO CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, N.B.*) 1035 (i).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).

Pacific Bank of Canada Incorp. B. No. 164 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 2582 ; 2°*, 2956 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3796 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 174.)

PACIFIC CABLE, CONCESSIONS TO EASTERN EXTENSION CO., LIABILITY OF CAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2675 (ii).
PARADIS, AMABLE, FERRY SERVICE AT WHITFORD, COR., &C.: M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) for copies*, 2338 (i).
PARDON PREROGATIVE OF, BY HIS EX., NUMBER RELEASED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 567 (i).
PARIS AGENCY, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 12589 (v).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: *See* 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENT, DATE OF CONVENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 14853 (vi).
See 'Sessions.'
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, LOWERING TONE OF : Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 14583 (vi).
See 'Debates.'
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS, OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
——— TRANSLATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 545 (i).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DUST NUISANCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 2104 (i).
——— LAWN MUTILATION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2398, 2421 (i).
PARLIAMENT: Opening, 1 (i), Prorogation, 14858 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14506 (vi).
PARRSBORO AND TRURO: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies for N.S.', &c.
PARRSBORO, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPE BASIN SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14460 (vi).
PASPEBIAC, LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PASSES, I. C. RAILWAY: M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret.. 2337 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9582 (iv.)
Patent Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4213; in Com.. 4213, 4674 (ii); 3°* 5293 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 46.)
PATENT ACT AMT., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 97 (i).
PATENT BRANCH, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
——— CLASSIFICATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4433 (ii).
Patent Relief: *See* 'Depew, Geo. M.'
——— *See* 'International Ry. Appliances.'
——— *See* 'Keller.'
——— *See* 'McDougall, James S.'
——— *See* 'Standard Car.'
——— *See* 'Woolf Valve,' &c.
PAVING SIDEWALKS, OTTAWA, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS, PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PEEL, CARDWELL AND HALTON CENSUS SCHEDULES: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6436 (iii).
See 'Halton.'
PEGGY'S COVE, HALIFAX, DISMISSAL OF LIGHTKEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2312 (i).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Latour,' &c.
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
Penitentiaries Act Amt. B. No. 217 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 5763 (iii): 2° m., and in Com., 8261, 8373 (iv), 10824 (v); Order dischg., 13444 (vi).
PENITENTIARIES, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
PENITENTIARIES, GENERAL EXPENDITURE: in Com. of Sup., 3511 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS *re* GROCERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 10100 (v).
See 'Justice.'
Penny Banks B. No. 198 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 4175 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 6456 (iii), 10793; 3°*, 10798 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 47.)
Pensions, Militia: *See* 'Militia.'
PENSION SYSTEM, &C., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 9216 (iv).
PENSIONS TO S.A. SOLDIERS, PETS. *re*; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 14284 (vi).
PER CAPITA TAX, REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE, 1896 AND 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13935 (vi).
PERCE, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
Père Marquette International Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 132 (Mr. *Cowan*), 1°*, 2014; 2°*, 2277 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 175.)
PERKINS, W.. PAYMENT TO *re* LISGAR ELECTION; in Com. of Sup., 14251 (vi).
PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726, 2753 (ii).
PERMANENT CORPS, QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith*, *Wentworth*), 4443 (ii), 6434 (iii).
——— INCREASE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
——— INCREASE OF PAY: Ques. (Mr. *Gilmour*) 13371 (vi).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Bourassa*), *re* STOCK GAMBLING, 7204 (iii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* REPORT OF SPEECH: (Mr, *Hughes*. *Victoria*) 14850 (vi).
See 'Privilege.'
PERTH PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— CANAL, LIFT LOCK: in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE PIER, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S, DEPOSIT CHEQUE: in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
See 'Atlantic.'
PETHIC, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).

PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).

PETITIONS, PRESENTATION OF, RULES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*), 6 (i).

PETITIONS *re* G.T.Ry., SIGNATURES, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*), 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 12715 (vi).

PETITION REJECTED AS CONTRARY TO RULE 86 (Mr. *Speaker*), 654 (i).
See 'H. of C.'

PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).

"PETREL", REPLACEMENT BY NEW STEAMER: in Com. of Sup., 13658 (vi).
See 'Marine.'

PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).

PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).

PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*), 13134 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).

PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).

——— LIGHTHOUSE CONSTRUCTION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4167 (ii).

——— LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).

PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi)

PIGEON LAKE ISLANDS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).

Pilotage Act (Montreal and Quebec) Amt. B. No. 261 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), Res. wthdn., 12493 (v); in Com. on Res., 12781; 1°* of B., 12800; 2°m., 12984; 2°, and in Com., 13628; 3°m., 13937 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)

Pilotage Act. Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), 1°*, 2100 (i); wthdn., 11302 (v).

PILOTAGE ACT AMT. B: Prop. Res. wthdn., 12493 (v).

PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4132-4168 (ii).
See 'Shipping Casualties Bill.'

PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3234 (ii).

PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).

PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).

POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).

POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i). 13249 (vi).

POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

POINT TUPPER, DREDGING, CLAIMS OF MR. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).

POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).

POLAR EXPEDITION, GOVT. AID TO CAPT. BERNIER: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), 12805 (vi.)

POLICE MAGISTRATES, YUKON. LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

POLITICAL CORRUPTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Dom. Elections B., 891 (i).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).

PORT ARTHUR, ADDITIONAL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii)., 13012 (vi).
See 'Ontario,' &c.

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).

——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).

——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).

——— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).

——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).

PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).

PORTER'S CHANNEL, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).

PORT GEORGE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).

PORT GREVILLE, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORT HASTINGS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).

PORT HAWKESBURY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).

PORT HOOD, N. S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).

PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).

PORT HOWE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORT LATOUR, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORT MAITLAND, N. S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).

PORT MOODY, MILITARY RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 446 (i).

PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

PORT AU PIQUE, N. S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).

PORTRAIT PAINTING OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING AND CANADIAN ARTISTS; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 13026 (vi).
See 'Art,' &c.
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).
Postal Scales: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 208 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1°m., 5240; 2°m., 5657; in Com., 5659, 5853: 3°*, 5871 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 49).
Post Office and Govt. Savings Bank B. No. 220 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°m., 6353; 2°*., and in Com., 6814; 3°*, 6815 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 62).
POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
POST OFFICE, GOVT'S. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487-533 (i).
POST OFFICE:
AFFIDAVITS *re* P. O. SUPPLIES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 6138 (iii).
AGRICULTURE DEPT., POSTAGE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4355 (ii).
AMHERST, N. S., POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1591 (i).
ASHCROFT-BARKERVILLE MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1595 (i).
AURORA FOUNDRY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
AURORA, MAIL BAGS REPAIRED, &C.: in Com of Sup., 6139 (iii).
AUTOMOBILES FOR P. O. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).
AYR, POSTMASTER ROBSON, RESIGNATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
BALACLAVA AND OWEN SOUND MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 13263 (vi).
BARRIE P. O., BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 6062 (iii).
BLOOMFIELD POSTMASTER, N. B., CHARGES AGAINST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 818 (i).
BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
See 'Postal Boxes,' &C.
BOX RENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
BRACEBRIDGE POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13071 (vi).
BRENNAN, MR. J. P., P. E. I., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
CAMPBELL, D. J., POSTMASTER AT MACLEOD, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oster*) 8082 (iv).
CAMPBELLFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13073 (vi).
CANADA AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (iii).
CANADIAN MAIL VIA NEW YORK, NUMBER OF TONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
CARLIN, PETER, J., POSTMASTER AT WHITNEY PIER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
CHATSWORTH POST OFFICE, VACANCY: in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iii).
CITY POST OFFICES, APPNMT. OF CLERKS ON PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 14001, 14009 (vi).
CLERKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5853 (iii).
CONVENTION, POSTAL, LONDON, ENG., RES. ADOPTED: Read (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14018 (vi).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
CORNWALL ROAD P. O., MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 14038 (vi).
COUNTRY POSTMASTERS, SALARY INCREASES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Post Office Bill, 5662, 5676, 5863 (iii).
See 'Postmasters, Rural.'
COUNTRY POST OFFICES, HOURS OF CLOSING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com. of Sup., 5931 (iii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii), 14011 (vi).
CROWN TAILORING CO., TORONTO, SUPPLIES FOR P. O. DEPT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6152 (iii).
CUTLER AND GORE BAY MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——— SPANISH MILLS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVING BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *William Mulock*) 89 (i).
DISTRIBUTION, &C.: REMARKS (Mr. *Bell*) 879 (i).
DEPTL. SALARIES, ADDITIONAL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).
DIXON, MR. J. W. T., DEAD LETTER OFFICE, WINNIPEG, ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13995 (vi).
DOYLE, MR., RY. MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
EDVILLE POSTMASTER, OPENING OF OFFICE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14035 (vi).
EMERSON MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
EMPLOYEES, HOLIDAYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4005 (ii).
ENTERPRISE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER; Remarks (Mr. *Avery*) in Com. of Sup., 14007; Memorandum (Sir *William Mulock*) read, 14008 (vi).
ERNESTOWN STATION POSTMASTER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1034 (i).
FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).
FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).
GAGETOWN MAIL CONTRACT, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 1676 (i).
GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., (Sir *William Mulock*) 14012 (vi).
GUELPH POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
HALIFAX POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES, PET. *re* INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on conc., 14759 (vi).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
H. OF C., LOCKED P. O. BOXES: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 6026 (iii).
INSPECTORS, SUPT. OF RY. MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
INSURANCE FUND, REP., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14660 (vi).
INVERNESS POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6051 (iii).
JUBILEE STAMPS, SALE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6060 (iii).
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938 (iii).
LAMBTON POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iii), 14278 14661 (vi).
LEMON, MR., TRANSFER TO TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

LETTER BOX COLLECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
LETTER BOXES IN POST OFFICES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARIES: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. of Sup., 14011 (vi).
——— BOOTS, PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. on Post Office B., 5660, 5672 (iii).
——— SALARY INCREASES: in Com. of Sup., 6004 (iii).
——— SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iii).
——— TORONTO, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iii).
——— WINNIPEG, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iii).
LIME ROCK, N.S., POSTMASTER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1297 (i).
MCNULTY, POSTMASTER, PET. *re* REMOVAL OF OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
See 'Lambton.'
MACLEOD, N.W.T., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 8082 (iv).
MAHONE BAY, POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 14038 (vi).
MAIL BAGS, REFUNDING EXPRESS CHARGES: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 14684 (vi).
See general heading.
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6139 (iii).
MAIL, CANADIAN, SENT VIA NEW YORK: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 10713 (v).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
MAILS CARRIED BY RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
MAIL CARS. N.W.T., INSUFFICIENT ACCOMMODATION: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) in Com. on P. O. Bill, 5870 (iii).
MAIL CLERKS, INCREASE OF SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13997 (vi).
See 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
MAIL MARKING MACHINES: in Com. of Sup., 6159 (iii).
MAIL SERVICE, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 6053, 6065 (iii).
——— P.E.I., IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MALLON, MR., DISMISSAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6037 (iii).
MAN. POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Postmasters.'
MEAFORD POST OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFAULTING POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
MONTREAL POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
MOOSEJAW POSTMASTER, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 6048 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
NAPANEE POST OFFICE, RENTAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1594 (i).
NESBITT, MAN., POSTMASTER WATSON AND EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1195 (i).
NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13088 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Sir *William Mulock*) 13256 (vi).
NEWSPAPER BOXES, NAMES OF MANUFACTURERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 14283 (vi).
See 'Boxes.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

N. W. TER., POSTAL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 14039 (vi).
ORLEANS ISLANDS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).
OTTAWA, POST OFFICE, ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 5844 (iii).
——— SUPPLY CO.: in Com. of Sup., 6146 (iii).
OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5924, 6004 (iii).
PARKHILL MAIL CONTRACT, REMUNERATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1594 (i).
PARLIAMENTARY DOCUMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, POSTAGE, *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 14036 (vi).
PICTON MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 13134 (vi).
PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13998 (vi).
PORTAGE, P.E.I., POST OFFICE, OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
POSTAL, BOXES ON STREET CORNERS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13091 (vi).
——— CONVENTION: *See* 'CONVENTION.'
——— MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iii).
POSTMASTERS, ASSOCIATION, MAN. AND N.W.T., MEMORIAL *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 13259 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *LaRiviére*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
——— STMNT. (Sir *William Mulock*) in Com. of Sup., 14016 (vi).
——— DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
——— DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).
——— IN MAN. AND N.W.T., PETS. *re* SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 125 (i).
POSTMASTERS, RURAL, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5920, 6037 (iii).
——— *See* 'Country.'
POSTMASTERS' SALARIES, ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 5921 (iii).
POST OFFICES IN CITIES, STMNT. OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* NEWMARKET OFFICE SPECIALTY CO., 13256 (vi).
QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RY. MAIL CLERKS: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— INCREASED SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— MAN. AND N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
See 'Mail Clerks.'
RY. MAIL SERVICE IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
RY. MAIL TRANSFER AGENTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6889 (iii).
ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).
RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 13259 (vi).
——— P.E.I., Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot*: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii); Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) 511 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5321 (iii).
——— POSTAL FACILITIES: Ques (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 6136 (iii).
SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
SMITH, F. H., P.O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).
SUPPLIES AND CURRENT WAGES, DECLARATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iii).
THETFORD MINES POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).
TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).
TORONTO POST OFFICE, BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).
——— AUTOMOBILES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6050 (iii).
TRANSFER OF TEMPORARY CLERKS TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).
VALLEYFIELD POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
VANCOUVER P. O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Bordon*, *Halifax*) on Conc., 14764 (vi).
WHITNEY PIER, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 130, 668 (i).
WINNIPEG P. O., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).

POTTINGER, MR., I.C.R., REP. OF *re* TIES, &C.: M. for Copy (Mr. *Haggart*) 3806 (ii).

'POULTRY FARMING,' PAMPHLET OF DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 7640 (iv).

POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River.'

PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'

PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, AND RT. HON. JOS. CHAMBERLAIN'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13375 (vi).
——— AND S.A. COLONIES, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3583 (ii).
——— WITH FRANCE *re* SHIPPING B. C. SALMON: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).
——— PAR. IN 'MONTREAL STAR' *re* MR. FIELDING'S PLEDGES *re* MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S SCHEME, 13936 (vi).
——— PREVENTION OF FRAUD, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3921 (ii).
——— *re* GERMAN GOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 5322 (iii).
——— MEMORANDUM OF MR. BALFOUR, PRES'DT. OF BRITISH BOARD OF TRADE, IN FINANCIAL STATEMENT, 1402 (i).
——— OFFER OF CAN. GOVT. TO G.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3219 (ii).

PRÉFONTAINE, HON. R., AND PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273, 2657, 2925, 2956 (ii).

PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, DELAY IN APPNMT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).

PRESCOTT, HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— INLAND REV. OFFICIALS, SALARIES, PROMOTIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 13968 (vi).

PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).

Press Associated Despatches: *See* 'British Cable,' &c.

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES IN GALLERY OF H. OF C., SESSIONAL SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 14114, 14242 (vi).

PRESTON, MR., INTERVIEW *re* CAN. BUTTER: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 10712 (v).
——— STATEMENT *re* CAN. APPLES: Remarks (Mr. *Cochrane*) 11184 (v).
——— SUIT BY CAN. EMPLOYMENT BUREAU: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12220 (v).
See 'Barr Colony,' &c.

PREVENTIVE SERVICE, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (ii).
———*See* 'Customs.'

PRIME MINISTER, CONGRATULATIONS *re* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AS A MEMBER (Mr. *Sproule*) 11690 (v).

'PRINCE ALBERT ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).
——— *See* 'Advocate.'

PRINCE ALBERT, CLERK OF COURT, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3401 (ii).
——— COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).

Prince Edward Island Ferry Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 180 (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°*, 3391; 2°*, 3984 (ii); in Com., 7771, 7914; 3°, 7914 (iv).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
AGENTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6884 (iii).
AITKEN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
ALBERTON RY. STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
——— STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE, PIER, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
——— RANGE LIGHTS, AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
BEACH POINT, BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BLUESHANK, STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
BONDED WAREHOUSES, RENTAL, CLOSING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12073 (v).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

BRENNAN, MR. J. P., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).
BROOKFIELD STATION, ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
CANOE COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 14131 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).
COAL FIELDS, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
CONROY, MR., SUB-COLLECTOR TIGNISH, DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13993 (vi).
COVE HEAD, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13222 (vi).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CURRY, JAMES, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CHARLOTTETOWN, SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3918 (ii), 13992 (vi).
DESROCHES, FISHERY GUARD, ALLEGED FRAUDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
DREDGING PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FARQUHARSON, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5512 (iii).
FISHING BOUNTIES, GUARDIAN DESROCHES, ALLEGED FRAUD: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 10955 (v).
FISH SHIPPERS, LOSS, &C., BY GOVT. STRS.: Memorandum read (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4051-54 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
——— PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3394 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13520 (vi).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
HIGGIN'S SHORE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
——— CONTRACTOR'S NAME, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
KELLEY'S CROSS, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5938, 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LARKIN, CAPT. W. S., COMPLAINTS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2922 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS: in Com. of Sup., 6058, 6063 (iii).
LEWIS POINT, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

LOBSTER INDUSTRY, INSPECTION, *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
MAIL SERVICE, IRREGULARITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 5937 (iii).
MAIL SUBSIDY, P.E.I. AND G.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NEW LONDON HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— REPAIRS TO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH CARDIGAN, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, WINTER NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6895 (iii).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
O'LEARY STATION, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).
O'REILLY, MR., CLAIMS *re* TOBACCO FACTORY, DAMAGED BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13978 (vi).
OYSTER FISHING, P.E.I., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2920 (ii).
OYSTERS, HERRING, &C., FISH INSPECTION, INVESTIGATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13649 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PETHICK, DR., VET. SURGEON, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5505 (iii).
PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
POINT PRIM, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
PORTAGE, POST OFFICE OPENING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 14008 (vi).
P.E.I. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
——— AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
——— AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
——— PROTEST *re* REPRESENTATION IN H. OF C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
——— *See* 'Redistribution.'
P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P. E. I.*) 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— RY. SALE OF TICKETS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
QUEENS, WEST, REPRESENTATION *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).
REDISTRIBUTION *re* P. E. I. AND N. B., COR. RESPECTING : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 876 (i).
REPRESENTATION IN P.E.I. AND N B. FOR H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS' OPINION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
RICHMOND AND NORTHAM, P.E.I. RY. STATION : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
RICHMOND BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, Par. in Charlottetown *Patriot* : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13806 (vi).
SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH, CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 13373 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND : in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com, of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SOURIS, KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR, RY. TENDERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
ST. LOUIS, ELMSDALE, COLEMAN AND CONWAY STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
"STANLEY," STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii),
——— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii)
STEEL RAILS, P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 3234 (ii).
——— COAL SHEDS : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
TELEGRAPH LINES AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I. : M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 2765 (ii).
——— COR. WITH GOVT. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*), 1036 (i).
——— STR. "STANLEY" : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 4006 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION OF STR. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6895 (iii).

Printing and Stationery Bill : *See* 'Public,' &c.

PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1102 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION EMPLOYEES : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4182, 4444 (ii).

——— AND UNION LABELS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Brock*), 4179 (ii).

PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 4444 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU, INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 4180 (ii).
——— PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).
——— SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
PRINTING COM. : M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 5314 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Parmelee*) to concur in 4th Rep. of Com., 5581 (iii).
PRINTING OF PARLT. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5267 (iii).
PRINTING, STATIONERY, CUSTOMS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3962 (ii).

Prisons Act : *See* 'Reformatory.'

PRITCHARD AND ANDREWS, P.O. SUPPLIES : in Com. of Sup., 6154 (iii).
PRITCHETT, AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION IN ONT. : Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*), 898, 908 (i).
PRIVATE BANKERS : *See* 'Bankers.'
PRIVATE BILLS : M. (Mr. *Morrison*), to extend Time, 10489 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Russell*) to suspend Rule, 4958 (ii).
——— NOTICES, REVISING RULES *re* : M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) in Com. on Rep. of Joint Com., 13547 (vi).
——— ORDER FOR PROCEDURE : Remarks (Mr. *La-Rivière*), 5138 (iii).
PRIVATE CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9682 (iv).
——— PURCHASED BY GOVT,, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COM., 1ST REP. OF SEL. COM. : Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*), 5511 (iii).
——— M. *re* Stenographer (Mr. *Fraser*), 7202 (iii).
——— 2ND REP. *re* MR. LOY, M.P. : Presented (Mr. *Wade*), 7916 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) to print Evidence, 7917 (iv).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 7918 (iv).
——— M. to conc. in Rep., 7922, 8008 ; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*), 8008, Neg. (Y. 40 ; N. 105), 8069, 8080 (iv).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF : (Mr. *Fisher*) Par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Montreal *Herald* Co., 5314 (iii).
——— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Par. in *La Patrie*, 6803 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Lennox*) *re* Visitors in Corridors, 11557 (v).
——— (Sir *William Mulock*) *re* Newmarket Office Specialty Co., 13256 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Osler*) *re* Western Rys. and 'Grafters,' 10497, 10529 (v).
——— (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) *re* Attendance at House, 2015 (i).
——— (Mr. *Roche, Halifax*) *re* Fishermen of N.S., 'Outskirts of Civilization,' 13373 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Purchase of Cheese Hoops, 5416 (iii).
——— (Mr. *Schell*) *re* Appnmt. of Mr. Stewart on Canals, 14599 (vi).

PRIVILEGE (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', in Campaign Literature, 14583 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 3127 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Talbot*) *re* Pets. of G.T.P. Ry. Co., 13265 (vi).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.,' &c.
——— (Mr. *Tarte*) *re* 'Eureka', 14687 (vi).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
PROCEDURE *re* ADJOURNMENT: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Sproule*), 6630 (iii).
PROROGATION: Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Secretary (Mr. *Speaker*), 14844 (vi).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 14858 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY FOR N.W.T.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup.' 13856; Neg. (Y. 29; N. 63), 13932 (vi).
See 'Autonomy.'
——— FURTHER COR., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*), 7295 (iii).
——— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 6891 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to print Papers, 5582 (iii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5512 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1296 (i).
——— RET., &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6946 (iii).
See 'N.W.T. Subsidies B. 256.'

Provincial Court Judges, &c.: *See* 'Judges Retiring,' &c.

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, INCREASES, &C.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 691 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 5764 (iii).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: M. (Mr. *Fraser*) 367 (i).
——— M. to add Name (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3431 (ii).
——— MEETINGS CONCURRENTLY WITH SITTINGS OF HSE.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 8334 (iv).
——— PRODUCING CENSUS SCHEDULES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7058 (iii).

Publication of Statutes: *See* 'Statutes.'

PUBLIC DEBT, CONVERSION, PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVANTS *re*, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14253 (vi).
PUBLIC DEBT, INTEREST DECREASE: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14665 (vi).
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, DISTRIBUTION TO BOARDS OF TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1378 (i).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS, QUARANTINE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
PUBLIC HEALTH, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Public Printing and Stationery Act Amt. B. No. 182 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3392; 2°*, 4203; in Com., 4203; 3°*, 4213 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5872 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 50).

Public Works Act (contracts) Amt. B. No. 193 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1° m., 3970; 2°*, 4221; in Com., 4221; 3°*, 4224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 52).

Public Works Management and Control B. No. 269 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 14281; 2°, and in Com., 14741; 3°*, 14755 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 53).

PUBLIC WORKS:
ABBOTT'S HARBOUR, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ABRAM'S RIVERS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13141 (vi).
ACTON VALE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
AITKEN'S WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
'ALASKA,' STR., PURCHASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 6629 (iii).
ALBERNI-CLAYOQUOT TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
ALEXANDRIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).
ALLISTON PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 495 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
AMAGANDUS WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068 (i).
AMHERSTBURG, ONT., HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1285 (i), 13235 (vi).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i).
ANDERSON AND KENNEDY'S LAKE: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
ANGLO-AMERICAN TEL. CO., MONOPOLY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13328, 13338 (vi).
ANNANDALE PIER, P.E.I., AMT. EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2921 (ii).
ANSE AUX GASCONS, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTICOSTI TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
ANTIGONISH POST OFFICE, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
ARBITRATION AND AWARDS *re* PUBLIC WORKS, PAYMENTS &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13339 (vi).
ARCHITECT'S (CHIEF) OFFICE, OTTAWA, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
ARCHITECTS *re* PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 524 (i).
ARCHITECT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY ARREARS: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).
——— STAFF, PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
ARICHAT, N.S., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
ARICHAT, WEST, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
ASHCROFT-DAWSON TEL. LINE AND BRANCHES: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
ASSINIBOINE AND RED RIVERS NAVIGATION, COM. FROM WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 1298 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1859 (i).
See "St. Andrews Rapids" (vi).
ATLIN-QUESNEL TEL. BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BAILEY'S BROOK, N.S., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1072 (i).
BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
BARRIE, ONT., WHARF CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1186 (i), 13452 (vi).
BARRY'S BAY, ONT., MADAWASKA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BATISCAN RIVER, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'
BAXTER'S HARBOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BAYFIELD EXTENSION PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1188 (i), 13141 (vi).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i).
BEACH POINT, P.E.I., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
BELFAST PIER, P.E.I., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
BELLE ISLE, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).
BELLE RIVIÈRE, SHEET PILING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1191 (i).
BELLEVILLE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 969, (i), 13082 (vi).
——— HARBOUR BOUNDARIES &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 5588 (iii).
BENOIT'S COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
BIG HARBOUR, PORT BEVIS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
BIG POND WHARF, N.S., SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 1071, 1073 (i).
BLACK BROOK, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13227 (vi).
BLIND RIVER, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
——— TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 1298 (i).
BOIS BRULÉ, TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE, EAST, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BOWMANVILLE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
BOW RIVER BRIDGE, CANMORE, PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).
BRACEBRIDGE, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13236 (vi).
BRAMPTON ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 966 (i), 13085 (vi).
BRANTFORD DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
BRASSES' POINT BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).
BRETON COVE, N.S., BOAT LANDING: in Com. of Sup., 13151 (vi).
BRIDGEBURG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
BRIDGES OVER CANALS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
BRIDGEWATER, N.S., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1074 (i).
B.C. TELEGRAPH LINES, WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).
BROAD COVE, N.S., HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
——— LIGHTHOUSE: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Henderson*) 5755 (iii).
BRUCE MINES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5911 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
BUILDINGS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 956, 1065 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 442 (i), 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 412, 486 (i), 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i), 5827 (iii), 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i), 13129 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 487, 956 (i), 5842 (iii), 13082 (vi).
——— OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13053 14245 (vi).
——— QUEBEC, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
See 'Dominion Buildings.'
BURK'S FALLS, MAGNETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
CABLE AND LAND LINES, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
CACOUNA WHARF, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
CAMPBELLFORD, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 504 (i).
CAMPBELLTON, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13037, 13042, 13052 (vi).
——— WHARF, EXTENSION AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
CAMPOBELLO, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in of Com. Sup., 13218 (vi).
CAPE TORMENTINE, N.B., PIER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
CAPE TRAVERSE, P.E.I., SURVEY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1173 (i).
CARETAKERS OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, GOVT. POLICY *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1016 (i), 13061 (vi).
CARIBOO ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR OF REFUGE: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CARLETON HEAD, P.E.I., SURVEY *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13219 (vi).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I., BEACH OPENING: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i).
CAYUGA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 502 (i).
CEMENT USED FOR BUILDINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHARLOTTETOWN, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13036 (vi).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHATHAM, N.B., LIGHTSHIP SLIP: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
——— TO TRACADIE, N.B., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
CHATHAM, ONT., DREDGING CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
CHEGOGGIN, N.S., PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

CHETICAMP, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
CHEVERIE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CHEZZETCOOK, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
CLERKS OF PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).
CLINTON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5834 (iii).
COAL CONTRACTS FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 639 (i), 13084 (vi).
——— HARBOUR REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13118 (vi).
COCAGNE WHARF, N.B., COMPENSATION TO CAPT. ARSENAULT: in Com. of Sup., 13231 (vi).
COLBORNE ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
COLEMAN, A. B., TENDERS *re* TORONTO POST OFFICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK, ESTIMATED COST: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5871 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. on Dry Docks B., 4679 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
COLUMBIA RIVER, B.C., ABOVE GOLDEN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— OPENING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13304 (vi).
——— REVELSTOKE, NAV. OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
CONNOLLY, M., PAYMENTS FOR DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
CORRY & LAVERDURE, AWARD *re* CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iii).
COUCHICHING AND SIMCOE LAKES, REGULATION OF WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COVE HEAD HARBOUR, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
COW BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
CREOSOTED TIMBER FOR PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
CROSS POINT PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMBERLAND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
DALHOUSIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DAUPHIN, LAKE LOWERING: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
DAWSON TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).
DEER ISLAND TO EASTPORT, ME., TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
DEPOT HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
See 'Parry Sound.'
DESCHAMBAULT WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESERONTO, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques., (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DIGBY PIER, RENEWALS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2101 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13034 (vi).
DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
DOCKS, HARBOURS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
DOM. BUILDINGS, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1065 (i).
——— N. B.: in Com. of Sup., 421 (i).
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
——— RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
DONALD'S HEAD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN, ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DREDGES, AT MIDLAND, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— NEW, COST, CAPACITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 1856 (i).
——— PLANT FOR B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13311, 13318 (vi).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2674 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii), 13311 (vi).
——— MAR. PROVS., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13309 (vi).
See "Hydraulic" &c.
——— ONT. AND QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
——— P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13313 (vi).
——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
DRILL HALLS, CONSTRUCTION OF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13043 (vi).
See 'Militia.'
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
DRUMHEAD BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
DUFFERIN AND SAPPERS BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
DUNCAN'S COVE, N.S., APPROACH TO WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
DUNNVILLE: *See* 'Grand River.'
DURHAM POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).
EAST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST BERLIN, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
EAST END, CAPE SABLE ISLAND, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
ECONOMY, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
EDMONTON, BRIDGE, SASKATCHEWAN RIVER, FLOORING: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
——— JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
ELECTRIC POWER FOR DOM. BUILDINGS GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
ENGINEERS OFFICE, PUB. WORKS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2726 (ii).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5919 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ESQUIMAUX POINTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
'EUREKA,' STR., LOAN BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14285 (vi).
——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Tarte*): 14687 (vi).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS, REPAIRS TO BUILDINGS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
FAIR WAGE SCHEDULE ON GOVT. CONTRACTS AND LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7156 (iii).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
'FIELDING, W. S.,' DREDGE PREPARATION OF PLANS, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14283 (vi).
FINLAY POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13181 (vi).
FISHER, CHAS. A. L., INSPECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1592 (i).
FIVE ISLANDS, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FLESHERTON ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
FT. DUFFERIN EXTENSION WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
FT. LAWRENCE, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
FT. WILLIAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
See 'Port Arthur,' 'Kaministiquia,' &c.
FRASER RIVER, B.C., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
FRAWLEY, MR., REMOVAL FROM ORILLIA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 1007, 1016 (i).
FREDERICTON MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
FREEPORT, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
FRIARS HEAD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
FRUDE'S POINT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13180 (vi).
FUEL CONTRACTS, INTEREST *re* UNPAID ACCOUNTS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5318 (iii).
GABAROUSE, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GANANOQUE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 970 (i).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1371 (i).
GASPEREAUX HARBOUR, GRAHAM'S POND: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GEORGEVILLE, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).
See 'Ottawa and Georgian Bay.'
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13184 (vi).
GODERICH, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13240 (vi).
——— HARBOUR WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
GORE'S LANDING, WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
GOUINLOCK, GEO. W., LETTER *re* CONTRACT FOR TORONTO P. O.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).
GOVT. BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, REP. *re* MARTINEAU INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
See 'Ottawa.'
GOVT. CONTRACTS, TENDERS *re*: Par in Ottawa *Free Press* (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

GOVT. POLICY *re* DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS: *See* 'Public Works, Transfer.'
GRAND BEND, ONT., BREAKWATER PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13239 (vi).
GRAND ETANG BRIDGE, ENTRANCE. in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
GRAND MANAN, N. B., BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
GRAND NARROWS, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, DREDGING AT DUNNVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 12497 (v), 13027 (vi).
GRAND RIVER, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS TO ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
GRAND RIVER WHARF, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIERE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLEE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514-1574 (i); on conc., 6070 (iii).
GRANITE VILLAGE, N.S., MOORING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13182 (vi).
GREAT SALMON RIVER, GROYNE AND BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).
GREEN COVE BOAT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1100 (i).
GREY COUNTY, LIST OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS WANTED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5835 (iii).
GUELPH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 637 (i).
GULL HARBOUR, ST. GEORGE'S BAY, MAN., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
GUYSBOROUGH, N. S., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5839 (iii).
HALIFAX, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13031 (vi).
———MUSEUM, REMOVAL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 13032 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
——— WHARF, LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
HALL'S HARBOUR, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13198 (vi).
HAMILTON DRILL HALL, ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
——— INLAND REVENUE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 145 (i), 5916 (iii), 13304 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (ii).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii), 13308 (vi).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i), 3354 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS. GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1185 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1163 (i), 5894 (iii), 13005, 13227 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1068, 1133 (i), 13141 (vi).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1185, 1352, 1424, (i), 3341, 3368 (ii), 5909 (iii), 13012, 13235 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1153 (i), 13218 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1512, 2241 (i), 3304 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— YUKON TER.: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS AND BRIDGES, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1369 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

HARDY BAY, B.C., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
HAWKESBURY, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5909 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13119 (vi).
HAWKESTONE WHARF, GOVT. AID *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13453 (vi).
HAWK POINT INLET, N. S., BOAT CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HERRING COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
HIGGIN'S SHORE, P.E.I., PIER: in Com. of Sup.. 1159 (i), 13222 (vi).
HNAUSA WHARF, EXTENSION, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1448 (i).
HOPEWELL CAPE, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13233 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
HULL, WHARF, COMPLETION: in Com. of Sup., 5900 (iii).
HYDRAULIC DREDGE FOR MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 2612 (i), 13312 (vi).
INDIAN HARBOUR WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
'INTERNATIONAL' DREDGE, LEASED OR BOUGHT FROM M. CONNOLLY: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 12218 (v).
INVERNESS MINES, N.S., BROAD COVE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 13199 (vi).
IONA, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND TEL. LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
—— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
See "Orleans," &c.
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5962 (iii).
JANVRIN'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1102 (i).
JEDDORE, EAST, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13179 (vi).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
—— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDIQUE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (iii).
—— Remarks: (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13013 (vi).
See 'Port Arthur.'
KAMOURASKA EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
KETCH, N. S., HARBOUR DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSPORT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1103 (i).
—— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK, AWARD TO CONNOLLY & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 13023 (vi).
—— MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., (i), 13094 (vi).
—— MILITARY STABLES: in Com. of Sup., 638 13117 (vi).
KINGSVILLE, ONT., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13244 (vi).
LAKE FRANCIS OUTLET, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1449 (i).
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i), 13459 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE IMPROVEMENTS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2246 (i).
See 'Temiscamingue.'
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ARDOISE, N. S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1104 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3230 (ii).
—— RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &C.: M. for copies*, 3236 (ii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
LATOUR, L. J., LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
—— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Le Canada.'
LEAMINGTON WHARF, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 13246 (vi).
'LE CANADA' CIRCULAR ISSUED BY J. L. LATOUR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 1032 (i).
See 'Pelletier and Latour.'
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249 (i).
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2978 (ii).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii).
—— LAND PURCHASED FOR I. C. R.: M. for O. Cs., &C.*: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3631 (iii).
—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
LEWIS POINT, P. E. I., PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
LIGHTING DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of SUP., 2257 (i).
LINDSAY DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13082 (vi).
LINGAN BEACH PROTECTION: in Com of Sup., 1105 (i).
LISTOWEL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13123 (vi).
LITTLE BEAR CREEK ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LITTLE CURRENT, GEORGIAN BAY, CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13245 (vi).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13200 (vi).
LONDON, DRILL HALL AND ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
—— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
LONGUEUIL, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
LONG WHARF, ST. JOHN, N. B., LEASE BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 11828 (v).
LORD'S COVE (DEER'S ISLAND) WHARF: in Com., of Sup., 1177 (i).
LOTBINIERE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOWER MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1159 (i).
LUNENBURG HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. of Sup., 13315 (vi).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

McKay's Point, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, N. S., Beach Protection: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Magann & Phin, Claims *re* Toronto Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwaters, Piers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— Land Tel. Lines, Repairs, Rewiring, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
Magog Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
Maguasha Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Main a Dieu, N. S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, N. S., Boat Channel Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, N. S., Harbour Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13201 (vi).
Marconi Telegraph Stations, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii), 13639 (vi).
——— Tel. Apparatus at Chateau Bay: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— Success of System: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
Margaree, N. S., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Margaretsville, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Maria Pier: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
Marysville, N. B.: Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5835, 5841 (iii).
Meaford Post Office: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13124 (vi).
Melbourne, N.S., Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater, Restoration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
Middle River, N.S., Shear Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13202 (vi).
Middleton Armoury, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 969 (i), 5841 (iii).
Midland Harbour, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
——— Dredges, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
Midland, Mercantile Co.'s Rental of Buildings on Dock, Midland: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
——— Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii).
——— Water Front, Lease to Pratt & Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
Miscou Harbour, N.B., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
Mistook (Delisle) Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Moira River, Flooding: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
Moisie Point, Road Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 13322 (vi).
Moncton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Buildings, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
——— Harbour Dry Dock, Site, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor., &c.*: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

Montreal, Harbour, Permanent Sheds, Plans prepared, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
——— Harbour Dock Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— New Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— Post Office, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— Post Office, Enlargement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
Moose Jaw Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).
Morrisburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 492 (i).
Morrison's Point, N.S., Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines, Tel. Line: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf Extension, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).
Musquodoboit, N.S., Wharf Approaches: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
Nappan, Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
Necum Teuch Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Negro Point, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
Neil's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Nelson Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— Racine Bros'. Claims against Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 7157 (iii).
Nepean Point, Improvement by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Birkett*) 11829 (v).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1142 (i).
Newcastle Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
New Harbour Breakwater, Protection Slopes, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
New London, P.E.I., Harbour Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— Repairs to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
Newport, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Nicola, Kamloops, Telephone Service: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
Noel Wharf, N.S., Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
Nominingue Lake Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
North Cardigan, P.E.I., Pier Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
North Sydney Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— *See* 'Sydney.'
N. W. T., Court Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Orillia, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 968 (i), 13086 (vi).
——— Public Buildings, Removal of Caretaker: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
ORLEANS, ISLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 5906 (iii).
——— *See* 'Submarine,' 'Island,' &c.
OROMOCTO WHARF, RIVER ST. JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 1181 (i).
OSHAWA PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13110 (vi).
OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 342 (i), 5842 (iii), 14243 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— APPROACHES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— CONCESSION STREET: in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
OTTAWA CITY, BUILDINGS, &C., ADDITIONAL LAND: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
——— CARETAKERS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
——— CENSUS BUILDING, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
——— COAL CONTRACT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).
——— COAL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— ELEVATORS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1012 (i).
——— ELEVATOR FOR WEST BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— FIRE SECURITY AND MARTINEAU REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 4673 (ii).
——— FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— GROUNDS, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— GROUNDS, PAVING, &C.: in Com of Sup., 13119 (vi).
——— HEATING, &C., WESTERN BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— "IMPERIAL" BUILDING, OTTAWA, GOVT. OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3803 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974, 988 (i).
——— LIGHTING OF CHAMBER, CHANGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 816 (i).
——— LIGHTING, BUILDINGS, OTTAWA, CONTRACT PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 3235 (ii).
——— TRANSFORMERS: in Com. of Sup., 5843 (iii).
——— MAJOR'S HILL PARK: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— OFFICE FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 438 (i), 13117 (vi).
——— FITTINGS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13090 (vi).
——— RENTALS, LEASES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Sproule*) 588 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5097 (ii).
——— RIDEAU HALL, LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i).
——— RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
——— STEEL SHELVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
——— VENTILATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
——— VICTORIA MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i).
OTTAWA RIVER, PETAWAWA NARROWS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
——— SURVEYS OF HEADWATERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13340 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

OUELLE, RIVIÈRE, PIER REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
OWEN SOUND, HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13110 (vi).
——— SURVEY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5317 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 5832 (iii), 13063, 13122 (vi).
OYSTER POND, N.S., BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 13204 (vi).
PARRSBOROUGH, N.S., LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PARRY SOUND, ONT., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13248 (vi).
See 'Depot Harbour.'
PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).
PAVING SIDEWALKS, CONCRETE: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PEACE AND PELLY RIVERS PACK TRAIL: in Com. of Sup., 13323 (vi).
PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR 'LE CANADA,' PAYMENTS TO, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
PELLY RIVER BRIDGE AT LETHBRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).
PEMBROKE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PERCÉ, EXTENSION PIER IN NORTH COVE: in Com. of Sup., 13467 (vi).
PERTH, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13075 (vi).
PETAWAWA NARROWS, AWARD TO G. C. POUPORE: in Com. of Sup., 13251 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENT TO CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PETERBOROUGH, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13083 (vi).
PETIT DE GRAT, PROTECTION WORK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PETIT ROCHER, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13234 (vi).
PICKERING HARBOUR, REPAIRS TO PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i).
PICKETT'S PIER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDING, LEVELLING GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
PICTOU, N.S., LIGHT BEACH: in Com. of Sup. 13205 (vi).
PIERREVILLE, WHARF: in Com. in Sup., 13468 (vi).
PLEASANT BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
POINTE AU BARIL, GEORGIAN BAY ROUTE, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1365 (i).
POINTE DU CHENE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).
POINT EDWARD, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1377 (i), 13249 (vi).
POINTE FORTUNE, WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT PRIM, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
POINTE AUX TREMBLES, WHARF: in Com of Sup., 13468 (vi).
POINT TUPPER DREDGING, CLAIMS OF M. CONNOLLY: in Com. of Sup., 14103 (vi).
POIRIERVILLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
See 'Fort William,' 'Kaministiquia.'

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT COLBORNE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3368 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR FOUNDATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT: in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— SUMMIT LEVELS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
See 'Welland.'
PORT DANIEL, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
PORT ELGIN, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1424 (i).
PORTER'S CHANNEL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT GEORGE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
PORT GREVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT HASTINGS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HAWKESBURY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1146 (i).
PORT HOOD, N.S., HARBOUR ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 13206 (vi).
PORT HOPE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
PORT HOWE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT LATOUR, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT MAITLAND, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
PORT AU PIQUE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13210 (vi).
PORT PERRY, ONT., DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
PORT STANLEY HARBOUR, DEEDGING, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i), 13249 (vi).
POST OFFICES, GOVT.'S POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 487–533 (i).
POUPORE, G. C., AWARD: *See* 'Ottawa River,' &c.
PRATT & CO., LEASE OF MIDLAND WATER FRONT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 5749 (iii).
——— *See* 'Midland.'
PRESCOTT, HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
PRESQUE ISLE, BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
——— DOCK, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1370 (i).
PRINCE ALBERT, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
P.E.I., PIERS AND BREAKWATERS, REPAIRS, &C.- in Com. of Sup., 1160 (i).
——— TEL. SERVICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).
PROSPECT, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE WHARFS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13451 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— MAN.; in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13037 (vi).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13129 (vi).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 411, 636 (i), 2612 (ii), 3304, 5006 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CIVIL GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 13498 (vi).
——— CIVIL GOVT., CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 5824 (iii).
——— CONTRACTS AWARDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*), 9080 (iv).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*), 6 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS, PROMOTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1058 (i).
——— AND MARINE DEPT., DIVISION OF WORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2266-2273 (i), 2657 (ii).
——— TRANSFER OF EXPENDITURES; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).
——— MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURES: in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).
——— PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925. 2956 (ii).
——— PRESERVATION OF HEALTH, REGULATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1857 (i).
——— TOTAL AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE IN CANADA, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
PUGWASH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
QUARANTINE STATION, LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
QUATSINO CITY, WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED; in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— DRILL SHED, SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*), 706 (i).
——— HARBOUR PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3972 (ii).
——— HARBOUR WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*), 2237 (i).
——— MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).
QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).
RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).
RACINE BROS., CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).
——— AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii).
——— Letters read from Deputy Minister of Labour, &c., 7164 (iii).
RED DEER, COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &C., PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).
RICHIBUCTO, NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).
RICHMOND BAY, P.E.I., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, DRAINAGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii). *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).
RIVIERE DU LOUP, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).
RIVIERE DU NORD, CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
RIVIERE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).
RIVIERE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).
RIVIERE VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com, of Sup., 13321 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).
——— RECONSTRUCTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
ROBIN, COLLAS, CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC: Remarks in Com. of Supply, 13464 (vi).
RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).
ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).
ROSSLAND, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
ST. AGNES, TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST. ALEXIS, BAIE DES HA HA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE, HA HA BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup.. 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c.: Que. (Mr. *Puttee*) 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 10490 (v).
——— RED RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— MAN., REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
——— NORTH RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE: in C m. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
ST. FIDÈLE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

ST. GÉDEON ISLANDS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODFROI DE NOUVELLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. JEROME, LAKE ST. JOHN, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
ST. JOHN, N.B., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).
——— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— WATER AND DRAINAGE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).
ST. JOHN RIVER TRIBUTARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i), 5895 (iii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WHARFS, TIDAL WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).
ST. JOHNS, QUE., CUSTOMS BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— DRILL HALL, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).
ST. LAURENT WHARF, ISLE OF ORLEANS: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER ISLANDS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER (LOWER) REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE, CABLE AND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2989, 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).
——— SHIP CHANNEL, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).
——— WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1127 (i), 13252 (vi).
ST. LOUIS DE MILE END PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
ST. LOUIS RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
ST. MARY'S CURRENT WHARF, CONTRACT WITH POUPORE & MALONE: M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
ST. MARY'S PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).
ST. MAURICE RIVER, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).
——— DREDGING EASTERN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— *See* 'Batiscan.'
——— SLIDES, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
ST. MICHEL DE BELLECHASSE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
ST. NICHOLAS PIER, REBUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
ST. PIERRE POINTE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
ST. SIMEON, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
SABREVOIS WHARF, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SACRÉ-COEUR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
SANDY COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SARNIA, PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi).
SAUGENAY RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
SAULT STE. MARIE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13252 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).
SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SELKIRK WHARF, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
SEVEN ISLANDS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEGAWAKE HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHERBROOKE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHIELDS MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF : Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup , 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 5587 (iii).
SKINNER'S COVE, N.S., PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
——— POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 2672 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re* : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
See 'St. Anne de Sorel.'
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT, P.E.I., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).
SOUTH INGONISH WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SPRINGHILL, N.S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— BOILER EXPLOSION : Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING : in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND : in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland.'
STRATFORD, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS : in Com of Sup., 13130 (vi).
STURGEON FALLS WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS : M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.*, 11301 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
——— BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
——— COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii).
SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).
SWIM'S POINT, N.S., WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).
SYDNEY, N.S., POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028, 13035 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
See 'North Sydney,' &c.
TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii), 5918 (iii).
——— P.E.I. AND MAINLAND : in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).
——— P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE : in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
——— QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— ST. LAWRENCE : in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).
TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418 (ii).
TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
TELEPHONE, LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).
TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'
TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).
TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
TERREBONNE, POST OFFICE BUILDING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
TEULON, NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).
THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).
THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).
THREE FATHOM HARBOUR, BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).
——— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, REBUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).
——— ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— LETTERS READ : in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
——— PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

TORONTO, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 647, 957, (i).
——— HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).
——— TOTAL AMT. PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Grant*) 1203 (i).
——— ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).
——— LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS, STORE HOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i), 13096 (vi).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).
——— PUB. WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).
TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).
TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13038 (vi).
TRANSPORTATION, COMMISSION *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
See general heading.
TRENTON HARDOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
VICTORIA, N.W.T., TO ANDREWS TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).
WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 13217 (vi).
WHARFS, &C., POLICY OF GOVT. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) in Com. of Sup., 13143 (vi).
——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS.—*Con.*

WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE MUD RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WILLIAMS HEAD, B.C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDING AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com of Sup., 438 (i), 13127 (vi).
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDING, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
WOODSTOCK, N.B, ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
——— PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5735 (iii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
——— PUB. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13108 (vi).
WOODVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).
YORKTON COURT-HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
YUKON TER., PUB. WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

PUGWASH, N.S., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13205 (vi).
PULP WOOD, DUTY BY U. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 4362 (ii).
'QUADRA,' STR., REGULATIONS *re* OFFICERS MESS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 9819 (iv).
Qu'Appelle Land Co. Bill: *See* 'Ontario and Qu'Appelle,' &c.
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*) *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates,' 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL: Read (Mr. *Osler*) 14588 (vi).
——— Co.'s LAND GRANT: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2338 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters,' 10497 (v).

QUARANTINE, ORGANIZED DISTRICTS: in Com. of of Sup., 5007 (ii).
——— PUBLIC HEALTH, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5490 (iii).
——— LAWLOR'S ISLAND: in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
QUATSINO CITY WHARF, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13305 (vi).
Quebec Bridge and Ry. Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Power*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756; in Com. 4586; and 3°*, 4587 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 177.)
Quebec Bridge Subsidy Agreement B. No. 272 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 14523; on Order for Com. on Res., 14690; 1°* of B., 14734; 2° m., 14734, in Com., and 3°*, 14735 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 54.)
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14280 (vi).
QUEBEC BRIDGE, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 14521 (vi).
——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Res., 14449 (vi).
QUEBEC, CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
——— DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— REPS. TO COUNCIL, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— PIER, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).
——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soliel* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.S SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14444 (vi),
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84: (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1023; 2°*, 1328; in Com., and 3°*, 1815 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 176).
Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No, 135 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); M. for Com., 5971; in Com., 5978, 6399; 3°*, 6399 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 178.)
QUEBEC, MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
QUEBEC PILOTS: *See* 'Pilotage,' 'Shipping Casualties Bills.'
QUEBEC POSTMASTERS: *See* 'Newspaper Agents.'
Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 56 (Mr. *Girard*) 1°*, 707: 2°*, 977; in Com., and 3°*, 2277 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 179).
Quebec Sup. Court: *See* 'Judges, &c.'

QUEBEC:
ACTON VALE POSTOFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
ADMIRALTY COURT, QUEBEC, REGISTRAR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3408 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*
AGRICULTURAL LECTURERS IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 8615 (iv).
AIDS TO NAVIGATION, CHANNEL SWEEPING BOATS: in Com. of Sup., 13633 (vi).
ANSE AUX GASCONS WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE AUX GRIS FONDS, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANSE ST. JEAN, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
ANTICOSTI ISLAND, FOX BAY, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).
——— LIGHTSHIP: in Com. of Sup., 5737 (iii).
——— TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &c.: Remarks (Mr *Marcil*, *Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).
BARACHOIS DE MALBAIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
BATISCAN RIVER CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i).
See 'St. Maurice.'
BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, FLOODING LANDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
BEAUHARNOIS ELECTORAL DISTRICT REPRESENTATION AND INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: M. (Mr. *Monk*) to ref. to Priv. and Elections Com., 7095 (iii).
——— *See* 'Loy, Geo. M.'
BELLE ISLE TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2989 (ii).
BERSIMIS TO GODBOUT TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
BOIS BRULÉ TRAINING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
BONAVENTURE EAST BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13446 (vi).
BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'G.T.Ry.'
BOURASSA, INSPECTOR, INLAND REV., QUEBEC, SHORTAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5405, 5407 (iii).
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, AMOUNTS PAID IN SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 10496 (v).
——— FURTHER AID BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
BRUNET, ARTHUR AND DOM. ELECTION ACT.: M. for Pets., O.C.'s &c. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 101 (i).
See 'St. James,' &c.
BRYSON BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION OF PIERS: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 13053, 14245 (vi).
——— RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 422 (i).
CACOUNA WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
CANALS IN ONT. AND QUEBEC, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1594 (i).
CAPLAN BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13448 (vi).
CENSUS COMMISSIONER FOR PROV. OF QUEBEC, TRAVELLING EXPENSES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1058 (i).
CHAMBLY CANAL, COLLECTOR OF TOLLS, SALARY Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).
——— MOREAU, MR., APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).
——— DISMISSAL OF JULES QUESNEL: (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).
——— ELECTRIC STATION BY-WASH: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
CHAMBLY CANAL, LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

CHAMBLY CANAL, LANDING WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
——— MACADAMIZING TOW PATH: in Com. of Sup., 12906, 14151 (vi).
CHAMBORD WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13454 (vi).
CHABOT, MR. F. X., DISMISSAL AS LIGHT-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2015 (i).
CHATEAU DE RICHER, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13455 (vi).
CHATEAUGUAY RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
CIRCULARS TO CURES, P.Q., *re* CENSUS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4657 (ii).
CITADEL DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
COUILLARD, ALFRED, GRATUITY: in Com. of Sup., 13546 (vi).
COUTURE, VET. SURGEON AT QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5504 (iii).
CRANE ISLAND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1513.
CROSS POINT, PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
CUMMINGS, JAMES, PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 9458 (iv).
CUSTOMS SALARIES AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
DEFAULTING POSTMASTERS *re* SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).
DESCHAMBAULT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, ALLUMETTE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DESJARDINS, CAMILLE, APPNMT., SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 3537 (ii).
DOM. ARSENAL STORE: in Com. of Sup., 13054 (vi).
DONCASTER INDIAN RESERVE, TERREBONNE: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi).
DOUCET'S LANDING WHARF, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).
DOUGLASTOWN ISOLATED BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, ADDITION TO: in Com. of Sup., 13077 (vi).
——— SCHOOL OF GUNNERY: in Com. of Sup., 13056 (vi).
——— ST. JOHNS, QUE., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (vi).
DROLET, CENSUS ENUMERATOR, AMOUNT PAID TO: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7055 (iii).
DUCHESNEAU, RESIGNATION AS WARDEN OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PEN.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Vincent.'
DUGAS, MR. BLAISE, AMOUNTS PAID TO *re* TRIP TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1034 (i).
ELLIS, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
——— INSPECTOR OF IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iii).
ESQUIMAUX POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup,, 2278 (i).
FATHER POINT LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1513 (i).
FRENCH CANADIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6674 (iii).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' &c.
GATINEAU RIVER, PROTECTION BANK, C.P.R. BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GOODWIN, GEO., COMPENSATION *re* SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

GRAND PILES DAM: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
G. T. PACIFIC, MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——— PARISHES CROSSED, LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
G. T. RY., STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
——— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
GRANDE RIVIÈRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
GRANDE VALLÉE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1514, 1574 (i); on Conc., 6070 (iii).
GRENVILLE CANAL, GUIDE PIER AT ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 12909 (vi).
——— PAYMENT TO HENRY TUCKER *re* INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
——— SUPPLIES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5496 (iii).
GUILBAULT, MR. EDWARD, GRATUITY TO WIDOW: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, QUEBEC: in Com. in Sup., 1512 (i), 3304, 3336 (ii), 5896 (iii), 12845, 13445 (vi).
——— IMPROVEMENTS AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2241 (i).
HARBOUR OF QUEBEC, IMPROVEMENTS, REPS. TO COUNCIL, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3336 (ii).
——— PIER, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3972 (ii).
——— WHARF CONSTRUCTION: Par. in *Le Soleil* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2237 (i).
HÊTU, RUDOLPHE, RELEASE OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Northrup*) 7915 (iv).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &C.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
HOSPITAL FOR TREATMENT OF TRACHOMA, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 14245 (vi).
HULL AND UNION BRIDGES, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).
IMMIGRANTS LANDING AT QUEBEC, MEDICAL INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5318 (iii).
IMMIGRATION, MEDICAL EXAMINER, QUEBEC, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3536 (ii).
INDIANS, QUEBEC, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iii).
ISLE AUX COUDRES, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2242 (i).
ISLE GROSBOIS, BOUCHERVILLE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5902 (iii).
ISLAND OF ORLEANS, LAND LINE EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13330 (vi).
——— SUBMARINE CABLE, &C.: M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v).
JESUS RIVER, DEEPENING, &C.: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).
JUDGES IN QUEBEC AND OUTSIDE LEGAL BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).
KAMOURASKA, EXTENSION PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13457 (vi).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES FOR GATES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7806 (iv).
——— ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12903 (vi).
——— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14157 (vi).
——— LIGHTING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14139 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

LACHINE CANAL, LOCK GATE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— MASONRY WALL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12906 (vi).
——— *See* 'Mill St.,' &c.
LAKE ST. FRANCIS, DYKING: in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
LAKE ST. JOHN COLONIZATION CO.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6679, 6888 (iii).
LAKE ST. JOHN, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13459 (vi).
——— WHARF, PIERS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2243 (i).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
L'ASSOMPTION, POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3230 (ii).
———RECEIPTS, CHEQUES FOR PAYMENT, &c.: M. for copies, * (Mr. *Monk*), 3236 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 427 (i)
LATOUR, L. J., CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* "LE CANADA": Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*), 1033 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA", &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) 13980 14002 (vi).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*), 1 (i)
"LE CANADA," CANVASSING, &c.: *See* Pelletier, and Latour.
——— CIRCULAR ISSUED BY L. J. LATOUR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 1032 (i)
LECTURERS ON AGRICULTURE IN QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 8615 (iv)
LE TABLEAU WHARF, SAGUENAY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 2249, (i)
LEVIS GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup.. 2978 (ii).
LEVIS, LAND PURCHASED FOR I.C.R.: M. for O. Cs., &c.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3806 (ii).
See general heading.
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS SALARIES, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 14665 (vi).
———Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
L'ILE D'ALMA, REMOVAL OF ROCKS: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
LITTLE METIS: *See* "Metis."
LLOYDS REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4133-38 (ii)
See "St. Lawrence".
LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, MONTREAL, GOVTL. ACTION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 2594 (ii).
——— PAY OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 4006 (ii)
———SETTLEMENT, &c.: Tel. Read (Mr. *Tarte*), 2676-7 (ii)
LONGUEUIL PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi)
LOTBINIÈRE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).
LOY, GEO. M., VIOLATION OF INDEPENDENCE OF PARLT. ACT: on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Privs. and Elect's., 8008; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 8008 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to employ stenographer, 7203 (iii).
——— *See* "Beauharnois Electoral District".
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATERS, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2264 (i).
——— LAND TELEGRAPH LINES, REWIRING: in Com. of Sup., 2714 (ii).
MAGOG PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13081 (vi).
MAGUASHA LANDING PIER: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. APPARATUS AT CHATEAU BAY: in Com. of Sup. 13325 (vi).
See 'Belle Isle'.
MARIA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 2265 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES STORE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13053 (vi).
MARTINEAU, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 10242 (v).
MATHURIN, JOS. A., DEATH SENTENCE, JUDGES REP., &c: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3236 (ii).
MAYRAND, DENIS, PETITION *re* DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 9082 (iv).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, *re* QUEBEC INDIANS: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iii).
MENARD, DENIS, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).
METAPEDIA STATION, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS, LITTLE, STATION CHANGES: in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MILITARY BUILDINGS, QUEBEC, IRON FOUNDRY: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).
MILITARY RIDING SCHOOL, ST. JOHN D'IBERVILLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8616 (iv).
MILLER BROS., PAYMENTS *re* DEFALCATION OF POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup. 14274, 14655 (vi).
MILL STREET PAVING, LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
MISTOOK (DELISLE) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONT LOUIS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13461 (vi).
MONTMAGNY PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
MONTREAL, BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13076 (vi).
———BONAVENTURE STATION: *See* 'Bonaventure,' 'Victoria Bridge.'
———BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
———CUSTOMS DEPT., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 8115 (iv).
———CUSTOMS PORTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3783 (ii).
———PORT OF ENTRY, CHANGES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3901 (ii).
———DRY DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———DRY DOCK, SITE, &c.: M. for O. Cs., Cor. &c.: (Mr. *Tarte*) 706 (i).
———DRY DOCK, REP. OF COMMISSION *re* SITE: in Com. of Sup., 2981 (ii).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE, ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13058 (vi).
———EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 433 (i).
———HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 8084 (iv).
———HARBOUR DOCK IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
———HARBOUR, PERMANENT SHEDS, PLANTS PREPARED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bureau*) 14282 (vi).
———INLAND REV. OFFICE, MONEY ABSTRACTED: in Com. of Sup., 5405 (iii).
———LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr *Monk*) 4006 (ii).
See 'Longshoremen's.'
———NEW POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).
———PILOT COMMISSIONERS COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4173 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ACCUMULATION OF MAIL &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3972 (ii).
———POST OFFICE, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 666 (i).
———POST OFFICE, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

MONTREAL, ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION : *See* 'St. James.'

——SHIPPING INTERESTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 5737 (iii).
See 'St Lawrence.'

—— SUBWAY CO., O. Cs. COR. &c. : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Tarte*) 705 (i).

—— TURNPIKE : *See* 'Turnpike Trust.'

MOREAU, DR. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8331, 8488 (iv).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12497 (v).

MURRAY BAY TO ST. CATHARINES, TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

MURRAY BAY, WHARF EXTENSION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2266 (i).

NEWPORT, BREAKWATER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).

NEW RICHMOND BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi)

NICOLET RIVER, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

NOMININGUE LAKE WHARFS : in Com. of Sup., 13460 (vi).

NORTH HALFWAY POINT, LIGHTKEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3536 (ii).

NOTRE DAME DU PORTAGE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13463 (vi).

OKA INDIANS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13779 (vi)

O'LEARY, J. & M., CLAIMS *re* SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

ORLEANS ISLAND, MAIL SERVICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 670 (i).

—— PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
See Island of Orleans.

OUELLE RIVER, PIER REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

PASPEBIAC LANDING PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

PELLETIER, H. L., CANVASSING FOR "LE CANADA," PAYMENTS TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Pope*) in Com. of Sup., 13980, 14002 (vi).
See 'Latour.'

PIERREVILLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PILOTS, RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, RETIREMENT, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
See general heading.

PLAINS OF ABRAHAM AND MILITARY PARADES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3234 (ii).

POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POINTE FORTUNE WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

PORTAGE DU FORT BRIDGE, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

PORT DANIEL WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

POSTAL FACILITIES TO PARISHES NEAR MONTREAL, PETS. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 12498 (v).

POSTMASTERS, DEFAULTING *re* SAVINGS BANKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MONTREAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'Montreal.'

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, DEFALCATIONS OF POSTMASTER : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14274, 14655 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS PORTFOLIO AND QUEBEC PROVINCE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2925, 2956 (ii).

QUEBEC BRIDGE : *See* general heading.

QUEBEC CITY : *See* 'Citadel,' 'Drill Hall,' 'Ellis, Dr.,' 'Harbour,' &c.

QUEBEC JUDGES, COMPLAINTS *re* OUTSIDE BUSINESS : Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14665 (vi).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 7203 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3231 (ii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

REPENTIGNY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &c., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).

RICHMOND, RIVER ST. FRANCIS, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIMOUSKI EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 12593 (v).

—— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup , 8309 (iv).

—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

——WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD FISH LADDERS, &C. : M. for Copies of Reps. * (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

ROBERT vs. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBIN, COLLAS CO., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC : M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

——IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i)

ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).

ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).

ST. ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).

ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

ST. ANDRÉ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE PIER, RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).

——WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

STE. ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'

STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).

ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY FERRY SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v),

STE. FAMILLE PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).

ST. FIDÈLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).

ST. FLAVIE STATION ACCOMMODATION ; in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).

STE. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

ST. FRANCOIS, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).

ST. FULGENCE, WHARF ; in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall; in Com. of Sup.. 13067 (vi).
——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
St. Irene Wharf, Headblock: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
St. James (Montreal) Electoral Division, Judgment of Sup. Court: Notification, (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— Issue of Writ: M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
——— Issue of Writ, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— Issue of Writ: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13303 (vi).
——— Notification of Vacancy: (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).
——— Vacancy: Remarks, (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i). *See* 'Brunet.'
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
St. Jerôme Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
St. Johns, Que., Customs Building; in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
——— Drill Hall, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*) 12496 (v).
———Examining Warehouse: in Com of Sup., 13069 (vi).
St. Lawrence, Cable and Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).
———Equipment for Transportation Facilities: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).
———Gulf Fishing, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).
———Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).
———Obstruction to Navigation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).
———Pilots, Retirement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2915 (ii).
———Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).
St. Lawrence Route and Fast Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
———and Lloyds, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).
———Rep. *re* Navigation Obstructions, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4133 (ii).
St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 3218, 3304 (ii).
———Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 5917 (iii).
———Tel. Service: in Com. of Sup., 13332 (vi).
———Transportation Facilities: *See* 'Transportation'.
——— Wireless Telegraph Stations: *See* 'Marconi', &c.
St. Laurent Wharf, Isle of Orieans: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii). *See* "Island of Orleans."
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building: in Com. in Sup., 13080 (vi).
St. Louis Lake, Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
St. Louis River, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).
St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupore & Malone: M. for Copy of Contract * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
St. Maurice, River Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

St. Maurice, Dredging Eastern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).
——— Slides, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas Pier, Rebuilding, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
St. Ours Canal, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
——— Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).
St. Pierre Pointe Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).
St. Simeon Wharf, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).
——— Acting Warden, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*), 10831 (v).
——— Hospital, Management, &c.: Ques. (Mr. (*Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).
——— Warden's Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).
Sabrevois Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).
Sacré Coeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13478 (vi).
Saguenay River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).
Savard, Mr. R. V., Emplymt. by Govt: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 6895 (iii).
Seven Islands Pulp & Lumber Co., Wharf *re*: Remarks in Com. of. Sup., 13480 (vi).
——— Quebec and Murray Bay Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
Shoemakers Federated Union, Res. *re* Slater Shoe Co.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— Cor. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
Soulanges Canal, Compensation to Geo. Goodwin: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— Contractor Stewart's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'Leary Claims: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— Repairing Breach in Bank: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
Southeastern Valley and United Counties Ry., Safety: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).
South Shore Ry., Complaint *re* Safety: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).
——— Working, &c.: M for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).
Submarine Cable to Island of Orleans: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*) 11186 (v).
——— M. (Mr. *Talbot*) for Ret.* 11301 (v) *See* 'Island of Orleans'.
Telegraph Lines, Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).
——— St. Lawrence: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).
Terrebonne, Indian Reserve: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).
——— Post Office Buildings, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).
——— Public Building, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).
Thetford Mines Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

QUEBEC.—*Con.*

THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— RETAINING WALL: in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).

TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).

TRACHOMA HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC: in Com. of Supt., 14245 (vi).
See 'Agriculture'.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, *re* SOREL WHARF: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
See 'St. Lawrence, &c'.

TRAP NETS, GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2917 (ii).

TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Quest. (Mr. *Morin*) 8488 (iv).

TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTEEAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &C.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).

TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).

VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).

———POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).

———POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCASE OF SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 98 (i).

———TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
See 'Loy, &c.'

———STRIKE, PAY OF MILITIA: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753, (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).

———STRIKE, 1900: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).

VERTE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. *(Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).
See 'Bonaventure'.

VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 11188 (v).

WIRELESS TELEGRAPH STATIONS: *See* 'Marconi, &c.'

YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

Queen's College, Kingston B. No. 190 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 3864; 2°*, 4404 (ii).

QUEENS, WEST, P.E.I., REPRESENTATION *re*: Remarks: Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) 13378 (vi).

QUESNEL-ATLIN TELEGRAPH BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

QUESNEL DAM, B.C., OBSTRUCTIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*), 11557 (v).

QUESNEL, JULES, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 7203 (iii).

QUES. OF ORDER, ON APPNMT. OF JUDGES: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker, Dcp.*), 209 (i).
See 'Order,' &c.

QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS, ANSWERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 544 (i).

QUINTE BAY BUOYS, PAYMENTS, &C. FOR SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 5587 (iii).

RACETTE, V., PURCHASE OF LAND BY GOVT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 3231 (ii).

RACINE BROS. CLAIMS *re* CONTRACTORS OF NELSON P.O., B.C., in Com. of Sup., 7168 (iii).

———AGREEMENT WITH CONTRACTORS: Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7162 (iii)

———LETTERS READ FROM DEP. MINISTER OF LABOUR, &C., 7164 (iii).
See 'Nelson P. O.'

"RAGGING" IN THE BRITISH ARMY: Remarks (Mr *Charlton*) on M. for Sup., 3130, 3134 (ii).

RAIL POWER SAW CUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 1032 (i).

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 9217 (iv).

———INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).

———INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 1329 (i).

——— LOSS OF LIFE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 873 (i).
See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' 'Windsor Jn.' &c.

Railway Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Lancaster*), 1° m., 93; 2° m., 552; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., agreed to (Y. 99; N., 53) 565 (i), wthdn., 7203 (iii).

Railway Act (consolidation) Amt. B. No. 21 (Mr. *Blair*), 1° m., 244 (i); 2°*, 2585; M. for Com., 2585; in Com., 2591, 3538, 3713, 3830, 3882, 3974, 3984, 4120, 4564, 4691, 4728 (ii), 5243, 5322, 5513, 5560, 5679, 5765, 6071, 6170, 6172, 6202, 6271, 7299 (iii), 7609, 8125; 3° m., 8334 (iv); Sen. Amts., 13834, 14519, 14663, 14690, 14734, 14740, 14760, 14762, 14844 (vi); Salaries of Ry. Commissioners, &c., Res. prop., 8085; in Com., on Res., 8119 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 58).

ACCIDENTS, INVESTIGATION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5550 (iii).

———NOTICE, &C., penalties, 5549, (iii), ret. *re*, 15772 (iii).

ACTS REPEALED, 5772 (iii).

APPEALS FROM AWARDS, PRACTICE, &C., 4574, 4575, 4693; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 4578 (ii).

———FROM DECISION OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5773 (iii).

APPEALS TO HIGH COURTS, 3975 (ii).

APPLICATION OF ACT, 2608, 3536 (ii).

ARBITRATION, DISQUALIFICATIONS, &C., 4574 (ii).

ARBITRATION PROCEEDINGS, &C., 4566 (ii).

ARBITRATORS' AWARDS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).

ASSETS, &C., RETURNS *re* TO BOARD, 5772 (iii).

AUTHORITY TO SELL OR CONVEY LANDS, 4131 (ii).

AWARDS, APPEALS, &C., 4574; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4574, 4693 (ii).
See 'Appeals.'

BALLAST PITS, &C., 4131 (ii).

BEACH LANDS, &C., 4125 (ii).

BELL AND WHISTLES, 5259, 5342 (iii).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, 5514 (iii).

BOARD OF RY. COMMISSIONERS FOR CAN., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3854 (ii).

BOARD'S DUTIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3859 (ii).

BOARD'S SESSIONS, &C., 3859, 3862 (ii).
See 'Staff,' 'Vacancies,' &c.

BONDS, MORTGAGES, ISSUE OF, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3993 (ii).

BRANCH LINE CONSTRUCTION, 4694 (ii); Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6080 (iii).

BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, PERMISSION, &C., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5251 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*
By-laws, Printed, 5563 (iii).
Canal Crossings, &c., 4125 (ii).
Cattle Guards *re* Crossings, 5774 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Fences, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6220, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6222, Amt. (Mr. *Wade*) 6253 (iii).
Charges, 2602 (ii).
Charters, Application for, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Davis*) 6322 (iii).
Classification of Freight, &c., 5577, 6284 (iii).
Commercial Rates, Privileges, 5680 (iii).
Commissioners' Disqualification, &c., Amt, (Mr. *Blair*) 3857 (ii).
Commissioners, Number, 3857, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Commissioners' Residence, 3859, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3887 (ii).
Compensation for Lands and Damages, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 4568 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 4568 (ii).
Compensation *re* Damage by Fire, Amt. (Mr. *L. P. Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Construction, &c., Buildings, &c., 3999 (ii).
Construction, Time limited, 3997 (ii)
County Divisions, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3882 (ii).
Crossings, Application of Provisions *re*, 3843 (ii).
Crossings or running on public highways, &c., 4697 (ii).
Crossings, Provisions *re*, 3843, 4697 (ii).
See 'Bells,' 'Highways,' 'Level Crossing', &c.
Crown Lands, &c., 4125 (ii).
Decisions of Board, Rules of Court, 3975 (ii).
Deviations of Line, Amt., (Mr. *Blair*), 4121 (ii).
Directors' Qualifications, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5774 (iii).
Discriminating Freight Rates, 6284 (iii).
Discrimination *re* Tolls, 5564-8 (iii).
Dividends and Interest, 3984 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6074 (iii).
Dividends *re* Capital, 3985 (ii).
Documents as Evidence, Procedure, &c., 3974 (ii).
Dom. and Provincial Rys., Crossing, 3846 (ii).
Drainage across or under Rys., Compensation &c , 4728 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6177 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 4735 (ii), 6186 ; Amt. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 6197 (iii).
Electric Rys, Tramways, Right of Municipalities, &c., 6080 (iii).
Equipment of Cars *re* Safety of Employees, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 (iii).
Express Companies, Rates, &c., 2596, 2608, 3538 ; Amt. (Mr. *Barker*) 3725 (ii).
Expropriation, &c., Notice, Service, &c., 4566; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4691 (ii).
Expropriation of Land, &c., 2591, 4564 (ii).
See 'Land,' &c.
Extension of Time specified in Order, 3976 (ii).
Farm Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Cowan*) 5774 ; Amt. (Mr. *Holmes*) 6202 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 6204 (iii).
Fire Guard along the Right of Way, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6071, 6318 ; Amt. (Mr. *Scott*) 5783, 6321 (iii).
Fire Guards along Line, Penalties *re* Damage, Amt. (Mr. *Demers*) 6299 (iii).
Fire Screens, 3894 (ii).
Forfeiture of Shares, 3988 (ii).
——— Sale of, 3989 (ii).
Free Transportation, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5776 (iii).
Freight Classification, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5577 (iii).
Freight Rates, &c., 3538 (ii), 5568 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*
Freight Rate Discrimination, Penalties, 6284 (iii).
See 'Discrimination.'
Freight Rate Standard, 5578 (iii).
Gates, &c., *re* unimproved Property, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6255 (iii).
Govt. Rys., Jurisdiction, 3563 (ii).
Headway of Bridges, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5251 (iii).
Highway Crossings, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5243, 6080, 6173 (iii).
See 'Municipalities,' &c. 'Bells,' &c., 'Ry.,' 'Watchmen,' &c.
Highways, Farm Crossings, &c., 3883 (ii).
Inspecting Engineers, 5251 (iii).
I.C.R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys.,' &c.
Interest Calls, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6075 (iii).
Judges Jurisdiction, 2591 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 3885 (ii)
Judicial Decisions, Citations, &c., 3886 (ii)
Jurisdiction of Board to make Orders, 3976 (ii)
Land Expropriation, 4000, 4120 (ii).
Lands of other Companies, 4130 (ii).
See 'Expropriation.'
Level Crossings, Protection, &c., 6256 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blain*) 6257 (iii)
See 'Highway,' 'Rails,' &c.
Location of Line, 4120 (ii).
Meetings, Notice of, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3981 (ii).
Mines under Ry., &c., 4124 (ii).
Minutes, Certified Copies, 3981 (ii).
Mortgage Bonds, Penalties, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6077 (iii).
Municipal Rights *re* Crossing, &c., 4697 (ii).
Municipal Rights *re* Highway Crossing, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5243, 6080 (iii).
See 'Highway'.
Orders, Notice of, Duties of Co., Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*), 3974 (ii).
Overhead Bridges, Width, &c., 4712 (ii).
Paid-up Stock issued for certain Purposes, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 6072 (iii).
Passenger Traffic on Rys, 2 Cent Rate, 6271, Amt., (Mr. *Macleau*) 6274 (iii).
Passes : *See* 'Free Transportation.'
Penalties recovered under this Act, 5767 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act, 5765 (iii).
Penalties *re* Violation of Act as to Tolls, 5692 (iii).
Plans and Maps, 2593, 4120 (ii).
Promissory Notes and Bills, 3995 (ii).
Protection Generally, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3895 (ii).
Rails *re* Level Crossings, 4709 (ii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5250 (iii).
Rys. constructed, General Advantage of Can., 3840 (ii).
Ry. crossing another Line, 4697 (ii).
Railway Express Companies, &c., 2596 (ii).
Ry. Facilities for Industries, &c., 4695 (ii).
Ry. or Highway Crossing, &c., 4697 ; Amts. (Mr. *Blair*) 4697 (ii).
Ry. Inspection, 5252 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5253 (iii).
Rates *re* Freight, &c., 5568 (iii).
See 'Freight,' 'Tolls, &c.' 'Two cent,' &c. Tariff.
Regulations *re* Board, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii).
Returns, Annual, 5770 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 2598 (ii).
See 'Train, &c.'
Safety Appliances, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5254 (iii).

RAILWAY ACT.—*Con.*

SAFETY EQUIPMENTS FOR EMPLOYEES, Amt. (Mr. *Ingram*) 6259 ; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 6325 (iii).
SHAREHOLDERS' LIABILITY, &c., 3992 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' MEETINGS, 3980 (ii).
SHAREHOLDERS' RECORD, 3993 (ii).
SHARES FORFEITED, SALE, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6075 (iii).
See 'Forfeited,' 'Paid-up Stock,' &c.
SIGNBOARDS AT LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 4715 (ii).
SITTINGS OF BOARD, 3862 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3885 (ii).
SPECIAL ACT, EXCEPTIONS, 3830 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 3835 (ii).
SPEED OF TRAINS THROUGH TOWNS, &c., 3888 (ii), 5322 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3888 (ii), 5323 (iii).
STAFF OF BOARD, SALARIES, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii), 14155 (vi).
STATIONS ON LINES NOT SUBJECT TO AUTHORITY OF PARLT., 5780 (iii).
STOCK PURCHASED IN OTHER COMPANIES, 5767 (iii).
STREET RYS. AND TRAMWAY CROSSINGS, 3850 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3887 (ii).
TARIFFS, JOINT, FILING AND PUBLICATION OF, 5681 (iii).
See 'Rates,' &c.
TELEGRAPH, &c., PROCEDURE, &c., 4721 (ii).
TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CONSTRUCTION, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 6173 (iii).
TELEGRAPH OR TELEPHONE WIRES, &c., Amt. Mr. *Lancaster*) 4717 (ii).
TELEGRAPHS, &c., 5513, 5561, 5680 (iii).
TELEPHONES AND TELEGRAPH, GOVT. USE, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 5346, 5513 (iii).
See 'Bell,' 'Telegraph.'
TIME-TABLES, RULES, &c., 5561 (iii).
TOLLS, APPORTIONMENT BY LAND AND WATER, 5575 (iii).
TOLLS, CLASSIFICATION, &c., 3538, 3713 (ii).
TOLLS, DISCRIMINATION, &c., 5568 (iii).
TOLLS LEVIED, BY-LAW FIXING, 5564 (iii).
TOLL, TRAFFIC, 2602 (ii).
See 'Penalties,' &c.
TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, 5700 (iii).
TRAFFIC PROVISIONS, 5680 (iii).
TRAIN EQUIPMENT, POWER OF BOARD, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5258 (iii).
TRAINS STANDING ON LEVEL CROSSINGS, PENALTY, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*), 5340 (iii).
TRANSPORT PASSENGERS, &c., 4000 (ii).
TREES, REMOVAL, &c., 4000 (ii).
TWO-CENT RATE *re* PASSENGER TRAFFIC, Amt. (Mr *Maclean*) 6271 (iii).
See 'Passenger' &c.
VACANCIES BY DEATH, &c., 3981 (ii).
VIOLATION OF BY-LAWS, PENALTIES, &c., 5765 (iii).
WATCHMEN AT CROSSINGS, Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 5260 (iii).
WEEDS, REMOVAL BY CO., 5552, 6299 ; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5554, 5560, 6311 (iii).
WITNESS FEES, 3978 ; Amt. (Mr. *Blair*) 3979 (ii).
WORKING EXPENDITURES, 2604 (ii).

Ry. Act (consolidation) Amt. B. 21, Res. from Senate *re* Appnmt. of Managers : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14519 (vi).
——— (Mr. *Fielding*) appointing Managers, 14663, 14690, 14734 (vi).
———FORMALITIES, &c.: 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
——— MESS. FROM SENATE, Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
——— PROGRESS REPORTED, (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 14740, 14844 (vi).

Ry. Commission : *See* 'Ry. Act B. 21'.
Ry. Debts : *See* 'Exchequer Court', &c.
Ry. Drainage : *See* 'Drainage.'
Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 74, (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 814 (i) ; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 3247 (ii).
Railway Act (employees safety) Amt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 872 2°, and ref. to. Sel. Com., 2387 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire damages) Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1° m. 283 ; (i) ; 2° m., 2780 (ii) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° *, 114 ; 2°, 871 (i) ; wthdn., 7203 (iii).
Railway Act (fire guards) Amt. B. No. 181 (Mr. *German*) 1° m., 3391 (ii).
Railway Act (telephones) Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 701 (i).
See 'Telephone B. 4'.
Railway Labour Disputes Settlement B. No. 17 (Sir *William Mulock*) 1° *, 114 (i) ; 2° m., 2535 ; in Com., 2923 ; 3° *, 3298 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 5653 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 55).
Railway Subsidies B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*), 1° m., 92 ; 2° m., 545 ; in Com., 550 ; ref. back to Sel. Com. on Rys., 700 ; in Com., 1059 ; 3° m., 1199 (i). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 56).
——— **Subsidies B. No. 270** (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 13549 ; in Com. on Res., 14313, 14428 ; 1°*, 14519 ; 2° and in Com., 14735, 14740 ; 3°*, 14741 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 57).
——— RES. 4, PAYMENT TO COS., SAFEGUARDS, &c.: in Com. on Ry. Res., 14511 (vi).
———RES. 5, NOTICE TO MUNICIPALITIES *re* LOCATION : in Com., on Res., 14513 (vi).
———RES. 6, RUNNING POWERS, TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : in Com., on Res., 14515 (vi).
———RES. 8, PRODUCTION OF BOOKS OF COS., &c.: in Com., on Res., 14516 (vi).
Railway Act (supplies to govt. rys.) Amt. B. No. 258 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 8332 (iv) ; Res. wthdn., 10715 ; Res. prop., 11189 ; in Com. on Res., 12574 ; 1°*, of B., 12584 (v) ; 2°*, and in Com., 12944 ; 3°*, 12983 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 59).
RAILWAY SUBSIDIES, STATEMENT *re* GRANTS TO PROVINCES : Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 14687 (vi).
———STATEMENT : laid on Table (Mr. *Fielding*) 14852 (vi).
See 'Subsidies to Rys.'
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RY. LAND GRANTS, MAN. AND N.W.T., AREAS EARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2102 (i).
———AREA UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
———VOTED &c., GOVTL. ACTION *re* SELECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
RAILWAY POLICY OF GOVT., DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii). *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.'

RAILWAY POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, PETS. RECEIVED: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).

RY. RATES, GOVT. CONTROL OF: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).

RAILWAYS:

ACCIDENTS IN CAN., APPNMT. OF OFFICIAL INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9217 (iv).

ACCIDENTS, DUTIES OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1032 (i).

——INVESTIGATION INTO: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1329 (i).

——INVESTIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup. 14154 (vi).

——LOSS OF LIFE, &C.,: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 873 (i).
See 'Belmont,' 'West Lorne,' &c.

AIR BRAKES FOR FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).

ALBANY STATION AND LAND PURCHASE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

ALBERTON, P.E.I. RY. STATION: in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).

AMQUI STATION, I.C.R., ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RY. SUBSIDY, CLAIMS AGAINST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 3299 (ii).

BELL TELEPHONE AND C.P.R. AGREEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

BELMONT ACCIDENT, GRATUITIES TO VICTIMS: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 13546, 14155 (vi).
See 'Windsor Junction.'

BLAIR, HON. A. G., RESIGNATION: Announcement (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6540 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6522 (iii).

—— Explanation (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 6735 (iii).

BLUESHANK, P.E.I., STRAIGHTENING CURVE: in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).

BONAVENTURE STATION, TERMINAL FACILITIES, AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 666 (i).
See 'G.T.R.,' 'Victoria Bridge.'

BORDEN, MR., RY. POLICY:
See 'G. T. Pacific.'

BROOKFIELD STATION, I.C.R., ENLARGEMENT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

CALGARY AND EDMONTON RY., REGULATIONS *re* MORTGAGE DEEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 13024 (vi).
See 'Qu'Appelle.'

C. A. RY., STRIKE OF SECTIONMEN: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*) 2303 (i).

CAN. CENTRAL, AND OTTAWA AND BROCKVILLE RYS., AMALGAMATION, COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES: in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).

CAN. FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION, APPROVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3537 (ii).
See 'Freight.'

CAN. NORTHERN RY., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND MACKENZIE & MANN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*) 916 (i).

CANADIAN NORTHERN RY. CO.: Ret. *re* cost, laid on Table, 5052 (ii).

C.P.R., ARRANGEMENTS WITH JAMES BAY RY. CO., &C.: Remarks in Com. on Res., 14445 (vi).

—— BELL TELEPHONE AGREEMENT: *See* 'Telephone,' &c.

—— CAR SHORTAGE, &C., in N.W.T.:
See 'Ry. Traffic,' &c.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C.P.R., EXPENDITURE FOR ROLLING STOCK: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 2311 (i).

——AND GREAT NORTHWEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2306 (i).

—— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXES IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 916 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 667 (i)

—— PRIVATE CAR NO. 001, IMPROVEMENTS, PAYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, St. John*) 14282 (vi).

—— TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS, WATER SUPPLY: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).

CAR SHOPS, I.C.R., NEW MACHINERY: in Com. of Sup.. 14106 (vi).

CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION, APPOINTMENT OF MR. GEO. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 668 (i).

—— APPOINTMENT OF MR. HOLT AND RETIREMENT OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1059 (i).

—— NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

—— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1199 (i).

—— REP. LAID ON TABLE, PRINTING, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 14758 (vi).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Lennox*) 669 (i), 3396 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. *Pringle*) 14686 (vi).

—— WITHDRAWAL OF MR. ROBERTSON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1034 (i).

'CHAPMAN' BALL-BEARING APPARATUS, REP. *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 7524 (iii), 8283 (iv).

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup. 14131 (vi)

—— REBUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4442 (ii).

CHAUDIÈRE JUNCTION, ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).

CHIGNECTO MARINE RY., SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 4404 (ii).

CLERGUE WORKS, SAULT STE. MARIE, CONTRACT FOR RAILS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*) 13668 (vi).

——Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

——Remarks *re* Subsidies to, in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14397 (vi).

'CLEVELAND' CYLINDER PATENT *re* I.C.R.: Remarks, (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 8284 (iv).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, PRIVILEGES, FARES, &C.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Clarke*) 5680 (iii).

DEMURRAGE REGULATIONS, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672, 4959 (ii).

DISCRIMINATING RATES, G. T. RY. CO., BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 10745 (v).

DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2726-2753 (ii).

——PROMOTION AS CHIEF CLERK, COR. &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lennox*) 1058 (i).

——CHIEF COR. CLERK: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).

DOUBLE TRACKING PARTS OF I.C.R. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 14062 (vi).

DRAW-BARS EXCHANGE ON FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8288 (iv).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).

DRUMMONDVILLE, RY. SIDING, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., N.B., BALANCE OF INTEREST *re* AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AWARD, FEES OF STENOGRAPHER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iii).
EEL RIVER, STATION, I.C.R., AGENT'S HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 12600 (v).
ELMIRA BRANCH LINE, P.E.I. RY., : in Com. of Sup., 12835 (vi).
FIRE PROTECTION OF STATIONS, RESTAURANTS, &C., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
FIRE REGULATIONS, N.W.T.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6775 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
FREIGHT CARS, I.C.R., ON CONNECTING LINES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Haggart*) 3805 (ii).
FREIGHT CLASSIFICATION (CANADIAN), C.Cs. &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3302 (ii).
See 'Can. Freight.'
FREIGHT RATES ON OCEAN STEAMERS, DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CAN. AND U. S. FREIGHTS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 13674 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
GATES OVER RY. CROSSINGS: Remarks in Com. on Bill (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 5775 (iii).
See 'Ry B. 21.'
GOVT. OFFICIAL, &C., CARS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR HAULAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
See 'Private.'
GOVT. RY. POLICY, DELAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7298 (iii).
See 'G.T.P.Ry.'
GRAIN CARRIED BY C.P.R. TO ST. JOHN, QUANTITY, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GRAND NARROWS BRIDGE PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 14094 (vi).
G.T.P. RY., ALTERNATIVE POLICY OF MR. BORDEN, HALIFAX: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
——BILL, DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 8918 (iv).
——BILL, FRENCH TRANSLATION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Leonard*) 8118 (iv).
——COMPARISON WITH DIFFERENT RY. SYSTEMS: Remarks (Mr. *Cargill*) in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——CONTRACTS *re* EASTERN PORTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 13027 (vi).
——GOVT. POLICY, DELAY, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6805, 6921, 7298, 7399 (iii).
——GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7399 (iii).
——Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7487 (iii).
——Remarks (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 8086 (iv).
——M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 447 (i).
——MEMBER READING SPEECH: Ques. of Order (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 10249; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 10250 (v).
——MOUNTAINS CROSSED: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PARISHES CROSSED FROM LEVIS TO TEMISCOUATA: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 8117 (iv).
——PETS. FROM BAGOT AND DORCHESTER: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bagot*) 12941 (vi).
——PETITIONS SIGNATURES, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 12715; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12715 (vi).
——M. (Mr *Talbot*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 13265 (vi).
——Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 13266; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 13266 (vi).
——MEETINGS OF COM. ON PRIVS. AND ELECTS.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13559, 13671 (vi).
—— AFFIDAVITS, &C., PAR. IN MONTREAL 'STAR': Remarks (Mr. *Talbot*) 14845; Ques. of Order (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 14846 (vi).
—— SUBSIDY FROM GOVT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 671, 1031 (i).
—— PAR. IN OTTAWA 'JOURNAL' *re* SUBSIDY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*), 5733 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

G.T.P. RY., PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* SUBSIDY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 5892 (iii).
—— SURVEYS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi).
—— Mr. Hays' Statement *re*, Par. in *Star*, 14648 (vi).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 14765 (vi).
——SURVEYS, BUSINESS SYSTEM, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14355 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, &C. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 14765 (vi).
—— SURVEYS, PLANS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 8230 (iv).
—— AND TRANS CANADA, SALE, &C. PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS': Read (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
—— TWO-CENT RATE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 10462 (v).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11556 (v).
G.T.RY. AND C.P.R. FISCAL POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12884 (vi).
—— DISCRIMINATING RATES BETWEEN CANADIANS AND AMERICANS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 10745 (v).
——LOANS BY DOM. GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 2920 (ii).
—— RENTALS FROM I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 12887 (vi).
—— STE. ROSALIE TO MONTREAL, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).
—— TERMINALS AT ST. JEAN DES CHAILLONS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13495 (vi).
——TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 2759 (ii).
See 'Bonaventure'.
GREAT NORTH WEST CENTRAL RY. AND C.P.R. CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*), 2306 (i).
HALIFAX COTTON, LOAN OF RAILS TO, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14477 (vi).
HALIFAX, ELEVATOR, LAND PURCHASE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12825, 12874 (vi).
——IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13033 (vi).
—— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8316 (iv), 12597 (v), 12824, 14080, (vi).
——Remarks (Mr. *Borden*) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12874 (vi).
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY., CLAIMS FOR LABOUR, MATERIAL, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) in Com. on Ry. Res., 14332 (vi).
HAULAGE OF GOVT. &C. CARS., AMOUNTS PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 9682 (iv).
HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
——AGREEMENT, AMOUNT PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2758 (ii).
—— CONTRACTORS NAME, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).
——PREPARATION OF CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4444 (ii).
I. C. R., PASSES: *See* 'Passes.'
See 'I.C.R.'
INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. SUBSIDY, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 872 (i).
KELLEY'S CROSS P. O., P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iii).
KENSINGTON STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 12840 (vi).
KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr *Reid, Grenville*) in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

KINKORA STATION ACCOMMODATION, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N. W. TERS. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1197 (i).
LAND GRANTS TO RYS., MAN., N. W. T., AREAS, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2101 (i).
——— MILEAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).
——— AREA RESERVED, PATENTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2307 (i).
——— UNEARNED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3797 (ii).
——— UNPATENTED : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2583 (ii).
LEGAL EXPENSES *re* RYS. AND CANAL DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 12911 (vi).
LEVIS ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R. STATION : in Com. of Sup., 3703 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, CARS, &c., I. C. R., PURCHASE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 4361 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES CONSTRUCTED AT MONCTON, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
LORNE SIDING, I. C. R., TRAFFIC, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 2918 (ii).
MACHINERY FOR CAR SHOPS, I. C. R. : in Com. of Sup., 14106 (vi).
MANAGERS *re* RY. CONFERENCE : *See* 'Railway Act B. 21.'
METAPEDIA STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14096 (vi).
METIS STATION, DIVERTING ROAD, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 12604 (v), 12828 (vi).
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SUPERSTRUCTURE : in Com. of Sup., 8307 (iv).
MONCTON, CAR SHOP EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 8312 (iv).
——— INCREASED SHED ACCOMMODATION FOR I. C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
——— STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12599 (v).
MONEY SUBSIDIES TO RYS., I. C. R., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*), 1197 (i).
MONTAGUE BRIDGE SURVEY, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
MONTREAL LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, CONTRACTS FOR I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. *Reid*, *Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 14090 (vi).
MONTREAL SUBWAY CO., O. Cs. COR., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Tarte*), 705 (i).
MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* WHEAT FREIGHT RATES : Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
MOUNT STEWART FREIGHT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii).
MUHLFELD, MR., REP. *re* 'CHAPMAN' BALL BEARING APPARATUS : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*), in Com. in Sup., 8283 (iv).
See 'Chapman.'
MUNICIPALITIES, COMPENSATION FOR AMALGAMATION OF CAN. CENTRAL, AND BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA RYS. &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14133 (vi).
MUNICIPAL RIGHTS *re* TRAMWAY COS., &c. : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill, 6081 (iii).
See 'Ry. Bill 21.'
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 7530, 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
See 'Hillsborough.'
NAPANEE AND TAMWORTH RY., CHARTER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 8084 (iv).
NEW GLASGOW, EXTENSION TO FREIGHT SHED, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 14095 (vi).
NORTHAM AND RICHMOND STATIONS, P.E.I. RY. : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
NORTH SYDNEY STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12597 (v).
O'LEARY'S STATION, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7536 (iii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

O'LEARY'S STATION, P. E. I. RY., BRANCH LINE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*), 6168 (iii).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Hackett*), in Com. of Sup., 12838 (vi).
OUELLE RIVER BRANCH, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
——— BRANCH LINE TO ST. DENIS WHARF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10490 (v).
PASSENGER RATES ON G.T.R. :
See 'Discriminating'.
PASSES, I.C.R. : M. (Mr. *Bell*), for Ret., 2337 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 14249 (vi).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT for I.C.R. CARS : in Com. of Sup., 8291 (iv).
POINT TUPPER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).
P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12608 (v), 12828 (vi).
——— GENERAL VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
——— MISREPRESENTATION *re* TOTAL COST : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *P.E.I.*), 1679 (i).
——— MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH AND HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14108, 14115 (vi).
——— SALE OF TICKETS : (Mr. *Hackett*), 2503 (ii).
——— SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, DISCONTINUANCE OF, &c. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4443 (ii).
——— STATION AGENTS, SALARIES, &c. : Ques., (Mr. *Hackett*), 4361 (ii).
——— STEEL RAILS : in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).
——— SUBSIDIES BY GOVT. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).
——— WATER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 12841 (vi).
——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).
PRIVATE CARS PURCHASE BY GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 2309 (i).
See 'Govt. &c.'
QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. BONDS, ATTACK ON MR. E. B. OSLER : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Scott*), *re* 'Lowering Tone of Debates', 14583 (vi).
——— MEMORANDUM FROM MR. KINGSMILL : Read (Mr. *Osler*), 14588 (vi).
——— LAND GRANT : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*), 2338 (i).
——— MORTGAGE DEEDS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 13024 (vi).
See 'Regina', &c.
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Osler*) *re* 'Grafters, 10497 (v).
——— Ret. laid on Table, 7297 (iii).
RY. ACT AMT. BILL : Remarks (Mr. *Lennox*) 7201 (iii).
See general heading.
RY. CARRIAGE OF MAILS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6268 (iii).
RAILWAY COMMISSION OF CAN., SALARIES AND EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14155 (vi).
RY. CONFERENCE WITH SENATE, &c., FORMALITIES, &c. : 'Bourinot' quoted, 14760 (vi).
——— Mess. from Senate : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 14760 (vi).
RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTED WITHOUT GOVT. AID, MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 8487 (iv).
RAIL CONTRACT WITH GOVT. : *See* 'Clergue.'

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Ry. Dept., Chief Clerk, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 5318 (iii).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).
——— Estimates, Insufficiency of Detail, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055. 14081 (vi).
——— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8269 (iv), 12593 (v), 12823, 14646 (vi).
Ry. Lands voted, &c., Govtl. Action *re* Selection: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 4831 (ii).
See 'Lands,' &c.
Ry. Mail Clerks: in Com. on Post Office B. 208, 5659 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5926, 6136 (iii).
——— Increased Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iii).
——— Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).
Ry. Mail Service in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup. 5934 (iii).
——— Post Office Inspectors, Supt. of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
Ry. Mail Transfer Agents: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6136, (iii).
Ry. Policy, Announcement by Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iii).
——— Delay in bringing down: M. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to adjn. Hse., 7109 (iii).
See 'G.T.P. Ry.'
Railway Policy of Mr. Borden, Pets. received: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 13028 (vi).
Rail Power Saw Cutter: In Com. of Sup., 12607 (v).
Ry. Rates, Govt. Control of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14502 (vi).
See 'Ry. B. 21'.
Ry. Supplies voted for one Estimate, transferred to another: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, (vi).
Ry. Traffic in N.W.T., Blockade, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
Rathbun Co.'s Ry., Charter, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
Regina, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).
Renfrew, Horton and Admaston Municipalities:
See 'Can. Central'.
Restaurants, Stations, I.C.R., Fire Protection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).
Restigouche Bridge Superstructure: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).
Rhodes, Curry & Co., Contract for Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100, (vi).
Richmond and Northam, P.E.I. Ry. Station: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).
Riviere du Loup, Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 8314 (vi), 12593, (v)
——— Freight Yard: in Com. of Sup., 8309, (iv).
——— I.C.R. Shops, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*), 12497, (v).
Robertson, Geo. *re* Cattle Guard Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i)
See "Cattle Guards Commission".
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8292, (iv).
St. Cyril Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Ste. Flavie Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman and Conway Station Agents, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
Scotch Hill Station, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 872 (i).
Sidings along Line of I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Southport and Murray Harbour Ry., Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey* 2584 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Working, &c.: M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*), 448 (i).
——— Complaint *re* Safety: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*), 205 (i).
Steel Rail Contract with Govt.:
See 'Clergue'.
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8295 (iv).
Subsidies for Public Highways, Pets., &c.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).
Subsidies, to Rys., Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).
——— Remarks, (Mr. *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).
——— Inquiry for, (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805 13005 (vi).
——— Interest payable, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).
——— for Man.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*) in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).
——— for N. S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*) in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
——— (Money) paid by Govt. since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).
See 'Money.'
——— per miles of rys. in N.W.T., and Man.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1677 (i).
——— Res., aggregate Vote for each Prov., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).
——— Statement *re* Grants to Provinces: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*), 14687 (vi).
——— Statement laid on Table: (Mr. *Fielding*), 14852 (vi).
——— Total Amount for ten Years: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*), 13934 (vi).
——— Voted by Parlt. 1901-1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 2306 (i), 12842, 13259, 13934 (vi).
——— Voted by Parlt. for 1900, 1901, 1902. Amount paid for 1903: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13027 (vi).
Ry. Transportation in N.W.T.:
See 'Ry. Traffic'.
Summerside Coal Sheds: In Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
——— Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
Sussex, N. B., Roundhouse, Gates, &c: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).
——— Station Grounds: Remarks, (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).
Sydney Accommodation, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R. and general heading.
Sydney, North, Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).
Telephone Agreement with C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*), 5513 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'
Ties imported for Govt. Rys., Cost, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1026 (i).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*), 2759 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC: Par. in Toronto '*News*' (Mr. *Monk*), 7566 (iv).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
——— GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
TRANSCONTINENTAL RY. AND SIR WM. MULOCK'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— PROPOSALS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
See 'G. T. Pacific.'
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1199 (i), 3129 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 9582 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 7297 (iii).
——— SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 8330 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
——— EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
——— FORMATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 9819 (iv).
——— FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c.: Remarks Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9458 (iv).
——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4120 (ii).
——— MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13027 (vi).
——— O.C., *re* APPNMTS.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*) 1324 (i).
———AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR IN MONTREAL "HERALD": Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 7206 (iii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3432 (ii).
———*re* ST. LAWRENCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION POLICY, *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).
TWO CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. Ry., REPEAL OF, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*), 11828 (v).
———Amt. in Com. on G. T. P. Ry. Bill, 12221 (v).
———RATE, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. Bill, 6271 (iii).
TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*), 7567 (iv).
VESTIBULES ON PASSENGER CARS: I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i.)
See 'Bonaventure,' &c.
WATER SUPPLY ON C.P.R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*), 9455 (iv).
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, REP. OF COMMISSON: Remarks, (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088, 5242 (iii).
——— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on Adjnmt., 4726 (ii).
———COMMISSION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 6168 (iii).
———JURY'S VERDICT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 3231, (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).
WHEAT, EXPORT FREIGHT RATE TO MONTREAL FROM ONT. POINTS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*), 11188, 11425 (v).
———RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*), 12074 (v).
WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).
WINDSOR JUNCTION RY. ACCIDENT, I. C. R.: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Clarke*), 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., NEW STATION, RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
See 'I. C. R.,' &c.

RAINY RIVER MAIL SERVICE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6889 (iii).
RAMA INDIANS, CONTRIBUTION *re* ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 13781 (vi).
See 'Indians,' &c.
RAMY'S POINT, WELLAND CANAL, REMOVAL OF OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 12902 (vi).
RAND'S MICMAC DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 12592 (v).
RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 12898 (vi).
RATES FOR LIVE STOCK AND COAL, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 1857 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 21', 'Freight Rates', &c
Rathbun Co.'s B. No. 122 (Mr. *Harty*), 1° *, 1675; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 5100 (ii), (3 Edward VII, c. 180).
RATHBUN CO.'S RY., CHARTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 8084 (iv).
REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*), on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
RECEIVER GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 12584 (v).
——— ADDITIONAL VAULT: in Com. of Sup. 5842 (iii).
RECIPROCITY WITH U.S. AND JOINT HIGH COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 14053 (vi).
See "Joint High", &c.
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup.. 960 (i).
Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1° *, 1295; 2° m., 1812; 2° *, 1853 (i); in Com., 5892; 3° *, 5892 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 181).
REDISTRIBUTION BILL, COR. WITH N.B. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1110 (i).
REDISTRIBUTION IN ONT., REDUCTION, &C., COR. &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Sproule*), 2337 (i).
——— *re* P.E.I. AND N.B., COR., RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 876 (i).
REDISTRIBUTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 204, 208 (i).
Redistribution Bill: *See* 'Representation'.
Reformatory Prisons Act Amt. B. No. 221 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 6427 (iii); 2°, and in Com., 8087; 3° *, 8087 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 51).
REGINA JAIL, ADDITIONAL LAND PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup. 5135 (ii).

Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Scott*) 1° m, 591; 2°*, 852 (i); in Com., and 3° *, 3583 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 182).

REGISTRAR, EXCHEQUER COURT, EDITING REP.: in Com. of Sup., 3407 (ii).

Registrar of Supreme Court B. No. 268 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop. 13670; in Com. on Res., 13831; 1°* of B., 13833; 2°, and in Com., 14300, 14403; 3°*, 14405 (vi). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 69).

RENFREW, HORTON AND ADMASTON MUNICIPALITIES, &c.: *See* 'Can. Central.'

REPATRIATION Agents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iii).

REPENTIGNY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

REPORTS, DEPTL. TRANSLATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 479 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:

AUDITOR GENERAL'S: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE LIST: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13373 (vi).
INDIAN AFFAIRS: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
INLAND REVENUE: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 89 (i).
INTERIOR: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 89 (i).
JUSTICE: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
LIBRARY OF PARLT.: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 6 (i).
MARINE: Presented (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 244 (i).
MILITIA: Presented (Sir *Frederick Borden*) 283 (i).
NORTH WEST MOUNTED POLICE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 92 (i).
PENITENTIARIES: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 90 (i).
POSTMASTER GENERAL'S: Presented (Sir *Willtam Mulock*) 89 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 89 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 92 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 125 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*), 92 (1).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 1° m., 708; 2° m., 1207; ref. to Sel. Com., 1294 (i); rep. of Sel. Com. (presented), 7293 (iii); M. for Com., 10832, 10903; in Com., 10911, 10958, 11087, 11427, 11567, 11692, 12293; 3° m., 12372, 12492, (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 60).

Representation in the House of Commons B. No. 66 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 2° m., 1207, 1265; Amt. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1284; Neg. (Y. 37, N. 72) 1292 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1207, 1265, 1290; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1219; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick* 1230; (Mr. *Barker*) 1241: (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1250; (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1257; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1259; (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1269; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1282, (amt). 1284 (i). 3° m., 12372; Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) 12404; Neg. (Y. 28; N. 65, 12431; Amt. (Mr. *Hackett*) 12432; (ruling) Mr. *Speaker*, 12432, 12435; Amt. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 12454; Amt. (Mr. *Clarke*) 12459; Amt. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 12476; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 12481; Amt. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12486; Amt. (Mr. *Lennox*) 12488; Amt. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 12492 (v).

In Com.,
BRANDON, 11032 (v).
BRANT, 11087 (v).
B. C., 11034 (v).
CAPE BRETON AND VICTORIA, 11028 (v).
CHAMPLAIN, 11035 (v).
DAUPHIN, 11748 (v).
ELGIN, 11517 (v).
FRONTENAC, 11114 (v).
GREY, 11525. 12293 (v).
HASTINGS, 11542, 12294 (v).
HURON, 11003 (v).
KENT, 11004 (v).
KING'S, P.E.I., 11030 (v).
LAMBTON, 11009, 11584 (v).
LEEDS, 11479 (v).
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON, 11114 (v).
LISGAR, 11033 (v).
MACDONALD, 11033, 11781 (v).
MANITOBA, 11032 (v).
MIDDLESEX, 11585 (v).
MUSKOKA, 11114 (v).
NEW-BRUNSWICK, 11809 (v).
NIPISSING, 11156 (v).
NORFOLK, 11114, 11117, 11427; Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 11427 (v).
NORTHUMBERLAND, 11010, 11584 (v).
NOVA SCOTIA, 11793, (v).
PETERBOROUGH, 11013, 11624 (v).
PERTH, 11013, 11623 (v).
PICTOU, N.S., 11028 (v).
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE, 11781 (v).
QUEBEC, 11034, 11792 (v).
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE, 11034 (v).
SOURIS, 11034 (v).
TORONTO, 11693 (v).
VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, 11497 (v).
WATERLOO, 11641, 12294 (v).
WELLINGTON, 11027 (v).
WINNIPEG, 11784 (v).
YORK, 11665 (v).

REPRESENTATION BILL, RESOLUTIONS, (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) moved in Sel. Com., 11441 (v).

——EVIDENCE *re* COMMITTEE: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 11423 (v).

——REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Hyman*) 7293 (iii).

——STMNT. OF HON. MR. PUGSLEY *re* N. B.: Read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 941 (i).

REPRESENTATION OF P.E.I. AND N.B. IN H. OF C., LAW OFFICERS OPINION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 5316 (iii).
See 'Redistribution.'

RESTAURANTS, STATIONS, I.C.R., FIRE PROTECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 14663 (vi).

RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, SUPERSTRUCTURE: in Com. of Sup., 8303 (iv).

Restigouche Boom and Log Co.'s B. No. 116 (Mr. *Logan*) 1° *, 1575; 2° *, 1816 (i).

Retiring Allowances of Judges Bill: *See* 'Judges.'

RETS. INQUIRIES FOR: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 5413 (iii)
See general headings.

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE FOR 1903, AMOUNTS COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 12715, 1337 (vi).

Revised Statutes of Canada B. No. 265 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 13667 ; 2° *, and in Com., 14297 ; 3° *, 14299 (vi), (*3 Edward VII c. 61*).

REVISION OF DOM. STATUTES, PAYMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 14643 (vi).

RHODES, CURRY & Co., CONTRACT FOR ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 14100 (vi).

RICHELIEU RIVER INUNDATIONS, &c., PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 10496 (v).

RICHIBUCTO HARBOUR, N.B., PIER : in Com. of Sup., 13235 (vi).

— —NORTH PIER EXTENSION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

———POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i).

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Tobin*), 1°*, 1575 ; 2°*, 1816 ; in Com. and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 183).

RICHMOND AND NORTHAM STATION, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 14132 (vi).

RICHMOND BAY, P.E. I., WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).

RICHMOND, QUE., RIVER ST. FRANCIS ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 7808 (iv).

———CONCESSION STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).

——— EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), 13302 (vi).

——— SWING BRIDGE AT HOG'S BACK : in Com. of Sup.,, 12904 (vi).

RIDEAU HALL AND GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5006 (ii), 13087 (vi).

——— DRAINAGE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 647 (i).

——— LIGHTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1005 (i)

——— MAINTENANCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 993 (i).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, GRANTS TO : in Com. of Sup., 3767 (ii).

RIMOUSKI, EXTENSION PIER AND TIDAL BASIN : in Com. of Sup., 13468 (vi).

RITCHIE, MR., U.S. IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 6848 (iii).

RIVERS, ROBERT, DISMISSAL FROM MISCOU LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3631 (ii).

RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).

RIVER VERTE, IMPROVEMENTS, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 13470 (vi).

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).

——— FREIGHT YARD : in Com. of Sup., 8309 (iv).

——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13476 (vi).

——— I.C.R. SHOPS, CONSTRUCTION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 12497 (v).

——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2281 (i).

RIVIÈRE DU NORD, CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 5907 (iii).

——— FISH LADDERS, &c. : M. for copies of Reps.* (Mr. *Ethier*) 2778 (ii).

RIVIERE OUELLE. BRANCH LINE, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 541 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10490 (v).

See 'Ouelle River.'

RIVIÈRE AUX PUCES, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1425 (i).

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 2279 (i).

ROACH, MR., CENSUS ENUMERATOR FOR N. ONTARIO : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7083 (iii).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 13321 (vi).

——— CONSTRUCTION, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iii), 13323 (vi).

——— RECONSTRUCTION, &c., in Com. of Sup. 2690 (ii).

——— YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

See ' Pub. Works,' &c.

ROBIN, COLLAS Co., LANDING PIER AT PASPEBIAC : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13464 (vi).

ROBERTSON, GEO., and CATTLE GUARD COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 874 (i).

See ' Cattle Guards Commission '.

ROBERT vs. KING, CLAIMS *re* FLOODING ON LAKE ST. LOUIS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

ROBERVAL TO JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).

ROBINSON INDIAN TREATY, PAYMENTS TO INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iii).

ROBSON, MICHAEL, RESIGNATION AS POSTMASTER AT AYR : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1195 (i).

Rocky Mountains Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 197 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 4262 ; 2°* 4404 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 184).

ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 8292 (iv), 14100 (vi).

RONAN, MR., AND OTTAWA SUPPLY CO. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6148 (iii).

RONDEAU HARBOUR, PIER IMPROVEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i).

ROOMS FOR MEMBERS, FURNITURE, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 5265 (iii).

See ' H. of C. '

ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE, SALE OF LOTS : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5319 (iii).

ROSEDALE WHARF, TRENT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

ROSSLAND, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).

ROSS RIFLE FACTORY, ESTABLISHMENT AT QUEBEC ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 109 (i).

——— IMPERFECT RETURN : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2109 (i).

ROSS RIFLE, EXAMINATION BY EXPERTS : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2758 (ii).

——— MANUFACTURE OF : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13057 (vi).

ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., GATES, &c. AT SUSSEX, N.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 4672 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.' 'Sussex,' &c.
ROYAL ASSENT : *See* 'Bills.'
ROYAL CANADIAN FIELD ARTILLERY, KINGSTON : Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) in Com. of Sup., 13128 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT, NUMERICAL STRENGTH, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 3801 (ii).
ROYAL COMMISSION *re* INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6984 (iii).
See 'Labour.'
ROY, GEO., INSPECTOR OF HIDES, QUEBEC : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3627 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 3778 (ii).
——— DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13094 (vi).
See 'Kingston.'
ROYAL MINT, OTTAWA : in Com. of Sup., 344 (i).
See 'Mint.'
Royal Trust Company's B. No. 103 (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1°*, 1295 ; 2°*, 1512 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 185).
RULES OF HSE., REVISION, &c. *re* PETS. FOR PRIVATE BILLS : M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Demers*) 4441 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) to amend, 12216 (v).
See 'Private Bills.'
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, FREE ESTABLISHMENT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*), 285 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*). 13259 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY, P.E.I., PAR. IN CHARLOTTETOWN "PATRIOT" : Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*), 13806 (vi).
RURAL MAIL DELIVERY : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 6137 (iii) ; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*), 511 (i).
RUSSELL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*), 1023 (i).
RUTHERFORD, DR., DUTIES IN ENGLAND : in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
ST. AGNES TELEGRAPH LINES : in Com. of Sup., 13334 (vi).
ST ALEXIS BAIE DES HA HA, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2289 (i).
ST. ALPHONSE HA HA BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
ST. ANDRÈ DE KAMOURASKA PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS' LOCKS, MAN., CONTRACT, COMPLETION, &c. ; Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 287 (i).
ST. ANDREWS' RAPIDS, RED RIVER : in Com. of Sup., 3354 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*), 10490 (v).
——— REPORT *re* CONSTRUCTION : Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 14284 (vi).
ST. ANDREWS, N.B., WHARF, REPAIRS : in Com. of Sup., 5894 (iii).
STE. ANNE DE LA PERADE, PROTECTION WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIÈRE, PIER RECONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
STE. ANNE DE SAGUENAY, TEL. LAND LINE : in Com. of Sup., 13331 (vi).
——— WHARF IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE ANNE DE SOREL, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 13489 (vi).
See 'Sorel.'
ST. ANN'S, N.S., NORTH GUT, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
———NORTH RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13203 (vi).
STE. ANNE TO LAC CLAIR, TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 13333 (vi).
ST. BONIFACE, MONEY ORDER BRANCH, CLOSING : Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 5321 (iii).
———POSTAL FACILITIES : Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1858 (i).
ST. CATHARINES DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13106 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
St. Chrysostome Railway Co.'s B. No. 158, (Mr. *Brown*) 1°*, 2582 ; 2°*, 2956 (ii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 7369 (iii) ; in Com., 7771 ; 3*, 7772 (iv). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 186).
ST. CYRIL STATION IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 14083 (vi).
ST. DENIS WHARF AND MURRAY BAY, FERRY SERVICE Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 10496 (v).
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14317 (vi).
STE. FAMILLE, PIER EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13488 (vi).
STE. FIDÈLE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).
STE. FLAVIE, STATION ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 12602 (v).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, TO COMPLETE DAM : in Com. of Sup., 14152 (vi).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER, ICE PIERS : in Com. of Sup., 2282 (i).
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14508 (vi).
ST. FRANCOIS PIER : in Com. of Sup., 2290 (i).
ST. FULGENCE, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GÉDÉON ISLANDS, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).
ST. GODEFROI DE NOUVELLE, BREAKWATER : in Com. 13489 (vi).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 13067 (vi).
———POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
ST. IRENE WHARF, HEADBLOCK : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i).
ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, ISSUE OF WRIT, &c. Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 13376 (vi).
——— M. (Mr. *Monk*) 707, 940 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13303 (vi).

St. James Electoral Division, Judgment of Sup. Court : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 1023 (i).

——Vacancy : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 409 (i), 6995 (iii).

St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).

St. Jerome, Lake St. John Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).

St. John, N.B., and Belfast SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).

——and Digby SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).

——and Glasgow SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).

——and Halifax SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).

——and London SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).

See 'Allan,' &c., 'Atlantic Fast SS Service,' &c.

——and W. Indies SS Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

St. John, N.B., Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 13042 (vi).

——Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 1181, 1183 (i).

See 'I.C.R.' &c.

——Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 412 (i), 13040 (vi).

——Increased Accommodation, I.C.R. in Com. of Sup., 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).

——Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 13041 (vi).

——Water and Drainage Service : in Com. of Sup., 414, 486 (i).

See 'N.B.', &c.

St. John River and St. Mary's River Indians, Pet. *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iii).

St. John River and Tributaries, Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 5895 (iii).

St. John River Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 1177 (i).

St. John River Wharfs, Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 1178 (i).

St. John's, Que., Customs Building : in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

——Drill Hall, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ball*), 12496 (v).

——Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

St. John Valley and River du Loup Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).

St. John Valley Ry. Co. and C.P.R. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).

St. Joseph Transportation Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°* 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii).

St. Joseph's Wharf, Lake Huron : in Com. of Sup., 3382 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Isle of Orleans : in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).

See 'Island of Orleans,' &c.

St. Lawrence, Cable and Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup., 2989 (ii).

——Equipment for Transportation Facilities : Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Hfx.*), in Com. of Sup., 12845-7 (vi).

——and Fast Atlantic Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).

——Gulf Fishing, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).

——Islands Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 14661 (vi).

——Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13632 (vi).

——and Lloyds, Cor. *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13698 (vi).

——Lower Removal of Rocks : in Com. of Sup., 2257 (i).

——Obstruction to Navigation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4041 (ii).

——Pilots, Retirement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2915 (ii).

See 'Pilots', &c. 'Shipping Casulties B.'

——Rep. *re* Navigation, Obstructions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Clarke*), 4133 (ii).

——Route : in Com. of Sup., 5758 (iii).

——Shipping Interests, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 5758 (iii).

——Ship Channel : in Com. of Sup., 3218 (ii).

——Ship Channel, Dredging, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3304 (ii).

——Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii), 13332 (vi).

——Wireless Telegraphy *re* : *See* 'Marconi'.

St. Louis, Elmsdale, Coleman and Conway Station Agents, P.E.I. Ry., Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).

St. Louis Exhibition, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).

——Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3001 (ii).

——Live Stock Exhibit : in Com. of Sup. 4602 (ii).

——Live Stock Exhibit, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 4837 (ii).

St. Louis Lake, Hydrographic Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).

St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

St. Louis River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 13473 (vi).

St. Mary's Current Wharf, Contract with Poupoee & Malone : M. for copy of Contract* (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

See 'Montreal', &c.

St. Mary's, Ont., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 13109 (vi).

St. Mary's River Railway Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2236 (i); 2°*, 2544 (ii); in Com., 4588; 3°*, 4591 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 187).

St. Mary's River Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14496 (vi).

St. Maurice River, Dam: in Com. of Sup., 13491 (vi).

——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i), 5904 (iii).

——— Dredging Eastern Channel: in Com. of Sup., 13469 (vi).

———Slides, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).

St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier: in Com. of Sup., 13494 (vi).

St. Nicholas Pier, Rebuilding, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).

St. Ours Canal, Landing Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).

———Stop Logs: in Com. of Sup., 12908 (vi).

St. Patrick's Day, Public Holiday: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1858 (i).

St. Peters to Louisbourg Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14489 (vi).

St. Philippe d'Argenteuil to Brownsburg, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14457 (vi).

St. Pierre Pointe, Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 2278 (i).

St. Regis Lockup: in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iii).
See 'Indians'.

St. Simeon, Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 13493 (vi).

St. Stephen and Back Bay Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 3534 (ii).

———Acting Warden, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 10831 (v).

———Hospital Management, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 13669 (vi).

———Ques. (Mr. *Grant*) 14284 (vi).

———Warden's Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 286 (i).

Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 13485 (vi).

Sacré-Cœur, Wharf: in Com, of Sup., 13478 (vi).

Saddles and Bridles for last S.A. Contingent, Contract, &c.: (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).

Safety of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 179 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 3298 (ii); 2° *, and in Com., 6918; 3° *, 6921 (iii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 63).

Saguenay Pilots: *See* 'Pilotage' and 'Shipping Casualties Bills'.

Saguenay River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 13472 (vi).

Sale of Tickets, P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 2503 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.

Salmon Canning Industry in B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 10102, 10241 (v)

——— Commissioners, B.C.: (Mr. *Préfontaine*) for Rep., 7109 (iii)

——— Hatcheries, B.C., Increased Capacity: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 12073 (v).

Salmon Industry, Fraser River, B.C., Tels. from Canners Association, &c.: Read (Mr. *Earle*) 9968 (iv).
See 'B.C.' &c.

———Salmon shipped to France from B.C., Tariff *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) in Com. of Sup., 7799 (iv).

Sand, Indian Boy adopted by Mr. Johnston: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iii)

Sandy Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

San José Scale: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 4434 (ii)

Sarnia, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13117 (vi)

Saskatchewan Election, Proclamation in Prince Albert 'Advocate': in Com. of Sup., 14268 (vi).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Sections acquired, &c.: M. (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) for Cor., 2338 (i).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*). 4863 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Lennox*) 7108 (iii).

——— Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2502 (ii).

——— Sections, &c.: (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 2306 (i).

——— Surveys of reserved Lands: in Com. of Sup., 6939 (iii).

Saturday Sittings of House: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13264 (vi).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 1462; 2°*, 1815 (i); in Com., 3225; 3°*, 3225 (ii). (*3 Edward VII*, *c.* 88.)

Sault Ste. Marie, Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).

——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup. 13252 (vi).

——— Labour Disturbances, Par. in Newspaper (Mr. *Borden*, *Hfx.*) 12610 (vi).

——— Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Militia: (Sir *F. W. Borden*, *Kings*) 12939 (vi).

———Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 13107 (vi).

Saunders, Dr. C. E., Appnmt. at Experimental Farm: Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 1676 (i).

Savard, Mr. P. V., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 6895 (iii).

Schedules *re* Census of 1891: in Com. of Sup., 705. (iii).
See 'Census.'

Schell, J. T., M. P., Goods supplied Govt.: Ques. (Mr *Fowler*), 4959 (ii).

——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Schell*), 5416 (iii).

——— 1st Rep. of Sel. Com.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland*, *Essex*), 5511 (iii).
See 'Privileges', &c.

Schooley, William Francis, Relief B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), 1°*, 2100; 2°m., 2305 (i); in Com., 3223; 3°*, 3224 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 189).

SCHOOLEY, WM. FRANCIS, RELIEF B. No. 128 (Mr. *Boyd*), in Com., 3223; M. to ret. Evidence to Senate, 3224 (ii).
SCHOOLS, B. C., INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iii) 13786 (vi).
——— MAN. AND N.W.T., SALES, AMT. PAID, &c.: M for Ret. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*), 706 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 6893 (iii).
——— PAYMENTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*), 6169 (iii).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
See 'Indians'.
SCHOOLS OF NAVIGATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. of Sup., 13535, 13545 (vi).
See 'Naval Reserve'.
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS AND HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).
SCOTCH HILL STATION, I.C.R., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*), 872 (i).
SCOTCH IRON MOULDERS AND TORONTO CAN. FOUNDRY CO.'S STRIKE: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iii).
See 'Can. Foundry'.
SCOTTISH DEMONSTRATION AT GLENGARRY, TEL. TO LORD DUNDONALD: Remarks (Mr. *Schell*), 10536 (v). *See* 'Dundonald'.
'SCOTIA' STR., SALVAGE SERVICES BY ANCHOR LINE, CONPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 14107 (vi).
——— Remarks on M. for Sup., (Mr. *Osler*), 7150 (iii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), 7206 (iii).
SCOTT'S BAY, N.S., BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).
SECORD, DR., MEDICAL ATTENDANT ON INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
See 'Indians.'

SECRETARY OF STATE.

'ADVOCATE' PRINCE ALBERT, PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING *re* ELECTIONS PROCLAMATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 14268, 14652 (vi).
ALIEN LABOUR ACT, PROSECUTIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 3971 (ii).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS LIST: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 479 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 125 (i).
——— DEPTL. SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 222 (i), 14254 (vi).
ELECTIONS IN SASKATCHEWAN, PAYMENT TO PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE': in Com. of Sup., 14652 (vi).
See 'Advocate,'
ELECTORAL LISTS, N.S., PRINTING, &c., CHANGES MADE: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 8331 (iv).
ELECTORAL LISTS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 288 (i).
ELECTION PROCLAMATIONS PRINTING:
See 'Saskatchewan Election.'
NATURALIZATION ACT, EXPENDITURE *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6952 (iii)
——— REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Larivière* 2015 (i).
——— RETURNS, N. W. T.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3804 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*

PRINCE ALBERT 'ADVOCATE,' PROCLAMATION *re* SASKATCHEWAN ELECTION: in Com., of Sup., 14268 (vi).
See 'Advocate.'
PRINTING AND STATIONERY, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1102 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU, COMPOSITORS AND TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4182, 4444 (ii).
——— INDEBTEDNESS OF MEMBERS, &c.: Ques (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 4180 (ii).
——— PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12587 (v).
——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
PRINTING BUREAU AND UNION LABELS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 4179 (ii).
SEED GRAIN, RELIEF TO INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6417, 6420 (iii).
SEED INSPECTION BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 5845 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 200 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 4442; in Com. on Res., 5084 (ii); 2° & and in Com., 6463, 7210 (iii); wthdn; 12493 (v).
SELKIRK WHARF MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i.)
SEMAPHORE LIGHTS, P.E.I. RY., DISCONTINUANCE OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4443 (ii).
Senate Representation of N.W.T.:
See 'N.W.T.'
SENATE REPRESENTATION IN MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*), 1297 (i).
SENATE, SALARIES, CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup. 5264 (iii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS, H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup. 14242 (vi).
——— INCREASES TO, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 14113 (vi).
SESSIONAL MESSENGERS: in Com. of Sup., 14243 (vi).
SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE, DATE OF MEETING: M. (Mr. *Boyd*) 462 (i), 14853 (vi).
SETTLERS' CLAIMS *re* REBELLION, 1885: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) on M. for Sup., 13948 (vi).
SETTLERS EFFECTS *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iii).
SEVEN ISLANDS PULP & LUMBER CO., WHARF *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13480 (vi).
SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 14456 (vi).
SEVEN ISLANDS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14325 (vi).
SHEGAWAKE, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 13479 (vi).
SHEPHERD, B., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5127 (ii).
See 'Fisheries.'
SHERBROOKE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 13079 (vi).
SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &c., YUKON, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).
——— FEES, YUKON, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).
——— LIVING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).
See 'Yukon.'

SHIELDS, MR. C., LETTER *re* GLACE BAY WHARF: Read (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com. of Sup., 13186 (vi).
See 'Glace Bay,' &c.
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR, PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1183 (i).
SHIPPERS OF FROZEN FISH CLAIMS, AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*), 13373 (vi).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Shipping Casualties Act 1901, Amt. B. No. 263 (Mr. *Préfontaine*), in Com. on Res., 12801; 1°* of B., 12805; 2°, and in Com., 12994; 3° m., 13560 (vi). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 64.)
Shipping Federation of Canada Incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 1°*, 1193; 2° m., 1328 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2956 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 190.)
Ships Safety:
See 'Safety of Ships.'
SHIVES, MR., PRIVATE WHARF, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1166 (i).
SHOEMAKERS FEDERATED UNION, RES. *re* SLATER SHOE CO.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 14666 (vi).
SHORT BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).
SHUTT'S REPORT *re* SOFT PORK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
SIDINGS ALONG LINE OF I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14055 (vi).
——AND INCREASED FACILITIES FOR I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 14081, 14107 (vi).
See I.C.R.
SIGNAL MARINE SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 13638 (vi).
See 'Marine.'
SILLS, E. H., PAYMENT *re* STORAGE OF FISH NETS: in Com. of Sup., 5128 (ii).
SIMCOE COUNTY CENSUS ENUMERATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
SIMCOE LAKE, FLOODING OF LANDS IN MARA, &C.: M. (Mr. *Grant*), for Reps., 2762 (ii).
SINCLAIR, MR. D., DISMISSAL AS FOREMAN OF COLUMBIA RIVER WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1451 (i).
'SIR WILFRID LAURIER' DREDGE, SINKING IN LAKE ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Thomson Grey*), 5587 (iii).
SISAL USED IN BINDER TWINE, AVERAGE PRICE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 8085 (iv).
See 'Binder Twine,' &c.
SITTINGS OF HSE.:
See 'Sessions.'
SKINNER'S COVE N. S., PROTECTION WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).
SKINNER'S POND, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13308 (vi).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Hackett*) in Com. of Sup., 13445 (vi).
SLATER SHOE CO. AND ALIEN LABOUR, RES. OF SHOEMAKERS UNION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 14666 (vi).
SLIDES AND BOOMS, GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK ON BRANT INDIAN RESERVE: in Com. of Sup., 6326 (iii).
———N.W.TER. RESERVES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6350 (iii).
——— PATIENTS, EXPENSES INCURRED BY GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 14688 (vi).
——— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5007, (ii), 5491 (iii).
SMITH, F. H., P. O. DEPT., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).
SMITH, WM., LATE M.P., AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION: Remarks (Mr. *Cowan*) 894 (i).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. Sup., 2672 (ii).
SNOWSTORMS IN N. W. TER., REPORTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 11822 (v).
SONGHEES INDIANS, REMOVAL TO RESERVE, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7258 (iii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845 (vi).
——— COR. *re*: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Pope*) 2302 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, COMPENSATION TO GEO. GOODWIN: in Com. of Sup., 14142 (vi).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iii).
——— CONTRACTOR STEWART'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 12913 (vi).
——— O'LEARYS' CLAIMS, PAYMENT OF: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).
——— REPAIRING BREACH IN BANK: in Com. of Sup., 14153 (vi).
SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 7746 (iv).
See 'Can. and S. Africa,' &c.
S. A. COLONIES, AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFF, RES. OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1678 (i).
S. A. CONTINGENTS AND GOVT. EMPLOYEES, REINSTATED, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1026 (i).
———M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2337 (i).
——— PENSIONS TO BY DOM. GOVT: Remarks (Mr. *Broder*) 14590 (vi).
——— SADDLES AND BRIDGES, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1675 (i).
S. A. CONSTABULARY, &C., INFORMATION *re* GRIEVANCES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 1027 (i).
———PURCHASE OF DISCHARGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 14287 (vi).
———MEDALS PBESENTED BY KING, PET. *re* FROM NON-COM. OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 10491 (v).
———REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), on M. for Sup., 8264 (iv).
———Remarks (*Sir Frederick Borden*) 8319 (iv).
———MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6992 (iii).
———PENSIONS FROM IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2920 (ii).
———SUPPLIES PURCHASED BY IMP. GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Copies of O.Cs. &c., 2760 (ii).

SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR, IMPROVEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1428 (i).

SOUTHEASTERN VALLEY AND UNITED COUNTIES RY., SAFETY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 451 (i).

Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Riley*) 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7770 (iv). (*3 Edward VII.*, c. 191).

SOUTH INGONISH, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

SOUTHPORT AND MURRAY HARBOUR RY., TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2584 (ii).

SOUTH SHORE RY., WORKING, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Tarte*) 448 (i).

——COMPLAINT *re* SAFETY: Remarks (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 205 (i).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: M. (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) 5 (i).

——Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).

SPEECH OF GOV. GEN.: *See* Gov. Gen.'s Speech.

SPEECH FROM THRONE: Prorogation, 14861 (vi).

SPRINGHILL, N. S., ARMOURIES, CARETAKER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1856 (i).

——BOILER EXPLOSION IN DOM. BUILDING: Remarks (Mr. *Logan*) 13257 (vi).

——PUBLIC BUILDING, REPAIRING: in Com. of Sup., 14247 (vi).

SPRY BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SQUATTERS CLAIMS ON DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6925 (iii).

STAFFORD & CO.'S RENTAL OF DOCK BUILDINGS, MIDLAND: in Com. of Sup., 13247 (vi).
See 'Midland', &c.

STAMPING LETTERS BY MINISTERS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6936 (iii).

Standard Car Truck Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 105 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 192.)

STANDARD CHEMICAL CO., LONGFORD: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5363, 5373 (iii).

—— CONTRACT: Read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5375 (iii).

—— PURCHASE OF WOOD ALCOHOL; in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Inland Revenue', &c.

"STANLEY", STR., AND P.E.I. WINTER COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).

—— MR. MACMILLAN'S REP. *re* REPAIRS: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. of Sup., 4050 (ii).
See 'Govt. Steamers'.

STATION AGENTS, P.E.I. RY., SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4361 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.', &c.

STATUTES, B.C., DISALLOWANCE: M. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to print, 2675 (ii).
See 'B.C.', &c.

Statutes Publication, Act Amt. B. No. 11 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 94; 2°*, 634; in Com., 634; 3°*, 635 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 65).

STATUTES, REVISION COMMISSION, NAMES, PROGRESS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1029 (i).

Statutes Revision: *See* 'Revised Statutes'.

Steamboat Inspection Act (Marine Engineers) Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2100 (i); 2° m., 3288 (ii).

—— **(Regulation of Naptha Yachts, &c., Fees, &c.) Amt. B. No. 225** (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Res. prop., 6270; in Com. on Res., 6541; 1°* of B., 6543; 2°, and in Com., 6915; 3°*, 6917 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 66.)

—— **(Coal Oil as Fuel) Amt. B. No. 237** (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1° m., 12494 (v); 2°, and in Com., 12777; 3°*, 12779 (vi). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 67.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

—— TORONTO DISTRICT: in Com. Sup., 13648 (vi).

STEAM LAUNCH FOR INDIAN AGENT, B.C.: in Com. o Sup., 13787 (vi).

Steel and Iron Bounties Act Amt. B. No. 238 (Mr. *Fielding*), Res. prop., 6629 (iii); in Com. on prop. Res., 7923; 1°*, of B., 7988 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 10799; 3°*, 10802 (v). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 68).

Steel, James Reid, Relief B. No. 195 (Mr. *McCreary*), 1°*, 4178; 2°*, 4404; in Com., and 3°*, 5100 (ii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 193).

STEEL RAILS AND FASTENINGS, CONTRACT WITH CLERGUE SYNDICATE: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Ross, Ont.*), 13668 (vi).
See 'Clergue'.

STEEL RAILS, CONTRACT, PRICES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 285 (i).

—— FASTENINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5005 (ii).

—— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 7802 (iv).

STEEL SHELVING, &c., OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13087 (vi).

STEEL SHIPBUILDING, BOUNTY TO AID: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13660 (vi).

STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 8296 (iv).

Sterling Bank of Canada Incorp, B. No. 100 (Mr. *Calvert*), 1°*, 1295; 2°*, 1512; in Com., and 3°*, 2304 (i). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 194).

STEWART, Mr., APPNMT. as SUPT. OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).

—— INSPECTOR OF MURRAY CANAL: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*), in Com. of Sup., 14146 (vi).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Schell*), 14599 (vi).

STEWART VS. KING, LEGAL EXPENSES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12912 (vi).

STEWART, E., FOREST INSPECTOR, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6416, 6774 (iii).

Stewart River Development Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 160 (Mr. *Davis*), 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 7487 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 195).

STOCK EXCHANGE SPECULATIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) to Com. of Sup., 7005 (iii).

Debate: (Mr. *Osler*) 7024; (Mr. *Fielding*) 7025; (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 7027; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7029; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 7032, 7045; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7034, 7047; (Mr. *Monet*) 7035, 7043; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 7035; (Mr. *Monk*) 7036; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 7038; (Mr. *Holmes*) 7038; (Mr. *Henderson*) 7040; (Mr. *Maclean*) 7042; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7046; (Mr. *Speaker*) members remarks checked, 7044; (Mr. *Tarte*) 7051; (Mr. *Ingram*) 7052 (iii).

STRATFORD ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).

STRATHCONA HORSE BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 13130 (vi).

STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 14314 (vi).

STUART, CAPT. D.C., HALIFAX, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4353 (ii).

STURGEON FALLS, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1431 (i).

SUBMARINE CABLE, ISLE OF ORLEANS: M. (Mr. *Talbot*), for Ret., 11301 (v).

———Ques. (Mr. *Talbot*), 11186 (v).

See 'Island of Orleans.'

SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAYS, PETS., &c.: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*), 591 (i).

SUBSIDIES, RYS., AGGREGATE VOTE FOR EACH PROV., &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*), in Com. on Res., 14481 (vi).

———BONUSES VOTED BY PARLT., 1900, 1901, 1902: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 13934 (vi).

———GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*), 14352 (vi).

———Remarks (Mr *Richardson*), in Com. of Sup., 14345 (vi).

———INTEREST PAYABLE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*), 3970 (ii).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 12805, 13005 (vi).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*), 10955 (v).

———Inquiry for (Mr. *Sproule*), 11422 (v).

SUBSIDIES FOR MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *McCreary*), in Com. on Res., 14494 (vi).

SUBSIDY FOR N.W.T. GOVT., INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 13787 (vi).

———FOR N.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).

SUBSIDY FOR P.E.I. RY.: Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14472 (vi).

SUBSIDIES (MONEY) PAID BY GOVT. SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*), 1198 (i).

SUBSIDIES PER MILES OF RYS. IN N.W.T. AND MAN.: (Mr. *Scott*) 1677 (i).

SUBSIDIES, TOTAL AMOUNT FOR TEN YEARS; Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 13934 (vi).

SUBSIDIES VOTED BY PARLIAMENT, 1901-1903: Ques. (*Mr. Wilson*) 2306 (i), 12842, 13027, 13259, 13370 (vi).

SUBSIDIES, &c.: *See* 'Provincial.'

Subsidies to Railways: *See.*

ATLANTIC, QUEBEC & WESTERN RY. CO.
BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.
BEERSVILLE COAL & RY. CO.
BRUCE MINES & ALGOMA RY. CO.
CANADA STEEL CO.
C. P. RY., ELKHORN BRANCH,
C. P. RY., EXTENSION TO WINNIPEG BEACH.
CAPE TORMENTINE RY.
CHATEAUGUAY AND NORTHERN RY. CO.
CHATEAUGUAY RY. CO.
CUMBERLAND RY. AND COAL CO.
DAWSON CITY TO STEWART RIVER RY.
DEBERT COAL MINES RY.
DOM. ATLANTIC RY. CO.
EDMONTON, YUKON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
ELKHORN AND MOOSOMIN RY.
HALIFAX AND SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
HARVEY AND SALISBURY BRANCH RY.
HAWKESBURY, ONT., TO SOUTH INDIAN RY.
'HOT AIR' LINE RY.
INDIAN RIVER RY. AND LAKE MEGANTIC.
INGERSOLL TO STRATFORD RY.
INTERNATIONAL RY. CO. OF N.B.
INTERPROVINCIAL AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
INVERNESS RY. AND COAL CO.
JAMES BAY RY. CO.
JOGGINS RY.
JOLIETTE AND LAKE MANUAN RY.
JONQUIERES TO HA HA BAY RY.
KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.
KLONDIKE MINES RY. CO.
KOOTENAY CENTRAL RY. CO.
LAC BOUCHETTE AND QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
LAKE ST. JOHN RY. AND LA TUQUE RY. CO.
LAKE SUPERIOR, LONG LAKE AND ALBANY RY. CO. TO PENINSULA HARBOUR.
LAKE TEMISKAMING AND JAMES BAY RY. CO.
LIME RIDGE AND MEGANTIC RY.
MABOU AND GULF RY. CO.
MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RY. CO.
MATANE AND GASPE RY.
MEDICINE HAT RY.
MIDDLETON AND VICTORIA BEACH RY. CO.
MIDLAND RY. CO., TRURO BRANCH.
MONTFORT AND GATINEAU COLONISATION RY. CO.
MONTREAL AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
NEPIGON RY. CO.
NICOLA, KAMLOOPS AND SIMILKAMEEN COAL AND RY. CO.
NICOLET RIVER BRIDGE.
NOVA SCOTIA EASTERN RY. CO.
ORFORD MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
OTTAWA, NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. CO.
PARRSBORO AND SPRINGHILL RY.
PASPEBIAC TO GASPE RY.
QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.
QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.
ROBERVAL TO JAMES BAY RY.
ST. EUSTACHE TO ST. PLACIDE RY.
ST. FRANCIS RIVER (YAMASKA) RY. BRIDGE.
ST. JOHN VALLEY AND RIVER DU LOUP RY. CO.
ST. JOHN VALLEY RY. CO. AND C.P. RY. CO.
ST. MARY'S RIVER RY. CO.
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBURG RY.
ST. PHILIPPE D'ARGENTEUIL TO BROWNSBURG RY.
SEVEN ISLANDS, QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY RY.
SHEDIAC AND COAST RY. CO.
STRATHROY AND WESTERN COUNTIES RY. CO.
STURGEON FALLS PULP AND LUMBER CO.
TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.
TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY.
TIMIGAMI RY. CO. TO STURGEON FALLS.
TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL.
TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY.
TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY.

Subsidies to Railways—*Con.*
TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS RY.
WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO. RY.
WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT RY.
WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY RY.
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY.
WOODSTOCK, N.B. AND FREDERICTON RY.
WOODSTOCK RY.
YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME RY.
YAMASKA TO LOTBINIERE RY.
YORK AND CARLETON RY CO.
YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.

SUDBURY COAL, DISCOVERY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6824 (iii).

SUGAR ENTERED FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL AMOUNT 1903, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 14285 (vi).

SUGAR IMPORTED INTO CANADA 1902: M. (Mr. *Madore*) for Stmnt. *, 3236 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE, BREAKWATER, P.E.I., COMPLETION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3234 (ii).
—— BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13223 (vi).
—— COAL SHEDS: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).
—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3367 (ii), 13227 (vi).
—— WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 12828 (vi).

SUMMERVILLE, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SUNBURY, N.B., CENSUS *re* RELIGIOUS CLASSIFICATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4005 (ii).

Superior Court, Quebec: *See* 'Judges of Sup. Court'.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES: Inquiry for (Mr. *Monk*) 10832 (v).
See 'Estimates.'

SUPPLIES FOR RYS. VOTED FOR ONE ESTIMATE, TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) in Com. of Sup., 14055, 14081 (vi).

Supply B. No. 206 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 5243 (iii). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 1).
—— **No. 218** (Mr. *Fielding*) Remarks, 6170; 1°*, 2°*, 6170; in Com., 6171; 3°*, 6172 (iii). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 2).
—— **No. 241** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 8404 (iv). (*3 Edward VII, c.* 3).
—— **No. 271** (Mr. *Fielding*) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 14765; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 14768 (vi). (*3 Edward VII., c.* 4).

SUPPLY BILL, VOTE *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 5995 (iii).
—— Prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6003 (iii).
—— Remarks *re* one-fifth Vote (Mr. *Fielding*) 6408 (iii).

SUPPLY: Conc., 5238 (iii).

SUPPLY:
COMMITTEE:
Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 4432 (ii)
Archives, 4429 (ii), 13503 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Con.
Census, 4594, 4635, 4800 (ii), 7053 (iii).
Cold Storage, &c., 4671 (ii), 7610 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Exhibitions, 4599 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 4548 (ii).
Fumigating Stations, 4434 (ii), 13502 (vi).
General Statistics, 4429 (ii).
Historical Data of Acadians, 13505 (vi).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 4435 (ii), 13508 (vi).
Osaka Exhibition, 4626 (ii).
Patents, Classifying Canadian, 4433 (ii).
Toronto Exhibition, Grant, 13501 (vi).
Year Book, 4429 (ii).
Charges of Management, 12584 (v).
Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 5135 (ii).
Public Debt, Conversion of, Expenses *re*, 14253 (vi).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii), 14255 (vi).
Auditor General's Office, 224 (i).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 4349 (ii).
Finance, 226 (i).
Indian Affairs, 13760 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 5033 (ii),
Public Works, 5824 (iii).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Customs, 319 (i).
Finance, 224 (i).
Geological Survey, 12592 (v), 13769, 13966 (vi).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 207 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 12585 (v), 13772 (vi).
Indian Affairs, 272 (i).
Inland Revenue, 227 (i).
Interior, 267 (i), 13761 (vi).
Mines Branch, 13762 (vi).
Justice, 207 (i), 14255 (vi).
Labour Gazette, 7151 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, 341 (i), 13663 (vi).
Clement, Jules, &c., 13664 (vi).
Militia and Defence, 221 (i).
North-west Mounted Police, 224 (i), 13760 (vi).
Post Office:
Allowance to J. W. T. Dixon, Winnipeg, 13995 (vi).
Higman, O., Report *re* Pneumatic Tube used in U. S. &c, 13998 (vi).
Junior second-class Clerkships, Salaries, 13995 (vi).
Smith, F. H., Salary Increase, 14000 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Privy Council Office, 207 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 223 (i).
Public Works, 333, (i).
J. B. Hunter, Salary, 13499 (vi).
Chief Architect's Salary, 13498 (vi).
Railways and Canals, 333 (i), 14055 (vi).
Additional second-class clerkship, 14055, (vi).
Secretary of State, 222 (i).
Additional junior second-class clerkships, 14254 (vi).
Trade and Commerce, 7573 (iv).
Culling Timber:
General Vote, 7798 (iv).
Customs:
Amount required for Yukon, 3968 (ii).
Kilroy, T., Amount *re* Services, 13993 (vi).
Miscellaneous, 3962 (ii).
Preventive Services, 3949 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 3782, 3897, 3949 (ii), 13980 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Surveys, &c., 6758, 6939 (iii), 13776 (vi)
Dominion Lands—Income:
Commissioners' Salary, 6765 (iii).
Protection of Timber Lands, 6773 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 13772, 13966 (vi).
Travelling Expenses, Contingencies, &c., 6766 (iii).
Tree and Timber Planting, 13775, 14272 (vi).
Dominion Police:
General Vote, 3511 (ii).
Excise:
Adulteration of Food, 5389 (iii).
Further Amount for Electric Light Inspectors, 5407 (iii).
Inspectors of Distilleries, Salaries, &c., 13974 (vi.)
Methylated Spirits, 5373 (iii).
Minor Revenues, 5404 (iii).
Salaries, &c., 5363 (iii), 13967 (vi).
Stamps for Tobacco, 5373 (iii).
To reimburse E. Forrest, 5405 (iii).
To pay J. M. Ferguson, 5412 (iii).
To pay Assistant Inspector Kelly, 5405 (iii).
To compensate A. Guay for Horses, 5406 (iii).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 5373 (iii); Additional amounts, 5404 (iii).
Weights and Measures:
Salaries, 5381 (iii).
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Arbitration, 13568 (vi).
B. C., New Steamer, 5278 (iii).
Building Fishways, &c., 4174 (ii).
Canadian Fishery Exhibit, 4174 (ii), 5308 (iii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 4174 (ii) 13660 (vi).
Fisheries Intelligence Bureau, 5277 (iii).
Investigation *re* Sardine, Oyster Fisheries, Dogfish, &c., 13649 (vi).
Licenses to U. S. Fishermen, 5309 (iii).
Protection Services, B.C., 4174 (ii).
Salaries, &c., of Fishery Officers, 5050, 5122 (ii).
Steamers to replace *Acadia* and *Petrel*, 13658 (vi).
Geological Survey:
Compiling of field-notes, &c., 6826 (iii).
General Vote, 6815 (iii).
Geologist to International Boundary Survey, Salary, 6825 (iii).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 13778 (vi).
Printing, Engraving, &c., of Maps, 13778 (vi).
Government of North-west Territories:
Further Amount for Assistance in Registry Offices, 6888 (iii).
General Vote, 6946 (iii), 13787 (vi).
Lethbridge, Bridge over Belly River, 13367 (vi).
McLeod, Bridge over Old Man's River, 13367 (vi).
Government of Yukon Territory:
Checking flow of Eldorado Gusher, 6949, 7274 (iii).
General Vote, 6802 (iii), 13367 (vi).
Roads and Bridges, 7283 (iii).
St. Mary's Hospital, Dawson, 7291 (iii).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 6615 (iii).
Further Amount required, 2299 (i), 6847 (iii).
General Expenses in Can. and G. B., &c., 6658 (iii).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13785 (vi).
General Vote, 6425 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
British Columbia—*Con.*
Hazelton Hospital, 13787 (vi).
Industrial Schools, 7254 (iii).
Medical Attendance, 13785 (vi).
Schools, &c., 13786 (vi).
Steam Launch for Agent, 13787 (vi).
Generally:
Indians, Generally, 6425 (iii).
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Amount for Triennial Clothing, 13783 (vi).
General Expenses, Dr. C. H. West, &c., 13784 (vi).
General Vote, 6350, 6422 (iii).
Implements, Purchase of, 13782 (vi).
Schools, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Surveys, Additional Amount, 13784 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Schools, 6409 (iii).
New Brunswick:
Additional Amount for Salaries, 13782 (vi).
To pay Fire Damage at Edmundston, 13782 (vi).
Nova Scotia:
Medical Attendance, &c., 6421 (iii).
Purchase of Lands for Reserves, 13781 (vi).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6417 (iii).
Ontario and Quebec:
Blankets and Clothing, 6409 (iii).
Doncaster Reserve, Squatters' Improvements, 13779 (vi).
General Legal Expenses, 6416 (iii).
Land Management Fund, 6415 (iii).
Lock-up at St. Regis, 6415 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario and Quebec, 6408 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Ontario, 6326, 6409 (iii).
Medical Attendance, &c., Quebec, 6326, 6408 (iii).
Rama Indians, Repairs to Roads, 13781 (vi).
Repairs of Roads, &c., 13779 (vi).
Robinson Treaty Annuities, 6410 (iii).
Salaries of Chiefs, Cape Croker & Gibson, St. Regis, 6410 (iii).
Schools, Ont. and Que., 6409 (iii).
Surveys of Reserves, 6410 (iii).
Yukon:
Education of Indians, 7270(iii).
Relief for Destitute Indians, 7270 (iii).
Inspection of Staples:
Chief Inspectors, &c., 7762 (iv), 13698 (vi).
Inspection of Binder Twine, 7763, 7772 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act, Expenditure, 7798 (iv).
Insurance:
General Vote, 12586 (v).
Justice, Administration of:
Allowance to ad hoc Judges, 3402 (ii).
Divorce Court, N.B., 3400 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Additional to Registrar, 3407 (ii).
Admiralty, Quebec, Registrar, 3408 (ii).
Accommodation for Court, 3408 (ii).
Contingencies, &c., 3407 (ii).
Junior 2nd class Clerks, 3406 (ii).
Legal Decisions, Report of, 3407 (ii).
Expenditure under R.S.C., c. 181, 3401 (ii).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 3398 (ii), 14257 (vi).
Additional Judge of Superior Court, N.W.T., 14257 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 3401 (ii).
Retiring Allowance, Judge Henry, 14662 (vi).
Salary of County Court Judge, District No. 7, N.S., 14259 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Justice, Administration of—Con.

Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Salary of Junior Judge, Nipissing, 14258 (vi)
Travelling Allowances, Judges, B.C., 3399 (ii).
Manitoba, 3399 (ii).
Supreme Court:
Contingencies, &c., 3404 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3402, 3405 (ii).
Printing and Binding, 3405 (ii).
Reporter's Salary, 3402 (ii).
Salary of E. R. A. Taschereau, 14257 (vi).
To assist L. W. Coutlee, 'Digest of Judgments,' 14256 (vi).
Yukon:
Clerk's Salary, 3410 (ii).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 3409 (ii).
Law Books, &c., 3506 (ii), 14267 (vi).
Living Allowances, 3411 (ii).
Living Allowances, Generally, 3414 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 3507 (ii).
Salary of Deputy Sheriff, &c., 3411 (ii).
Stenographers, 3411 (ii).

Legislation:
General:
Printing Paper and Binding, 5267 (iii).
Voters' Lists, 5274 (iii).
House of Commons:
Debates, Amanuenses, 14243 (vi).
Increases to Clerks, 14112 (vi).
Sessional Clerks, 14242 (vi).
Sessional Messengers, 14243 (vi).
Tradesmen and others, 14115 (vi).
Library:
Salaries, 5267 (iii).
Senate:
General Vote, 5264 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Aids to Navigation, 4173 (ii), 5735 (iii), 13633 (vi).
Halifax Harbour, Land Purchase for Buoy Service, 13638 (vi).
Lurcher's Shoal Lightship, 4173 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Agency, &c., 13632 (vi).
Montreal Pilot Commissioners' Court, 4173 (ii).
Repairs to Wharfs, &c., 4174 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4132 (ii).
Telephonic Communication, Atkinson Lighthouse and Vancouver, 13638 (vi).
Wireless Telegraph Stations, Equipment, 13639 (vi).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and Australia, 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
Canada and G. B., 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672 (vi).
Canada and South Africa, 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 7756 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 13694 (vi).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 7742 (iv).
Halifax and Canso, 6002 (iii).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 7730 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
Manchester and Canada, 7745 (iv).
Petit de Grat and I. C. R. Terminus at Mulgrave, 14249 (vi).
P. E. I. and G. B., 7744 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 7741 (iv).
P. E. I. and Nfld., 13676 (vi).
St. John and Digby, 7739 (iv).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 7731 (iv).
St. John and Glasgow, 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7734 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Conventions—Con.
St. John, Halifax, W. I. and South America, 7740 (iv).
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, 7742 (iv).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Back Bay, &c., 7759 (iv), 13695 (vi).
Services of Str. *Lord Strathcona*, 6002 (iii), 13697 (vi).
Sydney to Bay St. Lawrence, &c., 13677 (vi).
Tadousac and St. Catharine's Bay, 13695 (vi).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7741 (iv).
Victoria and West Coast Vancouver Island, 13694 (vi).

Militia:
Annual Drill, 3603, 5005 (ii).
Contingencies, 3778 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, Further Amount, 6950 (iii).
Dominion Arsenal, 7089 (iii).
Esquimalt Defences, 3778 (ii).
General Statement, 13379 (vi).
Grants to Associations, 3767 (ii).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, Additional Land, 6949 (iii).
Military Asylum, Pensions, 6788 (iii).
Military Properties, 3611 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 3584 (ii), 13379 (vi).
Royal Military College, 3778 (ii).
Salaries and Wages, 3608 (ii).
To pay Lieut. Col. Cole, 6950 (iii).
Transport and Freight, 3752 (ii).
Winnipeg Barracks, Paving Streets, 6949 (iii).

Miscellaneous:
Alaska Boundary Commission, 6931 (iii), 13957 (vi).
Arbitration, Can., Ont. and Que., 12590 (v).
Art Academy, 12589 (v).
Astronomical Observatory, 6791 (iii).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 6790 (iii).
Can. Mining Institute, Publication of Documents, 12591 (v), 13965 (vi).
C.P.R., Transportation of Sir Edmund Barton, 6952 (iii).
Classification of Records, Privy Council Office, 12592 (v).
Engraving, &c., of Maps of Can. and N.W.T., 6800 (iii).
Keewatin Govt. Expenses, 6798 (iii).
Maintenance of Lunatics, 6798 (iii).
Labour Dept., &c., 7197 (iii).
Labour Troubles, B.C., Royal Commission, 6984 (iii).
Litigation, Costs, 6794 (iii).
Maintenance of Assay Office, Vancouver, 6799 (iii), 13963 (vi).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., Banff Park, 6788 (iii).
Bath House, &c., 13955 (vi).
Museum Building, 6927 (iii).
Martineau Defalcations, Expenses of Commission *re*, 6991 (iii).
Middleton, late T. W., *re* Shortage, 6931 (iii).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6952 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt., Protection of Bow River Bridge, Canmore, 6925 (iii).
Paris Agency, 12589 (v).
Petersen, Tate & Co., Return of Deposit, 6953 (iii).
P. O. Savings Bank, Defalcation, Compensation *re*, 14274 14655 (vi).
Prince Albert *Advocate*, Payments, 14268, 14652 (vi).
Printing Bureau Plant, 12587 (v).
Rand's Micmac Dictionary, 12592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—Con.

St. Lawrence River, Improvements *re* Thousand Islands, 14661 (vi).
South African Memorial Association, Can. Grant, 6992 (iii).
Statutes, Revision, 14643 (vi).
Teulon Road, Man., Construction, 6927 (iii).
To compensate Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, 14274 (vi).
To meet Expenses *re* the King *v.* Bank Note Co., 14279 (vi).
To pay Amos Barnes *re* River Lots, Man., 6922 (iii).
To pay Wm. Perkins for Evidence *re* Lisgar Election, 14251 (vi).
To pay Casca Trading and Transportation Co., 6926 (iii).
Trade Combination *re* Lumber, Expenses *re* Commission, 14654 (vi).
Tuberculosis, Prevention, Grant *re*, 13517 (vi).
Turtle Mountain, Land Slides, Expenses *re*, 13965 (vi).
Unforeseen Expenses, Additional, 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).
Victoria Memorial, London, England, 14655 (vi).
Yoho Park Reserve, Construction of Roads, &c., 6790 (iii).

Mounted Police:

Compensation for Injuries, 5264 (iii).
Pay of Force, 5262 (iii).
Services in Yukon, 5003 (ii), 5262 (iii).

Ocean and River Service:

Cattle Inspection, 4116 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., 4041, 5033 (ii).
Surveys, &c., of Coasts of Northern Canada, 13760 (vi).
Tidal Service, 4114 (ii).
Unforeseen Expenses, 4116 (ii).

Penitentiaries:

General, 3511 (ii).
Kingston, 3511 (ii).
Manitoba, 3534 (ii).
Regina Jail, Additional Land, 5135 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3534 (ii).

Pensions:

To Lady Lafontaine, 14252 (vi).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 6065 (iii).
Outside Service, Salaries, &c., 5924, 6004 (iii), 14010 (vi).
Salaries, &c., 6136 (iii).
Salaries of fourth-class Clerks, &c., Increase, 14002 (vi).
Salaries of P. O. Inspectors, &c., Increase, 14001 (vi).
Temporaries in various cities, Appointment as fourth-class Clerks, 14001 (vi).
To pay Arrears Postmasters' Salaries, 5921 (iii).
To provide for Appointment of Additional Mail Clerks, 14041 (vi).
To provide for Promotions in City Offices, 14009 (vi).
Transfer of Temporaries to Permanent Staff, 13994 (vi).
Vancouver Division, Asst. P. O. Inspector 14000 (vi).
Winnipeg, Additional senior second-class clerkship, 14001 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:
Ottawa:
Astronomical Observatory, 342 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, &c., 13006 (vi).
Royal Mint, 344 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 353 (i), 14243 (vi).
Harbours and Rivers:
Kingston Graving Dock, 13023 (vi).
Port Arthur, Dredging, 3341 (ii), 13012 (vi).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 3368 (ii), 13024 (vi).
Quebec, Harbour Improvements, 3336 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 5825 (iii).
St. Andrew's Rapids, 3354 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 3218, 3304 (ii).
St. Mary's Current, Montreal Harbour, &c., 3365 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Quesnel-Atlin, &c., 5826 (iii).
Trails, Roads and Bridges:
Yukon:
To pay Trading and Exploring Co., Ltd., 5826 (iii).

Public Works—Collection of Revenue:

Esquimalt Graving Dock, Special Constables, 5919 (iii).
Slides and Booms, 2974 (ii).
Gatineau River, 2977 (ii).
Repairs and Working Expenses, 2978 (ii).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Co., 2974 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 13368 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, 2989 (ii).
N.W.T., 2991 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, 2988 (ii).
SS. *Tyrian*, &c., 5007 (ii).
Yukon Territory:
Ashcroft-Dawson, &c., 2992 (ii).
Working Expenses, 14041 (vi).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:
British Columbia:
Nelson Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Rossland Armoury, 13133 (vi).
Public Building, 13131 (vi).
Vancouver, Public Building, 13132 (vi).
Generally:
Construction of Armouries, 965 (i).
Experimental Farms, New Buildings, 972 (i).
General Vote, 961 (i).
Immigrant Buildings, 14247 (vi).
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 963 (i).
Manitoba:
Winnipeg, Immigration Buildings, &c., 5844 (iii), 13126 (vi).
Military Buildings, N.C.O.'s Quarters, 13127 (vi).
Military Building, Magazine, 13127 (vi).
Military Stores Buildings, 13126 (vi).
Public Building, Addition, 13127 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Dominion Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 421 (i).
New Brunswick:
Buildings, Generally, 421 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings, 13037 (vi).
Fredericton Military Building, New Officers' Stables, 13041 (vi).
Sergeant Major's Quarters, 13041 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income :—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick—*Con.*
Marysville, Public Building, 5841 (iii).
Moncton, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Newcastle, Public Building, 13038 (vi).
Richibucto, Public Building, 412 (i).
St. John, Drill Hall, 13042 (vi).
Immigration Building, 412 (i), 13040 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Water Service, 414, 486 (i), 13041 (vi).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Improvements, &c., 13038 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury and Gun Shed, 13039 (vi).
Public Building, 13041 (vi).
North West Territories :
Court Houses, Police Accommodation, &c., 958 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 13129 (vi).
General Repairs, 958 (i).
Macleod Court House, 959 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 13130 (vi).
Prince Albert Court House, &c., 13129 (vi).
Red Deer, Court House, &c., 960 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks, 13130 (vi).
Yorkton, Court House, &c., 961 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, P. O. Fittings, 13034 (vi).
Arichat, Public Building, 5827 (iii).
Digby, Public Building, 13034 (vi).
Guysborough, Public Building, 5839 (iii).
Halifax, Immigration Building, Addition, 13033 (vi).
Public Building, 411 (i), 13031 (vi).
Quarantine Station, Lawlor's Island, 412 (i), 13030 (vi).
Middleton, Armoury, 5841 (iii).
North Sydney, Public Building, &c., 13035 (vi).
Springhill, Public Building, 14247 (vi).
Sydney, Public Building, Addition, 13035 (vi).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 13028 (vi).
Ontario :
Alexandria, Public Building, 487 (i).
Belleville, Armoury, 13082 (vi).
Bowmanville, Public Building, 507 (i).
Brantford, Drill Hall, 13108 (vi).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Clinton, Public Building, 518 (i).
Cobourg, Armoury, 540 (i).
Improvements, 13118 (vi),
Deseronto, Public Building, 5842 (iii), 13112 (vi).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 636 (i).
Fort William, Public Building, 636 (i).
Guelph, Armoury, 13083 (vi.)
Public Building, 637 (i).
Hamilton, Public Building, Alterations, 13113 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 13119 (vi).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 638 (i), 5842 (iii).
R. C. F. A. Barracks, 13118 (vi).
Royal Military College, Drill Hall, 13094 (vi.)
R. M. C. Stable, 13117 (vi).
London, Drill Hall, &c , 641 (i).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Oshawa, Public Buildings, 13110 (vi).
Ottawa, Bacteriological Laboratory, 5842 (iii).
Electric Lighting, &c., 5842 (iii).
New Coal Sheds, 13115 (vi).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income :—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Ottawa—*Con.*
New Elevator for West Block, 13115 (vi),
Paving in front of Parliament Buildings, 13119 (vi).
P. O. and Customs House, 5844 (iii), 13117 (vi).
Rideau Hall, Drains, 647 (i).
Rideau Hall and Grounds, Repairs, &c., 13087 (vi).
Steel Drawers, &c., 13087 (vi).
Western Block, Heating Apparatus, &c., 13087 (vi).
Peterborough, Armoury, 13083 (vi).
Picton, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
St. Catherines, Drill Hall, 13106 (vi).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 13109 (vi).
Sarnia, Public Building, 13117 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 13107 (vi.)
Stratford Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Toronto, Asst. Receiver-General's Office, Vault, 5842 (iii).
Custom House, 547 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Generally, 650, 956 (i).
Drill Hall, Addition for new Corps, 13086 (vi).
Drill Hall, Paving Armoury Street, &c., 13115 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Addition, 13118 (vi).
Military Buildings, Magazine, 13115 (vi).
Engineer Company's Building, 13086 (vi).
Post Office, 956, (i), 5842 (iii).
P. O., Additional, 13112 (vi).
P. O., Additional Story, &c., 13096 (vi).
P. O., Station "C", 5920 (iii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 650 (i).
Windsor, Public Building, 13113 (vi).
Wingham, Public Building, 13120 (vi).
Woodstock, Armoury, 13125 (vi).
Public Building, 13108 (vi).
Prince Edward Island :
Charlottetown, Armoury, &c., 13035 (vi).
Dom. Building, Improvements, &c., 13036 (vi).
Quebec :
Actonvale, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Dom. Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 422 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 425 (i).
L'Assomption, Public Building, 427 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 431 (i), 13053 (vi).
Longueuil, Public Building, 13069 (vi).
Magog, Public Building, 13081 (vi).
Montmagny, Public Building, 5841 (iii), 13066 (vi).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 13076 (vi).
Examining Warehouse, Repairs, &c., 438 (i), 13058 (vi).
New Postal Station, 13080 (vi).
Post-office Improvements, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 436 (i).
Quebec, Citadel, Drill Shed, &c., 13053 (vi)
Drill Hall, 13077 (vi).
Hospital for Trachoma, 14245 (vi).
Iron Foundry, 14247 (vi).
Marine and Fisheries Public Stores, 13053 (vi).
Military Buildings, Dom. Arsenal, &c., 13054 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works:—*Income*—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 13067 (vi).
Public Building, 439 (i).
St. John's, Examining Warehouse, 13069 (vi).
Public Building, 13059 (vi).
St. Louis de Mile End, Public Building, 13080 (vi).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, 13079 (vi).
Terrebonne, Public Building, 13059 (vi).
Thetford Mines, Public Buildings, 441 (i).
Three Rivers, Custom House, New Heating Apparatus, 13069 (vi).
Retaining Wall, 13080 (vi).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 443 (i).
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., Salaries, 1016 (i).
Electric Power, 1067 (i).
Heating, &c., 1065 (i).
Lighting, 1067 (i).
Rents, 989 (i), 13133 (vi).
Water, 1067 (i).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings, Rents, &c., 973, 989 (i).
Elevators, Attendance, 1011 (i).
Fuel, Light, &c., 1005 (i).
Furniture, 1006 (i), 5007 (ii).
Grounds, 1015 (i).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1008 (i).
Lighting, &c., 1012 (i), 5845 (iii).
Major's Hill Park, 1015 (i).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, &c., 993 (i), 5006 (ii).
Telephones, &c., 1013 (i).
Yukon:
White Horse, Public Building, &c., 13133 (vi).
Dredging:
British Columbia:
To replace Snag Boats, *Samson* and *Mudlark*, 13311 (vi).
Tug and Hopper Scows, 13318 (vi).
Manitoba:
New Tug, 13311 (vi).
Maritime Provinces:
Additional Amount for Dredging, 13309 (vi)
Hydraulic Dredge, 13312 (vi).
New Plant:
Generally, 2673 (ii).
Manitoba, 2672 (ii).
Mar. Provinces, 2665 (ii).
Ont. and Quebec, 2671 (ii), 13318 (vi).
Ont. and Quebec, 2674 (ii).
P.E.I., New Dredge, 13313 (vi).
Repairs, Generally, 2612 (ii).
Manitoba, 2665 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Anderson and Kennedy's Lake, Clearing Outlets, 1451 (i).
Columbia River above Golden, Pile Driver, 13304 (vi).
Above Golden, Opening Channel, 13304 (vi).
Above Revelstoke, 1451 (i).
Arrow Lakes, Dredging Machinery, 13305 (vi).
Arrow Lakes Improvements, 13304 (vi).
Fraser River Improvements, 13305 (vi).
Hardy Bay Wharf, 5916 (iii), 13305 (vi).
Quatsino City Wharf, 13305 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
British Columbia—*Con.*
Victoria Harbour, Removal of Rock, 13306 (vi).
William's Head Quarantine Station, Wharf, 13306 (vi).
Generally:
General Vote, 13308 (vi).
Manitoba:
General Repairs, 1448 (i).
Gull Harbour, 1448 (i).
Hnausa, Wharf Extension, 1448 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, &c., 1448 (i).
Lake Francis, Outlet, 1449 (i).
Lake Manitoba, Outlet *via* Fairford River, 1449 (i).
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 1450 (i).
White Mud River, Dredging, 1450 (i).
Winnipeg Lake, Gimli Wharf, 1450 (i).
Mar. Provinces:
General Repairs, &c., 1185 (i).
New Brunswick:
Anderson's Hollow, 1163 (i).
Bay du Vin, Wharf, 1164 (i).
Black Brook, Additional Wharf, 13227 (vi).
Campbellton, Wharf, &c., 1164 (i), 13005, 13229 (vi).
Campobello, Breakwater, 13228 (vi).
Cape Tormentine, Improvements, 13228 (vi).
Caraquet, Wharf, 1173 (i).
Chatham, Slip, &c., 13231 (vi).
Cocagne Wharf, Compensation *re* Schr. *Morning Star*, 13231 (vi).
Dalhousie, Harbour Improvements, 13233 (vi).
Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 13233 (vi).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 1177 (i).
Hopewell Cape Wharf, Repairs, &c., 13233 (vi).
Lord's Cove Wharf, 1177 (i).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 13234 (vi).
North Head, Grand Manan, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 13234 (vi).
Point du Chene, Breakwater, Repairs, 13235 (vi).
Richibucto, North Piers, &c., 1177 (i), 13235 (vi).
River St. John, 1177 (i).
Oromocto Wharf, 1181 (i).
Wharfs on Tidal Waters, &c., 1178 (i), 5895 (iii).
St. Andrews, Wharf Repairs, 5894 (iii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Breakwater, 1181 (i).
Protection of Fort Dufferin, 1183 (i).
Shippegan Harbour, Protection Works, 1183 (i).
Upper Salmon River, Alma Pier, 1184 (i).
North-west Territories:
General Repairs, 1450 (i).
Nova Scotia:
Abbott's Harbour, Addition to Beach Protection, 13141 (vi).
Abram's River, Wharf, 13141 (vi).
Amagandus, Wharf, 1068 (i).
Bailey's Brook, 1072 (i).
Baxter's Harbour, Reconstruction of Breakwater, 13143 (vi).
Bayfield Harbour Works, Repairs and Improvements, 13141 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Benoit Cove, Improvement to Boat Landing, 13143 (vi).
Big Harbour (Port Bevis), Wharf, 13143 (vi).
Big Pond, Wharf, 1071 (i).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 13151 (vi).
Bridgewater Dredging, 1074 (i).
Caribou Island, Causeway, 13179 (vi).
Chegoggin Pier, Training Dam, 13179 (vi).
Cheticamp Point, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
Cheverie, Breakwater Extension, 1078 (i).
Church Point, Breakwater, Repairs, 1078 (i).
Cow Bay Breakwater, 1078 (i), 13178 (vi).
Digby, Pier Renewals, 1083 (i).
Donald's Head, Breakwater Repairs, 13179 (vi).
Drumhead, Breakwater, 1083 (i), 13179 (vi).
Duncan's Cove, Wharf, 13179 (vi).
East Bay, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
East Berlin, Breakwater, 13180 (vi).
East End, Cape Sable Island, Boat Harbour, 13180 (vi).
East Jeddore, 13179 (vi).
Economy, Wharf Extension, 1087 (i).
Finlay Point, Wharf, 13181 (vi).
Five Islands Wharf, Repairs, 13180 (vi).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 1087 (i), 13181 (vi).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 13182 (vi).
Friar's Head, Boat Harbour, 1087 (i).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 13180 (vi).
Gabarus, Breakwater Extension, &c., 13182 (vi).
Georgeville Wharf, 13198 (vi).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 1087 (i).
Wharf, 13184 (vi).
Grand Etang, Bridge Works, 1095 (i).
Grand Narrows, Wharf Repairs, 1094 (i), 13198 (vi).
Grand River, Entrance, 1094 (i).
Granite Village, Mooring Pier, 13182 (vi).
Green Cove, Boat Harbour, 1100 (i).
Hall's Harbour Improvement, 13198 (vi).
Hawke Point Inlet, Boat Channel, 1102 (i).
Herring Cove, Breakwater, 1102 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf, 13199 (vi).
Inverness, Harbour Works, 13199 (vi).
Iona, Wharf, 13200 (vi).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 1102 (i).
Judique, Breakwater Repairs, 1103 (i).
Ketch Harbour, Entrance, 13202 (vi).
Kingsport, Pier Reconstruction, 1103 (i), 13202 (vi).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Larry's River, Breakwater, 1104 (i).
Lingan, Beach Protection, 1105 (i).
Livingston's Cove, Breakwater, 13200 (vi).
Lunenburg, Dredging, 1106 (i).
McKay's Point, Wharf, 13201 (vi).
McNutt's Island, Beach Protection, 13201 (vi).
Main-a-Dieu, Breakwater, 13201 (vi).
Malagawatch, Boat Channel, 13203 (vi).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 13201 (vi).
Margaree, Improvements, 1133 (i).
Margaretville, Breakwater, 13202 (vi).
Melbourne, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 1133 (i).
Middle River, Pier Dam, 13202 (vi).
Musquodoboit Harbour, Wharf, 13203 (vi).
Necum Teuch, Wharf, 1137 (i), 13203 (vi).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 1139 (i).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 1142 (i).
New Harbour, Breakwater Repairs, 1143 (i).
Noel, Wharf, 13204 (vi).
North Gut, St. Ann's Wharf, 13203 (vi).
North River, St. Ann's, 13203 (vi).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 1145 (i), 13204 (vi).
Oyster Pond, Beach Protection, 13204 (vi).
Parrsboro, Landing Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 13205 (vi).
Petit de Grat, Protection Work, &c., 1146 (i).
Pickett's Pier, 13205 (vi).
Pictou Light Beach, Protection Works, 13205 (vi).
Pleasant Bay. 13205 (vi).
Poirierville, Wharf, 1146 (i), 13205 (vi).
Porter's Lake Channel, 13205 (vi).
Port George Breakwater, 1146 (i), 13210 (vi).
Port Greville, Breakwater. 13210 (vi).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 1146 (i).
Port Hood, Harbour, 13206 (vi).
Pier Repairs, 13206 (vi).
Port Howe, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Port Latour, Breakwater, 13210 (vi).
Port Maitland, Breakwater, &c., 13211 (vi).
Port au Pique, Wharf, 13210 (vi).
Sandy Cove, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Scott's Bay, Breakwater, 13211 (vi).
Short Beach, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Skinner's Cove, Channel, &c., 13213 (vi).
South Ingonish, Wharf, 1149 (i).
Spry Bay, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Summerville, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Sydney, Quarantine Station, 13213 (vi).
Tenecape, Breakwater, 13213 (vi).
Three Fathom Harbour, Beach Protection Works, 1149 (i).
Tiverton, Breakwater, 1149 (i).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 13213 (vi).
Wallace Harbour, 13216 (vi).
Washabuck Centre, Wharf, 1150 (i).
Wedge Point, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Wentworth, Wharf, 13216 (vi).
West Arichat, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
West Baccaro, Harbour Improvements, 1150 (i).
West Bay, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
West Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
White's Cove, Breakwater, 13217 (vi).
Windsor Harbour, Sheer Dam, &c., 14248 (vi).
Wolfville, Wharf, 13217 (vi).
Yarmouth Bar, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Ontario:
Amherstburg, Dredging, 1185 (i), 13235 (vi).
Barrie, Wharf Construction, 1186 (i).
Barry's Bay, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bayfield, Extension of South Pier, 1188 (i).
Belle Rivière, Sheet Piling, 1191 (i).
Bowmanville, Breakwater Repairs, 1352 (i).
Bracebridge, Wharf, 13236 (vi).
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, 1354 (i), 13236 (vi).
Bruce Mines, Dredging, 5911 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Ontario—*Con.*

Burke's Falls, Magnetawan River, 1358 (i).
Burlington Channel, Repairs to Piers, &c., 1359 (i), 13237 (vi).
Cobourg, Completion of Repairs, 5909 (iii).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 13239 (vi).
Cumberland, Wharf, 13238 (vi).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 1359 (i), 13239 (vi).
Georgian Bay, Point au Baril Route, 1365 (i).
Goderich, Harbour, 1365 (i), 13240 (vi).
Gore's Landing, Wharf, 13244 (vi).
Grand Bend, Pier, &c., 13239 (vi).
Hawkesbury, Dredging, 5909 (iii).
Improvements, Repairs, &c., 1369 (i).
Kingsville, Breakwater, 13244 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Wharfs, 1376 (i).
Leamington, Wharf, 13246 (vi).
Little Bear Creek, Dredging, 13245 (vi).
Little Current, Channel, 13245 (vi).
Midland Harbour, Dredging, 1376 (i), 5909 (iii), 13246 (vi).
Oakville Pier, Repairs, 1376 (i).
Orillia, New Wharf, 1377 (i).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1377 (i).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 13248 (vi).
Pembroke, 13248 (vi).
Petawawa Narrows, Ottawa River, 1425 (i), 13251 (vi).
Pickering Harbour, Dredging and Repairs, 1377 (i).
Point Edward, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 13249 (vi).
Port Burwell, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Elgin, Dredging, &c., 1424 (i).
Port Hope, Pier Repairs, &c., 1425 (i).
Port Perry, Harbour, 13249 (vi).
Port Stanley, Dredging, 13249 (vi).
Prescott, Dredging, 5915 (iii).
Rivière de Puces, Pile Work, 1425 (i).
River St. Lawrence, Wolfe Island Channel, 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
Rondeau, Harbour, 1427 (i).
Rosedale, Wharf, 13249 (vi).
St. Joseph, Wharf, 3382 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour, &c., 13252 (vi.)
Southampton, Harbour Improvements, 1428 (i).
Sturgeon Falls, Wharf, 1431 (i).
Sydenham River, Improvements, &c., 13250 (vi).
Thessalon, Breakwater, 13254 (vi).
Thornbury Harbour Works, 1432 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).
Magann & Phin's Claims, 13255 (vi).
Trenton, Dredging, 1434 (i).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, 13255 (vi).
Washago Works, Repairs, 13252 (vi).
Wendover, Wharf, 1434 (i).
Wiarton Wharf, 13256 (vi).

Prince Edward Island :

Beach Point, Widening boat Channel, 13218 (vi)
Belfast Pier, Dredging, 1153 (i)
Canoe Cove Breakwater, Repairs, &c., 13218 (vi).
Cape Traverse, Carleton Head, Survey, 13218 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*

Prince Edward Island—*Con.*

Cascumpec Harbour, Closing Breach, 1153 (i).
Cove Head Harbour, Entrance Channel, 1155 (i), 13222 (vi).
Creosoted Timber for Piers, &c., 1155 (i).
Gaspereaux, Fisherman's Harbour, 155 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1159 (i), 13222 (vi)
Lewis Point Pier, Repairs, 13223 (vi).
Lower Montague, 1159 (i).
New London, Breakwater, Repairs, 1160
Improvement to Clifton and French Rivers, 13223 (vi).
North Cardigan Pier, Extension, 13223 (vi).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 13223 (vi).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1160 (i).
Richmond Bay, Reconstruction of Wharf near Grand River, 13223 (vi).
Souris, Knight's Point. Breakwater, 1162 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 13223 (vi).
Tignish Harbour, Breakwater, 1162 (i).

Quebec :

Anse aux Gascons, Wharf Extension, 13345 (vi).
Anse aux Gris Fonds River, Improvements 13445 (vi).
Anse St. Jean, Wharf Extension, 13445 (vi).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 13445 (vi).
Bois Brulé Training Pier, &c., 13448 (vi).
Bonaventure East, Breakwater, 13446 (vi).
Cacouna, Wharf Extension, 5896 (iii), 13448 (vi).
Caplan, Breakwater, 13448 (vi).
Chambord, Wharf, 13454 (vi).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements, 13454 (vi).
Crane Island, Repairs to Wharf, 1513 (i).
Cross Point, Isolated Landing Pier, 1512 (i).
Deschambault, Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Desjardins, Allumette Wharf, 13457 (vi).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii).
Douglastown, Isolated Block 13457 (vi).
Father Point, Landing Pier, 1513 (i).
Gatineau River, C.P.R. Bridge Protection 13457 (vi).
General Repairs, 5907 (iii), 2241 (i).
Grande Rivière Wharf, New Covering, 13457 (vi).
Grand Valley Pier, 1514 (i).
Hull, Wharf, 5900 (iii).
Isle aux Coudres, Wharf, 2242 (i).
Isle Grosbois, Dredging Channel, 5902 (iii).
Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 13457 (vi).
Lake Nominingue, Wharf, 13460 (vi).
Lake St. John, Wharf, Dredging, 2243 (i), 13459 (vi).
Lake Temiscamingue, Improvements, 2246 (i), 14248 (vi).
Laprairie Ice Piers, &c., 2248 (i), 13460 (vi).
Le Tableau, Wharf, 2249 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 13460 (vi).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 2257 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 2264 (i).
Maguasha, Landing Pier, 13461 (vi).
Maria, Pier, 2265 (i).
Mistook (Delisle), Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 13461 (vi).
Murray Bay, Wharf, 2266 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, 2277 (i), 13462 (vi).
New Richmond, Breakwater, 13463 (vi).
Nicolet River, Dredging, 2278 (i).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 13463 (vi).
Paspebiac, Landing Pier, 13464 (vi).
Perce, Extension Pier, North Cove, 13467 (vi).
Pierreville, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe aux Esquimaux, Wharf, 2278 (i).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Pointe Fortune, Wharf Improvements, 13468 (vi).
Point St. Pierre, Breakwater, 2278 (i).
Port Daniel, Extension Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Repentigny, Wharf, 13468 (vi).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, Tidal Basin, 13468 (vi).
River Batiscan, Channel, 2280 (i).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 2280 (i), 3208 (ii).
River Fox, Breakwater, 2279 (i).
Rivière Jesus, Dredging, 13470 (vi).
Rivière du Loup, Wharf, 2281 (i).
Harbour Improvements, 13476 (vi).
Rivière Ouelle, Pier Repairs, 13470 (vi).
River St. Francis, Ice Piers, 2282 (i).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 13473 (vi).
River St. Maurice, Dredging Eastern Entrance, 2286 (i), 5904 (iii), 13469 (vi).
Grand Piles and La Tuque, 2285 (i), 13491 (vi).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 13472 (vi).
River Touladie, Improvements, 2286 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay, Pier, 2289 (i).
St. Alphonse, Baie de Ha Ha, Wharf, 13489 (vi).
St. André Kamouraska, Pier Extension, 2290 (i), 13492 (vi).
St. Andrew's Landing, Dredging, 5907 (iii)
Ste. Anne de la Perade, Bank Protection, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction, 13489 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay, Wharf Improvements, 13488 (vi).
Ste. Anne de Sorel, Ice Piers, 13489 (vi).
Sainte Famille, Pier Extension, 13488 (vi).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 13493 (vi).
St. Francis Pier, Orleans Island, 2290 (i).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 13491 (vi).
St. Godefroi de Nouvelle, Breakwater, 13489 (vi).
St. Irene, Wharf, &c., 2291 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons, Wharf, 13494 (vi).
St. Jerome, Wharf, 2291 (i), 5909 (iii).
St. Laurent, Wharf, 5906 (iii).
St. Michel de Bellechasse, Pier Repairs, 13494 (vi).
St. Nicholas, Strengthening Pier, 5905 (iii).
St. Simon, Wharf Extension, 13493 (vi).
Sabrevois, Wharf Improvements, 13485 (vi).
Sacré Cœur, Wharf, 13476 (vi).
Seven Islands, Wharf, 13479 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Shegawake, Harbour Improvements, 13479 (vi).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 2291 (i), 3374 (ii), 5921 (iii), 12845, 12869 (vi).
Three Rivers, Harbour, Wharfs, 2296 (i).
Valleyfield, Dredging Channel in Bay, 2298 (i), 5905 (iii).
Ville Marie, Wharf, 14248 (vi).
Yamaska Lock Dredging, 13498 (vi).
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon Rivers, Improvements, 13306 (vi).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re*, 13339 (vi).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, 2747 (ii).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 2726 (ii), 13340 (vi).
Insufficient Appropriations, 2925 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 2725 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 2715, 2720 (ii).
Surveys, Ottawa River Headwaters, 13340 (vi).
Temporary and Clerical Assistance, 2753 (ii).
Transportation Commission, 13362 (vi).
Transportation Facilities, Port Colborne, 13024 (vi).
Roads and Bridges :
Bryson Bridge, 13 21 (vi).
Edmonton Bridge, 13323 (vi).
Generally, 2701 (ii).
Hull Slides and Union Bridge, 13321 (vi).
North Shore, Telegraph Line, 13322 (vi).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers Bridges, 13321 (vi).
Ottawa City and Vicinity, 2700 (ii).
Peace River to Pelly River, Pack Trail, 13323 (vi).
Portage du Fort, Bridge, 2690 (ii).
Slides and Booms :
Generally, 2690 (ii).
St. Maurice River, 2677 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
B.C., Alberni—Clayoquot, 5918 (iii).
Kamloops—Nicola, Poles, &c., 13337 (vi).
Vancouver Island—Salt Springs Extension, 13337 (vi).
Mar. Provs. :
Cable Lines, 2701 (ii).
Chatham to Tracadie, 13325 (vi).
Deer Island—Eastport, Me., 13325 (vi).
N.W.T. :
Alexander Indian Agency, Telephone Line, 5918 (iii).
Edmonton — Athabasca Landing, 13335 (vi).
Edmonton to Edmonton Indian Agency, 13334 (vi).
Victoria to Andrews, 13335 (vi).
Wood Mountain Post—Willow Bunch, 13335 (vi).
Quebec, Anticosti, Fox Bay—Bescie River, 13325 (vi).
Belle Isle and Mainland, 2712 (ii).
Bersimis to Godbout, 13332 (vi).
Bryon Island and Anticosti, 5917 (iii).
Chateau Bay—Belle Isle, Marconi, 13325 (vi).
Chicoutimi, Ste. Anne to Lac Clair, 13333 (vi).
Godbout, 2711 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Public Works—Income—Con.

Telegraph Lines—*Con.*

N.W.T—*Con.*

Island of Orleans, &c., Ste. Famille, 13330 (vi).
Magdalen Islands, Land Lines, 2714 (ii).
Murray Bay to St. Catharines Bay, Second Wire, 13326 (vi).
Petite Rivière, St. Agnes, 13334 (vi).
Ste. Anne du Saguenay—Descente des Femmes, 13331 (vi).

Quarantine :

Cattle Quarantine and Veterinary Division, 5502 (iii).
Public Health, &c., 5007 (ii), 5490 (iii).
Public Works Health Act, 4440 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 4439 (ii).

Railways and Canals :

Canals :

Chambly, Electric Station By-wash, 12906 (vi).
Land Damages, 12908 (vi).
Macadamizing Tow Path, 12906, 14151 (vi).
Cornwall, Electric Plant for Lock Gates, 14134 (vi).
Compensation for Geo. Heath, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 12895 (vi).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 14155 (vi).
Enlargement, 7565 (iii), 12898, 14150 (vi).
Galops, Enlargement, 7803, 8268 (iv), 12899, 14141, 14644 (vi)
Generally, Operating Expenses, &c., 12920, 14157 (vi).
Salaries, Contingencies, Collectors' Offices, 12933 (vi).
Sunday Service, 12929 (vi).
Grenville, 12909 (vi).
To pay Henry Tucker *re* Investigation, 14156 (vi).
Lachine, Electrical Appliances, 7806 (iv), 14142 (vi).
Enlargement, &c., 12903 (vi).
Gratuity to Family of late F. Guilbault, 14157 (vi).
Lock Gate Protection, 14142 (vi).
Paving Mill St., 14153 (vi).
Renewing Masonry of Lock No. 2, 12906 (vi).
Lake St. Francis, Protection to South Side, 14152 (vi).
Lake St. Louis, 12904 (vi).
Murray, To purchase W. H. Johnson's House, 14143 (vi).
Wire Fencing, 14150 (vi).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 7803 (iv), 12899, 14142 (vi).
St. Ours Lock, 12908 (vi).
Landing Wharfs, 12908, 14154 (vi).
Rapide Plat, 12898 (vi).
Rideau, Brasses' Point Bridge, 7808 (iv).
Concession St., Ottawa, Bridge, 14150 (vi).
Hog's Back, Swing Bridge, 12904 (vi).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, &c., 7560 (iii), 12904 (vi).
St. Lawrence Canals, Surveys, Lifting Boulders, &c., 12900 (vi).
Soulanges, Construction, &c., 7549 (iii).
To pay Geo. Goodwin *re* Contract, 14142 (vi).
To pay J. and M. O'Leary *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
To repair Breach in Bank, 14153 (vi).
Trent, Construction, 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Railways and Canals—Con.

Canals—*Con.*

Trent—*Con.*

Peterborough, &c., Entrance Piers, 14645 (vi).
Repairs and Dredging, 14645 (vi).
To pay Corry and Laverdure *re* Claim, 14651 (vi).
Welland, Deepening Long Level, 14148 (vi).
Dunnville Dam, &c., 7809 (iv).
Electric Light Plant, 12900, 14148 (vi).
Foundations for Elevator, Port Colborne, 14149 (vi).
Improvements at Port Colborne Entrance, 12902 (vi).
Improving Drainage along Feeder, 12905 (vi).
Land Damages, Grand River, 7805 (iv).
Lock Valves, &c., 12905 (vi).
Lowering Mitre Sills, &c., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
Removing Obstructions, 7804 (iv), 12902 (vi).
Rock Cut, Port Colborne to Humberstone, 14148 (vi).
Stone Protection to Banks of old Canal, 12904 (vi).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 12903 (vi).
Surveying Lands, &c., 12905 (vi).
Williamsburg, Gate Lifter, 14149 (vi).
Overseer's House, 14150 (vi).
Working Scow, 14154 (vi).

Miscellaneous :

Investigations into Ry. Accidents, 14154 (vi).
Litigation, 12911 (vi).
Ry. Commission, Salaries, &c., 14155 (vi.)
Salaries of Engineers, Draftsmen, &c., 12910 (vi).
Works not provided for, 12910 (vi).

Railways :

C.P.R., Canada Central and Brockville & Ottawa Rys., Amalgamation, 14133 (vi).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 14646 (vi).
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 12887 (vi).
Intercolonial Ry. :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 14055, 14081, 14107 (vi).
Air Brakes on Freight Cars, 7527 (iii), 8281 (iv).
Passenger Cars, &c., 8311 (iv).
Amqui, Increased Accommodation, 12601 (v).
Anchor S.S. Line, Salvage *re* "Scotia," 14107 (vi).
Chaudière Jn., Engine House, 8314 (iv), 12594 (v), 14106 (vi).
Double Tracking, 14062 (vi).
Drawbars of Freight Cars, 7520 (iii), 8288 (iv).
Eastern Extension Ry. of N.B., Award, 7528 (iii).
Arbitrators' Fees, &c., 7529 (iii).
Eel River Station, Agent's Dwelling, 12600 (v).
Ferry Service, Strait of Canso, 7525 (iii), 12602 (v), 14093 (vi).
General Vote, 12873 (vi).
Grand Narrows Bridge, Protection, 14094 (vi).
Gratuity to Mrs. W. P. Brown, 14155 (vi).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, 12597 (v), 12824, 14080 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Railways and Canals—Con.

Railways—*Con.*

Intercolonial Railway—*Con.*

Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 14646 (vi).
Lévis, Accommodation, 3703 (ii), 7520 (iii).
Little Metis Station, Improvements, &c., 12604 (v), 12827 (vi).
Metapedia, New Station, Improvements, &c., 14096 (vi).
Miramichi Bridge, South-west, 8307 (iv).
Moncton, Extension of Freight Car Shop, 8312 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, 12599 (v), 14090 (vi).
New Glasgow, Extension of Freight Shed, &c., 14095 (vi).
New Machinery for Shops, 8290 (iv), 14106 (vi).
North Sydney, Improvements, 14089 (vi).
Operating Expenses, 7811 (iv).
Original Construction, 3698 (ii).
Passenger Cars, Vestibules, 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 8317 (iv), 12827, 14088 (vi).
Pintch Gas Apparatus, 8291 (iv).
Point Tupper, Improvements, 8309 (iv).
Power Saw, for Sawing Rails, 12607 (v).
Restigouche Bridge, New Superstructure, 8303 (iv).
River du Loup, Shops, &c., 8314 (iv), 12593 (v).
Yard, 8309 (iv).
River Ouelle Branch, 7526 (iii), 12599 (v).
Rolling Stock, 8292 (iv), 14109 (vi).
Ste. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 12602 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 8315 (iv), 12596 (v), 12823, 14063 (vi).
Steel Rails, 5005 (ii), 14097 (vi).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 8296 (iv).
Strengthening Bridges, 3699 (ii), 8269 (iv).
Sydney, Accommodation, 3696 (ii), 12597 (v).
To pay M. Connolly Interest *re* Dredging, 14103 (vi).
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 12603 (v), 12823 (vi).
Windsor, New Station, &c., 14097 (vi).

Prince Edward Island Ry. :
Albany, Station and Land, 14133 (vi).
Alberton, New Station, 14132 (vi).
Blue Shank, To straighten Line, 7530 (iii), 14133 (vi).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 14131 (vi).
General Vote, 12608 (v), 12891 (vi).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 12840 (vi).
Kinkora, Increased Accomodation, 12841 (vi).
Montague Bridge, Survey, &c., 14132 (vi).
Mount Stewart, Freight House, 7530 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 7530 (iii), 7801 (iv), 12829, 14108, 14115 (vi).
Northam and Richmond, New Stations, 12841 (vi).
Steel Rails, &c., 7802 (iii).
Summerside, Wharf and Coal Sheds, 12828 (vi).
Water Service, 12841 (vi).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Scientific Institutions :
General Vote, 4118 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection :
General Vote, 4119 (ii), 13648 (vi).
Gratuity to Capt. R. M. MacGregor, 6993 (iii).
Time Ball at Halifax, 6993 (iii).
Superannuation :
To ex-lockmaster W. J. Casselman, 14272 (vi).
Trade and Commerce :
Chinese Immigration Act, 7759 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 7760 (iv).
International Customs Tariffs Bureau, 7760 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties, 7762 (iv).
Law Costs, 7795 (iv).
Unprovided Items :
Generally, 6992 (iii).

CONCURRENCE :
Fisheries, Salaries, &c., 6069 (iii).
Galops Rapid, 8374 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, Quebec, 6070 (iii).
Grand Vallee, Pier, 6070 (iii).
Post Office, Additional Amount for Outside Service, 14764 (vi).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act (jurisdiction) Amt. B. No. 22 (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*), 1° m., 283; 2° m., 2351 (i).

Supreme and Exchequer Court Act : *See* 'Judges Retiring', &c.

SUPREME COURT CONTINGENCIES, DISBURSEMENTS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3404 (ii).

—— LIBRARY, PURCHASE OF BOOKS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3402, 3405 (ii).

—— N. W. TERS., ADDITIONAL JUDGE : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

—— REGISTRAR : *See* 'Registrar'.

—— REPORTER'S SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 3402 (ii).

—— REPORTS, BINDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3405 (ii).

—— SALARY OF MR. E. R. A. TASCHEREAU : in Com. of Sup., 14257 (vi).

Surtax, German, &c. :*See* 'Curtoms Tariff Act'.

—— *See* 'Customs Act', 'Customs Tariff', &c.

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2715, 2720 (ii), 13784 (vi).

SURVEYS FOR G.T.P.RY. in Com. of Sup., 14646 (vi). *See* 'G.T.P.Ry',

SURVEYS, INSTRUMENTS, PURCHASE, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iii).

SUSSEX, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

—— CONSTRUCTION, &c., OVERSEER'S QUALIFICATIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 8331 (iv).

—— BRIGADE CAMP : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 3235 (ii).

—— ROUNDHOUSE, GATES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4672 (ii).

——STATION GROUNDS, I. C. R. : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*), in Com. of Sup., 12601 (v).

SWAMP LANDS, CONSTRUCTION OF ROAD, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

SWIM'S POINT, N. S. : WHARF EXTENSION : in Com. of Sup., 13211 (vi).

SWINEHAMMER, GEO., LIGHTKEEPER AT PEGGY'S COVE : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 2312 (i).

Swing Bridges Control: *See* 'Navigable'.

SYDENHAM RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 13250 (vi).

SYDNEY ACCOMMODATION, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 3696 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.'

SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).

Sydney (North) Harbour Act Amt. B. No. 262 (Mr. *Prfëontaine*) in Com. on Res., 12304; wthdn., 12492 (v); in Com. on Res., 12800; 1°*, of B., 12801; 2°, and in Com., 12993; 3°*, 12994 (vi). (*3 Edward VII c.* 39).

Sydney Harbour Commission Act Amt. Bill (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com. on Res. 12304; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 12306 (v).

SYDNEY, POST OFFICE, ADDITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13035 (vi).

——QUARANTINE STATION, WHARF EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

SYDNEY MINES, N.S., POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 13028 (vi).

SYDNEY, NORTH, STATION IMRROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 14089 (vi).

TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).

TARGET PRACTICES, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3772 (ii).

TARIFF BILL: *See* 'Customs Bills, 174 and 273' (i).

TARIFF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 1406; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1489 (i).

TARIFF, CHANGES, FREE LIST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 817 (i).

——MANUFACTURERS' DELEGATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Ingram*) 265 (i).

TARIFF NEGOTIATIONS WITH FRANCE: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4957 (ii).

TARIFF POLICY OF THE GOVT.: Amt. (Mr. *Tarte*) to Com. of Sup., 4843, 4875; Neg. (Y. 50; N. 102) 4955 (ii).

Debate: (Mr. *Brock*) 4880; (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 4884; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 4889; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 4901; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4908; (Mr. *Bell*) 4912; (Mr. *Gourley*) 4919; (Mr. *Johnston, C.B.*) 4921; (Mr. *Ross, Victoria*) 4926; (Mr. *Osler*) 4929; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4931; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4920, 4937; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 4943; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 4945; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4951 (ii).

——Remarks (Mr. *Tarte*) 4263 (ii).

TARIFF PROTECTION, GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) in Com. of Sup., 6684, 6707 (iii).

——PROTECTION, &C.: in Com. on Binder Twine B 233: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*), 7304-7392 (iii).

TARIFF REVISION, COR. *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Tarte*), 3003 (ii).

TARIFF TAXATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., on Immigration, 6861 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONES, in Com. on Ry. Act Amt. B., 5513 (iii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2701 (ii).

——B.C., in Com. of Sup., 2952 (ii), 5826 (iii), 13337 (vi).

——WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 13368 (vi).

——N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 2991 (ii).

——P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 13326 (vi).

——P.E.I. AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup., 2988 (ii).

——P.E.I., RES. OF BOARD OF TRADE: in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).

——QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii).

——ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5007 (ii).

——WORKING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

Telephone Companies B. No. 4 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1°*, 92; 2° m., 700 (i).

——*See* 'Railway Act'.

Telephones, &c.: *See* 'Canadian Telephone,' &c.

TELEPHONE AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Remarks in Com. on Ry. Bill (Mr. *Maclean*) 5513 (iii).

TELEPHONE COS. IN MAR. PROVS., NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2585 (ii).

TELEPHONES IN OTTAWA BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

TELEPHONE LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 291, 409 (i).

——N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 13325 (vi).

——N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

——SERVICE LONG DISTANCE IN H. OF C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 5088 (ii).

TELESCOPE FOR OTTAWA OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 6792 (iii).

TEMISCAMINGUE LAKE, REPAIRS TO WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1376 (i), 14248 (vi).
See 'Lake Temiscamingue.'

TEMPORARIES IN P.O. DEPT., TRANSFER TO PERMANENT STAFF: in Com. of Sup., 13994 (vi).

TENDERS *re* GOVT. CONTRACTS, INJUSTICE TO ENGLISH FIRMS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 8405 (iv).

TENECAPE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup. 13213 (vi).

TENTS FOR IMMIGRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6849 (iii).

TENTS FOR N.W. MOUNTED POLICE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii), 5764 (iii).

TERREBONNE, INDIAN RESERVE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 288 (i).

——POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Desjardins*) 289 (i).

——PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13059 (vi).

TEULON NORTH, CONSTRUCTION ROAD: in Com. of Sup., 6927 (iii).

Textile Fabrics Regulation and Inspection B. No. 137 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°m., 2101 (i); 2°m., 3294 (ii).

THANKSGIVING DAY ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 13790 (vi).

THESSALON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 13254 (vi).

THETFORD MINES, POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i).

THOMPSON, MR. P., 'LABOUR GAZETTE', COR., TORONTO, REMUNERATION : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 7152 (iii).

THORNBURY HARBOUR WORKS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1432 (i).

THREE FATHOM HARBOUR BEACH WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

THREE RIVERS, CUSTOM HOUSE, HEATING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13069 (vi).

——— RETAINING WALL : in Com. of Sup., 13080 (vi).

——— HARBOUR, ADDITIONAL WHARVES : in Com. of Sup., 2296 (i).

TICKET OF LEAVE ACT, RELEASE, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 566 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 96 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4114 (ii).

See 'Marine' &c.

TIES, ISSUED, PURCHASED, USED on I.C.R., &c. : M. for Ret,* (Mr. *Haggart*), 3805 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*), 1679 (i).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER, RUBUILDING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1162 (i).

TILSONBURG, LAKE ERIE AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314, 14345 (vi).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Henderson*), 14737, 14739 (vi).

TILSONBURG TO WOODSTOCK RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14511 (vi).

TIMBER AND TREE PLANTING, PROTECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 13775, 14272 (vi).

See 'Tree Planting'.

TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED TO CANE BROS. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 2757 (ii).

TIMIGAMI RY. TO STURGEON FALLS, SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14428 (vi).

TIVERTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (i).

TOBACCO AGENT, MR. DUGAS, AMTS. PAID TO : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1034 (i).

TOBACCO COMBINE, CHAIRMAN'S REP. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 1297 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 8267 (iv).

TOBACCO DUTIES COLLECTED IN 1902, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 2103 (i).

——— COLLECTED IN 1903 : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*), 12217 (v).

——— DUTY ON FOREIGN LEAF, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*), 446 (i).

——— EXCISE DUTIES, PAR. IN TORONTO 'GLOBE' *re* INCREASE : Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*), 5701 (iii).

——— STAMPS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).

TOBIN CO.'S PULP MILL : Remarks in Com. on Ry. Subsidies, 14462 (vi).

TORONTO, ADDITIONAL POSTAL STATION : in Com. of Sup., 13112 (vi).

TORONTO, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 972 (i), 13086 (vi).

——— PAVING, &c. ; in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

TORONTO ARMOURY, LETTERS *re* ENLARGEMENT : Read (Mr. *Clarke*), in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).

TORONTO BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* GRAIN STANDARDS : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*), 11177 (v).

TORONTO CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 647, 957 (i).

——— CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, APPNMTS., SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

TORONTO ELECTRIC ST. RY. CO. : Remarks *re* running rights (Mr. *Clarke*) 6083 (iii).

Toronto and Hamilton Railway Co.'s B. No. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2396 (i) ; 2°*, 2756 ; in Com., 4672 ; Order for Com., 4868 (ii), 5555, (remarks) 5882, 6198 (iii), ref. back to Sel. Com., 7812 ; in Com., 9419 ; 3°*, 9431 (iv). (*3 Edward VII*, c. 196).

TORONTO AND HAMILTON RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. 147 (Mr. *Campbell*) on M. to resume adjnd. Deb., 5882, 6198 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) *re* running rights, 6091 (iii).

Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Co.'s B. No. 203 (Mr. *Calvert*) M. to receive Pet., 4261 ; 1°*, 4727 (ii) ; 2°*, 5139 ; in Com. and 3°*, 6399 (iii) (*3 Edward VII*, c. 197).

TORONTO HARBOUR, EASTERN ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 1433 (i), 13254 (vi).

——— MAGANN AND PHIN, CLAIMS : in Com. of Sup., 13255 (vi).

——— TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT. ON HARBOUR, &c. : M. for Stmnt * (Mr. *Grant*). 534, 1203 (i).

TORONTO INDUSTRIAL EXHIBITION, GOVT. AID TO : in Com. of Sup., 13501 (vi).

TORONTO ISLAND, DAMAGE BY STORMS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5589 (iii).

TORONTO AND JAMES BAY RY. SUBSIDY : Remarks (Mr. *Brock*) 14358, 14443 (vi).

TORONTO LABOUR COUNCIL AND TEL. *re* MECHANICS FROM ENG. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1854 (i).

See 'Can. Foundry Co.' &c.

TORONTO, LINDSAY AND PEMBROKE RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14314 (vi).

TORONTO, MILITARY BUILDINGS FOR MAGAZINE : in Com. of Sup., 13115 (vi).

——— STOREHOUSES : in Com. of Sup., 13086 (vi).

——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5842 (iii).

——— ADDITIONAL STORY : in Com. of Sup., 13096 (vi).

——— BRANCH OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 5920 (iii).

——— ENLARGEMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).

——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 956 (i).

——— PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYEES, DELAY IN PAYMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5588 (iii).

TORONTO JUNCTION POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 650 (i).

TOULADIE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 2286 (i).

"TOWNSEND" VALVE, *re* LOCK GATES, WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
TRACADIE, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 543 (i).
——— LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 4439 (ii), 13038 (vi).
TRACHOMA, EPIDEMIC *re* IMMIGRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 5493 (iii).
——— HOSPITAL IN QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 14245
——— IMMIGRANTS, MEDICAL INSPECTION, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6662, 6695, 6843 (iii).
TRACKMEN'S INCREASE OF WAGES, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 1297 (i).
——— INCREASE OF SALARIES : Remarks (Mr. *Lefurgey*) in Com. on B. 257, 12558 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— INCREASE OF WAGES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12874, 14083 (vi).
TRADE COMBINATIONS, INVESTIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14654 (vi).
See 'Lumber.'
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
TRADESMEN'S ACCOUNTS FOR H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 14115 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE :

ALLAN'S CONTRACT *re* ATLANTIC SERVICE, DISCRIMINATING RATES *re* CAN. FREIGHT : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 13674 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS.'
ALLAN LINE STEAMSHIPS WITHDRAWN FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, ALLAN'S CONTRACT : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 13672 (vi).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Hfx.*) 7091 (iii).
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, WITHDRAWAL OF ALLAN STEAMERS FROM ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) 13937, 14064 (vi).
See 'C.P.R.'
ATLANTIC FAST SERVICE, GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4007 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) for Stmnt., 4445 (ii).
——— PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) to Com. of Sup., 14158 (vi).
———Remarks *re* Amt. to Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 13948 (vi).
——— TENDERS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3882, 4120 (ii).
AUSTRALIA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).
BINDER TWINE, BOUNTIES, &c. : Ques. of Order (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*) 7305 (iii).
BINDER TWINE, CIRCULAR ISSUED *re* SALES : Ques. (Mr. *Léonard*) 4180 (ii).
BINDER TWINE INSPECTION, ADMINISTRATION OF, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF INSPECTOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 4959 (ii), 5588 (iii).
——— METHODS OF COLLECTING PENALTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 14684 (vi).
——— QUANTITY IMPORTED FROM U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 7565 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. *Douglas*) to conc. in Rep. on Agriculture, &c. 13788 (vi).
See general heading.
CAN. AND AUSTRALIA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii), 13677 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

CAN. AND G. B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7728 (iv).
See 'G. B. and Can.'
CAN. AND S. AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
C.P.R. STEAMERS LEAVING ST. JOHN : Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. of Sup., 14076 (vi).
See 'Allan'
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN PARIS, COR., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1297 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 7760 (iv).
——— DUTIES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Thomson, Grey*) 4360 (ii).
DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 92 (i).
DEPTL. VOTE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7759 (iv).
FAST MAIL LINE :
See 'Atlantic.'
FRANCE AND CANADA SS. SERVICE : Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4957 (ii).
See 'Ocean Steamship Subsidies Bill.'
FREIGHTS ON OCEAN VESSELS : *See* 'Freight Rates.'
FREIGHT RATES BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) in Com. of Sup., 7582 (iv).
———PROVISION IN CONTRACT *re* DISCRIMINATION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
FURNESS-WITHY CO.'S SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
GASPÉ AND DALHOUSIE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7756 (iv).
GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
GRAND MANAN AND MAINLAND AND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
G B. AND CAN. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 7573, 7728 (iv).
G.B. AND CANADA SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
See 'Atlantic Fast SS. Service,' &c.
HALIFAX AND CANSO MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iii).
HALIFAX AND LIVERPOOL *via* NFLD, MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv).
HAYCOCK, JOS., APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : Ques. (Messrs *Wilson* and *Taylor*) 4959 (ii).
———APPNMT. AS INSPECTOR OF BINDER TWINE : in Com. of Sup. 7763, 7772 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 5588 (iii).
HIDES INSPECTIONS, TEL. FROM W. F. MACLEAN, M. P. : Read (Mr. *Sproule*), 3969 (ii).
HIDES INSPECTOR AT QUEBEC, GEO. ROY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3627 (ii).
HIDES, TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 7748 (iv), 13678 (vi).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS SS. SUBVENTION : i n Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv), 13675 (vi).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 5878, 5997 (iii), 7573, 7728 (iv), 13672, 14249 (vi).
MANCHESTER AND MONTREAL SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup.. 7745 (iv).
PARIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE :
See 'Chamber of Commerce.'
PASPEBIAC AND GASPÉ BASIN SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S DEPOSIT CHEQUE : in Com. of Sup., 6953 (iii).
PETIT DE GRAT AND I.C.R. TERMINUS AT MULGRAVE, SS. SUBVENTION : in Con. of Sup.; 14249 (vi).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. AND G.B. MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 6001 (iii), 7744 (iv).
P.E.I. AND MAINLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
P.E.I. AND NEWFOUNDLAND SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13676 (vi).
ST. CATHERINE'S BAY AND TADOUSAC SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
ST. JOHN AND BELFAST SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7731 (iv).
———AND DIGBY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7739 (iv).
———AND GLASGOW SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7730 (iv), 13673 (vi).
———AND HALIFAX SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7742 (iv).
———AND LONDON SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7734 (iv).
ST. JOHN AND W. INDIES SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7740 (iv).
ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE AND FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7584 (iv).
See 'Marine,' etc.
ST. STEPHEN AND BACK BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7759 (iv).
S. AFRICA AND CAN. SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 5878 (iii), 7746 (iv).
SYDNEY AND BAY ST. LAWRENCE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13677 (vi).
TADOUSAC AND ST. CATHERINE'S BAY SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13695 (vi).
TRADE COMMISSIONER IN LONDON, ENG. : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) 3497 (ii).
'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' RATE OF SPEED, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).
VICTORIA, B. C., AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 7741 (iv).
TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
TRAFFIC IN N. W. T., BLOCKADE, &c. : Remarks (Mr *Scott*) on M. for Sup., 2424 (i).
TRAFFIC RATES, I. C. R. : Inquiry for Papers (Mr *Bell*) 3712 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.'
TRANS-CANADA RY. CO., APPLICATION TO GOVT. FOR SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1026 (i).
TRANS-CANADA RY. AND G. T. PACIFIC, PAR. IN TORONTO 'NEWS' *re* SALE : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 7566 (iv).
——— CONTRACT WITH GOVT., &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2759 (ii) ; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 2794 (ii).
——— M. for Cor (Mr. *Tarte*) 672 (i).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.', &c.
Transcontinental Ry. B. No. 235, 1°m, 7658 (iv).
———Ques. of Order (Mr. *Sproule*) 7726 (iv).
———AND SIR WILLIAM MULOCK'S SPEECH : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 367 (i).
——— DECLARATIONS BY MINISTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2308 (i).
———GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5765 (iii).
———PROPOSALS TO GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 874 (i).
——— REPRESENTATIONS *re* MILITARY PURPOSES : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*), 541 (i).
See 'G. T. Pacific.'
R
TRANSLATION OF PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 545 (i).
TRANSLATORS OF DEBATES, RENTAL OF OFFICES : Ques. (Mr. *Blain*), 3799 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 2311 (i).
TRANSPORT AND FREIGHT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES : in Com. of Sup., 3752 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AND TARIFF INQUIRY, PAR. IN MONTREAL "HERALD" : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 853 (1).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, APPNMT. OF CHAIRMAN : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 9582 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, &c., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS : Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 5137 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 1199 (i), 3129, 4840 (ii), 9819 (iv).
——— APPNMT. OF SIR WM. VANHORNE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 7297 (iii).
——— DISCUSSION OF *re* SOREL WHARF : Remarks (Mr *Brock*), in Com. of Sup., 12849 (vi).
——— EXPENDITURE *re* : in Com. of Sup., 13362 (vi).
———FORMATION, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9819 (iv).
———FURTHER ARRANGEMENTS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 9458 (iv).
———INSTRUCTIONS, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4120 (ii).
———MEETINGS, BUSINESS TRANSACTED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*), 13027 (vi).
———O. C. *re* APPNMTS. : M. for Copies (Mr. *Tarte*), 1324 (i).
———PERSONNEL, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 4727 (ii), 7206 (iii).
———SIR WM. VANHORNE'S VIEWS *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Barker*), 8330 (iv).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, GOVT. POLICY *re*, on M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3432 (ii).
Debate : (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*), 3438 ; (Mr. *Sproule*), 3442 ; (Mr. *Haggart*), 3444 ; (Mr. *Tarte*), 3451 ; (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 3456 ; (Mr. *Charlton*), 3459 ; (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*), Irregularity of debate, 3470, 3499 ; (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3471 ; (Mr. *Oliver*), 3479 ; (Mr. *Bickerdike*), 3483 ; (Mr. *Kemp*), 3486 ; (Mr. *Osler*), 3490 ; (Mr. *Pringle*), 3493 ; (Mr. *Bell*), 3497 ; (Mr. *Clare*), 3505 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES, PORT COLBORNE : in Com. of Sup., 13024 (vi).
——— *re* ST. LAWRENCE, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
TRANSPORTATION FROM THE N.W.T. : *See* 'Ry. Traffic', &c.
TRANSPORTATION POLICY *re* SPEECH FROM THRONE : Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*), 6404 (iii).
TRAP NETS IN GULF ST. LAWRENCE, PET. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*), 2917 (ii).
TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY, *re* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4840 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*), to Com. of Sup., 2796; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 95), 2914; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*), 2826; (Mr. *Pringle*) 2842; (Mr. *Blair*) 2863; (Mr. *Porter*) 2873; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2880; (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 2887; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2898; (Mr. *Barker*) 2906; (Mr. *Osler*) 2912 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 4486; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 88) 4546 (ii).

Debate: (Sir *William Mulock*) 4499; (Mr. *Monk*) 4505; (Mr *Borden, Hfx.*) 4509; (Mr. *Blair*) 4513; (Mr. *Tarte*) 4522; (Mr. *Northrup*) 4525; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 4533; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4536; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4541; (Mr. *Davis*) 4544 (ii).

TREADGOLD COMMISSION, APPNMT., &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).

———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1224 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).

——— APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*), 3864 (ii).

——— CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*), 6803 (iii).

——— ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. OF JUS., 2798 (ii).

———FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).

——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 3397 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioner (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 13134, 13258 (vi).

——— INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).

——— LETTER FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, 2818 (ii).

——— LETTER FROM HON. J. H. ROSS *re* LIB. CONVENTION, 2817 (ii).

——— LETTER TO SENATOR WOOD FROM HOLME, MILLER & CO., 2807 (ii).

——— LIBERAL ASSO'CN, PET., 2821 (ii).

——— LIB. PLATFORM, CONVENTION, 2842 (ii).

——— PLEDGES OF HON. J. H. ROSS, 2843 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', QUOTATIONS, &C., 2804 (ii).

——— 'MORNING SUN', REPS. OF DAWSON CITY MEETING, 2808 (ii).

——— NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4727 (ii).

——— PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).

——— PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, (iii).

——— PET. BY YUKON CITIZENS TO GOV. GEN., 2798 (ii).

——— PRINGLE, MR., Speech at Bonanza, 2822 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii), 7927 (iv).

——— RESOLUTIONS OF DAWSON CITIZENS' MEETING 1902, 2810 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, RESOLUTIONS *re* LIBERAL CONVENTION, 2815 (ii).

——— SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).

——— TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS IN "HARPERS WEEKLY", 2849 (ii).

——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).

——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).

——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9818 (iv).

——— Remarks *re* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9979 (iv).

TREADGOLD EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).

TREADGOLD, HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*), 288 (i).

TREASURY BOARD: *See* 'Auditor General.'

TREE CULTURE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iii).

TREE PLANTING: in Com. of Sup., 13775 (vi).
See 'Timber.'

TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 7551 (iii), 14645 (vi).

———EMPLOYMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8117 (iv).

———HASTINGS AND TRENTON, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*), 129 (i).

———MESSRS. CORRY & LAVERDURE, INTEREST *re* ARBRITATION: in Com. of Sup., 14651 (vi).

———PAYMENT TO THOS. DODDS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*), 8118 (iv).

———PETERBOROUGH ENTRANCE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 14645 (vi).

———REP. OF W. MCLEOD, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*), 12716 (vi).

———ROSEDALE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13249 (vi).

———SPECIFICATIONS, REPS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ward*), for Copies, 2313 (i).

TRENTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).

TROIS PISTOLES BRIDGE TO MACKENZIE AND RENOUF FALLS, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14462 (vi).

TROTTIER, LOUIS M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*), 8488 (iv).

TRURO TO PARRSBOROUGH, RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Gourley*), in Com. on Ry. Res., 14491 (vi).

TRURO STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 12603 (v).

Trust Co.: *See* 'Royal Trust.'

Trust Corporation: *See* 'Consolidated.'

Trust Funds, Moosonee Diocese B. No. 148 (Mr. *Osler*), 1°*, 2396 (i); 2°*, 2720; in Com., and 3°*, 3795 (ii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 157).

TUBERCULOSIS, AID TO CAN. ASSOCIATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13517 (vi).

TUCKER, HENRY, PAYMENT *re* INVESTIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 14156 (vi).

'TUNISIAN' AND 'BAVARIAN,' STRS., RATE OF SPEED, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13672 (vi).

TURNPIKE TRUST, MONTREAL, INDEBTEDNESS, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Monk*) 672 (i).

TURTLE MOUNTAIN LAND SLIDE, INVESTIGATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 13965 (vi).
See 'Frank.'

TWO-CENT FARE CLAUSE, G. T. RY., REPEAL OF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 11828 (v).
——— Amt. in Com. on B. 235, 12221 (v).
See 'Ry. B. 21.'

TWO MOUNTAINS DISTRICT, RAILWAY FACILITIES: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Ethier*) 7567 (iv).

TYERMAN, P. D., PAYMENTS TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 286 (i).

UNFORESEEN EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iii), 12588 (v).

United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 163 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2956; in Com., 3796, 3983; 3°*, 3984 (ii). (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 198).

U. S. COASTING LAWS, BONDING PRIVILEGES, &c., REGULATIONS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 13135 (vi).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 12714 (vi).

U. S. IMMIGRATION OFFICERS, NEWPORT VT., TREATMENT OF ENGLISH DELEGATES: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 12495 (v).

U. S. INDEMNITY TO FISHERMEN, COR. &c.: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor.*, 3236 (ii).

U. S. INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS *re* CUSTOMS MANIFEST AND POSTAGE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 5664 (iii).

UNPROVIDED ITEMS: in Com. of Sup., 6993 (iii).

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT CO.: in Com. of Sup., 2974 (ii).

UPPER SALMON RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

VACANCIES IN ELECTORAL DISTRICTS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

VALIQUETTE, MR. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 4005 (ii).

VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5905 (iii).
——— ELECTION: *See* 'Beauharnois.'
——— LABOUR STRIKE, PAYMENT OF MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 13371 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE, ERECTION, PURCHASE OF SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 98 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 443 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, TENDERS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 11187 (v).
——— STRIKE, PAY OF MEN, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586, 3753 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 2759 (ii).

Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Railway Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Macpherson*) 1°*, 1111; 2°*, 1328 (i); in Com., 4587; in Com., and 3°*, 4672 (ii) (3 *Edward VII*, *c.* 199).

Vancouver Harbour, Lands B. No. 76 (Mr. *Macpherson* 1°*, 872; 2°*, 1026 (i).

VANCOUVER ISLAND TO SALT SPRINGS ISLAND TELEPHONE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13337 (vi).

VANCOUVER POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 13131 (vi).
——— P.O., INSPECTOR, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 14000 (vi).

VANKLEEK HILL POSTAL SERVICE, COMPLAINTS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) on conc., 14764 (vi).

VEGETABLES IMPORTED FROM U.S., DUTY COLLECTED AT TORONTO AND MONTREAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1058 (i).
See 'Market'.

VENIOT, P.I., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT BATHURST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 3629 (ii).

VENTILATION IN H. OF C.: in Com. of Sup., 488, 975 (i).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) in Com. of Sup., 13006 (vi).
——— FANS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 4362 (ii), 6406 (iii).

VESTIBULE EQUIPMENT FOR I.C.R. CARS: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iii), 12600 (v).

VETERANS, CANADIAN, PET. *re* MILITARY SERVICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 11188 (v).

VETERINARY, CHIEF INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1591 (i).

VETERINARY DIVISION, QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5502 (iii).

VICTORIA BRIDGE, MONTREAL, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. *Monk*) 706 (i).

VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO S.S. SUBVENTION: in Com of Sup., 7741 (iv).

VICTORIA, B.C. AND VANCOUVER ISLAND, SS SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 13694 (vi).

VICTORIA GEOLOGICAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i), 14243 (vi).
See 'Public Works, &c.'

VICTORIA MEMORIAL, LONDON, CONTRIBUTION OF CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 14655 (vi).

VICTORIA, N.W.T. TO ANDREWS, TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).

VICTORIA, N.S., BEACH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13213 (vi).

VILLE MARIE WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).

VISITORS IN H. OF C. CORRIDORS: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Lennox*) 11427, 11557 (v).

VOLUNTEERS OF MAN. AND N.W.T., LAND SCRIP, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 820 (i).

VOTERS' LISTS, CONTINGENT EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (iii).
See 'Electoral Lists.'

VOWELL, MR., INDIAN SUPT., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 13785 (vi).

WABY, INDIAN PRISONER, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iii).

WADSWORTH, MR., INDIAN INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iii).

WAGNER, D. J., SALARY INCREASE: Remarks (Mr. *Fowler*) in Com. of Sup., 14256 (vi).

WALKERVILLE BRIDGE CO., SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14509 (vi).

WALLACEBURG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 505 (i).

WALLACE, DAVID WARDROPE, MEMBER FOR ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF RUSSELL: Introduced, 1642 (i).
WALLACE HARBOUR, N.S., FERRY LANDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WALPOLE CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).
WALPOLE ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iii).
WALTHAM STATION TO FERGUSON POINT, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14448 (vi).
WASHABUCK CENTRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WASHINGTON, MR. HECTOR, REP. *re* LAND VALUES: Remarks *re* in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
WATER SUPPLY FOR DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
WATER SUPPLY ON C. P. R. TRANSCONTINENTAL TRAINS: Remarks (Mr. *Wright*) 9455 (iv).
WATSON, JOHN, PRES. OF LIB. ASSOCIATION, NESBITT, MAN: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1195 (i).
WAYS AND MEANS: German Surtax in Com. on B. 273, 14755 (vi).
——— Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 89, 1378 (i).
——— Financial Statement, 1378 (i).
——— DEBATE: *See* 'Budget'
WEDGE POINT, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WEEKLY PUBLICATIONS, 'JESSE JAMES' SERIES, CUSTOMS DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 11426 (v).
Weigh Masters Bill: *See* 'General Inspection.'
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°m, 203; 2°m., 2338 (i), 3245 (ii).
——— **(scales) Amt. B. No. 188** (Mr. *Bernier*) 1°*, 3708; 2°*, 4009; in Com., 4009, 4187; 3°*, 4203 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 72).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES INSPECTORS: Salaries in Com. of Sup., 5381 (iii).
WELLAND CANAL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv).
——— DRAINAGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 14148 (vi).
——— ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 12900 (vi).
——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7805 (iv).
——— LOCK TENDERS, SALARIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 12921 (vi).
——— LOWERING MITRE SILLS: in Com. of Sup., 7804 (iv), 14149 (vi).
——— ROCK CUT: *See* 'Colborne.'
——— STONE PROTECTION WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 12904 (vi).
——— SURVEYS *re* GOVT. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 12905 (vi).
——— WATER POWER, O. Cs. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1859 (i).
——— WATER POWER, REP. OF BOARD OF TRADE OF ST. CATHARINES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 668 (i).
WELLINGTON TO UNION BAY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14491 (vi).
WENDOVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1434 (i).
WENTWORTH, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13216 (vi).
WEST BACCARO, BOAT HARBOUR CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (i).
WEST BAY, N.S., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WEST, DR., MEDICAL INSPECTOR OF INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 13784 (vi).
Western Alberta Railway Co.'s B. No. 205 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 5238; 2°*, 5362; in Com., and 3°*, 6657 (iii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 200).
Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 244 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 8406; 2°*, 8559 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 10903 (v), (3 *Edward VII, c.* 201).
Western Canada Mortgage, &c. Bill: See 'Canada Permanent.'
WEST LORNE RY. ACCIDENT, COMMISSION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clarke) 6168 (iii).
——— JURY'S VERDICT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3231 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on Adjmnt., 4726 (ii).
——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5088 (ii), 5242 (iii).
Westminster Bridge Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 249 (Mr. *Morrison*) M. to receive Pet., 10489 1°, 10744; 2°*, 10903 (v).
WEST POINT, U.S.: Remarks (Col. *Hughes*) in Com. of Sup., 13095 (vi).
WHARFS, &c., BUILDING BY GOVT.: Remarks in Com of Sup., 13143, 13449 (vi).
WHARF CONNECTIONS AND RY. SUBSIDIES BY GOVT Remarks in Com. on Ry. Res., 14463 (vi).
WHARFS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4174 (ii).
——— PRIVATE, GOVT. EXPENDITURE, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1352-1377 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
WHEAT, BLOCKADE IN N.W.T.; *See* 'Ry. Traffic,' 11425 (v).
——— EXPORT FREIGHT RATES PER HUNDRED POUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 11188, 11425 (v).
——— FREIGHT RATES, RES. OF MORDEN BOARD OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Stewart*) 12074 (v).
——— SHIPMENTS FROM PORT ARTHUR AND FT. WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 284 (i).
———Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 542 (i).
See 'Grain,' &c.
WHITBY PUBLIC BUILDING: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13111 (vi).
WHITE, ALBERT S., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*), 4673 (ii).
WHITE'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WHITE, MR., EXPENSES *re* IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6732, 6853 (iii).
WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
WHITE, MR., INLAND REVENUE, PRESCOTT: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13970 (vi).

WHITE MUD RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WHITNEY PIER, N.S., SALARY OF POSTMASTER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*), 130, 668 (i).
WIALLARD, PAUL, EMPLYMT, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*), 11188 (v).
WILLIAMSBURG CANALS, APPNMT. of SUPT., &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*), in Com. of Sup., 12927 (vi).
——— COLLECTOR'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 12934 (vi).
——— GATE LIFTER: in Com. of Sup., 14149 (vi).
——— OVERSEER'S HOUSE; in Com. of Sup., 14150 (vi).
——— WORKING SCOW: in Com. of Sup., 14154 (vi).
See 'Galop'.
WILLIAM'S HEAD, B. C., QUARANTINE STATION WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).
WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 13228 (vi).
Wilson, Stephen, Relief B. No. 228 (Mr. *Wade*), 1°*, 7922; 2°*, 8264; M. for Com., 9149; in Com., and 3°*, 9152 (iv). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 202).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Costigan*), 1°*, 367; 2° m., 630, 664 (i).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, N.S., SHEER DAM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14248 (vi).
WINDSOR JUNCTION ACCIDENT, I. C. R, EVIDENCE *re*: Remark (Mr. *Clarke*), 3301, 3398, 3496, 3712 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S, NEW STATION, RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 14097 (vi).
WINDSOR, ONT., CUSTOMS PORT OF ENTRY, SALARIES, &C.; Remarks in Com. of Sup.. 3907 (ii).
WINDSOR, ONT., POST OFFICE, LETTER BOXES: in Com. of Sup., 13113 (vi).
WINGHAM, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13120 (vi).
Winnipeg Bank: *See* 'Bank of Winnipeg'. &c.
WINNIPEG BARRACKS, STREET PAVING: in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iii).
WINNIPEG BEACH TO ICELANDIC RIVER RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14338 (vi).
Winnipeg City Water Power Bill: *See* 'Assiniboine River'.
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS AND POSTAL STATION: in Com. of Sup., 13126, (vi).
——— LAND OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iii).
——— MILITARY MAGAZINE: in Com. of Sup., 13127 (vi).
——— MILITARY STORES: in Com. of Sup., 13126 (vi).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 438 (1), 13127 (vi).
——— P.O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 14001 (vi).
——— P.O., REVENUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 666 (i).
Winnipeg Western Land Corporation Co.'s Limited B. No. 61 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°* 707; 2°*, 977 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2720 (ii) (3 *Edward VII, c.* 204).
WINNIPEGOSIS, CHANNEL DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1450 (i).
WINTER COMMUNICATION BY STR. 'STANLEY', P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 4006 (ii).
———M. for Copies of Pets., &c., (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).
———CONSTRUCTION OF STR.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett* 6895 (iii).
———COR. WITH GOVT.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1036 (i).
———M. for Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 2765 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.,' &c.
WIRE FENCING, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup. 14150 (vi).
See 'Canals,' &c.
WIRELESS STATIONS ON MARINE COASTS: in Com. of Sup., 13639 (vi).
See 'Marconi,' &c.
WOLFE ISLAND, DREDGING SHOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1427 (i), 13252 (vi).
WOLFVILLE, N.S., WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 13217 (vi).
WOOD ALCOHOL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5373 (iii).
——— MANUFACTURE IN CANADA, OUTPUT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 98 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 227 (i).
See 'Standard,' &c.
WOODS, J. W., RENTAL OF BUILDINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
——— TENDER FOR TENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3804 (ii).
———Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 5764 (iii).
Woodmen of the World, Can. Order B. No. 31 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 367; 2°*, 632; in Com., 1854; 3°*, 1854 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 206).
WOOD MOUNTAIN POST, TEL. SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 13335 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, N. B. AND FREDERICTON RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14342 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, N. B., ARMOURY AND GUN SHED: in Com. of Sup., 13039 (vi).
———DRILL SHED, PURCHASE OF SITE: M. (Mr. *Hale*) for Cor.,* 3236 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4563 (ii), 5735 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. *Borden Hfx.*) 4593 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Hale*) 705 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 672 (i).
WOODSTOCK, N. B. TO U.S. BOUNDARY, RY. SUBSIDY: in Com. on Res., 14322 (vi).
WOODSTOCK, ONT., ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 13125 (vi).
———PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13041, 13108 (vi).
Woolf Valve Gear Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 161 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2582; 2°*, 2756 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5560 (iii). (3 *Edward VII, c.* 205).
WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12873 (vi).
———P. E. I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 12891 (vi).

WRECKING PLANT, STR. 'LORD STRATHCONA,' MAINTENANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iii), 13697 (vi).

WRECKS, INVESTIGATION *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).

——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13524, 13514 (vi). *See* 'Marine.'

WRIGHT, MR. A. W., AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 8116 (iv).

YAMASKA LOCK, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13498 (vi).

YAMASKA TO LOTBINIÈRE, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14318 (vi).

YAMASKA RIVER AND ST. GUILLAUME, RY. SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14486 (vi).

YARMOUTH, N.S., BAR, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 13218 (vi).

'YEAR BOOK' : in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

YOHO PARK, ROAD CONSTRUCTION, &C : in Com. of Sup., 6790 (iii).

YORK AND CARLETON RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14488 (vi).

YORKTON COURT HOUSE, in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).

YUKON, COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

YUKON, EDMONTON AND PACIFIC RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : in Com. on Res., 14341 (vi).

Yukon Territory Act (Jurors) Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°m., 94 ; 2°*, 313 ; in Com., 313 ; 3°*, 314 (i). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 73).

Yukon Ter. Act (Court of Appeal) Amt. B. No. 254 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* 1°m., 11692 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 12301 (v). (3 *Edward VII*, c. 74).

YUKON :

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : In Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

ADMINISTRATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 13367 (vi).

BRITTON, JUDGE, CHARGES *re* INVESTIGATION OF TREADGOLD COMMISSION, PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Monk*), 11065 (v).

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).

CLERKS, &C., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

COMPENSATION TO CAN. BANK OF COMMERCE : in Com. of Sup., 14274 (vi).

COURTS, PURCHASE OF LAW BOOKS : in Com. of Sup., 3506 (ii).

CUSTOMS EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 3968 (ii).

DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re* TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks (Mr *Borden, Halifax*), 1024 (i).

DAWSON TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

DISTRICT NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

DOM. LAND REGULATIONS: in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

DUGAS, JUDGE, REFUND TO DEPT. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

EILBECK, SHERIFF, FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

——— SALARY, LIVING ALLOWANCE, FEES, &C. : in Com., of Sup., 3414 (ii).

ELDORADO GUSHER, EXPENDITURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6949, 7275 (iii).

GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DAWSON CITY, DEFALCATIONS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

GOVTL. EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 6802, 6949 (iii), 13367 (vi).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

YUKON—*Con.*

HOSPITAL GRANTS : in Com. of Sup., 7291 (iii).

HYDRAULIC LEASES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*), 1323 (i).

INDIANS, GENERAL EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 7272 (iii).

——— RELIEF, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 7270 (ii i).

JUDGES' LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

——— TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3409 (ii).

——— LAW LIBRARY : in Com. of Sup., 14267 (vi).

LEWES AND YUKON RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 13306 (vi).

LITHGOW, MR., CONTROLLER : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iii).

MIDDLETON, T. W., GOLD COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE, DEFALCATION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iii).

MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5262 (iii).

NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT. : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Monk*), 706 (i).

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

OFFICIALS, LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3509 (ii).

POLICE MAGISTRATES, LIVING ALLOWANCES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

POST OFFICE DEFICIT : Remarks (Sir *William Mulock*), in Com. of Sup., 14014 (vi).

PUBLIC WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 13133, 13306 (vi).

REGULATIONS *re* DOM. LANDS, APPROVAL, &C. : in Com. on Res., 13791 (vi).

ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 5826, 7283 (iii).

SHERIFFS, CLERKS, &C. SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3410 (ii).

SHERIFFS FEES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3507 (ii).

——— LIVING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 3414 (ii).

STENOGRAPHERS, APPNMT. OF J. A. VALIQUETTE : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*), 4005 (ii).

——— SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).

SUPPLIES, PURCHASE, &C. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6930 (iii).

TAYLOR, GEO. L., POLICE MAGISTRATE, YUKON, SALARY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3415 (ii).

TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 2992 (ii).

——— MANAGEMENT, &C., PAR. IN 'POST INTELLIGENCER' *re* : Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 7003 (iii).

——— WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 14041 (vi).

TELEGRAPH OPERATORS, SALARIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3418, 3509 (ii).

TRADING AND EXPLORING COMPANY'S EXPENSES *re* YUKON TRAIL : in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

TREADGOLD AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, INQUIRY *re* : (Mr. *Borden, Hjx.*) 4840 (ii).

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4960 (ii).

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) to Com. of Sup., 2796 ; Neg. (Y. 52 ; N. 95) 2912 ; (Amt.) 2826 (ii).

——— Letter from Dawson Board of Trade, 2818 (ii).

——— Letter from Hon. J. H. Ross *re* Liberal Convention, 2817 (ii).

——— Letter to Senator Wood from Holme, Miller & Co., 2807 (ii).

——— Liberal Association, Pet., 2821 (ii).

——— Liberal Platform, Convention, 2842 (ii).

——— Pledges of Hon. J. H. Ross, 2843 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Quotations, &c., 2804 (ii).

——— '*Morning Sun*' Reps., Dawson City Meeting, 2808 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &c., Amt. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 4486 (ii).
———APPNMT. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3298, 3303, 3713 (ii).
———APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3864 (ii).
———APPNMT. &C.: Notification (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5137 (iii).
———AND DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE, MEMORIAL *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 1024 (i).
———CORRECTED ANSWER (Mr. *Sifton*) 6803 (iii).
———ENGINEER'S REP. TO MIN. of JUS., 2798 (ii).
———EXHIBITS, GLASGOW EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 4612 (ii).
———FREE REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 5990 (iii).
——— FREE REPRESENTATIONS: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6427 (iii).
———HYDRAULIC LEASES, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell*) 288 (i).
———O. Cs. &C.: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Ross, Yukon*).
———Inquiry for Papers (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 3397 (ii).
———Inquiry for Rep. of Commissioners (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 13134, 13258 (vi).
———INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120, 4564 (ii), 5242 (iii).
———Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 5243 (iii).
———NAMES OF COMMISSIONERS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*), 4727 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2424 (i).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS, &C., O. C. 12th June 1901, 2800 (ii).
———O. C. 7th Dec. 1901, 2801 (ii).
———O. C. 21st April, 1902, 2803 (ii).
———PAR. IN DAWSON NEWSPAPERS *re* EVIDENCE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 11064 (v).
———PERSONNEL: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638, 7297 (iii).
———REPRESENTATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 6638 (iii).
———SEC. 14, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.* 4593 (ii).
——— TEL. FROM DAWSON BOARD OF TRADE *re* PETS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 1195 (i).
——— TEL. FROM BOARD OF TRADE, DAWSON: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 8085 (iv).
——— TEL. FROM W. A. BEDDOE *re* COMMISSIONER'S REFUSAL TO PRODUCE FILES: Read (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 9618, 9979 (iv).
———TAPPAN ABNEY'S REMARKS "IN HARPERS' WEEKLY," 2849 (ii).
VALIQUETTE, MR. J. A., APPNMT. AS STENOGRAPHER IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5005 (ii).
WHITE HORSE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 13133 (vi).
YUKON ITEMS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 13500 (vi).

Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Canadian Yukon'.
Yukon Ry.: *See* 'Coast'.

ERRATA.

Bazinet, Mr.
Joliette and Lake Manuan Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 654; 2°*, 977; in Com. and 3°*, 2050 (i).

Blain, Mr.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Blair, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5144 for 5139 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5149 for 5145 (iii).

Clarke, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5141 for 5139 (iii).

Davis, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5148 for 5145 (iii).

Fielding, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5151 for 5147 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Fowler, Mr.
Supply—Public Works, Buildings, Ottawa (census building) read 992 for 982 (i).

Haggart, Mr.
Bonding Privileges with U.S., read 12757 for 12751 (vi).

Heyd, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 5152 (iii).

Ingram, Mr.
Dorchester Penitentiary, read 10102 for 10101 (v).

Kemp, Mr.
Supply—Pub. Works, Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Wendover wharf) read 1439 (i), and delete 1439 for Que. Harbour Improvements.

LaRivière, Mr.
Private Bills, read 5138 for 5137 (iii).

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid.
Blankets, &c., read 10102 for 10101 (v).
Private Bills, read 5139 for 5137 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 64, in Com., read 5139 for 5138 (iii).

Murray, Mr.
G. T. Pacific Ry. B. 235, read 10111 for 1011.

SUBJECTS.

Page clxii first line for "Census Buildings" read "Census, Cost," &c.